OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT

1-2 GEORGE V., 1910-11

VOL. CII

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DAY OF APRIL TO THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DAY OF JULY, INCLUSIVE



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

House of Commons Debates

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, April 27, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. HUGHES.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In the Ottawa 'Free Press' and I understand in some other papers of recent date there appears an item, trival it is true, but still more or less important, to the effect that I had apologized to the legal gentleman in the city of Montreal who had defended the prisoner in the recent Masonic trial in that city. I thought I was very fair to that gentleman in explaining to the House, and the country that he had not appealed on his own account to religious fanaticism in order to defend the prisoner. I think I went much further than I might have been expected to do. He explained, as I stated to the House, that his object in referring to religious fanaticism in the trial to show that the prisoner had no intent to commit robbery for the sake of robbery itself, but was carried away by the spirit of fanaticism characteristic of all religious fanatics. I made no apology to any one. I merely recited the statement in fairplay to the gentleman who conducted the defence on that occasion. The object of the barrister was to show that the prisoner was carried away with fanaticism, and had no intention to rob. That was the reason why he brought it in. The fanaticism was admitted as regards the prisoner, but not on the part of the lawyer further than to explain that the prisoner had no intent to commit robbery for his own advantage.

CHARGES AGAINST MR. A. LANCTOT, M.P.

Mr. W. M. GERMAN, (Welland). Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to move that the third report of the Select Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections be now concurred in. Before submitting the motion, it is perhaps advisable that I should as shortly as possible explain to the House my views in regard to the evidence that was taken before that committee. The committee had several meetings, and examined a number of witnesses, and were aided in their investigations by counsel employed for the gentleman who made the charge, and for the gentleman against whom the charge was made. Speaking for myself, I wish to say that the committee were very considerably aided by the intelligent manner in which those gentlemen conducted their respective sides of the case. They both showed themselves to be keen examiners, good lawyers, and very correct in their mode of conducting proceedings of this kind. The charge is a very serious one, in so far as a member of this House is concerned. That charge is as follows:

That in the course of the years 1908, 1909 and 1910, irregularities, abuses, frauds, malversations and robberies have been committed in the shops and stores of the government of Canada at St. Joseph de Sorel and in the city of Sorel, in the electoral district of Richelieu.

That barrels and tins of paint and other goods of this nature have been illegally and fraudulently taken and carried away from the said stores and shops and transported to the house of Mr. Adelard Lanctot, then and now a member of the House of Commons of Canada, for the electoral district of Richelieu, which house was then being built on George street, at Sorel above mentioned, and ready to be painted.

That with these goods and paint, paint works, decoration and varnish works, have been done by the employees of the government of Canada under the supervision of the painters' foreman employed by said government at the said place, at the government's expense and during the hours supposed to be devoted to the government and for which said employees were paid by the government, these men registering each day as if they had really worked for the government, and this during weeks and months; the materials and time, thus furnished, are valued at about one thousand or twelve hundred dollars.

That said goods were so fraudulently appropriated to, and said work so fraudulently done at the expense of the government of Canada for the benefit of the said Adelard Lanctot, then and now a member of the House as aforesaid, with his knowledge, assent and approval, the said Adelard Lanctot abusively and fraudulently profiting at the

public expense and to the public detriment by his position as member of the House.

Now, that appears to me to be a very serious charge made against an hon. member of this House, and before the House comes to the conclusion that the hon. member for Richelieu is to be condemned on a charge so serious, it seems to me that the evidence, and all the evidence taken, should be very carefully weighed and very fairly considered. On the day the charge was given utterance to in the House, Mr. Lanctot, the member for Richelieu, made a statement in which he said that in 1910, in consequence of the serious illness of Mrs. Lanctot, his wife, who was away at a health resort, it was necessary for him to be considerably away from home, and it was—I think he used the word 'impossible' —at any rate, he was unable to get painters in Sorel to paint his house, and he, therefore, spoke to Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé, who was foreman of the painters in the government yards at Sorel, to know if he could let him have the men to paint the house, and would look after the painting of the House. Mr. Pagé lived across the street from the building which Mr. Lanctot was having painted. Mr. Pagé told him that he would be glad to do it, the expression he used being 'with pleasure, if you can get the permission of Mr. Papineau' who was the director or superintendent of the government shipyard at Sorel. The men were permitted to go and work on Mr. Lanctot's house. Mr. Lanctot said that he had on different occasions asked to have an account of the men's time and the paint that was supplied sent to him so that he could from time to time pay the men's wages, but Mr. Champagne who was the timekeeper at the government yards, and who kept the time of the men, told him to wait until the work was all completed, and then he would send in a full account of the whole work, and it could be paid in one lump sum. I apprehend, if that is the true condition of affairs, that no person inside or outside this House will condemn Mr. Lanctot for having fraudulently, or with intention of fraud, used the employees of the government, or government material for the painting of his house. It is simply a question as to whether that statement is true or untrue, as to whether or not the evidence which was adduced before the committee bears out the statement of Mr. Lanctot.

In the first place, it is alleged that he could have procured men in Sorel to do the work and that it was not necessary for him to go to the government yard to secure employees to do it. The evidence on that particular point is not voluminous. There were only three witnesses called, and the first witness called was Mr. Henry Proulx, a contractor in Sorel. He makes the statement that there were four painting contractors in Sorel who could have done this work for Mr. Lanctot. His evidence will be found on page 48 of the printed evidence. But, he says this:

I do not know that they would have had the time to do the work.

So that his evidence as to that is more guesswork than anything else. He says that there are four painting contractors there who might have been got to do the work, but he does not know if they would have had the time. Of these four only two are called. A Mr. Georges Cartier, a painter is called, and Auguste Payette, a painter, is also called, two out of the four contractors whom Mr. Proulx said were able to do the work. Why the other two were not called I cannot understand because I may say that the committee gave every possible opportunity to the learned counsel, Mr. McDougall, who is a very able lawyer, evidently well accustomed to conduct a case of this nature, and well accustomed to conducting cases of any nature as he showed himself to be an expert cross-examiner, and an expert conductor of the case. But yet, he only calls two of these witnesses. What does Cartier say:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What page?

Mr. GERMAN. Mr. Cartier's evidence will be found on pages 29-36. He says that in the month of November, 1909, almost a year before Mr. Lanctot's house was ready for the painter, he met Mr. Lanctot and asked him about doing the painting. He says that he asked for the job of painting the house and that Mr. Lanctot said he would not give the job without seeing him, but that he did not see him again. This was in November, prior to the July or August when the painting work began. Mr. Cartier, in his cross-examination, admits that during the year 1910 he was busy with other jobs of painting, that he had work to do. He went to the city of Montreal to do certain work, his time was occupied, and on cross-examination he had to admit that the painting work which he had done in Sorel had not been satisfactory to, at any rate, some of his customers. It was very evident from his own statement that he was not a man whom any person would be willing to trust with the responsibility of looking after work of that kind, particularly when the owner of the work and the man who wanted the work done would not be present himself. I think, therefore, that Mr. Cartier's evidence is not such as should impress the members of this House with the idea that he could have done the work, and done it with satisfaction. Mr. Augustin Payette gives his evidence at page 120, and he says that one evening in March, 1910, he met Mr. Lanc-

tot on the street about nine o'clock and said to him:

You won't forget me for the painting.

And that Mr. Lanctot said:

I will think it over.

Nothing was further said. These were the only two men who were called to even say that they could have done the work. Mr. Payette, on cross-examination, also showed very clearly that he was not a man of that standing as a painter, or as a contracting painter, whom a person would be willing to trust to do a good piece of work such as this was supposed to be. These are the only two witnesses, and this the only evidence to controvert the proposition of Mr. Lanctot, that he could not get men in Sorel during the months of July, August and September, when he wanted the painting done. I cannot imagine that any person with the feelings of fairness will say that Mr. Lanctot was overstepping the mark when he made the statement that he could not get men in Sorel during those months to do his painting.

That being the case he goes to the government yards. In May, 1910, between the 15th and 30th, he had a conversation with Mr. Pagé—acquaintances, it is sure, and no doubt, friends. He met Mr. Pagé and asked him if he could overlook the painting and lend men to him from the government yards. Mr. Pagé says:

Yes, if you will get the consent of Mr. Papineau, the director.

About the 29th of May—the evidence is the 29th, but it was evidently the 28th as the 29th was on a Sunday—he went to the government shipyards to see Mr. Papineau. Upon going there he saw Mr. Champagne, and he saw Mr. Pagé. He asked one of them to see Mr. Papineau and see if Mr. Papineau would consent to allow the men to work on the house. They found, and it is proved clearly now, that Mr. Papineau was away from Sorel. Mr. Papineau says that he left Sorel early in the morning of the 28th, went to Montreal where he stayed until Monday afternoon, attending some fête or church entertainment that was being held in Montreal on Sunday. It is very clear that Mr. Papineau was not in Sorel on Saturday the 28th of May or on Sunday the 29th of May. But, he did see Mr. Champagne. Mr. Champagne is the timekeeper, and would be the man that one would naturally be inclined to speak to with regard to a matter of this kind particularly when Mr. Papineau was away. Mr. Champagne said:

Yes, we can let you have the men.

And Mr. Lanctot said:

Keep an account of their time and I will pay you for the men's time.

On that day, or a day or two previous, he is not sure which, he had a conversation with Mr. Pagé, the foreman painter, about the supply of paint, and he told Mr. Pagé to get the paint required from time to time from the firm known as Cyrille Labelle & Co., of Sorel, with which firm, Mr. Lanctot said, he had an account. Mr. Pagé said to Mr. Lanctot: They may not have the paint you will require. It was then arranged that if they had not the paint in stock which was required, Mr. Pagé was to lend the paint from the government store, was to keep an accurate account of the paint used; and Mr. Lanctot would pay for the paint after the completion of the job. That is all there was about the transaction so far as Mr. Lanctot was concerned. He was very seldom in Sorel during that summer; he was back and forth from time to time, but not very frequently. He saw that the work was going on, and that Mr. Pagé was looking after it. That being the case, and if that is all there was to the matter, surely there was no fraud and there was no indiscretion on the part of Mr. Lanctot. He went to these men to borrow the men required; the foreman consented to allow the use of the men; they were to keep an accurate account of the time of the men and of the supplies, and all were to be paid for. That, to my mind, is exactly what happened.

It is contended that the accounts were falsified, that certain men worked on Mr. Lanctot's house for a longer period of time than was charged for in the accounts. One Alfred Douaire, a painter, states in his evidence that he worked on Mr. Lanctot's house for eight weeks, during July, August, September and October. He kept no account or record of the time, and it will be noticed that in his declaration read to the House when the charge was made, he does not state that he worked eight weeks or any specified time. But he says in his evidence that on his conscience he worked eight weeks during the period referred to. He is down in the account which was filed as exhibit No. 2, for only 15 days' work at $2 a day—and there is no dispute about the daily wages which are admitted to have been the correct wages the government paid the men. Now, it is contended that Alfred Douaire's evidence on that point is to be accepted, that he worked eight weeks instead of 15 days. Mr. Pagé says that he kept the time of every man from day to day. It was not shown that he has any personal interest in the matter. When he was first spoken to about it, he told Mr. Lanctot he would be willing that the men should go there if Mr. Lanctot got the approval of Mr. Papineau. He was to keep

the time of the men, and he swears he kept the time of the men and kept it accurately. He had his time book, which was produced before the committee shown as exhibit 23. That book was criticised most carefully. He was cross-examined at great length by Mr. McDougall on his time book. Every opportunity was given to show inaccuracies or falsification; and, after a thorough examination by Mr. McDougall of Mr. Pagé and his time book, the book was shown to be in every particular absolutely accurate—no suspicion of falsification in the book. He kept the time from day to day, and each week he supplied Mr. Champagne, the time-keeper, with a sheet showing the time of the men as he had kept it. These sheets were kept by Mr. Champagne until the work was completed and the account sent to Mr. Lanctot was made up from these sheets and from Mr. Pagé's time-book. Now, it is asked that the statement of Mr. Douaire should be accepted in preference to the statement of Mr. Pagé, that we are to believe that Mr. Douaire worked eight weeks and that, instead of keeping an account of eight weeks' time in his book, Mr. Pagé deliberately and fraudulently failed to keep account of Douaire's time, and in that way defrauded the government. I do not quite see how any person of fair mind can possible reach such a conclusion. It can be easily imagined that Mr. Douaire is mistaken. He is not working continuously for the government. His evidence in that particular shows that for many days, and for weeks at a time, he was not working for the government but was laid off. It can easily be imagined that Mr. Douaire, in that matter, was mistaken. But we cannot reject the statement of Mr. Pagé without at the same time holding him responsible for perjury, for he deliberately says: There is my book; I kept the time from day to day; I marked it down each day in that book. He cannot be mistaken; either his statement is correct or he is deliberately perjuring himself. I will ask any hon. member which of these men he is prepared to believe. Are you going to say that the evidence of Mr. Douaire, who worked from time to time and who kept no record of his time—does not pretend that he did; admits that he did not—is to be taken against the evidence of Mr. Pagé, who did keep the time and kept it correctly. I should hardly think so; I should hardly think that any jury or any court would say that Mr. Douaire's evidence was to be accepted and that of Mr. Pagé rejected. The only man besides Mr. Douaire who says that he worked for a greater number of days than is shown by the time-book kept by Mr. Pagé is Mr. Louis Paul. There is a peculiarity in regard to Mr. Louis Paul's statement. At page 61 of the evidence is given exhibit No. 14, in which Mr. Paul states that he worked 30 days or one month. It is shown in the evidence by Henri Proulx, who is called as a witness, that Louis Paul gave him this statement in which he says:

I declare that I have worked at Mr. Lanctot's house for one month, paid for at the government.

On the time-book, Mr. Louis Paul is down as having worked 20 days at $2 a day. When that statement was placed before the committee I unhesitatingly, and with the approval of all the members of the committee, ruled that the statement was not evidence, it was only marked for identification, with the expectation that Mr. Louis Paul would be called as a witness to verify the statement himself. I submit that that statement should not have been offered as an exhibit in this evidence, and it should not be considered, because it is certainly not evidence of any kind. There was no opportunity to cross-examine Louis Paul, this is his bald statement, not even made to the committee, but given to an outsider who is called as a witness. He says he worked thirty days, and even applying the same rule that you apply to Mr. Douaire and Mr. Pagé, where does it land us? Supposing Louis Paul had been there and made that statement; 'I worked for thirty days,' he kept no accurate account of it, he kept no account of any kind. Mr. Pagé did keep an account, and says he kept it correctly. I submit that the evidence of Mr. Pagé, on these matters should be accepted, rather than the evidence of Douaire, or the evidence of Louis Paul, even though that evidence were admissible, which it is not. Those are the only two witnesses called who say they worked a longer time than is shown in the time-book kept by Pagé. Well it appears to me that the committee would be doing a wrong thing to doubt the evidence of Pagé, who appears to be an eminently respectable man, and a highly intelligent man, who was not shown to be in any way personally connected with the matter, who states frankly, and above board, what his connection with the matter was, with an apparent desire to tell the truth, apparently having been desirous of keeping a correct account of the time of all these men. I say we should not place the statements of these men who kept no time as against the statement by Mr. Pagé, and as I say, those are the only two who were called, the only evidence there is of any time having been worked which was not charged for.

But it is said that the work did not cost nearly as much to Mr. Lanctot as it was

worth, and that that is evidence that the men's time has not been fully accounted for, and that all the material which went into the painting of the house had not been charged for by the government and paid for by Mr. Lanctot. Now, what is the position with regard to that? We find that Mr. Lanctot paid the government for 217 days painting on his house. There were about four days of ordinary labourers, who were not working on the painting work, which made it a little more than that; but the labour on the painting came to $367.59. Now, Mr. Douaire, the star witness of the gentleman who made this charge, himself admits, at page 36, that 216 days' work was all that was necessary to do the painting of that house, and 217 days work was paid for by Mr. Lanctot at the prices paid by the government, and Mr. Douaire says that 216 days' work is what he calculated. Now, we find there is $367.52 for labourers on the painting. An account was kept of all the paint that was supplied, and Mr. Pagé tells us what was done. He says that he mixed the paints himself. When he found that paint could not be obtained from Labelle & Company, at Sorel, he mixed the quantity of paint to be used on Mr. Lanctot's house, and set it apart for that use and for none other. The whole of that paint was not used, but the whole of it amounted, in value, to $81.60. As soon as that account came in to Mr. Lanctot after the work was completed, he paid the money. Mr. Papineau replaced the paint, having purchased it from the same people, I presume, the government buy their supplies from; Mr. Papineau purchased the paint at $81.60, and Mr. Lanctot paid him the money. Then there was $18.95, an account with Labelle & Company, for paints, and there was an account of $25 with Mr. Joseph Rivet for painting blinds, windows, &c., making a total of $493.07 for the painting. Now, we are reminded that Mr. Douaire says that the painting should have been worth $950, but he calculates in the $950, about 20 per cent of a profit. Another witness says about $1,200, but they all admit that 217 days is the requisite number of days to do the painting, and then it is a question of what the paint itself was worth.

Now, to establish that with accuracy, three witnesses are called who give their evidence in regard to that matter at pages 201, 204, and 215 of the evidence. The first witness is Mr. Trudeau, manager of the painting department of Henry Morgan & Company, of Montreal. He has occupied that position for 11 years, is an experienced man in painting work. He went to Mr. Lanctot's and measured the house, took the number of cubic yards in the house which had been painted, and can speak with accuracy. These men who gave their evidence as to the cost of painting did not measure the house, they all admit that they did not measure the house, and they are speaking from guess. Mr. Trudeau went there and measured the house, and he put the number of yards at 685, and he puts the value of the painting done $491.38, as against $493 which it actually cost. Then we have at page 204, Mr. Joseph Dagenais, sworn. He lives at Montreal, he is a painter and contractor, and has been a painter for 16 years. He went to Mr. Lanctot's and made a measurement of the number of yards of painting that was done, and he put the value of the work at $502.71. Here I wish to distinguish between the cost and the value, because all these men say that in estimating the value they add a profit of 10 to 15 per cent; he puts the value of the work done at $502.71, and he measured accurately the number of yards of painting, and indeed went there for the purpose of making a statement of the value of the work. Then at page 215, we have the statement of Mr. Joseph Edmond Gauthier, of 354 Champlain street, Montreal, manager for the painting department of Castle & Sons, Montreal.

He has had many years experience at painting work. He went to Sorel, measured the house, took the number of yards of paint work and he puts the value at $461. There are three men of experience, none of them having the slightest interest in this matter, one way or the other, all leading business men of Montreal, and is there any person who will be bold enough to say that these men will come here and deliberately perjure themselves for the sake of satisfying the desires of Mr. Lanctot or any one else. They are experienced men, they went there to make the measurements, they did make them, they speak with authority, and that is the statement they give. Two of them are below the amount it cost Mr. Lanctot and one of them is only $4 or $5 above that amount. Remember they are including in that the contractor's profit as well as the cost of the work. So I say that when Mr. Lanctot made his statement in the House or in the committee, that he thought the work was costing him more than it should have done, he was speaking by the book. I cannot apprehend that any one will feel that the work cost Mr. Lanctot actually less than it should have cost. When you have got that far you have got just as far as the evidence will carry you in regard to those particulars. In the first place was the time of the men, employees of the government, who worked on Mr. Lanctot's house, fully and completely paid for? The evidence is overwhelming

that it was. There cannot be any evidence shown to the contrary excepting by the merest possible partisan suspicion. The fact remains that men who knew, unprejudiced and unbiassed, swore to the records as being a truthful record of the situation. The men's time was paid for fully. The paint supplied by the government was returned in full and that being so, every element of fraud in regard to the matter is removed and disposed of. Whether or not it was advisable for the foreman of the yards to allow the government employees to work on Mr. Lanctot's house or on any person else's house, is another question altogether with which the committee have nothing to do, and that was settled very emphatically at the first meeting of the committee. A question was then suggested by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) as to whether or not we were going further than to investigate the simple charge against Mr. Lanctot; and the hon. member for East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) who attended all the meetings of the committee, stated then, with the approval of all the committee, that it was the charge against Mr. Lanctot that was to be investigated, only and solely, and that is the one which was investigated. Of course if Mr. Lanctot had been shown to have been guilty of any wrong-doing less than the serious charge made, I suppose it would have been the duty of the committee to so find. For instance, if a man is indicted for murder, and the jury can only find him guilty of manslaughter, it is their duty to find him guilty of manslaughter, but we certainly cannot find any evidence to establish any suspicion of fraud or wrong-doing on the part of Mr. Lanctot in connection with this matter.

But they try to go further. They say that fraud was shown. One of the contentions of Mr. McDougall was that there was a conspiracy between Mr. Lanctot, Champagne and Pagé to defraud the government. You could hardly have a conspiracy to defraud when no fraud was attempted, intended or perpetrated. Mr. Lanctot secured the men and it is said that certain of the men's time which was kept by Pagé was marked against them in the government time-books, they not being present. That happens to be the case. Mr. Lanctot's house is in Sorel. The shipyard is in what is known as St. Joseph de Sorel, across the river. Most of these men live in Sorel. In order to have their time properly marked in the government books they would have to cross the river three times a day, record their time of leaving and then go back to Sorel. In order to avoid the necessity of doing that, and to save them the expense of crossing the ferry, Mr. Pagé instructed one of the men to keep the time of these men as though they were present themselves. Whatever may be said in regard to the management of that particular branch of the department, I submit we have here nothing to say or do unless it is shown that Mr. Lanctot was a party to that, and that it was being perpetrated for the purpose of permitting a crime against the government. It is absolutely certain that no matter what Pagé did in regard to that, or what Champagne thought, Mr. Lanctot knew nothing about it. He states and the evidence shows that he supposed the time was being properly kept and charged against him, and him only, that it was not being paid for by the government and that he frequently, during the whole course of this work, was asking Champagne for the account and was anxious and willing to pay for the work. But Champagne explains it, and says that he did not want to mix matters up, and thought it better for himself and the men that the time should be kept as other government time, and then when the whole work was completed the time would be sent in to Mr. Lanctot, and he would pay the bill. Then they say the time of the men was sent in to the department as though the men were doing work on government work whereas they were working on Mr. Lanctot's house. That is a matter which must be conceded. The evidence shows that the men working from day to day on Mr. Lanctot's house were being put down as working those days on government work or at least not as on Mr. Lanctot's house, and they must have been put down as doing government work, because they were paid from time to time by the government. But that was a thing with which Champagne had exclusively to do, with which Mr. Lanctot had nothing to do. Mr. Lanctot tells us that his desire was continuously to pay the men as the work was going on. Champagne, for purposes of his own which he explained in his evidence, did this without the knowledge of Mr. Lanctot, without any information to Mr. Lanctot that he was doing it, without knowledge on the part of Mr. Lanctot that it was being done. So far as Mr. Lanctot was concerned, he was under the impression that the work was being charged to him, and to him directly, and that when the work was completed the bill would be sent in.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did Mr. Lanctot understand that he was making this compact or arrangement with the men or with the department?

Mr. GERMAN. With the men through Mr. Champagne and Mr. Pagé. The evidence shows clearly what happened, and we cannot go outside the record. The evidence shows that Mr. Lanctot went to the yards, having first spoken to Pagé about being able to secure the men. He went to

the yeards to see Papineau, to get the consent of Papineau, he got the consent of Champagne, and Mr. Lanctot that day left Sorel, and was not back for several weeks, and was there for only a little time in the summer; Champagne and Pagé were the men exclusively and solely responsible for the sending of the employees and the providing of the paint.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am merely asking for information. Might I be permitted one more question? Did the officials understand it in the same way as Mr. Lanctot?

Mr. GERMAN. Does my hon. friend mean Champagne and Pagé?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I mean the men who made this arrangement—did they understand it in the same way that Mr. Lanctot understood it, according to my hon. friend's apprehension?

Mr. GERMAN. As to how the men understood it there is no evidence at all.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not the men, but the managers, the foremen.

Mr. GERMAN. Champagne and Pagé understood it just as Mr. Lanctot understood it. They understood that the time of the men was to be kept and that Mr. Lanctot was to pay the men when the work was completed. Mr. Champagne, of course, understood that these men were being paid at that time by the government, but outside of Mr. Champagne there was no other official of the government who knew how the men were being paid. Mr. Pagé did not know; he kept the time and returned it to Mr. Champagne as being time for work done on Mr. Lanctot's house. Mr. Champagne, instead of sending in these accounts day by day or week by week to Mr. Lanctot, and having Mr. Lanctot pay the accounts, sent in the time to the government, and had it paid by the government, as if those men were doing ordinary government work, and kept it against Mr. Lanctot, and Mr. Lanctot paid it at the end.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The reason I asked was this: If the officials understood it in the same way Mr. Lanctot understood it, according to my hon. friend's view, I do not see why the government had anything to do with paying the men at all.

Mr. GERMAN. Mr. Champagne explains that in his evidence where he says that he did not want to pay the men himself, as they might think that he was getting more money than they were getting, and so he sent in the bill to the department, and the men were paid by the department. As to the propriety of Mr. Champagne doing that, I have nothing to say, and I do not know that this House, on this particular question at this time, has anything to say; that will be for the minister to ascertain later on. But at any rate, Mr. Lanctot knew nothing about that. Mr. Champagne knew the men were being paid by the government; he explains why he was doing it that way and claims that he believes he was acting properly. Whether he was or not is another matter, but Mr. Lanctot knew nothing about it, and Mr. Pagé knew nothing about it.

Mr. TALYOR (Leeds). Lanctot knew he was not paying the men.

Mr. GERMAN. Lanctot knew the account was being kept and that the account would be rendered to him as soon as the work was completed, and that was done, and the money was paid by Lanctot, as soon as the work was completed. There was some evidence as to the men being instructed to carry paint in a roundabout way from the shipyards to Mr. Lanctot's house so as to avoid being seen by the merchants in Sorel, and by Mr. Papineau, the director, but that is a class of evidence that did not impress me, and I do not think it impressed the committee, as being of any great weight, if any weight at all, because it is absurd to suppose that these men would receive instructions to avoid Mr. Papineau when it is known that Mr. Papineau lived within a few feet of Mr. Lanctot's house, and directly on the same street. The whole evidence, Mr. Speaker, is divulged in what I have stated. There are two or three men down on exhibit No. 2 as having done some day work—it seemed that Mr. Lanctot wanted a large telephone pole which was in front of his house and which was an incumbrance, removed, and the superintendent of the Bell Telephone Company said he could not get any men, but that if Mr. Lanctot would supply the men he would have the pole removed; which clearly demonstrates that even day labourers were not very easy to get in Sorel at that time. Mr. Lanctot had two or three men from the government yards help remove the pole, and their pay for a day and a half was paid by him. There is no doubt, and there is no dispute of the fact, that outside of Alfred Douaire and Louis Paul every man who worked on Lanctot's house was paid in full. As to that there can be no dispute. The only two men as to whom there is a suggestion that there was not complete payment is Alfred Douaire and Louis Paul, and I have stated what the evidence is in regard to these two. The rest of the account is correct and will be admitted by every member of the committee. Now, was all the paint that was taken from the government yards and used on Mr. Lanctot's house carefully and accurately returned?

Mr. PORTER. What about the paint that was spoiled and not used?

Mr. GERMAN. I will come to that in a moment. The only evidence as to the quantity of paint that was prepared and taken to Mr. Lanctot's house is the evidence of Mr. Pagé, and he is the only man who knows. There are men who did carry paint there, but they do not know, and do not say in what quantities they took it, but Mr. Pagé says he prepared all the paint that was taken from the government yards to Mr. Lanctot's house; he kept a correct account of all the paint, and he says that more paint was prepared and charged against Mr. Lanctot than was actually used as all the paint he had prepared for Lanctot's house had not been used in painting it, and some of it was still on hand when the work was completed, and as it was not the kind of paint that could be used in the government works it was not used, but Mr. Lanctot paid for it, and it was returned to the government stores. Now there is the question as to the independence of parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the hon. gentleman leaves the evidence—what business had this man, an employee of the government, to take away property belonging to the government and deposit it on Mr. Lanctot's premises? Was there any explanation of that? How did he come to do it? What justification is there for it, or what orders had he to do it? It strikes me as most peculiar.

Mr. GERMAN. He had no orders excepting the orders he took from himself and to himself. He was asked by Mr. Lanctot if, being unable to get all the paint that was required from the Labelle Company, he might supply some paint and keep a record of it, and later he would return it. It will be remembered that Mr. Pagé suggested to Mr. Lanctot when he spoke to him about the paint and told him to get it from Labelle and Company, Mr. Pagé said: They may not have all the kinds of paint you want, and I will let you have some from the government, and Mr. Lanctot said: Keep a record of that paint, and I will return it, and Mr. Lanctot did return it. Whether or not Mr. Pagé should have done that is another matter, but Mr. Lanctot was acting in perfect good faith and every thing he did was perfectly justified by the circumstances as they arose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose Pagé has been dismissed?

Mr. GERMAN. I do not think so. He did not say he had when he was before the committee, and I do not suppose he would be for he impressed me as being a good employee of the government. And whether or not that has been the custom in the yards of lending men to do work on private houses or lending paint for work on private houses I do not know. There is no evidence as to that, but at any rate Mr. Pagé appeared to feel that he was quite justified in what he did in lending the paint so long as he kept a correct account of it, and saw it was returned to the government stores. There is some question of Mr. Lanctot having violated the independence of parliament——

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Before you leave the report, will you kindly give us some reasons for handing out this severe censure to Mr. Blondin?

Mr. GERMAN. Before I finish I will give my hon. friend from Winnipeg my view with regard to that matter. There has been a suggestion that Mr. Lanctot has violated the independence of parliament.

There is an Act of parliament which declares that certain things done by a member of parliament shall be a violation of that Act, and by reason of which he shall not be entitled to occupy his seat in this House; but that is a statutory enactment, and a man cannot be guilty of a breach of the independence of parliament unless he is guilty of a breach of the Independence of Parliament Act. The gentlemen who prepared what is known as the minority report probably feel that they cannot possibly succeed in establishing the charges made against Mr. Lanctot, and, trying to read between the lines, and perhaps to create some feeling of suspicion, they would like to accuse him of something. But I cannot see how Mr. Lanctot or any one else can be accused of a violation of the independence of parliament unless he has violated some Act of parliament. Now, the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) has asked what justification there is for the last paragraph of this report. That paragraph reads as follows:

> Your committee feel that in view of the very serious nature of the charges made they should express an opinion on the propriety of Mr. Blondin making the charges in the manner he did. Your committee do not wish to state that Mr. Blondin did not believe there was truth in the allegations, or that he did not act from a bona fide belief in their truthfulness, but the committee think that before making so serious a charge against an honourable member of the House of Commons, he should have made some independent inquiry to verify the truthfulness of the charges made, and which he apparently did not do. The Minister of Marine was called as a witness. His evidence as to this on page 189, where he says he had information that no fraud had been committed and that all labour supplied by the shipyards had been paid for and all material supplied had been returned, and which information he would have been pleased to give Mr. Blondin had he applied for same.
>
> Your committee think that if Mr. Blondin had made these inquiries he would not and should not have made these charges.

I think the assertion contained in that last clause of the report is absolutely justified. The evidence not only fails entirely to establish any wrong-doing on the part of Mr. Lanctot, but disproves any wrong-doing on his part. Mr. Blondin could have inquired, had he seen fit, from the Minister of Marine, and could have got every particle of evidence that was given before the committee, before he made his charge. Before a member of this House makes a charge of so serious a nature against another member of this House, it seems to me that he should exhaust every means of ascertaining the truthfulness of that charge, and that he should not on mere suspicion, or on the statements of men who had been employed by the government, and who were evidently disgruntled, make such charges as those made by Mr. Blondin. To my mind the evidence disproves every charge of wrongdoing on the part of Mr. Lanctot, and I have no hesitation in moving the resolution which I now have the honour to place in your hands.

Mr. F. D. MONK (Jacques Cartier). Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of regret that in a controversy of this kind the Committee on Privileges and Elections was not able to come to a unanimous decision, because, as members of the House are well aware, when we are examining a matter before that committee, we are in a sense sitting in judgment upon our own selves, and dealing with circumstances which might become our own at any moment. We should, I think, before that committee, free ourselves as much as possible from partisan prejudices, and I must say that the annals of that committee to a very large extent bear out my contention, because on many different matters in the past it has come to unanimous conclusions. We must not forget either that that committee, perhaps the most important in parliament, has under its charge the care of the privileges of parliament, both collective and personal, and we know what the obtaining of those privileges, and their maintenance has cost of struggles in the past. If my hon. friend had narrowed down his argument merely to the question of the quantum, of the amount, which the sitting member in this case has actually refunded to the government, I do not think the discussion would last a very long time. If we adopt this report, and if we sanction the principle that members of parliament can secure the officers of the government for the performance of works such as were performed in this instance, and all other analogous works—if we can have our houses built and repaired by government employees, and in other respects use them for our own ends, and purposes, I know sufficiently well the temper of the members of this House, on both sides of it, to say that there never will be any very serious controversy about $66 or $99, or any other such sum in the settlement of the amount of the refund. But there is a far more significant and important question, the question of the principle upon which we are obliged to insist, upon the preservation of that principle depends to my mind the utility of every institution of parliament. History shows that without it parliament, from a body destined to represent and protect the people, has degenerated into an institution destined to betray the various interests which it was created to guard. The matter, therefore, to my mind goes far deeper and beyond what most of the argument of my hon. friend was addressed to. It is a most important matter, particularly at this moment, when we must admit that representative institutions have lost a great deal of favour, and with good reason, and that it is sought in every possible way to check the influence which those institutions are exercising.

Now, I do not wish to take up unduly the time of the House in discussing this question. I will come at once to the uncontroverted facts about which there is no doubt whatever. My hon. friend who has just spoken admits that. There are incidents as to which there is controversy, and as the debate progresses they will probably be insisted upon at greater length. I will speak of the facts regarding which there is no doubt whatever. What are they, Sir? Some years ago, in connection with the St. Lawrence ship channel the government established at Sorel extensive shipyards. Those shipyards are in the electoral division of Richelieu. The member for that division in 1909 started to build a house. I will not insist on the surrounding facts. They were excluded at the inquiry, and I think unwisely. I think it was unwise on the part of the committee to exclude the proof of what is the custom in those shipyards at Sorel, and what happened when Mr. Lanctot began the construction of that house.

The building of the fence and some of the woodwork was done by employees of the government. That was not laid down specifically in the charges and I will pass that over, but when you come to appreciate all the circumstances surrounding this incident, these are material facts. In 1910 the house was so far advanced that it was ready for painting and glazing. What did the sitting member do? He proceeded to have this part of the work—an important part of the construction and completion of the house—executed by government workmen, men attached to the shipyards and to have the material furnished from the government stores. The sitting member

pointed out that it was his purpose and intention that the cost of the work should be refunded. I state that immediately in justice to the hon. member. I assume that for the purpose of the argument, but to any man who reads the evidence, as I think the house will perceive as I proceed, the undertaking to refund was not made sufficiently clear. It is not sufficiently apparent, and it is impossible for any man of the world to read that evidence throughout, and not come to the conclusion that this gentleman, like all others in that locality, intended to avail himself of the custom prevailing to get work done by government employees without any refund. There is the evidence of Mr. Pagé that the sitting member declared that he would refund; ten times, says Mr. Pagé, during the summer, he offered to give me money and I refused, because I told him that the workmen might suppose that I intended to keep the money myself, and that it was better to wait till the end. When you have read the evidence through you cannot come to any other conclusion than that the sitting member, not realizing the exceptional position in which he was, intended to avail himself of a general popular privilege in the town of Sorel, a notorious privilege which is known to exist because it is a matter of public notoriety that a man who can exert sufficient influence may obtain materials and get work done without reimbursing anybody for them. But, I assume for the purpose of my argument that this refund was to be made. It is vouched for by the sitting member himself and by Mr. Pagé. I may say at once with regard to this man Pagé, and this observation is provoked by the question put a moment ago by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) who did not follow this inquiry, that his testimony is not worthy of confidence because at the beginning he started in to perpetrate an odious fraud upon the government.

I shall not follow my hon. friend (Mr. German) in his argument regarding the impossibility of having this work executed otherwise than by government employees. As a matter of fact there was only one witness produced, as my hon. friend says, a painter, a man of repute in the town of Sorel, who stated that he asked for the work, and that he was capable of executing it. It was not necessary to go further. Every man who has some experience knows that in the province of Quebec there is not a village where you cannot get painting done, and if the painting is of such a quality that it requires men of greater skill you can get them in any large centre, in Sorel, or in Montreal which is only a few miles from Sorel. But, why insist upon this point? If the work was done illegally and irregularly, if the sitting member entered into a contract that he had no right to enter into, it is no argument to say that he could not get workmen elsewhere. If he could not get the work done legally and legitimately he had to give it up; there was no other recourse for him. The circumstances do not authorize any illegality.

I repeat that I regret that we could not agree upon a report, but we have to deal with the facts as we find them without fear or favour since the question is before parliament to-day. The member seemed to think that he was in the same position as other people in the town of Sorel. I repeat that it is a matter of public notoriety in Quebec that these things are done daily in Sorel. You get material if you have sufficient pull, and you do not require much; you get cement, you get boards, paint, nails. Men have started stores from what they have obtained from the government workshops. The sitting member is supposed to know the law; he knows the disabilities that attach to a member of parliament. However, I will come to that in a moment. He occupies an exceptional position in the electoral division. He disposes of the patronage of the division. Unfortunately, under the baneful system which prevails in this country as to the exterior service, he disposes of the patronage, and we know that this regrettable system costs the country millions and millions of dollars a year in waste. That is the result in our province at any rate. He knows that that is his position in the county and he should have thought of that when he undertook to deal with men who owed their nomination and maintenance to him in order to get this work executed. Could he possibly ignore the system which prevails in connection with public works at the government workshops in Sorel? My hon. friend (Mr. German) says that the sitting member did not know what Mr. Pagé and Mr. Champagne were doing in order to have this work executed. He could not ignore it, Sir, because it is not possible to believe that the sitting member did not know the system prevailing with regard to the distribution of work and material at the shipyards at Sorel. At the very outset the sitting member was informed by Pagé, the foreman to whom he went to get this work executed, that he would be glad to get the work done if the director of the works authorized him to do so. There, knowledge was given to him, if that knowledge was necessary, that nothing of that kind could possibly be done without the approval of Mr. Papineau. Starting with these data what were the methods resorted to in order to have this work executed? Let me point out in two words what the system prevailing at Sorel is. There is an army of employees of the

government under the control of foremen or clerks of works. By these foremen or clerks of works the men are placed upon different jobs. There is an official time-keeper who punches the work cards four times a day, at the time of starting and at the time of quitting. Reports are made by the foremen and the wages are charged up to the cost of the different government jobs in books kept for that purpose. The materials which are kept at the stores can only be obtained from the stores by requisitions from the foremen and by requisitions showing what these materials are wanted for.

There also records are kept; materials are measured, weighed, taken out of store and charged up, with the time of the men, to the different public works. Afterwards, pay-lists are made up from time to time. They are certified by the foreman and submitted to the director of works and the accountant. There are 600 or 700 employees at least. The director and the accountant certify the accounts, which are then sent up to Ottawa. A cheque is sent from Ottawa to the director, who deposits it. When the money is drawn the director hands it over to the paymaster on the pay-list and he distributes the money to the men. Now, you will not find in the books of the department at Sorel or in the records of the workmen's time or of the materials, one single jot or tittle having reference to this work on the Lanctot house—nothing whatever. Here were men working for the entire season, from June until November, and you will not find any trace whatever in the government records which will enable you to identify them with this Lanctot job. I speak from the evidence. How, then, is the trick done, how was the matter managed? If there was, as my hon. friend (Mr. German) stated a moment ago, an agreement fair and above board that this work was to be done, a strict account kept and afterwards the government to be reimbursed, it is all legal and legitimate if it was done in the way my hon. friend says. But what were the means resorted to, and why is it we can find no trace of this transaction in the books? It was done in this way: First, as to wages, a fraud was resorted to. The workmen were directed to have this work done by Mr. Pagé. Remember, I am giving facts as to which there is no controversy. Pagé and Champagne, both foremen, were the men who directed the workmen to this particular job, without any authority whatever. There was no order from the director of the works who alone had the right to give it. The men's time was punched on their cards by the time-keeper by agreement between the time-keeper, Pagé and Champagne. Their time was punched as workmen engaged on government work. That is the important point. It was in that way that men who were supposed to be working on government jobs were working all the time for the private advantage of the sitting member; otherwise they could not have been paid upon the certified pay-lists as having been engaged on government work. The money was taken out of the public treasury, entered up in the books of the government against the various jobs. The whole thing was put through as being for material furnished and work done for government account. Therefore, I say, the government money was, in consequence of this, expended from June to November in payment of wages and material, and there was nothing in the record that could possibly raise a suspicion as to the real nature of the work done and destination of these materials.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any evidence to show to what particular work this was charged up in the books?

Mr. MONK. No; that is the peculiar point. Some of these pay-sheets are charged to job No. 169—I believe that is the number. But turn up 169 and it is not that at all. There is no difficulty on that point. These two foremen recognized that this work was done upon the supposition that it was being done for the government.

Now, as to material. These materials were sent by foreman Pagé to the Lanctot house. How could he get them with the system of record to which I have referred? The foremen send in requisitions for material for government work, and they always have a certain quantity of these materials. Pagé took these materials out of materials that he had obtained upon regular requisition approved of for government work, and sent them over. Consequently, these materials, at the time the requisitions were sent, were charged up to the different government jobs and not to any private undertaking. That is the way materials were obtained without creating any suspicion—it was by agreement arrived at between Pagé and Champagne, the time-keeper and the foreman. My hon. friend says there is no evidence that the sitting member was privy to this conspiracy—for that is what it was—to obtain these materials and get the work done. There is no evidence that I am aware of that the sitting member ever actually planned this system. But what I say is this, and we cannot ignore it, nor can the public ignore it—that the sitting member addressed himself to the foreman, assuming that he thought the foreman had authority for this work, though he could not do it without the permission of the director of work. Mr. Papineau was there continuously—perhaps he did not happen to be there on a Sunday or on the 28th of

May, but he was there during the summer continuously. Mr. Lanctot was there, yet he never went to see Mr. Papineau. Is it conceivable that a member of parliament, under these circumstances and at such a juncture, should not have walked across the street to see the director of work and find out what was being done, if everything was regular and proper? And I would even say further that it is somewhat surprising that a man of affairs should go through an entire summer with this kind of mandate and never seek to find out at the head office, the place whence the direction emanated, what was being done, what expenditure was being incurred, how far his account had mounted up. An entire summer was spent, the whole building was finished, and not an inquiry. I say it is impossible, under these circumstances, to entirely exonerate the sitting member from responsibility in regard to these men. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) asked if these men had been dismissed. I will say a word from my personal acquaintance with Mr. Papineau, the director of works. Mr. Papineau is an absolutely honest man. It is utterly impossible for him to cause a cessation of the abuses that exist there if he is not vested with authority, and he is not vested with authority. A proof of the reputation he enjoys is the fact that this work was put through, and the whole summer was spent, and he never heard of it. He asks Mr. Papineau: Would you authorize such a thing as this? Well, he said, it would have to be a pressing case, I suppose a case of a fire, or something of that kind, because otherwise I could not authorize it at all. But he was kept in ignorance the entire summer.

Now, as to the refund—I do not wish to diminish the importance of the refund. What are the facts? We are men, we know how these things happen. The summer had not yet passed, before this matter of the construction of Mr. Lanctot's house was public property in Sorel and Montreal, a matter of public notoriety. Affidavits were prepared. There were outside people—I had the visit myself of one of these men, who told me long before parliament assembled, at any rate long before the matter came up, that he hoped the matter would be brought up, and he was a good Conservative. But there is no doubt that a question of this kind, even if we exonerate Mr. Lanctot from any evil intention, is one that arises above party, and we must be careful about consecrating the principle that parliament sanctions doings of that kind. Well, when it became a matter of public discussion in the town of Sorel, Mr. Pagé prepared an account. Mr. Pagé, while he was defrauding the government, using materials which he held in trust, for certain private parties, and while he was countenancing the payment of men for government work who were employed on this private work, informs us that he kept a private memorandum of the time of the men. This was kept on loose leaves. I do not know that my understanding of the evidence exactly coincides with that of my hon. friend. My recollection is that this memorandum was kept on loose leaves, and slipped into a corner of the drawer in the evening; and at the end, a general memorandum was made up from them in a little book which was produced before the committee. I may be wrong as to that, but the memorandum kept was private, and from these leaves was prepared the statement of $375.60, which, on the 22nd of November, was sent up here. Parliament was sitting, and the sitting member sent a cheque down for the labour only, on the 22nd of November, for $375.60. That cheque was finally paid on the 12th of January following, and upon inquiry from the department, as before stated, the deputy minister wrote that he required a statement to place it in the hands of the Auditor General, so that the Auditor General might know what the object of this refund was. The sitting member went down to Sorel—and this is important, these circumstances are not trifling—he met Mr. Papineau on the street and told him, 'there are the materials, I will replace the materials out of my own pocket.' And in fact Mr. Papineau, having found out that those materials had been substracted from the government stores in the manner I have indicated, immediately got a statement as to the materials from Mr. Pagé, or Mr. Champagne, from this private memorandum, and gave an order, had the materials replaced, and paid them himself out of his own pocket, and then on the street reminded Mr. Lanctot that this bill was still unsettled, and Mr. Lanctot refunded the director of the works.

Those are the facts with regard to which I think there is no possibility of doubt, and no controversy. $375.60 for labour, $81.60 for the material. I think I can say, without really wishing to make any pleasantry in a matter so serious, that I never, in my own experience, heard of a house of that kind being painted inside and outside at so very low a rate. I do not wish to make that an issue, because I think the matter is far more important. But I think the affidavits mention $700 or $1,000, or $1,200 and that is what it would have cost most of us ordinary mortals to get that work done. In the meantime, affidavits had been made. I wish to say this as regards the hon. member for Champlain that the matter was public property.

Under the terms of those affidavits which charged theft and robbery—the latter word was somewhat peculiar—but charged theft, what was the duty of my hon. friend? Those who sit on this side of the House in opposition know what these affidavits stated. The duty of the opposition under those circumstances was to lay those facts before parliament, and when those facts were laid before parliament, parliament ordered an inquiry. It seems to me that the evidence adduced certainly brings to the knowledge of the House a most deplorable state of affairs. It is not a question of whether the sitting member wanted to defraud the government. There was fraud, there was conspiracy on the part of those foremen; undoubtedly they obtained these materials and this labour in an illegal manner. But if he was not a party, by his conduct and his silence, to that fraud, then we come to the interpretation of my hon. friend from Welland (Mr. German) that he made an agreement which he carried out. Could he make that agreement? Had he the right, under the Independence of Parliament Act, to make such an agreement? Let me quote to the House the sections bearing on that point from chapter 10 of the Senate and House of Commons Act:

14. No person, directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House.

15. If any member of the House of Commons accepts any office or commission, or is concerned or interested in any contract, agreement, service or work which, by this Act, renders a person incapable of being elected to, or of sitting or voting in the House of Commons, or knowingly sells any goods, wares or merchandise to, or performs any service for the government of Canada, or for any of the officers of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada is paid or to be paid, whether such contract, agreement or sale is expressed or implied, and whether the transaction is single or continuous, the seat of such member shall thereby be vacated, and his election shall thenceforth be null and void.

To my mind it seems beyond doubt that, even accepting the interpretation of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), the sitting member for Richelieu made an agreement with the government as to the completion of his house for which public money of Canada was to be expended and was expended. These are the words of the statute. To leave that out, what are we asked to do by the motion of my hon. friend? To declare that the whole transaction was regular as far as the sitting member was concerned, is to be countenanced and is to be commended. Is there not, beyond the words of this statute, a tendency by cases of this kind, to weaken and impair the independence of parliament? When I heard doubt expressed as to the applicability of these sections of the Act I stated that I had an open mind, but no doubt whatever on the second point, that if parliament sanctions such proceedings as these, we are undoing the work of centuries in establishing the independence of parliament, we place a member in absolute dependence. He, by getting work done by a department of the government, places himself in a position of absolute control and subserviency to this department. He loses, in other words, his independence, there is no doubt whatever about that. It seems to me that very far from commending and approving this conduct, we should, at any rate, in adopting this report, point out that this conduct is fraught with extreme danger and is a menace to the independence of parliament.

I have referred to Mr. Papineau. I say, on my responsibility as a member of this House, it is not necessary to produce affidavits of that, that the condition of affairs in Sorel is an eyesore in our province, it is a public scandal, it is notorious. How is that with such a director? Can the question be asked? In the first place he has been there for only a limited time, but what do we now see? We see these four men come up boldly and tell us the system under which they had been able to execute these works. A man employing men who had his confidence under these circumstances would not hesitate for a moment, he would dismiss them. They have forfeited the trust, they have betrayed the confidence placed in them and so they were justifying themselves before the director of the works and in the presence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. It is his own incompetency that is at fault. They should not have been allowed to leave the committee room if my hon. friend had time to satisfy himself on that point without his satisfying himself then and there, and dismissing them. Are we going to be told that with that state of affairs enduring for years, it would be impossible for a competent minister, acting for the people, supported by this House, to put a stop to that state of affairs within ten days? I say on the same responsibility that there should be a general inquiry. What is there to fear? If I am right in saying that this is a matter of public notoriety, the minister should have an inquiry, the government should grant one, and if there is an inquiry hon.

members of this House will see that this is not an isolated case, it is a small case, in reality, as far as the amount is concerned, but that system is general in the shipyards at Sorel. It is a general system, but it is time that it should stop and we certainly will not be stopping it by commending the sitting member for the district for his actions in this case. I, therefore, beg to move:

That the said report be not adopted but that this House adopt, in lieu thereof, the draft report suggested by the minority of said Standing Committee on Privileges and Elections, as the same appears of record on the minutes of said committee marked 'B.'

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). There is one point with regard to this case, in respect to which probably there will be no difference of opinion in this House, but I am afraid that there is likely not more than that one feature of which that could be said. I think we are all agreed that the matter now under consideration is one of very great importance, and I only wish that it were possible that we could all look at it as one which ought to be decided and which might be decided without any reference to political feeling. The charges which have been made here and which this House now has to decide are charges which affect not only the seat in this House of one of our members, but also affect that man's personal reputation and personal honour ; he is literally on trial here before his peers. The independence of parliament has always been and has properly been a subject in regard to which the House of Commons in England as well as in this country has been peculiarly jealous, and the privileges of a member of parliament are privileges which ought to have and I am sure will receive at our hands, as members of the House of Commons, the most careful and anxious consideration. Any man who has the honour of being chosen by his fellow electors as their representative in this House is entitled surely, at the hands of his fellow members in this House, before any doubt even is cast upon his right to be a member of this House, to a careful trial and an honest consideration of the circumstances and the facts upon which it is proposed that he should be condemned. In what I have to say in reference to this matter I certainly set before myself in all honesty the effort to avoid being prejudiced in favour of the hon. gentleman against whom these charges are made, because of the circumstance that he is a political supporter as well as a personal friend. I want to try and I intend to try to discharge absolutely from my own consideration of the evidence which is here presented the fact that during the few years I have known the member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot) I have formed a personal affection for him, that I have in him an intimate friend for whom I have the highest regard and esteem. I submit to you that considerations of that character ought to be discarded in the decision of a matter of this sort, and I hope to be able to do so while confessing, as I have confessed before in this House, that I consider myself as strong and as partisan in my political feeling as any other member of this assembly. But while I say that I think I have plenty of companions in that regard. And, if hon. gentlemen would but confess—they only deceive themselves if they think they are not every bit as partisan in the strength of their political feeling as I unhesitatingly acknowledge myself to be.

There is another view of this matter ; while one should try, and while I shall certainly endeavour my utmost to keep out of view any question of my own personal feelings toward the member for Richelieu, there is something in regard to his course in this matter which is entitled to have taken into consideration by us in coming to any conclusion. A man's character is his most valuable possession ; it is that which he earns by the course of conduct which he pursues during his lifetime, and if any of us are acquainted as a matter of personal knowledge with the character of the hon. gentleman whose seat is in question upon this occasion, I think we are entitled to weigh his action in the light of that character which we know him to possess, whether it be for good or for evil, if any one knows of him matters in regard to which his course of action in this affair would very probably be influenced, that is a consideration which he is entitled to apply to the determination of the facts which are in issue now. And another thing that we are entitled to look upon is the behaviour of the hon. gentleman since these charges were made against him in this House. Every one knows that it is the privilege of the person accused either to remain silent or to say: Not guilty, prove your case. Nothing is to be inferred against a man because he may choose to take that course, but it is open to us to consider what one of us would do, what any honourable or right minded man would do, if charges were made against him which were of disgraceful character, made to an assembly of which he was a member, and which, if proved, would show him to be such a man as ought no longer to retain his seat in a body of gentlemen. This House, as the House of Commons in England, has been spoken of before now as a gentleman's club; certainly it ought not to be put upon any lower footing. And I ask you, Sir, whether this charge ought to be considered in any less careful or any more heated and partisan manner if presented to this assembly of two hundred and twenty gentlemen for our

consideration, than would be the case if we were all of us members of a social club, and one of our number preferred charges against another, which, if proved, might render him unworthy any longer to retain his membership among us. If that were the position of matters, then upon this evidence I think there would be very short work indeed made of the charges which have been perferred. And in a case such as the present, the behaviour of the man charged from the time the charges are made against him is a circumstance very properly to be taken account of. If a man is conscious of his guilt, his actions very probably will betray that consciousness to any observer. I have to call attention to the course which in this matter has been pursued by the hon. member for Richelieu. When the charges were made, now nearly two months ago, he stood in his place; he made his statement in a few brief sentences of what exactly were the facts. I am content to leave it in the judgment of any and every hon. gentleman in this House whether or not he kept back the truth, whether or not that statement which he then made in the hearing of this House was a frank, manly, open, and honourable statement of exactly what had taken place in this matter. The charges having been referred to the appropriate committee, the very first witness to go into the box was the hon. gentleman himself. He answered such questions as were put to him; he submitted himself to cross-examination. He has placed his case by that course in the hands of his fellow members of this House and he has walked out of the House and not entered it again or participated in its deliberations, and has purposed to continue to do so until his fellow members pronounce upon the question of whether or not he has done anything which would render him worthy of expulsion from their midst. I think in that respect his course has been that which any honourable man would be inclined to take if charges of this kind were made against him.

Before referring to the nature of the evidence, in regard to which I shall be very brief, I want to premise one other thing—these charges are literally of the personal character which I have described. So far as their result is concerned, so far as the question for consideration on the motions which are in the hands of Mr. Speaker is concerned, the one thing is, whether or not the member for Richelieu has deserved to lose his seat in this House by reason either of the fact that he has been guilty of any infraction of the Independence of Parliament Act, or been guilty of conduct of such disgraceful nature that he ought no longer to be received as a member in a body of gentlemen. The Department of Marine and Fisheries, the government of this country, is not upon trial in this matter to-day. The conclusion of this matter whatever it be does not in any degree interfere with any member of this House taking such course as upon the facts disclosed he may be advised to take in regard to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, the government of this country, or any officer of the department who may have been, in his opinion, guilty of any wrong-doing in connection with these matters. I venture to think, Sir, this is not an occasion for political declamation, not an occasion for the making of a campaign speech which might be received with applause from the hustings, but that it is literally that which at any rate I seek to look upon it as being, the trial of a man to determine whether or not in our honest judgment he ought any longer to retain his seat among us. Accordingly I certainly do not propose to discuss the question of what the employees of the department at Sorel may or may not have been doing. I want to limit myself in a few words to that which it seems to me is the one question for our consideration, whether or not the conduct of the member for Richelieu merits our condemnation.

Now, Sir, it may be that those who think differently from the way in which I think upon this matter may consider that there is to be found somewhere in the evidence taken before the committee upon these charges, proof of fraudulent behaviour, of dishonourable behaviour, or collusion with employees of the department, on the part of the member for Richelieu. I can only say that I am not able to find any such evidence. I did not attend any of the meetings of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. It would have been difficult if not impossible for me to have followed the evidence of the witnesses as that evidence was being given, and I kept myself purposely away from the meetings of that committee, knowing that the question would necessarily have to be ultimately decided by this House itself. The case now comes here upon the report adopted by that committee, and upon the motion just placed in your hands for the adoption of a different conclusion. I have read, as I certainly ought to do, as a member of this House, and one who has felt a keen interest in this matter, every word of the evidence as given in the printed proceedings of that committee—not once only, but all important passages more than once; and I have studied that evidence as closely as it was possible for me to study it. I speak now in the sense of responsibility which I think rests upon each one of us as a member of the High Court of Parliament. Our students are taught that the highest court in the British realm is the court of

parliament itself. It is the body which constitutes the courts, and we here, as members of this House of Commons, at any rate in dealing with this matter, are members of a court with the like responsibility resting upon each one of us as rests upon a judge himself in adjudicating upon the rights of a fellow man. If we look at this case from that standpoint, if we remember that it is something which ought to be decided, not upon appeals to political partisanship, but upon the evidence which has been given by the witnesses, and upon exactly the same principles as would govern us without doubt if we were sitting as jurymen upon the trial of a charge such as this, I venture to think, Sir, that there will be little hesitation in coming to a conclusion with regard to it.

I do not intend to discuss the details of the evidence. That has been done very fully, and I would think very satisfactorily, by the chairman of the committee, than whom no other member was in a better position to have discharged that duty. But I want to point out just one thing in that connection. The great majority of us who have now to pass upon this question have not heard the evidence, have not seen the witnesses who gave that evidence, are not in as good a position as our fellow members who constitute that committee were in, to come to a correct conclusion upon the question of what witness or what statement ought to be believed. If there is a contradiction between one witness and another, it is the function of the judge who hears and sees those witnesses, or of jurymen, if there be a jury, to come to a conclusion which man is, in their opinion, the more likely to be telling the truth, to weigh the evidence, and to draw, in the first instance at any rate, the deductions of fact. No judge, no human being, could be, from the nature of the circumstances, in as good a position to do that work as the men who hear the witnesses and who see the way in which they answer, and who judge as the words fall from the lips of the witnesses which of them is telling the truth. I seek to apply that in this case, only to this extent, that if there is a contradiction between one man and another man, if it is a question of which man is the better entitled of two witnesses to be credited, then we ought to rely upon the conclusions of the committee of our own members who heard and saw those men, and who have reported to us in that respect. But fortunately in this case I think there is less than the amount of contradiction between one witness and another that generally, I am sorry to say, is seen in contested cases in our courts. The facts in this matter are really not open to dispute with regard to the main, and I think all the necessary points in reference to this charge. There is no difference of statement among the witnesses who have been called. There is no question but that this work was done on the house of Mr. Lanctot by men who were in the general employment of the government; there is no question but that government supplies were used to a greater or less extent in the doing of that work; there is equally no doubt that that work was paid for by Mr. Lanctot, that those supplies which were used in the doing of the work were replaced at his cost, and that there is no loss in respect to them to the people of this country.

The transaction with regard to the supplies is plainly no transaction of purchase on Mr. Lanctot's part. No one can pretend to say that it is; no one does pretend to say that it is. The agreement between him and the government employees with whom he discussed the matter is perfectly distinct—that government supplies should be used for the doing of Mr. Lanctot's work, that an account should be kept of how much of such supplies were so used, and that goods of equal quantity and of equal quality should be supplied at Mr. Lanctot's expense to replace the goods so used. The chairman of the committee, in speaking of the transaction used the word 'lend.' I think it was not an inappropriate word. These goods were lent to Mr. Lanctot to be returned, not in specie, but in kind, exactly the same kind of transaction that often takes place between individuals, in which goods are handed over by the owner to another with the intention that they shall be consumed and that they shall be replaced by goods of equal value and equal quality as the goods which are given by the owner to the man whom he has accommodated and which are consumed. That was literally the transaction here. The evidence is not in dispute, the evidence is distinct that the man who was custodian of these goods in the government service set apart a certain quantity, which he measured and weighed as being sufficient to do the work which was in hand, that some—the greater part, but not all of these goods—were sent to Mr. Lanctot's house and were used in the doing of the work, and that after the work was done that quantity of goods, equal in amount and equal in quality, was supplied at the expense of Mr. Lanctot to replace the goods which had been taken. Now, in that respect, it is impossible for any one to argue that there has been any loss to the public. On the contrary, this evidence is quite distinct that in point of fact a slightly greater quantity of goods was obtained at Mr. Lanctot's expense than had been sent to his house. But whether there was a greater quantity or not, there was no sale, there is no pretense

that there was any arrangement for a sale of these goods to Mr. Lanctot by any one on behalf of the government, and it would not have made the slightest difference if there had been. It would not have been the slightest infraction of either the spirit or the letter of our Independence of Parliament Act.

Now, with regard to the work, very much the same condition of things exists. The arrangement which was made was distinct that the men who did the work were to be paid, at Mr. Lanctot's cost the exact rate of wages they were receiving when in the government service; in other words, if a man worked one particular day at Mr. Lanctot's house, the wages of that day were to be paid by Mr. Lanctot. Mr. Lanctot evidently thought that he was expected to pay as the work proceeded. He said that he was perfectly willing to do so. He asked for an account over and over again, not only he, but also the government official states. It was more convenient to the official that he should not be rendering an account periodically. As the chairman of the committee explained, he said that he was afraid that if he took money from Mr. Lanctot he would be told by some of the workmen that he had, in fact, received more money than he was giving to them, and not wanting to put himself in that position, he kept his account in the matter until the whole thing was over, and then that account was rendered. I ask your attention, as bearing on the question of whether there was evil mind in this matter, to the circumstances of the way in which that account is made out. That account was sent to Mr. Lanctot by post on the 21st November last, and it is an account charging Mr. Lanctot with a certain amount of money in respect to these services as being due to the Marine and Fisheries of Canada: 'A. Lanctot, Esq., Dr. to Marine and Fisheries, Canada, Post office address, Sorel. On the face of the document it is presented as a government account. How does Mr. Lanctot deal with it? He pays it within twenty-four hours, and in what shape? He pays it by his cheque and he makes the cheque payable to 'Department of Marine, or Order.' Well, if this were a charge in an election trial I think every counsel in the court would be somewhat astonished to find a charge of corrupt practices or of the improper use of money for election purposes supported by evidence of the payment of that money by cheque, and the payee named in the cheque one of the public departments of the government of Canada. I think I may appeal to the experience of hon. gentlemen in that regard, whether or not they are members of the legal profession; I ask any man of ordinary acquaintance with business affairs whether or not it is the mark of fraud that a man pays his debt by cheque upon his bank account, thus preserving the evidence for any one who chooses to search the manner in which that payment has been made. That circumstance is one which is entitled to have, at the hands of any one considering what conclusion ought to be reached in this case, its due and proper weight. I present it to the House simply as one of the circumstances in this matter, and I say, without delaying to labour the details of the evidence, what the chairman of the committee has said, that I have read this evidence with all the care in my power and I cannot see any question of any importance in it which has not been truthfully and correctly summed up in the report of the committee, the adoption of which has been moved by the chairman. Those are the undisputed facts of this case. You may insinuate what you please, you may make political charges as much as you care to, but you cannot change the sworn facts in this case, and these facts are truthfully and correctly summed up in the report which has been presented to this House.

I say no more about the facts in this case, except to repeat what I said a little while ago, that I am not discussing the case at the present time from the standpoint of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, or from that of the conduct of the men in charge of that branch of the department which is established at Sorel. I submit respectfully to you, Sir, that to do that on this occasion is simply beclouding the issue, and is seeking to whip, over the shoulders of a member of this House, the government which he supports, and to treat this question as one of party politics rather than that which it truly is—a question of the right of this man to retain his position, and his seat among us. Upon that question I have no more to say in so far as the facts of the case are concerned. Mr. Lanctot paid the bill which was rendered to him, he paid it promptly, and he paid it openly. If that bill was less than it ought to have been, unless you show some collusion on Mr. Lanctot's part with the man who made out that bill, Mr. Lanctot is not to be condemned in the premises. Condemn the men who did wrong, if they have done wrong, but on this occasion I am not discussing their conduct. I say the question here is simply, whether or not we shall adopt the report of the committee. That committee has dealt only with the charges so far as Mr. Lanctot is concerned. If it had been an investigation of the department, or of the conduct of the officials of the department, it is very likely, to say the least of it, that a good deal more evidence would have been given than has been given, and very different considerations would have arisen. Upon the question which was referred to them, it was enough for them to say that, at any rate, whatever opinion

may be entertained by hon. gentlemen—depending upon their political sympathies—of the behaviour of the employees of the government, Mr. Lanctot has been clearly shown to have been guilty of no wrong.

Now, Sir, just one word—and I shall be very brief about it—in regard to the conclusions of law which are sought to be applied to this matter. In the report which was proposed before the committee by the minority members of the special committee appointed to draft a report, there are conclusions at the end which speak of the law, and which seem to be based upon a view of the law entertained by the hon. gentlemen who have joined in making that report. Under the heading 'Conclusions, these words appear:

It is our conclusion from the evidence that Mr. Adelard Lanctot, a member of the House of Commons, knowingly and unlawfully did procure the employees of the government of Canada to do certain work for him and on his behalf in the year 1910, he then being a member of the said House, and by collusion with the servants of the government did procure the payment of such labour by and out of the public moneys of the Dominion of Canada for his own purposes and benefit, without lawful right and contrary to the public interest.

That he did furthermore, knowingly and unlawfully, cause and procure certain materials, the property of the government of Canada to be delivered to himself for his own benefit and use, he then being a member of the House of Commons, and with such intent and purpose did collude and contrive with the servants of the Dominion of Canada to whom the said materials had been entrusted for use in the works of said government to so deliver the same to him by unlawful misappropriation, contrary to their duty and obligation to the government and contrary to law and the public interest.

And further it is our conclusion that the said Adelard Lanctot, by the acts and proceedings aforesaid, did infringe the independence of parliament.

S. BARKER,
F. D. MONK.

I suppose that the meaning of the conclusion that, by his acts the said Adelard Lanctot 'did infringe the independence of parliament' is that he did thereby infringe the Independence of Parliament Act. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) shakes his head. I certainly would have been, but for that circumstance, at a loss to understand that a distinction was supposed to exist, between the infraction of the Independence of Parliament Act and the infraction of the independence of parliament. I suppose there is, in the mind of my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), if it is his hand which penned these words, some beautiful general idea of the spirit of the statute, some misty idea that something which is not struck at the statute and not made an unlawful thing, is to be considered as an infraction of the intention of parliament; that parliament had some other meaning in adopting this statute than that which is conveyed by the words which parliament used, and that that meaning is to be interpreted in the light of the political interests of the gentlemen who read it. Our independence of parliament is secured by the Independence of Parliament Act. The sections which constitute the Independence of Parliament Act are to be found in our statute relating to the Senate and the House of Commons, and they appear under these very words: 'Independence of Parliament.' And how, in view of that circumstance, any lawyer can seek to draw a distinction between the meaning of the expression 'Infraction of the Independence of Parliament,' and the meaning of the expression 'Infraction of the Independence of Parliament Act' I leave to hon. gentlemen who entertain such ideas to attempt to explain. The independence of parliament is secured by these few sections, ten in number, of that particular statute, and the provisions of these sections are simply that any man who enters into or has a certain kind of contract with the Crown or public of Canada is ineligible to a seat in this House. It is not every kind of contract which is prohibited; it is not an interest in every kind of contract which would prevent a man holding a seat in this House. There is, in the most distinct way, an express limitation and description of the only kind of contract which is struck at by this legislation or which parliament has seen fit to forbid to its members. That one particular kind of contract which alone is mentioned in this legislation is such a contract as involves the payment to the contractor of any public money of Canada. There is no prohibition whatever upon a man entering into a contract by which he is obliged to pay to the public moneys of Canada. The prohibition is only upon the reverse kind of contract, a contract under which he receives, not a contract under which he pays. The language of the principal section is perfectly clear on the subject, and the language of every other section of the ten I have referred to implies the same thing. The section which is the key to the whole group, and, which is absolutely distinct on the subject, is worded in this way:

No person directly or indirectly, alone or with any other, by himself or by the interposition of any trustee or third party, holding or enjoying, undertaking or executing any contract or agreement, expressed or implied, with or for the government of Canada on behalf of the Crown, or with or for any of the officers of the government of Canada, for which any public money of Canada it to be paid, shall be eligible as a member of the

House of Commons, or shall sit or vote in the said House.

Now I ask how that would have been interpreted if these highly important words 'for which any public money of Canada is to be paid' had not been present? Would there have been any question then but that any man interested, directly or indirectly, in any kind of contract at all with the government of Canada, was rendered thereby ineligible to hold a seat in this House? There could be none. But parliament deliberately refrained from enacting such a law, parliament deliberately said: It is not our intention to prohibit every kind of contract between the public and members of this House, it is only that kind of a contract for which the public money of Canada is to be paid that is a contract which will prevent a man holding a seat in this House. It would have been very simple to omit those words. Indeed, if it had been the intention to prevent an interest in every kind of contract whatsoever, it would have been very easy so to enact. An example of it was before the men who drafted this statute. In the Ontario Municipal Act there is exactly the wholesale kind of prohibition I refer to. Under the Ontario Municipal Act no man is eligible to a seat in a municipal council if he owes money which stands unpaid to the municipality; even though there be no express contract between him and the municipality, the mere fact that he owes the debt implies in the law an obligation of a contractual nature resting upon him to pay that debt. The mere fact that a man might be owing to the municipality an unpaid debt, under the Ontario Municipal Act would disqualify him from membership in the municipal council. This parliament never meant to go that length, this parliament refrained from going that length; this parliament at any rate did not prohibit a member of this House from purchasing public stores or goods of Canada if it was decided to sell them. If there were an unused dredge belonging to the Department of Public Works which was being put up for sale by auction, there is nothing whatever to prohibit a member of parliament from purchasing that article, and if he purchased it, from paying for it, as would be his obligation, to the Receiver General of Canada. And just as Mr. Lanctot paid his debt in this case by his cheque to the department, and as his moneys have gone to the credit of the receiver general, so a member of parliament purchasing any goods which might be placed upon sale if there was no longer use for them by the government of this country, would pay his purchase money into the treasury of Canada, and in paying his debt he would in no respect infringe the statute governing the independence of parliament.

Now that it was the deliberate intention of parliament to prohibit only the transactions under which the contractor receives money or is to receive money from the public treasury, is not only the distinct language of the law which I have read, but it is the distinct inference from every other one of those sections of the statute. I suppose every hon. gentleman is alive to the fact that if he accepts any office of emolument under the Crown, he thereby vacates, his seat. That is provided for by the first one of this group of sections. But notice, it is the receipt of the money or the entering into the relationship which involves the payment of money by the government to the individual, which disqualifies him. If the office, in other words, is one which has no salary attached to it, there is no vacating of the seat, by express language of the enactment. The following section of this statute provides that unless that office is one which involves the payment of money to the holder of the office, there is nothing inconsistent in his being an office holder and a member of this House at the same time; and his acceptance of the office, provided there is no money to come from the public treasury to the individual, has no effect whatever upon his right to sit in this House. That is the express language of the enactment, and the wording of every clause in this group of ten sections which constitutes our Independence of Parliament Act. The views which I present certainly seem to me the clear meaning of the law in this regard, which is that any man who owes a debt to the government of Canada is entitled to pay that debt, and must pay that debt, notwithstanding the fact that he is a member of this House. If, on the other hand, any debt is owing from the government of Canada out of the public moneys of this country to an individual, he cannot take payment of that debt, (although it is his own money) as long as he remains a member of this House. If he is interested in any contract which involves payment to him out of the public moneys of this country, or any money the property of the Crown in Canada, that circumstance avoids his seat in this House. But otherwise a contract such as this is one which any member of parliament in so far as its legal effect is concerned, can enter into with perfect impunity.

For that reason I must admit that I read the conclusions of this minority report with considerable astonishment. I am quite prepared to concede to every gentleman, whether he is a legal practitioner or not, his right to his view of the law just as I have a right to my view. I do not criticise in the least degree the use of the word

'unlawfully' in the different branches of these conclusions to the minority report, if the hon. gentlemen who have signed that report thought themselves justified in using that word. I have tried to point out why, to my mind as a lawyer, it is perfectly clear, if any question of law can be clear, that there was nothing whatever unlawful about it. I should be certainly, as an advising solicitor, unable to give a client any other advice, if he were to be sued, under the provisions of the sections of the statute to which I have been referring, for the penalties that he would incur by sitting in this House if disqualified —I could not give him any other advice, I say, than that I have indicated, that he was perfectly free of any danger of the success of such an action in circumstances such as existed here. I am discussing it, in that view of the matter, purely and entirely from the dry legal standpoint; I am sure I am not misunderstood in that regard. I said at the outset that these facts might be viewed either from that standpoint, or as evidence of facts from which some one or other might, according to his political temperament, infer that there had been dishonest conduct, fraudulent conduct, if you like, on the part of the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot), but dealing with it from the standpoint solely of the legal responsibility, it seems to me the law is too clear to admit of two opinions.

One other thing I wish to say with reference to this conclusion of the minority report which we are now asked to adopt. I was astonished when I read these conclusions and saw affixed to them the name of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). He bears a name in this country of distinguished and honoured parentage. I had thought him a man of judicial temperament and a man who, however, strong his political feeling might be, would not put his name to a paper which suppressed the all important feature in this case, the feature which existed, to his knowledge as a member of the committee who heard the evidence, and which makes all the difference between the truth and that half truth which is wholly a lie. In this report I find these two hon. gentlemen stating as their conclusion, to this House, that Mr. Adelard Lanctot did unlawfully, &c., procure the payment of such labour by and out of the public moneys of the Dominion of Canada for his own purpose and benefit; and leaving the matter at that and making no mention of the fact that every cent of the public money of Canada which had been used in the payment for this labour had been repaid and replaced by Mr. Lanctot, so that the treasury of this country did not lose one cent by the transaction.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (St. Anne, Montreal). Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure that we were all most edified by the homily with which the Minister of Justice premised his most eloquent address of this afternoon. I am not quite certain that that homily was exceedingly necessary. It would perhaps not be unfair to suggest that the address that followed on it was rather of a nature to make one feel that the orator, as he rose, felt that he himself needed to be reminded of those very sound principles which he laid down as those which should be our guides in dealing with this question. In my very humble way, Mr. Speaker, I purpose trying to put into practice the doctrine which he so lucidly and so clearly and so forcibly set forth with regard to the frame of mind in which this House should approach the consideration of the question that is before us. I purpose doing that even though in the doing of it I shall find myself compelled to absolutely refrain from following the example which the Minister of Justice set us with regard to the manner in which this question should be approached and judged, I rise with as high a realizing sense as any man could have, of the gravity of the duty that lies this evening upon the conscience of each and every one of us. I have no protestations to make with regard to my partisanship or absence of partisanship—protestations are something that I am not very fond of, and they do not carry much weight. I am willing to let my conduct speak, and to stand or fall by the testimony that that conduct may afford as to whether I be or be not a partisan. I must however, do the justice to the Minister of Justice of saying, that to a very great extent indeed he did follow his own advice that we should not make campaign speeches. He was not able to preserve quite to the end, however—and I believe it is to those who persevere unto the end that the crown is to be given—but he made a very successful effort for a considerable part of the time to avoid making a campaign speech. He made a speech, however, the tone of which is much more familiar to my ears than that of a campaign speech; he treated us with that eloquence which characterizes him to the typical speech (of course done in its most perfect method), but after all to the typical speech of the counsel before a criminal court who stands

making the defence of a man about whose case the least that is said the better. The Minister of Justice was eloquent on the character of his client. Now, I have no desire to say one word that would reflect on the character of the hon. member for Richelieu, save in so far as what I feel it my duty to say with regard to this particular charge may necessarily reflect upon his character. I am willing to assume, and I do so with pleasure, that we are approaching the consideration of the question, of whether, this gentleman hitherto enjoying an irreproachable character, is or is not guilty of the offence that is laid to his charge. The hon. the Minister of Justice was also eloquent on the penalty that might ensue if this House should decide that the hon. member for Richelieu was guilty of the charges brought against him. Hon. members who have had occasion to be present at criminal trials will have observed the pathetic tones with which counsel representing men whose offence carries capital punishment are apt to get far away from the question of the offence and to keep vividly before the eyes and the ears of the jurors the penalty that will follow if they find the accused guilty. That we had done this afternoon and done to perfection by the Minister of Justice. We were told that the question was whether the hon. member for Richelieu should be expelled from this House, and yet, Mr. Speaker, you hold in your hand the motion and the amendment to that motion, and is there one word of suggestion in either motion or amendment as to the infliction of a penalty upon the hon. member for Richelieu. Before you proceed to inflict a penalty you have to deal with the question of fact, and the question of fact is the whole question that we have before us for decision; the question whether as a matter of fact the hon. member for Richelieu is guilty of the offence charged against him, or, possibly as suggested by the hon. member for Welland in moving the motion, of some lesser offence that might be included in that charge that was made. That is the question we have before us. We have besides that, the question whether the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) has merited the censure that was passed upon him in the report of the majority of the committee. Those are the questions that we are called upon to determine; those are the questions that it is our duty to approach in that judicial frame of mind which the Minister of Justice so highly commended to us. And, we would be making just as grave a mistake if we allowed our judgment on those two questions to be swayed by the fact that the consequence of the finding in one way might be very grave for the hon. member for Richelieu, as we would be if we allowed ourselves in reaching a conclusion to forget that it is not only the hon. member for Richelieu who is gravely interested in the decision of this parliament, but that this parliament itself is gravely interested in the decision that it is going to render. We are called upon in this decision to set before the people of Canada what the standard is that parliament thinks should be fixed for worthiness or unworthiness to form part of itself. That is a matter of no little importance. It is important to this whole country that the people of this country should be taught that the standard of morality, the standard of honour, of their representatives, if not of the very highest which I would like to see it set at, is at all events one which does not fall below the average standard of the people of this country.

And now, Mr. Speaker, I address myself directly to the consideration of the questions that we are called upon to consider and decide. We have before us two reports from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, one of which tells us in substance that the conduct of the hon. member for Richelieu, as revealed in the evidence laid before that committee, is above reproach—not only that, but that he was so stainless, that his conduct was so far above suspicion, that the belief, the acknowledged honest, sincere belief, of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin), that the hon. member for Richelieu is guilty or rather his action based on that belief is deserving of the condemnation of this House. We have, on the other hand, a minority report that finds in substance that the hon. member for Richelieu has been guilty of unlawfully procuring for himself the services of workmen paid with the moneys of the people of Canada and goods belonging to the people of Canada, that that work and those goods have been appropriated to his own uses, and that he obtained them by unlawfully combining or co-operating with employees of the government of Canada to place at his disposal that work and hand over to him those goods; and we have the further finding that, in the judgment of the minority of the committee, this conduct on the part of the hon. member for Richelieu infringed the independence of parliament. So far, on the part of the two hon. members who have spoken in support of the report of the majority, it has appeared that they considered that the question that we have to decide, the great important question, was not how the member for Richelieu got that work done for him or how he got hold of those goods, but whether he paid for them or not. I think that very fairly results from what I consider, if I may be permitted to say so, the very moderate, and from his point of view very fair, laying before this House of the questions involved, by the hon. member for

Welland (Mr. German). It certainly appears absolutely clear from the speech of the right hon. Minister of Justice, who, in addition to the high character of the hon. member for Richelieu, dwelt upon the fact that his conduct, since this charge was made, has been such as to bring home to the mind of every fair man conviction of his innocence. And what was the particular act that he held up to us as showing that conclusively? Why, Mr. Speaker, he said that the hon. member for Richelieu, when he paid for these goods, paid for them with his own cheque to the Department of Marine and Fisheries. He made this payment in the manner that would make it the most public thing possible, that would make it absolutely susceptible of such conclusive proof that he that ran might read and be convinced. If the hon. member for Richelieu had felt that there was anything guilty in this payment, would he, the Minister of Justice asked, have made it in that way? The hon. minister was very eloquent on that point. But he completely forgot that the payment was not the thing with which the member for Richelieu was charged. The payment is the entire defence of the hon. member for Richelieu, and, the payment being his entire defence, wonderful to relate, and as conclusive proof of his spotless innocence, he took the trouble to provide himself with conclusive proof of his entire defence. Who can be so partisan as to think him guilty after that? I say that hon. gentlemen on the other side have treated this matter as though the question were whether the hon. member for Richelieu paid or did not pay. The hon. member for Welland seemed to consider that he having paid, that ended the matter, and there was no further ground of complaint. I am not clear what the view of the hon. Minister of Justice was of the nature of the act of payment, because he seemed to consider it something wonderful that that act should have been publicly performed ; but I take it that it was in that fact that he found the proof of innocence. Now, Mr. Speaker, whether the hon. member for Richelieu paid in the end or did not pay, I submit, is not material to the substantial question which we have to decide. If we were dealing with the question of what penalty ought to be meted out to the hon. member for Richelieu, I am not prepared to say that this payment, made just as it was, might not avail as a mitigating circumstance; but I ask you, Mr. Speaker, does any one doubt that there are numbers of thieves in the penitentiary to-day who would gladly have paid what they had stolen if thereby they could have avoided the penalty? Both of these hon. gentlemen who spoke are lawyers, and distinguished lawyers, lawyers of the very highest eminence; and yet they stand before this House, apparently expecting us to accept their proposition, that it is of no consequence how the hon. member for Richelieu got the goods or got the work, provided only he paid for them. I wonder if these distinguished lawyers have heard of such a thing as compounding a felony. I wonder if they know that the victim of a theft who accepts restitution of the goods and undertakes not to prosecute the offender is guilty of an offence himself. And yet, if the charges brought against the hon. member for Richelieu, in regard to the manner in which he got the goods of this country, are true, then this House is being asked on his behalf to compound a felony because he paid. That is the position purely and simply. I am not saying at this stage whether the hon. member for Richelieu is guilty of these charges, but all I want to point out is that what is offered as a defence is absolutely no defence and has absolutely no bearing upon the question of his guilt so far as it is made to rest upon the proposition that he paid for these goods. The question is: Did he lawfully get these goods? If he got them unlawfully it did not become lawful because he paid for them afterwards. If he got them unlawfully it did not become lawful because he meant to pay for them later.

An hon. MEMBER. When he was found out.

Mr. DOHERTY. An hon. gentleman says ' when he was found out.'

Mr. TALBOT. That is a good Tory remark.

Mr. DOHERTY. It is a pleasure to hear the hon. gentleman, once in a while, approve of a Tory remark. But I was saying that even if it were true that when the hon. member for Richelieu got these goods he meant to pay for them, if he got them unlawfully, he is just as guilty as if he had not meant to. How many bank clerks, how many men in positions of trust, are in the penitentiary to-day expiating the offence of having embezzled the funds of their employers, who, nevertheless, when they took that money, honestly, sincerely and earnestly intended to pay and believed that they would pay?

Mr. Speaker, the question is not what was in the mind of the hon. member for Richelieu as to what he was going to do in the future when he got these goods; the question is not as to what he and these employees of the government from whom he got them, had in their minds as to what was going to be done in the future when they handed him over these goods; the question is whether, when these employees delivered over to him these goods and undertook to pay out the moneys of this country to the workmen of the hon. member

for Richelieu, they had the right to do it, and whether the hon. member for Richelieu, when he took those goods from those men and when he took the benefit of that work and allowed the government of Canada to be called upon to pay for it, had a right to do it. It is on that point that I want for one moment to refer to one statement in the evidence because I think that the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) when he stated the evidence upon this subject—and I do not question but that he did it in perfect good faith—misapprehended the effect absolutely of the statement of these accused men themselves as to what was in their minds and what they said to each other at the time of the commission of the alleged offence. I was surprised to hear the hon. member for Welland and, if I am not mistaken, the hon. Minister of Justice, speak of Pagé as an absolutely disinterested man, as some one entirely unaffected by the result of these charges. I was surprised at this, or rather I was not surprised because there are some things that the necessities of the case exact from a counsel. I recognize the familiar devices of a counsel to get around a difficulty and the Minister of Justice finds that he must absolutely separate the hon. member for Richelieu from the employees of this department. If I understand him aright his reasoning is: Well, perhaps the employees of the department stole those goods that they gave to Mr. Lanctot, but that has nothing to do with Mr. Lanctot, nothing in the world to do with him. Innocent Mr. Lanctot; guilty Mr. Pagé; guilty Mr. Champagne! Guilty of what?—giving the country's goods to Mr. Lanctot and paying the country's money to Mr. Lanctot's workmen. They may be guilty, the Minister of Justice says, and the Department of Marine may have many things to answer for, many wrong things may have been done, but, oh, turn your eyes away from the immaculate hon. member for Richelieu because he is not affected in the slightest!

Now, my proposition—and I think it is clearly demonstrated by the undisputed facts of this matter—is that if Mr. Pagé and Mr. Champagne misappropriated the goods and property of this country and handed them over to the hon. member for Richelieu he is an absolute and equal sharer in their guilt, and if they paid out the moneys of Canada to his workmen to paint his house he is as guilty as they of the commission of the offence. Inasmuch as we seem to live in an atmosphere where it seems to be considered that when you are dealing with the property and moneys of the people of this country, the ordinary words of the English language have no application, I would like to get down to the very simplest form of expression as to what, it seems to me, the uncontradicted evidence here, show to have been the nature of the act of Mr. Champagne and Mr. Pagé. As applied to government property and government money, at all events in the Department of Marine, the operation is described as 'borrowing.' In the ordinary parlance of this country and in the language of the criminal code it is called 'theft.' For the information of the eminent lawyers who consider that the whole question is whether this cheque was paid, I would like to read the definition of 'theft':

> Theft or stealing is the act of fraudulently and without colour of right taking or fraudulently and without colour of right converting to the use of any person——

You will notice there is no exception for members of parliament.

> —anything capable of being stolen——

Notice again absolutely no exception for things that belong to the people of Canada.

> —with intent to deprive the owner or any person having any special property or interest therein temporarily or absolutely of such thing or of such property or interest.

On the undisputed facts, what did Pagé do when he gave that paint? What did Champagne do when he undertook, and when he did, by false pretenses, by falsehood, get the money of the people of Canada from the department here and pay it over to Lanctot's workmen? If Mr. Pagé did not convert that paint, which, so far as I know, is an object capable of being stolen, to the use of a person, which I understand the hon. member for Richelieu to be, I am at a loss to know what he did. And if he did not do that fraudulently and without colour of right, then, I would ask some of the defenders of this act who may follow me, to tell me just how he did do it. Pagé and Champagne were two servants of the people of Canada. Pagé had in his possession these things, the property of the people of Canada. He had them entrusted to him—he says so himself, and it would be impossible to deny it—for use in the works of the people of Canada. And what did he do with them, he gave them to Mr. Lanctot for use in Mr. Lanctot's house. And when he gave them to Mr. Lanctot he effectively and for all time, deprived the people of Canada of the ownership of those goods. But hon. gentlemen opposite will say: Ah, but he did not do it fraudulently. I have not heard them suggest that he did it with any colour of right, but if I understand rightly, they do attach a great deal of importance to the point that he did not do it fraudulently. I wonder what the definition of these eminent lawyers is as to what constitutes doing a thing

fraudulently. Pagé has no right to use these articles other than for the work of the people of Canada. He handed them over absolutely without right to Mr. Lanctot and so deprived the people of Canada of these goods. I wonder how one of these hon. gentlemen opposite would feel if he went home some evening and found that some servant of his had given away—what shall I say?—these gentlemen are so devoted to harmony, let us say, the grand piano. The servant had got a solemn promise from the gentleman to whom he gave it, that he would bring it back again, or would give the hon. gentleman another piano. I wonder how long it would be before there would be a policeman in the house to deal with the servant who had—in such complete absence of fraud—given away the piano of the hon. gentleman. Why, the thing does not stand a moment's consideration. I give away another man's property, I turn it over from the purpose for which he entrusted it to me and give it to another person, and I have not acted fraudulently?

And now, with regard to the payment of the men—and that is a thing upon which I venture to correct a statement, in regard to the evidence of the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German). That hon. gentleman seems to have gathered from the evidence with regard to these men, that Mr. Lanctot went on throughout this transaction under the supposition that he was dealing with Mr. Champagne, and would have to pay Mr. Champagne, and that he did not know that the money of the government of Canada was being procured and paid over to these men. Now, the very evidence that the hon. member (Mr. German), cites as establishing the point, really shows that the hon. member for Richelieu could not have the very slightest notion of it. I am willing to take the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Lanctot), that, at the outset, that is what he meant—that he meant to pay the money to Champagne, and Champagne to pay it to the men. But that was never carried out and the evidence shows that he knew who was paying them. He tells us he offered to pay to Champagne. And what did Champagne tell him. He said: 'don't give the money to me for the men will think I am not giving all that I get; I don't want the money to go through my hands at all.' And the hon. member for Richelieu, notwithstanding his desire to pay, acquiesced in that. And this thing went on for four or five months. Does anybody suppose that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lanctot), thought the men were not being paid at all? He knew he was not furnishing the money. He knew the money was not going through the hands of Champagne, because Champagne absolutely refused to pay the men himself, and take the money from Lanctot, because, as he said—I am taking these versions to be true—the men will think I get more than I am paying. The hon. gentleman knew that the men were being paid and that Champagne was not paying them, and that he himself was not paying them. And the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), would ask us to believe that he (Mr. Lanctot), did not know that the government of Canada was paying. But we need not indeed we must not use any inferences—though inferences sometimes are as conclusive as any proof imaginable—for we have been warned by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), that any inferences that we draw will necessarily be inspired by our partisan feeling, so, we will be careful not to draw inferences but will take the testimony of the hon. member for Richelieu himself, as to whom he was dealing with. Here is the wind up of his testimony :

Q. How did you come to send this cheque to Mr. Papineau when you had arranged about this matter with Mr. Champagne and Mr. Pagé?—A. Because the account that was sent to me was made in the name of the Marine and Fisheries Department, Ottawa, and was made: 'A Lanctot Dr. to the Marine and Fisheries Department of Canada, Sorel.'

Q. Was it the first time at that date, November 21, 1910, you learned that you were doing business with the Marine and Fisheries Department for the painting of your house?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did you know from the beginning that you were doing business for the Department of Marine?——

No doubt that means 'with' the Department of Marine.

—A. Certainly. I knew that the men of the Department of Marine were working at my place, but not Mr. Champagne's men.

I think the hon. member for Welland himself, will correct his impression on that subject. The hon. member for Richelieu knew as well then as he knows now that these men were being paid with the moneys of the people of Canada, and, unless we assume that the hon. member for Richelieu is absolutely bereft of ordinary intelligence—and I am sure my hon. friends opposite would not ask us to make such an assumption as that—he knew that these moneys were not paid to these men unless they figured on the pay-lists of the government of Canada. And to tell us now that he is absolutely innocent in regard to the means resorted to to get that money, to tell us that Champagne was the bad man in that connection, that all the benefit was going to the hon. member for Richelieu and all the guilt was on the head of Champagne, why, it is childish, perfectly childish.

I say then, that the hon. member for Richelieu knew that these painters who were working for him were being paid with the money of the people of Canada, and he knew that that result could only be produced by a falsification of the pay-list. But whether he knew there was a falsification or not, is immaterial; he did know that they were being paid with the money of the people. I want to say here and now that it does not make any difference, so far as the member for Richelieu is concerned, whether that money was being paid without the knowledge of Mr. Papineau or with the knowledge of Mr. Papineau; that it does not make any difference whether that money was being paid with or without the knowledge of the minister, because that money was not Mr. Papineau's money and was not the money of the minister, and was not the money of the government; and neither Mr. Papineau nor the minister had any more right, if they had known this, to pay that money out to paint Mr. Lanctot's house, than Mr. Champagne had. The only difference it makes is, who is the guilty man in the Department of Marine and Fisheries, that is all. But Mr. Lanctot's position is absolutely the same, whoever it was that paid that money. Surely I am not to be told that Mr. Lanctot may have innocently supposed that Mr. Champagne had a right to do that; that he may have innocently supposed that Pagé had any such right; that Mr. Lanctot may have innocently supposed that the minister had that right. If the minister had been the man that Mr. Lanctot dealt with, the only difference would have been that it was the minister and Mr. Lanctot who had combined to steal from the people of Canada; that it all.

Mr. GERMAN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question? Supposing Mr. Lanctot had entered into a distinct arrangement with Mr. Champagne that the government officials were to be supplied to paint his house, that they were to be paid for by government money during the course of their work, and that he was to refund the money to the government; under those circumstances does my hon. friend think that Mr. Lanctot would be guilty of an offence?

Mr. DOHERTY I certainly think he would be guilty of a legal offence.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. GERMAN. The Independence of Parliament Act.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am not discussing the Independence of Parliament Act, I am discussing the offences of which this hon. gentleman is accused, and I am somewhat pained to see the amusement created in the minds of some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House because I have suggested that if Mr. Lanctot went to Mr. Champagne and asked him to pay the money of the people of Canada to his workmen, because he, Mr. Lanctot, was going to pay him back again, Mr. Lanctot would have been guilty of an offence. If the laughter of the hon. members indicate their standard of what is right and wrong in the matter of dealing with other people's money, it is to be hoped that their views will not prevail in this House. Why, Sir, if I walked into a bank to-morrow and asked the teller behind the counter to go on and pay the bank's money out to my workmen and I would pay him by and by, and if the bank manager came down at the end of the week and found that young man short in his cash, I wonder whether that bank manager's standard would be that of the hon. gentlemen who laugh. I see my distinguished, and eloquent and eminent friend, the Crown prosecutor for the distrirct of Montreal, sitting opposite and listening to me with an attention that is flattering. I wonder if he would hesitate to indict the young man whose cash was so found short for having embezzled the funds of his employer. Why, the thing seems to me, as it must seem to every normal mind with ordinary ideas of the difference between meum and tuum, as absolutely self evident. I do not know whether it is that hon. members who are so much amused, having been so long now in the enjoyment of all the benefits and advantages that come from being faithful supporters of the present administration, have come to have a somewhat confused notion about whose the tuum is when it is a question of the money of the people of Canada. Do they apply a different rule in that case? I say that Mr. Champagne, when he paid the money of the people to the men who worked on Mr. Lanctot's house, stole the money of the people of Canada, and I say that Mr. Lanctot knowingly took that money which belonged to the people. It may have been salve to his own conscience—I am not here to judge this matter in foro conscientiae; we are living in the outside world where we have to judge of mens' intentions by their actions—it may have been salve to his conscience that he had paid the money back again. But whether he got these goods rightfully or wrongfully, they were not his and he owed for them, or was bound to restore them, and if he got them wrongfully, that made a double debt. So I say that on the undisputed facts, these men, to the knowledge of Mr. Lanctot, stole the money of the people of Canada to pay Mr. Lanctot's workmen. Possibly he may not have realized that to do so they had to falsify the pay-list, that is a matter of minor interest. But the great fact stands

there that they stole the money, they stole the goods, or the Criminal Code does not mean what it says, and does not mean anything. It used to be said the receiver was worse than the thief. As I understand the position to-day, a man who is an accomplice is guilty of the offence; and Mr. Lanctot was as clearly as a man could be an accomplice in the acts of these men.

Now I am told that he had agreed to pay it back again, and he did pay it back again. The offence was complete when he got the goods, and the fact that he paid for the goods afterwards does not alter the fact that he had committed the offence; and what may have been the idea in his mind as to what he was going to do, I submit we cannot safely take as having any bearing on the question. We are told that he was in dire necessity, there was not a painter in Sorel. Mr. Lanctot's house had to be painted. The hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) spent some time this afternoon in showing how completely the attempt had failed to prove that there were any painters in Sorel. A convenient doctrine. I need something for my house, I cannot get it in Montreal.

My hon. friend the member for Welland has it. My hon. friend the member for Welland has a most agreeable and obliging servant who is a friend of mine. What more natural, what more absolutely innocent, what more positively commendable? It puts me on a pedestal as a hero. Why of course I go to my hon. friend's servant and I say: You just give me this thing which your master owns and I do not, and I will give you another one by and by. That is precisely the position. Why should we waste time discussing whether there were painters in Sorel or not? It does not make a particle of difference to the fact that this man gave away government property. Are we to have every time-keeper and foreman painter—because Champagne a time-keeper and Pagé a foreman painter—throughout Canada in any department of this government empowered to sit in judgment on the relative necessities of the citizens of this country and give them what they want, whenever such employees are satisfied that they cannot get what they want anywhere else. It is difficult really, to have patience with pretensions of this kind, really difficult. Manifestly the pretended absence of painters in Sorel has no bearing on the question arising on the different reports of the committee, the question before us, namely, the question of how Mr. Lanctot got these goods. I fail to see how it is possible to describe the operation by which he was put in possession of these goods, and secured the payment of this money to these workmen by any other word than theft. If the English language has another word, I would be glad to employ it. The word 'borrow' is suggested, and might be used if you could borrow from a man what is not his own, and what he has no right to lend, own, and what he has no right to lend, and if he may lend that without stealing goods; if that is so then Mr. Lanctot borrowed it. If you cannot do that, Mr. Lanctot got the proceeds of the thefts of these men and there is no other way to describe it. I was surprised to hear the Minister of Justice declare that there was nothing unlawful in all this matter, because, forsooth, there was no violation in his opinion of section 14 of the Independence of Parliament Act. Besides the Independence of Parliament Act, there is the Criminal Code, and it makes a variety of things unlawful, amongst others, the appropriation of your neighbour's goods when you have no right to them. There is besides that a moral code which may be supposed to have some restraining influence over gentlemen worthy to be members of parliament, and so far as I understand the rules of that code, it likewise rather frowns upon the appropriating to yourself of the goods of other people when you have no right to them.

I need not waste time pointing out that Champagne's consent and Pagé's consent and Papineau's consent if it had been obtained did not bear upon the question in the slightest degree and that Mr. Lanctot knew that; but so far as it goes, even if we assume that Mr. Lanctot was in a state of ignorance I would be sorry to attribute to him, and did suppose that Papineau the superintendent sat there with jurisdiction to determine when he was entitled to give the goods of the government away, we have it clearly shown that Mr. Lanctot being told that that was the essential condition, never got the permission of Papineau. As throwing light upon this state of perfect good faith that is attributed to Mr. Lanctot, I think it is our duty not to pass over the circumstances with regard to the obtaining of that permission. He proved to us by his own testimony as conclusively justifying his taking the stuff without permission, that he went to see Papineau, and Papineau was not in, and he seems to have assumed that because Papineau was not in, that changed the whole nature of the situation with regard to the person who was entitled to control, even if we suppose that the superintendent had power to give these things away. He went immediately to Champagne and made his bargain with him, and it all had to be done in a hurry because he was going to Saranac that afternoon, and he had to catch a train. This was on the 29th of May, and the painting went on until the 21st of November, and we have it on the testimony of Mr. Lanctot himself that the only thing about which there was any hurry on the 28th or 29th of May, was

that the carpenters were engaged in putting the clapboards on the exterior, and there was some hurry to have a man put the priming on the boards before they got dry. —Let us say that that justified Mr. Lanctot in getting a man to go and hurry up the job. But how does that explain his refraining from any communication with Papineau throughout the whole summer and fall? It is quite true there were some weeks when Mr. Lanctot was absent from Sorel, but we have his testimony that he got back on the 20th of June and was there until the 20th of July. He came again in August, and he was there for quite a period of time and all this work was going on; in fact the contention is, when it is a question of showing that Mr. Douaire did not paint as many days as he said, that there was little work done in July and August, and that the bulk was done in the fall after Mr. Lanctot came home and Mr. Lanctot with his knowledge that he should have the permission of Mr. Papineau at all events, never went near Mr. Papineau in any way. The testimony of Mr. Papineau, whom we are all agreed, is an honest and reliable man, in reply to my own question is that if he had been asked to do this thing he would not have done it. He adds that no subordinate of his, of course, had power or right to do a thing that he had not the right to do. He does say—because I do not want to mis-state it, although I do not think it has any bearing—that there might conceivably be cases of such urgency and necessity as to induce him to send a man out for a day. But he says that under normal circumstances he would not have done it, and that he considered no subordinate of his had a right to do that which he himself had no right to do.

Mr. TALBOT. Is it not a fact that Mr. Papineau lives right across the street from where that house was being built, that every day he saw these men working there and knew they were in the employ of the government?

Mr. DOHERTY. It is absolutely a fact that Mr. Papineau lives just about opposite Mr. Lanctot's house, but it is also a fact that Papineau swears—I do not know if the hon. gentleman throws discredit on his testimony—that he did not know that this work was being done. I am perfectly free to say that it is a great pleasure once in a while to be able to agree with people with whom you generally disagree. I am quite willing to say it is a matter of surprise to myself that Mr. Papineau did not know. I cannot claim any very intimate personal acquaintance with Mr. Papineau, but I have heard from all sides, and I think the minister will bear it out, that Mr. Papineau is a truthful man and he swears that he did not know.

There is just one word I would like to offer which perhaps the member for Bellechasse may be willing tol isten to, although he seems very incredulous, and it is that what Papineau did not know was that these men who were working there were working for the government and being paid by the government. The fact that they were usually government employees and were working on that house might be explained. I have no brief for Papineau and it is immaterial to me whether he knew or not, but I think it is right to be fair to every man, particularly to a man in whose honesty you have absolute confidence, when it is put in question by my hon. friend. There was a custom in Sorel of which Mr. Papineau did know; a custom under which it did happen that people came to the department and said: Would you lend me a man, and men were lent in a way with regard to which I see no reproach to make—a man was actually lent, that is to say, the department said to him: Go and work for Mr. So and So, and Mr. So and So will pay you and you will get your job when you come back, but in the meantime you won't be stamping on the clock and drawing your money from the government of the country.

Mr. TALBOT. If Mr. Papineau is the man whom my hon. friend believes he is, does he not think he would inquire how these men got there and why they were there?

Mr. DOHERTY. I do think that Mr. Papineau would have been entitled to more commendation if he had done so, although I do not recognize I have jurisdiction to pronounce upon Mr. Papineau's actions. It did strike me as extraordinary that Mr. Papineau did not concern himself more about the matter than he did, but it is fair to say that Mr. Papineau was not charged before us and was not offered an opportunity of giving an explanation, and I do not stand here to condemn him. I am trying to deal with the matter that is before us, and I am trying to be just to every one concerned. If the hon. member for Bellechasse thinks he has any interest in convicting Mr. Papineau of some offence, I can refer him to Mr. Papineau's superior, the Minister of Marine, who, no doubt, will accommodate the hon. member. But I do say that Mr. Papineau swears, and he is not contradicted, that he did not know this kind of thing was going on, that if he had been asked he would not have permitted it. And Messrs. Pagé and Champagne, who were carrying out this job for the member for Richelieu, were very careful to see that nothing happened that came to the knowledge of Mr. Papineau. Mr. Champagne even went the length of falsifying his pay-list with no other object that I can see than to conceal the fact that

these men were working for Mr. Lanctot. There is every evidence that so far as these men could they kept it from Mr. Papineau's knowledge. There is Mr. Papineau's own testimony that he never knew, and there is the testimony of the men who swore—testimony at which the hon. member for Welland sneers, but which stands there, and finds remarkable corroboration in the fact that Mr. Papineau did not know—that they were warned when they carried the paint from the Sorel yards to take a route that would enable them to avoid Mr. Papineau. Much has been made of the fact that Mr. Papineau lived opposite and that they had to pass in front of his house, but the hour at which they were carrying the paint would be the hour at which Mr. Papineau would be on his way from his house to the works, and they were told to take certain streets so that they would not meet him. It was not a question of their being seen from Mr. Papineau's house; it was a question of their not being seen by Mr. Papineau on the way, because they were loaded with paint and Mr. Papineau might have asked inconvenient questions. I can quite conceive that Mr. Papineau may have known that these particular men were working on Mr. Lanctot's house, and may have supposed it was under this custom we were told existed there, of men being really and genuinely lent to outside people. There may be something to be said about the desirability of that custom, but at all events it does not mean employing the money of Canada for other people's advantage, or giving the goods of Canada to other people. For my part, I believe that Mr. Lanctot knew—because he could not help knowing—that these goods were in the Sorel yards for the people of Canada and not for him, that these men were working in the Sorel yards and that the money paid them was to be paid for the work they did for the people of Canada and not for him. That he could not help knowing that. If he had gone in there and stolen a barrel of paint would he be able to defend himself by saying: I did not know it belonged to the people of Canada, I did not know whom it belonged to. And if he could not defend himself in such a case, he can no more defend himself now by saying he did not know that that paint was not the property of these men who gave it to him. The two things are absolutely on a parity. So that I say, that not only did he know but he was warned with regard to Mr. Papineau that without his permission, at all events, he could not have these things. And if we assume him to be ignorant enough to think that Mr. Papineau's permission would have helped him, he never moved a finger to get it; never did anything after that one afternoon when he went down and found that Mr. Papineau was not in. I do not want to draw any inference or make any insinuations, but I might be pardoned for saying that sometimes people do go calling and are not heartbroken when they are told that the person they go to call on is not in. At all events, this fact does stand out: that Mr. Lanctot succeeded very very much better in his mission, because Mr. Papineau was not there, for if Mr. Papineau had been there we have his own testimony that Mr. Lanctot would not have got this permission. On that branch of the case, to my mind, it is perfectly impossible to reach the conclusion of the majority of the committee that the hon. member for Richelieu was blameless in this matter; it is absolutely impossible unless you are prepared to say that a man may take what does not belong to him, and if he only pays for it afterwards it is all right. Unless you are prepared to say that every man who is prepared to pay for what he steals is entitled to steal. Mr. Lanctot cannot be acquitted in the way in which he has been acquitted by the majority of this committee. For my part I would be glad to take any charitable view that could possibly be taken of what has happened. I would be willing to make allowance for what may have been the habit in Sorel. but that is not proved and I do not want to affirm it. I must say that somewhat to my surprise Mr. Lanctot's counsel strenuously objected to proof that this kind of thing went on generally in Sorel. If I had been defending Mr. Lanctot—I am not now talking about what might have been the interest of the department or others—but if I had been defending Mr. Lanctot, I certainly would not have objected to that proof because it might at least have explained how he came to let himself slide into the idea that he could take these goods under the circumstances and not be guilty of any offence. That might have been in mitigation; that might have had to be considered when we came to deal with Mr. Lanctot's position from the point of view of any penalty that might be imposed. We are not at all concerned to-night in determining, I repeat, whether Mr. Lanctot ought to be expelled from this House or not; we are not determining whether there should be any penalty meted out to him, or what penalty should be so meted out to him, we are concerned simply with the question of fact: did he lawfully or unlawfully get these goods and that money, the property of the people of Canada. And, the verdict that is going to be sent out to this country if the majority of the House stands behind the Minister of Justice and finds there was nothing unlawful, is going to be an invitation to the public in general: Come on one and all; here we are, the government of Canada,

maintaining workshops to do the work of the country, and you are quite welcome to come in and get your work done for you at cost price; we will pay the whole fixed charges and the operating charges and all the expense involved in the maintenance of these great establishments, and you will be the pink of honesty if you come in and get your goods from our employees even without our knowledge. Provided, you give us back exactly what the goods cost us and exactly what we pay the men, we will stand up and say that the people of Canada have lost nothing. Who pays to maintain that establishment? Who pays to put those facilities there, at the disposal of Mr. Lanctot, if they are at his disposal, and at the disposal of everybody else? Who pays for that entire organization of superintendents? Who supplies all the brushes and tools of every description that were used in this work? Everybody knows that paint brushes were used to paint the house, and yet there is not a solitary paint brush paid for. Who pays for all these things? Surely, Mr. Speaker, if the people of Canada have gone into the business of contracting painters, or any other business, they are entitled to have the reasonable profit that anybody else has; and Mr. Lanctot, if his payment has been made, is keeping in his pocket to-day the profit which the people of Canada were legitimately entitled to on that work.

I come to a point where, in his conclusion at all events, I am happy to be able to agree with the Minister of Justice; but it is not nearly as troublesome to me to get to my conclusion, and fortunately it does not need anything like the same eloquence as he devoted to his conclusion this afternoon; nor does it need any argument to support it. The Minister of Justice says that we have not proof of a violation of section 14 of the Independence of Parliament Act. Mr. Speaker, I do not think there has been proved a violation of the text of section 14 or section 15 of the Independence of Parliament Act, for one very simple reason: the Independence of Parliament Act deals with contractual relations between a member of parliament and the government of this country. In this case, to my mind, it is absolutely clear that there were no contractual relations between Mr. Lanctot and the government of this country. The relation that existed between Mr. Lanctot and the government of this country was the relation between a man who had unlawfully obtained another man's property and the man whose property had been so obtained, and which generates an obligation to repay it, and that is not a contractual obligation.

Now, I would stop here if it were not for what strikes me as the most extraordinary feature of the report of the majority of this committee. I am free to confess that in the face of the evidence, I find the report as a whole extraordinary; but what is extraordinary beyond my limited powers of expression, is the censure which the committee has pronounced upon the hon. member for Champlain. And if anything could be more extraordinary than that censure, it is the reason on which it rests. It is worth reading:

> Your committee feel that in view of the very serious nature of the charges made they should express an opinion on the propriety of Mr. Blondin making the charges in the manner he did. Your committee do not wish to state that Mr. Blondin did not believe there was truth in the allegations, or that he did not act from a bona fide belief in their truthfulness, but the committee think that before making so serious a charge against an honourable member of the House of Commons, he should have made some independent inquiry to verify the truthfulness of the charges made and, which he apparently did not do. The Minister of Marine was called as a witness. His evidence as to this on page 189 where he says he had information that no fraud had been committed and that all labour supplied by the shipyards had been paid for and all material supplied had been returned and which information he would have been pleased to give Mr. Blondin had he applied for same.

Now what is the information that Mr. Blondin could have had? Had it any bearing on how the member for Richelieu got these goods or this work? Not a particle. It was that the hon. member for Richelieu had paid for them. What I said at the outset, I think, quite disposes of that. If it were true that the hon. Minister of Marine had said, as he is made to say in this report, that he had information that there was no fraud at all in the matter, and had been in a position to satisfy Mr. Blondin the hon. member for Champlain of that, there might be something to be said, though for my part I question the soundness of the proposition that a man who has credible information that very grave offences have been committed, is bound to go to any minister in this government or any other and absolutely abandon them on the ipse dixit of the minister. I am not in that desirous of being understood as wishing to question in any way the truthfulness of the particular minister. I am speaking as a general proposition. To say that with the strong testimony Mr. Blondin had it was his duty to go further before he laid those charges, and that the going further meant that he should have gone to the minister and been satisfied with what he said, is, I submit, absolutely untenable. But more than that. Stop for a moment to reflect on what the committee knew. The hon. member for Champlain rose in his place and made these charges and read these affidavits; and the

hon. member for Richelieu rose in his place and thanked the hon. member for Champlain for giving him an opportunity of disproving them, admitting in the most categorical way that there was ground for suspicion and that he was labouring under grave and serious suspicion which he had an interest to remove. I am not inventing that. You will find that in the very first statement of the hon. member for Richelieu:

I must say that I have no objection whatever to the motion of the hon. member for Champlain, asking that the charges preferred against me as a member of this House be referred for investigation to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I am glad that he has brought this matter to the attention of the House, and I court the fullest and the most complete investigation of it.

Now, if the hon. member for Richelieu did not know that there was a prima facie case, and a strong prima facie case against him, would he have said that he was glad to have the charges brought forward and to have an investigation? But, more than that: the Minister of Marine and Fisheries sat in the House and heard these charges and this answer, and if he had then in his possession this information which was absolutely conclusive and which would have led the hon. member for Champlain to abandon his charges, did the hon. minister quite do his duty when he did not put that information before the House? I am not imputing to him that he did not do his duty, because I have no hesitation in saying that there is nothing in the evidence which the hon. minister laid before the committee which justifies the conclusion that if the hon. member for Champlain had gone to him and had heard what he had to say, he would have adopted a different course. The minister in giving his testimony was very careful, I think quite properly so, to express no opinion whatever on the lawfulness of what had been done. I would like to read that testimony because it is important in its bearing on this branch of the case. Now, this is what the hon. member for Champlain would have learned if he had gone to the hon. minister—I am not going to read it all. He would have learned, in the first place, that the hon. minister had a letter from the hon. member for Richelieu denying these charges. And just while we are passing, to show how conclusive a basis that would have been for the hon. member for Champlain to have accepted as a reason for abandoning these charges, let me point out that there is on the very face of that letter an absolute falsehood. We have had the conduct of the hon. member for Richelieu, since the charges were made, held up to us as a reason for concluding in his perfect innocence and yet, on the 6th December—and this is a part of the evidence that the majority of the committee think should cause my hon. friend from Champlain to withdraw his charges—the hon. member for Richelieu, in answer to a letter from the minister, calling his attention to the charges, writes:

Mr. Douaire states in his declaration that certain painters of the Department of Marine and Fisheries have worked at my house, and have been paid by said department. This is true; but as soon as their work was finished I reimbursed the department as per understanding with the officers.

So far so good.

I did the same with regard to borrowed material. The whole was paid several days before the filing of those documents.

These documents were dated on the 30th November. There was no settlement for the materials until the 12th December, six days after that letter was written in which the hon. member for Richelieu affirmed that the whole was paid several days before the making of the declaration.

Mr. GERMAN. Is it not fair to state that Mr. Lanctot had made an arrangement with Mr. Papineau that the materials were to be returned prior to the date you have mentioned?

Mr. DOHERTY. It would be fair to state it, but I think it would be a mistake.

Mr. GERMAN. No, that is right.

Mr. DOHERTY. I will just show the testimony of Mr. Lanctot himself as to when he made that arrangement.

Mr. GERMAN. There was not more than a day or two difference anyway.

Mr. DOHERTY. Before I go on to show that there was no settlement before this letter was written with regard to the materials, I want to point out that in any case it was absolutely untrue to say that the whole was paid for before the 30th November and before the declarations were made. That was absolutely untrue.

Mr. GERMAN. Well, it had been arranged for.

Mr. DOHERTY. To get right down to the question of whether, when that letter was written, there had been any settlement for the paint, let us take Mr. Lanctot's own testimony. If it shows me to be mistaken I shall acknowledge it most fairly and most unhesitatingly, because I have no desire to be unfair. The account dated December 12, 1910, will be found on page 24, of the evidence. I want to take the evidence verbatim so that there may be no question as to what Mr. Lanctot himself says about it.

Q. To who did you ask the accounts for paints?—A. To Mr. Pagé?

Q. Did he make a bill for it?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Have you got it?—A. Yes, sir. It was sent to Mr. Papineau.

Then he gives us the bill which is the bill that Mr. Papineau paid to the people who furnished the goods. I think that, as Mr. Papineau's honesty has been questioned, we here have the evidence of it. Mr. Papineau did not wait for Mr. Lanctot to come and make a settlement. When he found that the goods for which he was responsible had disappeared he ordered and paid for similar goods with his own cheque and restored the things that had been within his custody and that he was responsible for although he had no guilty knowledge of how they had disappeared.

Mr. GERMAN. What was the date of the bill that he paid?

Mr. DOHERTY. The 12th December, 1910. Mr. Lanctot is asked:

Q. I do not understand this account, Mr. Lanctot; this account is from the Mount Royal Color and Varnish Company, Limited, of Montreal, to the Department of Marine?—A. This is the account that was sent to the Department of Marine and Fisheries to replace the materials I had got from the Department of Marine and Fisheries. I will explain how it was done: After having sent my cheque to Mr. Papineau on the 22nd of November, 1910—which was Tuesday or Wednesday, I believe—the following Saturday, I think, I came from Ottawa to Sorel. I saw Mr. Papineau at the Department of Marine who told me:——

That is a little remarkable. He does not go to Mr. Papineau to get his bill but he saw Mr. Papineau, and the latter said to him.

—'You have an account for paints; you had some paint; you had some material from Mr. Jean-Baptiste Pagé. Here is his account.'

Q. He had the account?—A. Yes, he had the account. He told me: 'You want to return these goods, do you not?'——

That is not an offer to return them.

—'I said: 'Yes, as it was understood with Mr. Pagé.'

Q. At what date did this take place?—A. I could not say exactly at what date. I know it was a Saturday, at all events.

Q. How many days had elapsed from the time you had sent your cheque to the time you had this interview with Mr. Pagé?—A. I do not know. It was the following Saturday or the Saturday after or the fortnight after——

That was either the first Saturday or a fortnight after he had the interview with Mr. Papineau.

—I coud not say exactly. It was not very long after anyway.

Q. Then it was the following Saturday, or the Saturday a week following?—A. I suppose so. Perhaps I saw him on the street; I do not remember. Mr. Papineau told me: 'I will send Mr. Pagé's account. I will give a requisition to get the same quantity and the same quality of material from the factory to correspond with the material you got from the shop.'

Q. I repeat my question. Did you receive an account from Jean-Baptiste Pagé for the paint that was furnished to you?—A. I tell you it was sent to Mr. Papineau. I do not remember having seen it.

Q. Will you, if you please, answer directly to my question and say if Mr. Pagé furnished you with an account?—A. I do not remember. At all events if I got an account from Mr. Pagé, I took it to Mr. Papineau. Mr. Papineau sent a requisition for the same quantity and the same quality to the same factory and the goods were shipped to Sorel and I paid the freight for the carriage of the goods from Montreal to Sorel.

Q. Will you explain, Mr. Lanctot, how it is that on the 22nd of November, 1910, you had settled, according to your statement, with the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the sum of $375, amount of your cheque for the work done by the men at your house and you did not settle on the same day for the material and paint furnished?—A. It is because I was not to pay for the material. I had borrowed it and I was to return it. . .

Then below:

Mr. Papineau paid the factory and I reimbursed Mr. Papineau.

So that, unmistakably, he had not paid Mr. Papineau on the 6th December. Thus, I say whether this understanding with Mr. Papineau was or was not before the 6th December, it is clear that he had not paid for the material before the declarations were made, and clear that he was not to pay for the material at all but was to return it. I think the letter does say that he was to return it. The testimony of Mr. Papineau shows that there was quite a long delay, shows that it was in December. This is what Mr. Papineau says at page 109: He is asked about the painting of the house:

When did you see Mr. Lanctot in connection with this account, Exhibit No. 20?

That is for painting.

A. Well, I saw him—at the time of receiving the letter. I expected to see him within a few days and then I acknowledged the receipt.

So that on December 2, when Mr. Papineau acknowledged the receipt, he had not yet seen Mr. Lanctot.

When I saw he was not turning up in Sorel I acknowledged the receipt of the letter,——

I hope the hon. member is satisfied that he had no arrangement previous to the 2nd of December.

—and a few days afterwards I had occasion to see him in Sorel and I mentioned the account.

That is the second, the day on which Mr. Papineau wrote, and he had not yet any

pretense of a settlement. Four days after that, on the 6th, Mr. Lanctot was in Ottawa. He can hardly on the interval have made a settlement, And even if he had, was it right that he should say he had made a settlement long before the 30th of November? It is inconceivable he should have done that if he were trying to tell the truth.

—which account, the account Mr. Champagne had given you?—A. The account for material. I told him I thought the best plan would be to have the same quantities of material returned to the department. He was quite willing that I have that done for him.

Q. That was the last communication you had with him on that subject?—A. I do not recall any other.

Q. Well, in writing you, for instance, inclosing the cheque to pay for the mens' time did not he also tell you there would be an account for material, for paints? Did he say anything about that?—A. I do not think he said anything, but I knew it about the same time.

Q. Then you knew it from Mr. Champagne? Well then he agreed to return the materials to the department?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, how were the materials got?—A. About the same time——

That is, about the time the settlement was made—about the 12th December, I put it at:

—about that time there was the manager of the Mount Royal Paint and Varnish Company——

Q. Mr. Lamontagne?—A. Mr. Lamontagne—happened to be in Sorel and as he was one of the men supplying material for the department at one time and another, I gave him a list of what we required; you see the list was according to that memoranda.

Q. The memoranda of Mr. Champagne? Exhibit No. 20?—A. Yes. Mr. Pagé, so that Mr. Lamontagne agreed to send the goods to the department, and I gave him my personal cheque.

Q. Have you any cheque with you, Mr. Papineau?—A. Yes. Then at the next——

Q. Will you exhibit your cheque?—A. Yes.

And the cheque is dated 12th of December, and the goods were charged on the 12th, and delivered, I think, on the 13th. So, I think I was making no mistake in saying that not only was there no payment but there was no settlement with Mr. Papineau when Mr. Lanctot wrote that letter. In the second place, the minister himself says that he would not have undertaken to say a word to Mr. Blondin, if that hon. gentleman had gone to him, about the lawfulness or unlawfulness of what had happened, what he would have told him was that the goods had been paid for. Well, of course, if that settled matters we would not be here this evening. But the whole point is that we do not settle an unlawful appropriation of goods by paying for them. This is what the minister says on the subject, I quote from the portion of his evidence which bears on Mr. Blondin's conduct. The minister (Mr. Brodeur), is being examined by Mr. Laflamme:

Q. Well now, just one question: from the 22nd of November up to the 6th of March, did Mr. Blondin ever inquire from you directly or indirectly, verbally or in writing, personally or through outside parties, whether or not the labour had been paid as well as the material?

Question objected to, but the Chairman allows the question.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur.—No, he did not.

By the Chairman—

Q. Could he have ascertained by inquiry from you that Mr. Lanctot had paid for the labour that was done on his house and also had returned to the department the material which had been supplied to him for that purpose?—A. Yes, Mr. Blondin, being a member of parliament, and making an inquiry of that kind, I would be very glad, of course, to have given him the information which I had in my department concerning the matter.

By Mr. Laflamme—

Q. That is to say, you had on the 6th of March all the information required to inform the House generally——

We know the minister did not inform the House generally:

—as well as Mr. Blondin, that the material had not been fraudulently appropriated, robbed or stolen?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. But had been borrowed?—A. Immediately after I got that information, as I told you, I inquired from Mr. Lanctot, and later on from Mr. Papineau, and I was informed that the labour had been reimbursed, had been paid by Mr. Lanctot and that the material had been given back.

Now, if there is anything in that to satisfy one that the labour and material had been lawfully got, then Mr. Blondin should have withdrawn his charges. But to say material illegally got had been paid for or returned, leaves the charge exactly where it was.

By Mr. McDougall—

Q. As I understand, that would be a matter of opinion. You considered at that time the matter to be lawful and others may have considered it unlawful?—A. I do not speak of the lawfulness of the matter. I speak of the information which I had been given.

Q. The information which you had?—A. Yes.

Q. And the information which you had consisted of letters of Mr. Lanctot saying that the matter was all right, that he had borrowed the goods and had paid for them?—A. Yes. He told me that it was true that some men had worked on his house——

This also is important as showing that Mr. Lanctot—different from the impression of the hon. member for Welland—knew that these men were on the pay-lists.

—and were retained on the pay-list, but that he had had reimbursed the money.

Q. And from that you drew an inference?—A. I must say, however, if I remember aright, in all justice to Mr. Lanctot, that he did not think those men were to be put on the list.

Q. And from that you drew the inference that everything was all right. As minister, you were prepared to impart the information to Mr. Blondin or to anybody else that everything was all right?——

And here again the minister was guarded.

—A. Without passing judgment on the irregularity of the proceeding, I would have been ready to give any member of parliament all the information I had because I thought it was for the benefit of all concerned.

I think that is all that bears on the statement that Mr. Blondin could have got the information if he had asked for it.

So, the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin), has been censured by this majority report in this respect, because he did not go to the minister by whom he would have been told that Mr. Lanctot had paid for the work on the 22nd of November, and had returned the goods some time after. Now, if it were not that sufficient weight, is attached to the fact to build on it this condemnation of the hon. member for Champlain, I would not refer to it, but it is a significant fact—which might have influenced the judgment of the hon. member for Champlain as much as the statement of the minister, which no doubt was perfectly true according to the information he had received—that what the hon. member for Champlain would have learned is that the sending of this cheque with great promptitude on the 22nd of November, the bill being made on the 21st, was singularly coincident with the fact that the minister, on the 22nd of November had sent instructions to Sorel to institute further investigation into the Marine and Fisheries Department. Now, was that a circumstance that would have added, in the mind of the hon. member for Champlain, any very great weight as bearing upon the manner in which these goods were obtained, to the fact that payment had been paid on that very specific date? All these circumstances would still have remained, that all this thing had been carried on in secret without the knowledge of Mr. Papineau, that there did not exist in any book of the government at any period one single charge to show that Mr. Lanctot had ever got anything from the department, that from the beginning to end this thing had been kept concealed until this date, the 22nd of November, coincident with the day on which the Minister of Marine sent instructions to Sorel for further investigation.

I am speaking now only from the point of view of the question whether the hon. member for Champlain had reasonable cause for going ahead. He might well have thought that there was not much weight to be attached to the fact that payment was made just when the investigation was being started, for work and goods the disposal whereof had been withheld from everybody representing the department up to the 22nd of November. Might he not well have thought, that does not mean much, this payment made just when is coming the time when the people will find out what has been done. You have to look at the position of the member for Champlain, and the reasons he had for forming his opinion on that matter. What would he have had reason to believe had he gone to the minister and got that information? He would simply have got the information that after the thing was all done, when the cat was just coming out of the bag, a payment had been made.

It does seem to me an extraordinary thing that a committee whose standard was so low that it could see no harm in what the member for Richelieu had admittedly done, should suddenly take so lofty a position when it came to be a question of the degree of prudence which the member for Champlain should have exercised in making these charges If it were not for the eloquent protests of the Minister of Justice, one would have been tempted to think—of course my thinking so might have been attributed to partisanship—but one would have been tempted to think that there had been perhaps a slight grain of partisanship in the balance that he was holding as between these two gentlemen. I must apologize to the House for detaining it so long on this case. I have spoken to this length because I thought it was my duty to do what I could to clearly convey my view of what is the proper conclusion to be reached on this matter, and thus to show at least that I realize how deeply the public interest is involved in parliament coming to a right decision on this important question.

Mr. V. GEOFFRION (Verchères). The hon. gentleman (Mr. Doherty) who has just taken his seat was very impressive in his opening remarks. I would be glad if I were able to congratulate him on a change in the length of his addresses; because when he was judge in Montreal his judgments were as long, and interminable, and as wearisome to the advocates practising before him, as his speeches are in this House. Sir, the reasons given by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) why the majority report should be adopted, have been commented upon at great length. The Minister of Justice has treated exhaustively the legal question, and I will make a very few remarks on a point that does not appear to have been touched by hon. members. The only question for me is

whether the charges made by the hon. member for Champlain have been proved. We are not concerned with the question whether any employees of the Department of Marine and Fisheries in Sorel have exceeded their duty. That might form, if necessary, the basis of another inquiry by another committee; but surely the Committee on Privileges and Elections has been instituted only for the purpose of ascertaining whether members sitting in this House are duly qualified to do so. Now I regret that some newspapers in this country have seen fit to try to prejudice opinion, both in the public and in this House, without having had the privilege, as members of the committee have had, of hearing and seeing the witnesses who were being examined. They have discussed the question mostly on hearsay. But lawyers and judges know that it makes a great difference in forming a judgment whether you have the privilege of seeing the witnesses when they are examined. They seem to make a kind of hero of the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) who has made the charges. What were the charges made by the hon. member for Champlain against the hon. member for Richelieu? I shall read a part of them for the sake of my argument. He charged:

That I am credibly informed, and I believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence:—

That in the course of the years 1908, 1909 and 1910, irregularities, abuses, frauds, malversations and robberies have been committed in the shops and stores of the government of Canada at St. Joseph de Sorel and in the city of Sorel, in the electoral district of Richelieu. . .

That said goods——

That is the goods sent to Mr. Lanctot's house.

Were so fraudulently appropriated to, and said work so fraudulently done at the expense of the government of Canada for the benefit of the said Adelard Lanctot, then and now a member of the House as aforesaid, with his knowledge, assent and approval, the said Adelard Lanctot abusively and fraudulently profiting at the public expense and to the public detriment by his position as member of the House.

I submit that these charges have not been proved. I shall briefly review the evidence in the case. Mr. Lanctot, in 1910, at the date mentioned in the report, was building a house in Sorel. A good many people in this House know and many at Sorel knew that Mr. Lanctot's wife was very ill at Saranac lake. This was known by everybody on this side of the House especially, because we had more friendly relations with Mr. Lanctot than hon. members opposite. Being obliged to absent himself often, and having need of painters to finish his house which was ready to be painted, Mr. Lanctot went to the government workshops to get painters. Hon. members may laugh as they please at the idea that Mr. Lanctot could not get painters at Sorel. Every member of the committee who wants to be fair knows that it has been proved that there were only three painters in the city of Sorel who were not in the employ of the government at the time, and that two of them were unfit to fill the job and the other could not do it. Mr. Lanctot went to the workshops and tried to see Mr. Papineau and Mr. Papineau being absent, he went to Champagne whom he knew well, and asked him if he could let him have some painters to finish his work. I need not go minutely into the evidence in the case. He was answered that he could have them, and he said that if Champagne would keep the time of the men he would reimburse the government or that he would pay the men and was ready to pay them himself every week if necessary. Is it extraordinary that a man should go to an extensive workshop like that in Sorel to get workmen when he could not get them anywhere else? It is done in the great cities, in every place where there are large workshops. It is known also that these large shops employ a great number of workmen in certain seasons of the year, that they do not have so much need for these men at other seasons; they sometimes would prefer to see workmen going out and working somewhere else, but they do not want to send them away, and thus be deprived of their services when they need men. This is done every day. Hon. gentlemen opposite may say that the government ought not to do it. It may be so, but anyhow it is not extraordinary that Mr. Lanctot should have gone to those shops, the only place where he could get those workmen, and he got them. He paid them, the evidence is clear on that point; he got some material for which he also paid. Where is the proof of robbery charged by the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin)? I am sorry to say that the hon. member for Champlain in making such grave charges against a colleague in this House had not the courage to offer to resign his seat if he could not prove the charges which he had made. There is probably no example in this House or in the parliament of any other country of a member making so grave a charge as that an hon. member or colleague had rendered himself guilty of robbery, of fraudulently obtaining money or merchandise under false pretenses and not having the courage to say: If I am not able to prove those charges then I will resign my seat. If the hon. member for Champlain had simply said: I hear that there are irregularities committed in the workshops of the government at Sorel and I ask that they be investigated, well and good; but he charges

a colleague with fraud and robbery, and he has not the courage to put his seat in jeopardy. Mr. Lanctot in this House has answered the charges. He made an honest, fair, straightforward declaration. Witness after witness has been examined by the member for Champlain and his counsel, and all the evidence which we got from them went exactly to prove that the declarations of the hon. member for Champlain were correct. Mr. Blondin declared that he had been credibly informed, but the evidence has raised some doubt in my mind as to whether he was very credibly informed. He got his information from discontented men who had been dismissed from the department, from blackmailers, from suborners of perjury. This has been proved before the committee. We had a witness there who declared that an affidavit had been obtained from him under false pretenses.

Another of the witnesses had sent a letter to the member for Richelieu trying to blackmail him if he would not get him contracts; others of the witnesses admitted that they had been dismissed from the department, and this is the company in which we find the hon. member for Champlain and by which he was credibly informed that fraudulent acts had been committed. The hon. gentleman from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) dealt with the question of the independence of parliament, and as usual he pretended he was sorry to have to attack an hon. member on this side of the House, although he is generally very unfair when he is dealing with party questions of the kind; the hon. member (Mr. Monk) pretends that the independence of parliament has been infringed by the acts committed by Mr. Lanctot. Well, I believe that the opinion of the Minister of Justice is the true interpretation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and the hon. member for St. Anne himself admitted that there was no infringement of that Act. I believe that to infringe the Independence of Parliament Act one must make a contract by which he derives some pecuniary benefit from the government. Suppose a member of parliament—and I understand that members on both sides of the House do it—should go to the King's Printer and have copies of his speeches printed and pay for them, is he not making a contract and violating the Act if we wanted to put a severe interpretation upon it? I do not wish to be personal, but I would like to ask my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), who has left the Chamber, whether a judge who has descended from the bench and who is paid every year a sum of money by the country is not infringing the Independence of Parliament Act when he sits here and votes the money which is paid to himself? The hon. member comes here and makes tragedian speeches in which he lifts up his hands and calls to his aid a high moral tone, and he sits in this House and votes the money which is paid to him, but he covers his head with ashes at the actions that have been committed by the hon. member for Richelieu. The delicate conscience of my hon. friends opposite was not touched so much some years ago when one of their friends on their side had some work done in the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Prescott, when he had a boat painted. He made a declaration which, for my part, I accepted in good faith, and from this side of the House no one lifted his voice to blame him because we accepted that he was in good faith, and that he had paid as he declared he had paid. But his actions were exactly the same, if not worse, as those of the hon. member for Richelieu. We did not raise a row about it. But the delicate conscience of hon. members opposite is touched because a member on this side of the House, by an error of judgment perhaps, has committed similar acts to those committed by their own friends, and in whose case they sat there dumb and condoned the action they are actually blaming now. I wish in conclusion to say that I agree with the interpretation of the evidence given by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German) and with the interpretation of the Independence of Parliament Act given by the Minister of Justice. I believe that the majority of the committee having heard the evidence and weighed it, could not come to any other conclusion than that the hon. member for Richelieu had acted in good faith. The work which he had done by employees of the department was paid for, the material which he got was paid for, everything was paid for, and if any blame—I am not going to say that there should be any blame attached—but if there is any blame to attach to any one it must be to the employees of the department who perhaps exceeded their powers. I will vote for the adoption of the majority report.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish to ask the hon. member (Mr. Geoffrion) a question. I was not in the Chamber a moment ago, but I understand that the hon. member made the statement that I had a boat painted in Prescott a few years ago. Did the hon. gentleman make that statement?

Mr. GEOFFRION. I simply said that I was so informed. At the time I knew who the hon. member was, but I do not at the moment know whether it was the hon. member (Mr. Reid), or not.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. GEOFFRION. I did not name anybody.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. GEOFFRION. If my hon. friend wants to know, I can get the name very soon and give it to him.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I heard that my name had been mentioned, and if so I want to say that the statement is absolutely untrue and false.

Mr. T. W. CROTHERS (West Elgin). Apart altogether from the intent of the hon. member for Richelieu, of which I shall speak later, the facts in connection with this matter are few, simple, clear, admitted, and it is not easy to understand intelligent and honest men differing as to the conclusion in law that should be drawn from these facts. The Richelieu river runs in a northerly direction and empties into the St. Lawrence about 45 miles below Montreal. On the easterly side of its mouth is the city of Sorel, containing a population of about 10,000 people, and just opposite, on the westerly side of the river, are the government shipyards and storehouses. The river runs through the constituency represented by the hon. member for Richelieu, who lives in the city of Sorel. The principal officers of the shipyard are Mr. Papineau, who is director, Mr. Terreault, Oscar Champagne, time-keeper, and John Baptiste Pagé, foreman of painters. The hon. member for Richelieu was building a palatial residence on George street, in the city of Sorel, in the years 1909 and 1910. On or about the 29th of May, 1910—and at present I am only stating facts that are admitted all—Mr. Lanctot went over to St. Joseph de Sorel, and there saw Mr. Champagne and Mr. Pagé. He asked Mr. Pagé to send some painters over to this new house that he was building on George street in Sorel. Mr. Pagé told him he would have much pleasure in doing so if he would get the authority of Mr. Papineau, the director of the shipyard. Mr. Pagé says that Mr. Lanctot promised to see Mr. Papineau and get his authority. Mr. Lanctot admits that he never did see Mr. Papineau. That you will find in his evidence on page 19:

Q. Did that conversation take place on the 29th of May or sooner in the month of May?—A. I canot say so at present.
Q. Did you ever go to Mr. Papineau's after that to obtain his authorization?—A. No, sir.
Q. You never spoke to him of the matter?—A. No, sir. Mr. Papineau lives opposite my house, at about seventy-five feet from me.

So that on the 29th of May, Mr. Lanctot saw Mr. Pagé and Mr. Pagé told him he would send the painters if he got the authority of Mr. Papineau, he agreed to get the authorization of Mr. Papineau, and he never spoke to Mr. Papineau about it until the work was all completed in the latter part of November, although Mr. Papineau lived only 75 feet from him. He went and induced an inferior officer of the government, Mr. Pagé, to send workmen to paint his house; he knew that while these men were working at his house, extending from the 3rd of June till the latter part of November, between five and six months, the time that they were giving to his house was being charged up against the government, and he knew that the government was paying these men for the work they were doing upon his house. Now, what follows from that? It follows that he, in connection with Pagé and Champagne, defrauded the government out of money that was paid to these men while they were doing the work on his house. It is no answer at all to say that he agreed to pay the money back afterwards. It follows from these facts that he was guilty of conspiracy with these men to get from the government or the people of Canada the money that was paid to the men while they were working at his house. It follows further that that money was obtained from the people of Canada through this government by false pretenses of Mr. Lanctot and Mr. Pagé. Now, is that so? The Minister of Marine and Fisheries would tell you that he consented to the payment of this $375, believing the pay-sheets that were sent to him from Sorel, representing that these men during these five months were working on government work. So that the minister was deceived and the money was obtained from the government by false pretenses. Therefore, I say that the hon. member for Richelieu was a party to defrauding the government; he was one of the conspirators for getting the money from the government; he was a party to getting that money from the government by false pretenses. And that is not all; he induced them to take from the government storehouse in St. Joseph de Sorel to his house on George street, in the city of Sorel, some $80 worth of goods belonging to the government of this country. Now, those goods were not loaned. You cannot borrow a thing unless you return that identical thing. There was no intention of returning the thing. The property in it passed forever from the owners, the people of Canada or the government, to Mr. Lanctot's house. In this connection, I want to read a sentence or two from the third edition of James Crankshaw on the Criminal Code of Canada. At page 413, in considering the section of the code which was read by my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), section 347, he says:

Theft defined.—Theft or stealing is the act of fraudulently and without colour of right taking, or fraudulently and without colour of right converting to the use of any person, anything capable of being stolen, with intent,—

(a) to deprive the owner, or any person having any special property or interest there-

in, temporarily, or absolutely, of such thing, or of such property or interest; or,

(b) to pledge the same or deposit it as security; or,

(c) to part with it under a condition as to its return which the person parting with it may be unable to perform; or,

(d) to deal with it in such a manner that it cannot be restored in the condition at which it was at the time of its taking and conversion.

And so by putting the paint and putty on Mr. Lanctot's house, they dealt with them so that they could not return them, and there is no evidence that there was any intention of returning the identical goods that they got from the government storehouse.

2. Theft is committed when the offender moves the thing or causes it to move or to be moved, or begins to cause it to become movable, with intent to steal it.

So that as soon as these goods were taken from the government storehouse the offence was complete.

3. The taking or conversion may be fraudulent, although effected without secrecy or attempt at concealment.

4. It is immaterial whether the thing converted was taken for the purpose of conversion, or whether it was, at the time of the conversion, in the lawful possession of the person converting.

In commenting upon this section, at page 413, the learned author speaks as follows:

It is generally laid down that any act which is an interference with the dominion and right of property of another is a conversion. A conversion does not mean a destruction of the goods nor does it necessarily import an acquisition of property by the defendant or a total or absolute loss of the goods to the owner, but it consists in any wrongful act by which the defendant deprives the owner of his goods either wholly or for a time. To constitute a fraudulent conversion, the owner must be deprived of his property or money by an adverse using or holding.

Under the terms of section 347, theft by conversion is committed whenever a person, already in possession of a specific article of personal property with the owner's consent, fraudulently and without colour of right converts it to his own use or to the use of any other person than the owner of it, with intent to deprive the owner of it, either temporarily or absolutely, or with intent to deprive any person having any special property or interest therein, temporarily or absolutely, of such special property or interest, or with intent to pledge the same or to part with it under a condition, as to its return, which he may not be able to perform, or to so deal with it that it cannot be restored.

This was what the Act dealt with because in this case it was impossible to return the goods.

The effect of section 347 is to put all persons whomsoever, whether they are or are not clerks, servants, employees, bankers, merchants, brokers, solicitors, factors, agents or bailees, upon the same footing, and to make every person whomsoever, without any distinction, guilty of theft by conversion (or what may, perhaps, be more properly termed embezzlement), when, having become rightfully possessed of something belonging to another, he, instead of handing it over, in specie or instead of doing with it what he was entrusted to do, fraudulently and without colour of right, converts it to his own use or to the use of any other person than the owner. In other words, embezzlement by clerks, servants or other employees, fraudulent conversion by bankers, merchants, brokers, solicitors, factors or other agents, of property entrusted to them for safe custody, &c., and larceny by bailees, are three only of the various ways of committing the offence of theft by conversion treated of by section 347. So that it may not be out of place to briefly review some of the authorities on these three subjects.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that in taking these goods belonging to the people of Canada from an inferior officer who had no authority to give them the hon. member for Richelieu was strictly within the terms of section 347, of the Criminal Code and was therefore guilty of theft. What is the difference between the position occupied by Mr. Lanctot with reference to these goods and that of a man who goes to an inferior officer in a bank—the teller or the ledger keeper and get $1,000 from him saying to him: I will return this money in a week? The teller or ledger keeper had no authority to give him $1,000, he gives him $1,000, he invests that in margins, at the end of the week the $1,000 is not paid and the clerk is arrested and convicted of embezzlement or theft. The intention of both parties was to return the money at the end of a week or at the end of a month. Why, our prisons are full of men who have embezzled thousands and scores of thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars intending all the time to return the money. I remember that a short time ago a man from our city stole $287,000 before being arrested, embezzled it, intending every moment to return it as soon as he made it, but he kept on losing and losing, hoping against hope until finally the whole matter was disclosed and he was sent to penitentiary for twelve years. He did not intend to cheat anybody, he intended to return the money just as this man, admit that if you like, intended to return these materials. He did not borrow these goods, but he got these goods promising to return a similar quantity and a like quality of goods just as the young man who gets $1,000 from a bank intends to return, not that identical $1,000, but a like sum of money in ten or thirty days as the case may be. He fails to do it and he is guilty

of theft just as sure as we are sitting in this Chamber to-night. There can be no longer any doubt about the fact that the hon. member for Richelieu, in reference to the mens' time, is in law, guilty of fraud, of conspiracy, of getting money from the people of this country by false pretenses and, in reference to these goods, guilty of theft. I am speaking about the legal aspect of it now, Mr. Speaker. There is no manner of doubt whatever that he is guilty of theft.

One of the discouraging features of this whole question is that we have a majority of the Privileges and Elections Committee coming into this house with a report—doing what?—saying that the hon. member for Richelieu inadvertently broke the law, did not intend to break the law, was not really guilty of an intent to do anything wrong, disapproving of the conduct of Pagé, Champagne and Lanctot and saying in effect that it was not the intention to defraud anybody? Is that the report we have? If we had a report of that kind, while I could not approve of it, there would be some mitigating, extenuating circumstances in connection with it. I am not going to take up your time by reading this report. You have all read it and you are all familiar with it. The report of the majority which we are asked to approve has not a word of condemnation in connection with this whole transaction except in so far as the majority condemn the hon. member who exposed the whole transaction. They ask us to approve of this whole transaction, and they ask us to condemn the member of this House who took the means of exposing it. They express approval of the man who in law was and is guilty of theft and they express condemnation of the member of this house who took the means of exposing that theft. What were the facts that were in the hands of the hon. member for Champlain when he read these charges on the 6th day of March last? First, what were the charges? I am quoting from 'Hansard,' unrevised edition, of March 6:

I, Pierre Edouard Blondin, a member of parliament for the electoral district of Champlain, in the province of Quebec, Dominion of Canada, declare that I am credibly informed, and I believe that I can establish by satisfactory evidence:

10. That in the course of the years 1908, 1909 and 1910, irregularities, abuses, frauds, malversations and robberies have been committed in the shops and stores of the government of Canada at St. Joseph of Sorel and in the city of Sorel, in the electoral district of Richelieu.

I am quite ready to admit that in so far as the word 'robberies' is concerned, I do not think there is any evidence before this committee that there was any robbery, but I am told that this word 'robberies,' which is too strong a word, crept in in the process of translation from French to English. We all know there can be no robbery unless there be a stealing by violence, and there is no pretension here that there was any violence—it was all done willingly by the officers of the government. But, with the exception of 'robberies,' I contend that all these charges made by the hon. member for Champlain have been fully established.

2. That barrels and tins of paint and other goods of this nature have been illegally and frudulently taken and carried away from the said stores and shops and transported to the house of Mr. Adelard Lanctot then and now a member of the House of Commons of Canada, for the electoral district of Richelieu, which house was then being built on George street, at Sorel above mentioned, and ready to be painted;

3. That with these goods and paint, paintworks, decoration and varnish works, have been done by the employees of the government of Canada under the supervision of the painters' foreman employed by said government at the said place, at the government's expense and during the hours supposed to be devoted to the government and for which said employees were paid by the government, these men registering each day as if they had really worked for the government, and this during weeks and months; the materials and time, thus furnished, are valued at about one thousand or twelve hundred dollars;

4. That said goods were so fraudulently appropriated to, and said works so fraudulently done at the expense of the government of Canada for the benefit of the said Adélard Lanctot then and now a member of the House as aforesaid with his knowledge, assent and approval, the said Adélard Lanctot abusively and fraudulently profiting at the public expense and to the public detriment by his position of member of the House;

I found the belief I have just expressed upon affidavits which I desire to read and produce in support of the motion I am about to make:

Then there are a number of affidavits which were in the possession of the hon. member for Champlain. I shall read only one or two of them and call your attention to the others:

I, the undersigned, Alfred Douaire, painter, of the city of Sorel, 51 years of age, solemnly declare:

That I have been in the employment of the federal government at its shipyards situated at Saint-Joseph de Sorel, from January, 1906, inclusively to the 5th of November, 1910, as painter under orders of J. Bte. Pagé, foreman of the painters' department at the said shipyards, during the last two years;—that during these two years, and principally during the last year, and especially in July, August and September, 1910, I have been requested by the said J. Bte. Pagé to go to Sorel, at the house of Mr. Adélard Lanctot, M.P., then being built on George street, in order to paint, cement, polish and varnish, &c., &c., the said house and that, as it was well under-

stood, after having registered at the shipyard as present and working on behalf of the government, and my departure each morning was to be from the said shipyard.

That, as a matter of fact, I regularly registered and punched as previously mentioned, and that in conformity with my orders I left the shipyard each working day and went, as above stated, during the months of July, August and September, 1910, to the said Lanctot house, where I have worked at the painting, varnishing and staining of the said Lanctot house.

That this work was also done in part by Messrs. Théodore Emond, Edmond Brault, Adélard Letendre, Albérique Letendre, Omer Pagé, Arthur Trempe, Louis Paul, Adélard Alie, all painters, employed at the time by the said government, and on the working hours due to the government and each of them having punched at the same time as myself as aforesaid.

That during the time that work was going on, the said J. Bte. Pagé and Adélard Lanctot, M.P., were visiting the job from time to time, looking at the progress of the work, Pagé giving orders for having some paint brought from the shipyard and also for the execution of the work, and that, many times to the knowledge and cognizance, and in the presence of the said Adélard Lanctot,—this gentleman knowing also where the paint came from and that the work was being done by employees of the government whom he was seeing often and often at work.

That the said Adélard Lanctot never spoke of paying these painters, and in fact was not paying them, but they were regularly paid their salaries by the government at each pay day, as if they had worked for the department.

That the above mentioned persons who have worked with me at this painting have given to that work, some four weeks, and others from four to ten weeks.

I positively declare:—that Mr. Adelard Lanctot knew at the time that the paint and other goods which were used in the painting of his house were coming from the said shipyard of the government; 2. that this work was done by the then regular employees of the government who were paid, for the time they were doing that work, by the government itself, and that for that purpose the time of each employee was punched as employee of the government.

On the seventh day of December, 1910, at 10 p.m., Mr. Alfred Lavallee, lumber merchant, of Sorel, came to my house at Sorel, asking me to go immediately to the house of Mr. Adelard Lanctot, at Sorel, who desired to see me without fault; I went immediately and found Mr. Lanctot who was waiting for me and who, after the ordinary salutations, showed me and read me the solemn declaration which I had given during the said month of December to the same purpose as the present one, and spoke to me the following words:—'Is it you, Mr. Douaire, who gave this affidavit? I answered: 'Yes.' He added: 'You have signed it?' I answered 'Yes.' He asked me if I would see Albert Thibaudeau and try to lay my hands upon certain papers relating to this affair, which he did not like to see circulating. I answered that it was not easy to get hold of these documents, principally the affidavit dated at Sorel, the 30th of Nvember, 1910. Mr. Lanctot added: 'I will look to that myself, and I will try to get hold of them. Mr. Lanctot wanted me to change my course of action, he offered me a position under the government, which I refused. He told me that if some one was troubled about that affair, principally Mr. J. Bte. Pagé, I would be treated the same way he would be. I answered that I was not afraid. Before leaving, I told him that the affidavit which he had in his hands, and which he got, I did not know from whom, was true and signed by me in perfect knowledge and without any outside influence, as I gave the present one.

And I make this solemn statement, believing it conscientiously to be true, and knowing that it has the same force and effect as if it was made under oath, under the witness law of the Dominion of Canada, and I have signed.

ALFRED DOUAIRE.

Declared before me, the undersigned, at Sorel, the first of March, 1911.

VICTOR A. BOURGEOIS, Notary.

The original one, I believe, was dated the 30th of November. There are others; one by Mr. Proulx, which I will not take up the time by reading, though it is in English. He said he was sent for to go to Mr. Lanctot's house; that he went; that his two uncles were present there with him; that Mr. Lanctot then and there asked him to sign another affidavit saying that the previous one he had signed was untrue, and telling him that if he did so he would use his influence to get him reinstated in a government job. That is set forth in the statement of Mr. Proulx and also in his evidence given before the Committee of Privileges and Elections, and it is corroborated by his uncle. Another statement was by Mr. Peloquin, which I shall not read. There is also one by Mr. A. Senecal, and one by Napoleon Laroche, and one by H. Lambert. There were others in the hands of the hon. member for Champlain, set forth in unrevised 'Hansard,' of March 6th, but as they are in French, owing to my defective early education I shall not attempt to read them. But the hon. member for Champlain had these six or eight affidavits setting forth the facts as I have stated them. With these affidavits in his possession, what was his duty. This committee, or rather a majority of the committee, state that he should have gone to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and asked him about the whole matter. But what does the Minister of Marine and Fisheries say to us now? He appears before the Committee on Privileges and Elections and has not a word to say in condemnation of this whole transaction.

He was present in that committee, and he quoted from this report of the majority which we have before us, exonerating com-

pletely Mr. Lanctot, justifying this whole transaction, and condemning the hon. member for Champlain for having called public attention to it. And he is the man to whom it is said the hon. member for Champlain should have gone and accept his ipse dixit as to this whole transaction. Well, I was surprised at the Minister of Marine and Fisheries voting for that majority report, for the department he administers has been in the public eye for several years, and the people to a large extent have lost confidence in the way in which that department is managed. It was found by a commissioner appointed by this government, Judge Cassels, that scores and scores of men in the employment of that department had been guilty of defrauding the government. Some of those who were proved guilty were superannuated on large superannuation allowances, one or two, or perhaps a few more, were dismissed. But there were no prosecutions issued against either the bribers or the bribees, although there were scores and scores of cases reported by Judge Cassels of crimes committed against the government and people of Canada, and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not see fit to prosecute any one of them. If the law had been enforced in that case we would not have had such an exhibition as we have seen here, in what will come to be known in this country as the Lanctot job. Yet the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, it is said, is going to England to represent Canada. It is said that later he may have a seat on the Supreme Court of this country. And that is the man who has been at the head of this Marine Department, and whose record is well known in this House and in this country for the last three or four years in reference to these transactions; and that is the man to whom the majority of this committee suggests that the hon. member for Champlain should have gone when he received these sworn statements showing that this government had been defrauded, and showing conspiracy, showing that money had been obtained by false pretenses, showing theft. And forsooth the majority of the members of this committee, intelligent members of this House, come forward with a report and say to the people of Canada: All this is perfectly regular and honest, we subscribe to the whole thing; and we denounce the man who exposed it.

Well, I was to a certain extent surprised that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries should vote approval of this whole matter, saying in substance: It is all right, saying to the people of Canada that the department over which he presides permits this sort of thing to be done. Not a word of condemnation of it, but instead of condemnation for these offences and these crimes, there are words of condemnation of the hon. member for Champlain who, in the discharge of his duty, brought these frauds and these thefts to the attention of this House and the people of Canada. Why, Sir, a majority of this committee suggested that the member for Champlain should have gone to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and got from him—what? A statement of the accused. Affidavits similar in substance were sent to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries in November, and what did he do with them? Why, he actually sent the original affidavits to Mr. Lanctot and asked him what he had to say about them. Did you ever hear of such a thing as that in your life? A man is charged with conspiracy, with defrauding the government, with getting money under false pretenses, with theft, and the papers charging him with all these crimes and offences are sent to him and he is asked what he has to say about them. He makes his reply, and that is what the minister says he was perfectly willing to give to the member for Champlain. The minister was examined before this committee, and he, in answer to leading questions put by council for Mr. Lanctot—because that is the position that was taken there—said over and over again: I was perfectly willing to give Mr. Blondin all the information that I had if he had come and asked me. Now to have taken the course that is suggested, that my hon. friend from Champlain should have gone to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, would have been to take a course like that which the Minister of Finance took when he sent for the manager of the Farmers' Bank and accepted his statement as to the frauds that were charged against him, with all the disastrous results that have followed. What do we do where a man is charged with fraud, with conspiracy? Do we send for him and ask what he has to say about it? And if he declares through his counsel that he is innocent, do we say to him: Depart in peace, may the Lord be with you?

If I was surprised a little to find that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries was endorsing this majority report, I was surprised to a greater extent in listening to the Minister of Justice this afternoon. The Minister of Justice told us he was a strong partisan. It was not the first time he has told us that in this House. Whenever he is called upon to defend an indefensible transaction, he prefaces his remarks by telling us that he is a strong party man. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that any other Minister of Justice having a seat in the government of Canada ever found it his duty to rise in this House from time to time and tell the people's representatives, and through them the people of Canada, that he was a strong party man. Why, Sir, it was not necessary for him to say that. I want to say

to him now—I am sorry he is not present, but he will read what I have to say—I for one will excuse him from ever repeating that again in this House. It never was necessary. We in the province of Ontario, who have known him for the last thirty years, know well that he has always been a strong party man, one of the most bitter partisans we have in the whole province of Ontario. He is the man who represents the goddess of Canadian justice, who gets up in this House and endorses every word that the majority report contains. He has stated that he has read the evidence over two or three times, and there is absolutely no proof of wrong-doing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what are we to think of that? That the Minister of Justice in this government, the representative of justice in Canada, declares to the people of this whole country that to get workmen from the government, as these men were got, to use them while the government is paying for them, to make false paylists, by misrepresentation to get money from this country, taking the goods and the property of this country, and therefore being guilty of theft under the law—**that he, the Minister of Justice, sees absolutely no** wrong in all that. And that does not come from a back bencher, that comes from the representative of justice in Canada and it may be read from the Atlantic to the Pacific as the opinion of the Minister of Justice in this country that any man may treat the government of Canada as Mr. Lanctot has done, and if he be a good Liberal he will have not only the Minister of Marine and Fisheries backing him up in all these transactions, but he will have the representative of the sacred Goddess of Justice rising in this House and justifying him.

If I had time I would go over the evidence upon which I found these statements in order that the people might be able to read that evidence, but I shall not do so. I wish to call attention to the intent of Mr. Lanctot. Mr. Lanctot promised Mr. Pagé and Mr. Badeau that he would see Mr. Papineau and get his authority for the use of these men and for the taking of these goods, but he never did so; he never saw Mr. Papineau although he lived only 75 feet away, just across the road from him. For six months this was going on. He promised to see Mr. Papineau. He was in Sorel over and over again but he did not. Why did he not? Was it because he knew that Papineau would not approve of this if he did see it? Evidence of that will be found on pages 19, 130, 172 and 173. He never spoke to Papineau about paying for this paint, Papineau spoke to him first about paying for it, and you will find if I remember right, evidence of this on pages 23 and 24. Another piece of evidence as to intent is his trying to get these two or three men who made these affidavits, Douaire and Proulx, to sign other affidavits denying what they had asserted in their first affidavits, and promising that if they would make other affidavits denying what they had said, he would use his influence to get them jobs under the government. What does that indicate? How does that affect the question of intent? How does that affect the question of guilty knowledge? In this letter inclosing a cheque for $375 for the men's time, pages 23 and 24, he said nothing about the paint, and that letter was sent on November 22. The account for the paint is dated November 16, as you will find on page 109. This account for the paint taken out of the government stores and going to Lanctot's house, amounting to $81.60, is dated November 16. Champagne sent to Mr. Lanctot his account for the wages of the men, $375 on November 22. Nothing was said in that letter of the 22nd November about the paint although the account for it is dated November 16, 12 days before the letter was sent with reference to the pay for the men. In his letter to the minister, of December 6, he stated that he had settled for the paint, and that statement was not true. Look at page 177 and you will find Mr. Lanctot's letter to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, dated December 6, 1910. The minister had sent him these affidavits that were made in November, and what does he say?:

> This is true; but as soon as their work was finished I reimbursed the department as per understanding with the officers. I did the same with regard to borrowed material. The whole was paid several days before the filing of those documents.

Follow the dates: This is dated December 6. If you turn to page 111 you will find, beyond any peradventure, that that money was not paid even by Papineau until December 13, so Mr. Lanctot in his letter to the minister of December 6, declared he had paid not only for the men's wages but for the goods that had been delivered to him, and on page 111 you will find the account for $81.60 paid on December 13 by Mr. Papineau, a week after Mr. Lanctot had said he had paid it, and Papineau's evidence shows that Mr. Lanctot did not pay him until some time after he had paid the company in Montreal. So there you have a statement of facts that is utterly untrue. Remember that he did not mention anything to Papineau, it was Papineau who went to him. This account was sent to Papineau who says he had occasion to see Mr. Lanctot and he told Mr. Lanctot after Mr. Lanctot had sent the account for the men's wages, $375, that the accounts were paid. Mr. Lanctot did not say anything to him about the paint. Did Mr. Lanctot intend to pay

for the paints at all, Mr. Speaker? His statement is untrue. Then he stated further that there were no other painters at Sorel. Well, there are three or four witnesses to show that is not true. A good deal has been said about the cheque sent for $375. He did not pay Papineau with a cheque. I wonder why? I would like to see that cheque if it every was given; it was not produced.

Mr. LENNOX. He says it was paid in cash.

Mr. CROTHERS. And when he wrote to the minister on December 6, that he had paid the wages of the men and had paid for the goods, that was absolutely untrue, and he knew it was untrue when he wrote the letter. Papineau himself had not paid it at that time, or until December 13, and a copy of the receipt is given on page 111, dated Quebec, December 12.

I am very sorry I have not time to refer to some other matters, but the evidence I have adduced as to the intent of Mr. Lanctot will suffice. Why did he make statements that were not true if that intent was honest all the way through? Why resort to these petty and paltry excuses of there not being painters in Sorel? We have evidence that there are two or three competent painters in that city of 10,000 inhabitants. But suppose there was not a painter in the whole city of Sorel does that justify his being a party to conspiracy and theft. If his wife was ill we all deeply sympathize with him, but what under heaven has that to do with it. That is no excuse whatever for being a party to these offences I have mentioned. Why are these little insignificant side issues brought in; why these false statements made by this man who is now accused? He said nothing to the minister when he sent the letter with the cheque for $375; he knew that the paint had been taken to his house before that; he told the minister that he had paid it on the 6th December, whereas it was not paid until the 13th of December; he promised to see Papineau, and why did not he see him? These are all ear marks of the fraud and guilt that I have brought to the attention of the House; these are indications that would justify any jury in any part of Canada in finding that on the part of the member for Richelieu this was not an innocent transaction. I must now conclude my remarks.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. CROTHERS. No, I have a train to catch, and I cannot stay longer. Let me read what the Ottawa 'Free Press' said about this matter on April 20, and mind you, this is the Liberal organ of the capital city of the Dominion. Referring to Mr. Lanctot, it says:

But what he should have done the moment the charge was preferred against him was to have resigned his seat and appealed to his constituents for re-election. He could then have been re-elected by acclamation; whether he could do so now is another question.

Where a member of a party in the control of the public business places himself, wittingly or unwittingly, under the penalties of the parliament Act there is only one course open for him to take, and that is what Mr. Lanctot should have done.

For him to now ask a majority of the House of Commons to excuse his fault is to ask many of them to cancel their own records, and we do not believe that they will do so.

Even the 'Free Press' would not believe it, but I fear we will be forced to believe it by this vote to-night. We will be forced to believe that not only a majority of the Privileges and Elections Committee, but that a majority of the men supporting the government, including the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, including the man who occupies the high and sacred position of Minister of Justice of Canada. I fear we will see every one of them expressing their approval of this very thing that their own organ disapproves of. The Montreal 'Herald,' another Liberal organ says:

What is irritating about the case is that Liberals in and out of parliament are assumed to be ready to defend Mr. Lanctot, to maintain his right to get his house painted by the government's workmen and with the government's paint, because it is supposed that in defending Mr. Lanctot they are defending the Laurier Cabinet. The 'Herald,' for one, does not propose to rest its confidence in the Laurier administration on any such basis. The fact is, indeed, that the house painting was done by connivance between the member for Richelieu and subordinate officials at Sorel.

That comes from the Montreal 'Herald,' the great Liberal organ of the city of Montreal:

And that the Minister of Marine was actually demanding the facts about it when the investigation was brought on by Mr. Blondin. And Liberals are expected to testify their confidence in Mr. Brodeur's administration by affirming their satisfaction with what was done, to the injury of the reputation of Mr. Brodeur's department, without his acknowledge and without his approval. It will not down.

That is what the great English speaking Liberal organ in the great metropolis of Canada says; that this will not down, but so far as that is concerned and so far as they can, it will be downed to-night by the pliable mechanical majority if big enough on the other side of the House.

Evidently Mr. Lanctot, for all the ability he undoubtedly possesses, has failed to realize that a public man is under a responsibility towards those who give him their confidence and towards the leaders and the rank and file of his party.

Not only Mr. Lanctot has failed to realize it, but the majority of the members of the Privileges and Elections Committee have failed to realize it, the Minister of Marine has failed to realize it, the Minister of Justice has failed to realize it, and the Liberal members of parliament and the Prime Minister not only fail to realize it, but actually appear to applaud and support it.

He seems to be content to prove that he paid for the painters' time and replaced the materials used on his place. He does not seem to recognize that it was unworthy of him as a member of parliament to arrange with subordinate officials, without the knowledge of their superiors on the spot, even, to have men working for him whose services were all the time being charged to the Crown and presumably apportioned against some work that had been ordered by parliament. If Mr. Lanctot cannot see the unworthiness of that, he ought to be in some other role than that of a Liberal party leader. Certainly no government, Liberal or other, can be maintained in this country on the principle that its supporters in parliament are justified in such enterprises.

There is the opinion of the Liberal organ of the city of Montreal. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard anything so far from my right hon. friend the Prime Minister. Is it to be said of him—and it will be said of him and justly said of him what the 'Herald' has said of Mr. Lanctot, and if he votes for the adoption of the majority report he will make himself just as guilty as Mr. Lanctot. I had hoped; yea I have told several of my friends, that while I was not a supporter of the right hon. gentleman, and while I have not as much confidence in him as a great many other members of this House have, yet in the last two or three days I have told in private several of my friends that Sir Wilfrid Laurier would never stand for the frauds and the crimes that were set forth in this evidence, and I really believe he would not stand for it, and I had hoped until the last moment that there would be at least one man big enough on the other side of the House to get up and condemn this transaction. I hope I will hear after I get home to-morrow, that the right hon. gentleman rose equal to the occasion and showed to the people of Canada that he was big enough to protect the best interests of the people of this country which are their moral interests, and to protect justice in this country. And although his Minister of Justice by the address he delivered here to-night degraded the Canadian goddess of justice as she has never before been degraded in this parliament of Canada, I hope I will hear to-morrow that the Prime Minister of this country has risen equal to the occasion and denounced the conduct which I submit, every intelligent and honest and patriotic Canadian must in his heart condemn.

Mr. G. W. KYTE (Richmond, N.S.). Mr. Speaker, I was a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections, and I attended regularly every sitting of that committee while the subject now under discussion was before us for investigation. I am one of the members of the committee who signed the majority report, and I desire to state a few reasons which led me to the conclusion I came to with respect to that report. The position taken by hon. gentlemen who are opposing the adoption of this report is somewhat different from that which was taken by them in the committee. So far as I have been able to appreciate the objections made by hon. gentlemen who support the minority report, I am led to the conclusion that they no longer contend seriously that the Independence of Parliament Act has been violated.

There can be no longer any question of doubt as to that, having regard to the argument addressed to this House by the hon. Minister of Justice this afternoon. Having conceded that, what is the conclusion that we must come to with respect to hon. gentlemen opposite? If the hon. member for Richelieu has not committed an infraction of the Independence of Parliament Act, then it must be that hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to invoke some higher law, with respect to the conduct of the members of this House which perhaps they are not ready to apply to themselves or to their associates. Another question which was brought into the discussion, and now practically dropped from further consideration is whether the hon. member for Richelieu has fully paid for the services rendered to him by the department at Sorel, and adequately compensated the department for the goods which he borrowed. That point has not been emphasized this evening, but hon. gentlemen who have spoken have said that whether or not the hon. member for Richelieu paid for the labour he received or the material supplied to him, he is guilty of having committed an offence in respect of the manner in which they were procured. With that much conceded, the task which falls to hon. gentlemen supporting this report is very much lightened. We come then to the discussion of the general principles which the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) sought to apply to this case. I must confess that I had not very much experience as a member of the Committee on Privileges and Elections when the sittings commenced to hear the case against the hon. member for Richelieu. I endeavoured to inform myself as well as I could as to what was the action of this House and the action of hon. gentlemen opposite and the action of hon. gentlemen supporting the government, in similar cases. In the course of the address delivered by the hon. member for Verchères (Mr. Geoffrion) to-night, he made

reference to charges that had been established in the Public Accounts Committee in a preceding session which the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) understood as applying to himself. I want to read the following from page 9774, volume 5, of 'Hansard' of the session of 1907-8:

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—MR. J. D. REID.

Mr. J. D. Reid (Grenville). I rise to a question of privilege. On my arrival here this morning I noticed in last night's issue of the Ottawa 'Free Press' the following headings on an article.

'A Conservative member of parliament got yacht repaired at country's expense.

Dr. Reid of Grenville has received favours from the Marine Department at Prescott—Merwin paid on the repairs to his tug "Victor" but Conservative member has not made good.'

I want to say that this is absolutely untrue. So far as I am concerned, the government works at Prescott never did any work on my yacht, so far as I know, that I have not paid for. . . . This matter will come up in the committee on Wednesday next, when I shall be present, and I hope the Minister of Marine will be there too, so that the question can be gone into thoroughly. In the meantime I state that I deny the whole matter absolutely.

Having been made aware that a matter similar in character had come up in parliament in the session of 1907-8, I thought it well to inquire what were the circumstances surrounding the particular incident to which the hon. member for Grenville had reference, and I have procured a copy of the evidence. I desire hon. gentlemen, particularly the hon. member for Grenville, not to understand me as going into this question for the purpose of arguing that he had committed any offence against the independence of parliament. I simply do so for the purpose of pointing out that in the conclusion which I have come to with reference to the charges made against the hon. member for Richelieu, I have been guided by the evidence elicited in the case in which the hon. member for Grenville was concerned. This is the evidence taken before the Public Accounts Committee on June 10, 1908. The witness on the stand is Mr. J. Offspring, an official of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, in the town of Prescott:

Q. Tell me the names of some of the boats or vessels you worked on in 1905?—A. There was the 'Reserve,' the 'Maisonneuve,' 'Lotbinière'.

Q. And the 'Dack'?—A. Yes.

Q. What did you do to her?—A. Hauled her out in the fall, kept her over all the winter on the ways, and in the spring did some work on her.

Q. By whose instructions did you haul her out?—A. A. J. F. Fraser's.

Q. What work did you do to her?—A. Put a caulker, a carpenter and a labourer on her.

Mr. KYTE.

Q. How many days did the caulker work?—A. Two days, I think.

Q. Who paid this man?—A. Well, I tried to find Dr. Reid and could not, and I went to the office and told Mr. Noble that the man wanted to go home in the morning, and Noble paid him.

Q. Was it paid from the government or private funds?—A. I understand that Mr. Noble paid it out of his own pocket.

Q. What Dr. Reid are you referring to?—A. John D. Reid.

Q. What is his business?—A. He has a starch factory at this time.

Q. Was he the owner of the boat?—A. I understand that he was.

Q. Who also worked on this boat—other employees?—A. Well, Malone put in the planking.

Q. What is the business?—A. Ship carpenter.

Q. How many days did he work?—A. Two and a half days I think, he put in six planks.

Q. And who else?—A. Mr. McGarr did the scraping and some painting.

Q. Have you any knowledge of how many days he worked?—A. I could not say exactly.

Q. Well, we will get that another way. However, he worked some days on this boat?—A. Yes.

Q. Was he in the employ of the department?—A. Yes, he was a government man.

Q. Anybody else?—A. John Eamer—he was one of the labourers.

By Mr. Northrup:

Q. How many labourers?—A. McGarr and Eamer.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. Do you remember Lalonde?—A. That is a carpenter.

Q. Yes, did he work?—A. Yes, two and a half days.

Q. What were his wages?—A. $2.25 per day.

By Mr. Northrup:

Q. Was there a man named Malone and one named Lalonde?—A. It is one man I think. He goes by both names; I cannot tell you which he had then.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. Lalonde is a carpenter?—A. Yes.

Q. Salary $2.25 a day and he worked how long?—A. Two and a half days.

Q. Did you have to do any work in order to get things ready to get this boat out of the water?—A. Yes, we had to get ways in.

Q. For the purpose of getting this boat out?—A. Well, for all of them.

Q. How many did you haul out?—A. Four altogether.

Q. How much time was occupied in getting the ways in?—A. I . . . well it cost about $200. We had everything ready to haul out for $200.

By Mr. Northrup.

Q. That is for the ways?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Carvell.

Q. And after the ways once got ready you pulled out for boats?—A. Yes.

Q. The yacht 'Dack' was one of them?—A. Yes, of course.

Q. Did the other boats that you have named belong to the department or to private parties?—A. They belonged to the department.

Q. All the boats you worked on, with the exception of the 'Dack,' belonging to the department?—A. Yes.

Q. Well, now, who kept the men's time for this work along with other work?—A. Well, we had a time keeper.

Q. Did you keep books yourself?—A. I made out the time and put it in the office.

Q. Have you these original books that were kept?—A. No, I haven't got them. When we have done with the books we return them to the office.

Q. Who was the official who kept the books in the office?—A. Mr. Mundle.

Q. Do you know that they make up a regular time sheet every month?—A. As far as I know, they do.

Q. I have here the time sheets for the month of May produced by Mr. Boyle, who is the officer in charge. We could have Mr. Mundle here to swear to them if necessary. I notice in this time sheet, over the marks representing the work on days by Mr. McGarr, that the letter 'R' is marked?—A. Every man who worked on the boat for Reid you will find his name marked with an "R".

Q. That means that on that day he worked on Reid's boat?—A. Every man who worked on Reid's boat I marked their name, so that there would be no mistake about it.

By Mr. Northrup:

Q. Is that your sheet?

Mr. Carvell.—No, it is a copy.

By Mr. Northrup.

Q. Are you prepared to swear that that is your sheet?—A. No.

Mr. Carvell.—We can call Boyle as to that.

By Mr. Northrup:

Q. When you handed in your time sheets were you particular to mark the number of days that each man worked on Reid's boat?—A. Very particular, and took all pains to do so.

Q. Now, on this document produced as the official time sheet we find the letter 'R' over marks representing day's work by McGarr, and these 'R's' are over the days of the 9th, 10th, 11th, 12th, 13th, 15th, 16th, 17th, 18th, 19th, 23rd, 24th, 25th, 26th, and 27th of May, 1905. Do you know, as a matter of fact, that in the month of May, 1905, McGarr worked on Reid's boat?—A. Yes, I know he worked on the boat.

Q. But you do not know, as a matter of fact, the exact days I have mentioned?—A. I could not say that.

Q. But in the month of May he worked on Reid's boat?—A. Yes.

Q. I find 'R' over these days in the month of May, and you say that for some days he worked on Reid's boat, and you so reported it?—A. Yes, I reported every day he worked on that boat.

Q. Now, Lalonde—did you also report to the head office the days Lalonde worked on Mr. Reid's boat?—A. Well, I cannot mind exactly whether I did or not.

Q. Well, now, I find in this sheet on the 9th of May, 1909, the letter 'R' marked over one-half day and 'R' marked over the 10th and 11th against Lalonde; that is 'R' over two and a-half days' work of Lalonde in 1905. Did he work on Reid's boat two and a-half days?—A. Yes, he put in six planks on that boat in the two and a-half days he worked.

Q. This man Lalonde, the man you said was paid by Noble?—A. No; his name, I think, was David Mountry. I do not know whether that is the right name or not, it is always the name he went by.

By Mr. Carvell:

Q. Do you know who prepared this account I am showing to you, that is do you know of your own knowledge?—A. I think that is Mundle's writing.

Q. Give me this man's name as nearly as you can?—A. David Mountry, I think. I cannot find it on the government pay-list for the month of May. It may be spelled differently, but I cannot find it on the official time sheet.

Q. There is a D. Montrel, a calker?—A. That is the man.

Q. You look at that list for the month of May, and see if the letter 'R' is over any of his day's work?—A. I do not find it.

Q. Did you find it over any of his day's work?—A. I do not.

Q. Did he work after the 7th day of May, in the year 1905?—A. I cannot tell you exactly what day it was.

Q. According to this time sheet did he?—A. No, sir.

Q. Did Dr. Reid have any other boat repaired at the government expense?—A. Yes, he had one hauled out since.

Q. Yes, the name, please?—A. The 'Helen.'

Q. What was done to her?—A. Just hauled out.

Q. Reid furnished his own men for the work on her?—A. Yes, and the timber.

Q. All the department did was to loan the ways for him to do his own work on?—A. Yes.

Q. And, so far as you know, there was no charge to Reid for that?—A. Not so far as I know.

By Mr. Northrup.

Q. Were you there?—A. Yes.

Q. Tell me how you came to haul Reid's boat up?—A. Dr. Reid spoke about hauling the boat up.

Q. Spoke to who?—A. To the office.

Q. You ought to speak of your own knowledge. What was it first that you knew?—A. He came to me and said he had leave to haul out his boat.

Q. And what was said by you?—A. I said, you get around and as soon as I am ready I will haul her up.

Q. And what then?—A. He sent around the boat to our slip.

Q. His factory is near you?—A. Yes.

Q. So that it was only a few feet to haul around?—A. Yes.

Q. He had his men bring it around?—A. I believe they did and tied it to the slip.

Q. Do you know why his men did not haul her up?—A. I think they did not have enough men.

Q. Why did they not pull her up?—A. Well, I think they did not know enough to pull her up.

Q. Then she was left there at the ways?—. The ways were not ready at the time. She was left there until the ways were ready.

Q. How long did it take to pull her up?—A. I don't think it was more than an hour. We hauled her from the water 110 feet.

Q. Do you think you did that in an hour? You haul these boats along two rails, do you?—A. No, I used holders outside the rails.

Q. Then your power comes from what?—A. A capstan.

Q. How many men?—A. I did not have any men to work the capstan, I had a horse.

Q. Do you remember what repairs were made on the 'Dack'?—A. Scraping and painting and puttying, and putting in six new planks and caulking.

Q. How long would the six planks be?—A. They were 16 feet planks, one and a quarter inch stuff.

Q. Six pieces of one and a quarter-inch stuff were put in?—A. Yes.

Q. As a practical man, how long would you say it would take to put in those six planks?—A. It took a carpenter two days and a half.

Q. Did he do all that himself?—A. All himself, except that when he wanted a plank to be lifted he called the labourers.

Q. The labourers being for work on the ground?—A. Yes.

Q. When he wanted a plank lifted he would call one of the labourers to help?—A. Yes.

Q. Besides putting in the plates, you painted and puttied and caulked?—A. That is right.

Q. And the caulking was done by this man Montrel?—A. Yes.

Q. And there was no charge made to the department for that?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. How long did it take a man to scrape that boat?—A. It would take one man three or four days to scrape her.

Q. Do you remember, as a matter of fact, that any one man did work three or four days?—A. McGarr worked on it.

Q. Did he do all the scraping?—A. Yes, as far as I remember.

Q. Now, about the painting?—A. McGarr did the painting, too.

Q. What else was there? We had the calking accounted for, the putting in of the plates, the scraping and the puttying. What else was done on the boat?—A. That is about all I know of.

Q. Then we are quite clear that one man did the painting and another man the carpentry and put in the plates, and he had another man to help him when he wanted to lift a plank, and the man McGarr did the scraping?—A. Yes.

Q. And the puttying?—A. Yes.

Q. That accounts for all the work done?—A. All that I know of.

Q. So far then we have only McGarr and the carpenter (Lalonde). These are the only two. We won't bother about the caulker, for he was paid outside?—A. There was somebody else. I did not remember. There was a man called Aimer, he worked on it.

Q. What do you say he did?—A. If I remember right, Aimer helped to put her back into the water.

Q. You say that one man, a carpenter, put in the planks, another man, McGarr, also did the puttying and also the scraping?—A. Yes.

Q. Now, can you tell me anything that was done besides carpentry work, painting and puttying?—A. Putting her in the water.

Q. That is not repairs. So that all the work on that boat outside caulking was done by carpenter Lalonde and McGarr?—A. That is so far as I know.

Q. And you were there all the time?—A. I was there all the time.

Q. That being the case, what would you think of this extraordinary document (time sheet produced). I see we have McGarr apparently working sixteen days?—A. I cannot tell you how many he worked.

By Mr. Northrup—

Q. Would you pledge your oath that this man McGarr worked for fifteen days?—A. I cannot tell you how many he worked.

Q. There is an entry here for a caulker, paid at $3 a day or $2.25 a day, paid to May 5. Do you remember this man?—A. No man worked for $2.25.

Q. It is here $3 a day?—A. That is right.

Q. Leland, as a caulker, was paid to May 5 at $3 a day, and then there are the figures $2.25 paid and then three hours?—A. I do not know anything about that.

Q. You would not say that is made up from your sheet?—A. I do not know anything about that. I know he caulked more than two days.

Q. Do you remember the fact of this caulker working for the government at the same time and then being paid off?—A. Yes.

Q. Do you remember that he was working for the government and that he was paid off, and that he then worked for Dr. Reid?—A. Dr Reid asked me three days before, and I told him I could not put on a caulker just then, but that I would in a short time, and that as soon as the work was done I would put him on.

Q. He was discharged from the government and afterwards worked for Dr. Reid?—A. Yes.

Q. The government have nothing to do with the caulker at the time he was working for Dr. Reid?—A. Not at all.

Q. If the government pay-sheet shows six days charged against him, that would be wrong?—A. I cannot say.

Mr. Northrup.—According to this account put in, there are a caulker, painter, carpenter and two labourers apparently, and then two men had half a day each, so there would be four or five labourers apparently.

Q. Can you give me any idea of your own knowledge of what took place, what labourers would be doing on that boat?—A. Labourers were painting.

Q. You told me that McGarr did all the painting?—A. McGarr did the painting, he was a labourer working on the boat.

Q. The painting was all done by McGarr?—A. As far as I can tell you.

Q. If any labourers time is charged for, would you say that that was for hauling her out or putting her back?—A. I suppose that is what it would be for.

Q. I find this item:—'To getting ways ready and hauling out, $28.56.' Did you send in any items from which that would be made up?—A. I think Mr. Mundle took over the matter.

Q. When?—A. The same fall.

Q. How would you average up?—A. We averaged up and then we charged Dr. Reid.

Q. You told us a little while ago that you thought the ways cost about $200?—A. Yes in the neighbourhood of $200.

Q. How did you arrive at this $28.66 for getting ways ready and hauling out?—A. We took the $200 and put so much on the heavy boats and put a little on Dr. Reid's boat. We divided it up as far as we could.

Q. The department has spent $200 on their ways. They had had four boats on ways and they figured out that Dr. Reid's proportionate share would be about $28.66?—A. Yes.

Q. When you charged $28.66 it is clearly un-

derstood that that was not based on the particular time that any man took. It was just based on the average cost?—A. The average cost.

Q. This took place in 1905 and you handed in your slips day by day, reporting what was done in May, 1905. Did you ever ask Dr. Reid to pay any bill?—A. I had nothing to do with that.

Q. You did not know of any bills being rendered?—A. No.

Q. When you handed in your slips, did you do anything more?—A. No.

Q. What brought the account to your mind. You started in May, 1905, when did you next hear about these charges against Dr. Reid?—A. I did not hear anything about it until some time this summer or the spring.

Q. The spring of 1908?—A. Yes.

By Mr. Reid (Grenville):

Q. Was there any work done on Sunday on that boat?—A. Not that I know of.

Q. Are you positive?—A. I never have any of them working on Sunday.

Q. You are sure?—A. Yes, none of my men worked on Sunday.

Q. If that time-sheet shows that some of them worked on Sunday, you would say it was untrue?—A. There might have been a watchman put on on Sunday.

Q. Supposing it mentioned that any of these men worked on Sunday at that, you would say it was untrue?—A. I do not remember any of them working on Sunday.

Q. Take McGarr, you are sure that McGarr did not work on Sunday at that boat?—A. Not that I know of; I do not think so.

Now, one other matter referred to that, I think, has special application to the charges made against the hon. member for Richelieu:

Q. Did you know anything about a gas tank?—A. I placed it myself.

Q. Where was it?—A. Down at the east fence on the government property.

Q. Take this plan. Will you point out where it was? Was it placed as close to the starch factory as you could get it?—A. Yes, on the government property.

Q. But as close to their property as you could get it, and yet have it on your own property?—A. Yes, right inside the fence.

Q. I think there was correspondence about that, we may as well have that, too. I find this letter:

October 19, 1904.

Dear Dr. Reid,—On further consideration it seems to me to be practical to roll the steel store roller on the east side of the depot. There will be less pipe required this way than any other. I have given instructions to have this carried out at once.

Yours obediently,
F. F. FRASER,
Commissioner of Lights.

Q. What was meant by steel store roller?—A. That must be the same gas holder.

Q. That must be the gas tank placed on the east side of your lot?—A. Yes, sir.

Q. And it says there will be less pipe required this way than any other. What was the pipe for, do you know?—A. I guess we ran the pipe down from the valve, down to the ground and under the fence.

Q. Where to?—A. We ran it under the fence so that Dr. Reid could attach his pipe.

Q. Did Dr. Reid attach his pipe to your pipe?—A. Yes.

Q. And carried it to his factory?—A. Yes.

Q. That was in your own knowledge?—A. Yes.

Q. Did Dr. Reid use acetylene gas from the government works?—A. He used some.

Q. For how long?—A. I cannot tell. There was a man there trying some new process. I heard of it. They could not get along without gas and they used the gas for that.

Q. For how long?—A. I think they filled three times to my knowledge.

Q. Kindly explain what you mean by filling?—A. Putting gas in.

Q. How much gas would it take to fill it?—A. I think it would hold about 70 atmospheres.

Q. And you pumped that in three times?—A. Three times to my knowledge.

Q. What would be the value of that gas to fill the tank once?—A. I cannot give the figures.

Q. Anyway you know there would be 210 atmospheres pumped in?—A. Somewhere about that.

Q. Do you know whether a government dredge did any work in front of Dr. Reid's property, the starch company's property?—A. I had a dredge digging there and she ran two cuts, one down and one back. I do not know who it was done for.

Q. Was it done in front of his property?—A. Yes, in front of his property. She took one cut down and one back, two cuts.

It is only fair to the hon. member for Grenville that I should read the evidence given by him in answer to the evidence I have just read:

Dr. John D. Reid, M.P., called, sworn and examined.

By Mr. Northrup:

Q. Dr. Reid, the Department of Marine charges this account against you for hauling out your boat, the 'Dack', on the ways at Prescott in the fall of 1904, putting some repairs on her in the month of May, 1905, what have you to say about that?—A. The only thing that I wish to state about that—in fact I want to state first that so far as this matter is concerned I consider it was rather unfair of the minister to bring it up in my absence.

Mr. Carvell.—Tell us the facts, you are in the witness box now, doctor, and you are dealing with facts.

Mr. Northrup.—That is one of the facts connected with this matter.

Hon. Mr. Brodeur.—Matters have been brought up in my absence very often.

A. In the fall of 1904, I wanted to haul out this small yacht, as is customary, with all small yachts which are hauled out in the winter on account of the ice. I did not haul her out for the purpose of making any repairs, I did not expect there were any repairs to be done on her. Of course, at the end of the spring it is always necessary to have a little caulking done, and at the end of the winter I remember speaking to Mr. Offspring and asking him when he got through with the caulker that he had there, doing work for the government, and when he ceased to be a

government employee I told Mr. Offspring I would like to get the services of the man for a couple of days to do some caulking that might be necessary on my boat. I did not know of any repairs being done, nor did I expect that any repairs would be done, and from that time until now I never knew of anything about any repairs being done; nor have I ever had any accounts presented to me for repairs done on that boat by the department. I may say that in so far as the hauling out of the boat is concerned, I asked permission of Mr. Préfontaine to haul the boat out on these government ways, government ways that were built and were there in place for their own work. At the time I asked permission from Mr. Préfontaine I mentioned to him that I wanted to do it with my own men, as on no account would I allow or would I wish that any of the government men should be employed doing that work. I never knew from that time until this investigation came on, or until about a week ago, that the government men had even hauled out the boat. I inquired from a man, who was my foreman at that time, if the government men did actually haul out the boat, and the answer he made to me was: that I had told him to take the boat round and haul her out with our own men, and he took the boat around prepared to do that, but Mr. Offspring said to him: 'Never mind, I will haul her out in fifteen minutes, when we are hauling out our own boat.'

By Mr. Northrup:

Q. When were you told that?—A. About a week ago, when I asked him if our men had not hauled her out. I had, at that time very many men in my employ, and could have done it, and would have done it, but I have'nt any doubt that Mr. Offspring told him that thinking it was only a matter of a few minutes to haul her out, and that he did not think anything of the matter further than that.

Q. Now, about the caulking?—A. The caulking was done, I saw Mr. Noble afterwards, and asked him what charges there were against me, and he replied $6. I paid it, and I have never heard one single thing from that day until this about the charges; that is all I know as far as the yacht is concerned.

There are one or two other matters which have been referred to, which I would like to speak of, there is the question of acetylene gas for the Starch Company. Let me say about that that we had secured a chemist from Chicago, a new man, that wanted to use gas for testing purposes, for lighting purposes. We had no gas in the town of Prescott and he wanted me to put in an acetylene gas plant which would cost a good many hundred dollars; he was not quite sure whether acetylene gas would work, and in order to have a simple test of this acetylene gas, I asked Mr. Fraser if he would allow me to use a little acetylene gas just for a day or two in order to test it. Mr. Fraser did put this gas over there and we tested it, and it would not work. It was only just for the test, and the result was we did not put in an acetylene gas plant that I would have put in if it had worked. So far as I was concerned, I did not consider that we had used any quantity or that the value of it would be hardly anything. Now, that is all about the acetylene gas, but I personally derived no benefit whatever from the use of that gas.

Q. Excuse me, it was a company?—A. Yes, it was the company that derived any benefit there may have been from the use of the gas.

Another matter that was mentioned here was with reference to an engine. Now, I wanted—we started up our works and I had ordered machinery which had not arrived, and we wanted to start, and the government had an engine in store which I understood was one which had been laid aside for many years, but that it would answer the company for a short time until we could get our own. I asked Mr. Fraser if he would allow the company the use of this engine until we could get our own. The engine was in a bad state of repair at that time on account of not having been in use for many years. I took it over to the machine shop and got it repaired up and used it for a short time, and then returned it in better condition, I believe, than when we got it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Would the hon. gentleman also read the evidence of Mr. Noble, the man who was in charge of the matter?

Mr. KYTE. I should be glad to read it if I could put my hand on it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Noble was in charge of the plant and right there all the time.

Mr. KYTE. I will pass the book over to the hon. member (Mr. Reid, Grenville), and perhaps he will find it for me.

Now, I desire to say that I was led to an expectation as to the manner in which the charges against the hon. member for Richelieu would be dealt with having read the evidence elicited in the Public Accounts Committee in the charge made against the hon. member for Grenville. We have there a case of the hon. member (Mr. Reid, Grenville) who was then, as now, a member of the House seeking to get a favour from the government. I am going to admit at once that the hon. member for Grenville paid the bill when he knew what was due. I will admit that the hon. member might perhaps have been deceived when the caulkers were put to work upon his vessel as to being still upon the pay-roll of the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I object there. The caulkers the hon. gentleman speaks of were two men who had never before been in the employ of the government. They were brought from Kingston, where they were the employees of Davis & Sons. They were brought down just to caulk three boats, and the minute they were through they were discharged, and ceased to be government employees.

Mr. KYTE. I am merely stating what I read from the evidence. It may have been

a mistake to continue their names on the government pay-roll.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They were never on the government pay-roll for caulking government boats prior to being on my boat.

Mr. KYTE. I do not desire to enter into a wordy controversy with the hon. member with respect to it. I read the evidence taken from the Public Accounts Committee and which will appear upon the 'Hansard' to-morrow. The evidence is available, and any one who desires can read it. With regard to the repairs made upon the boat, and the painting upon the boat of the hon. member for Grenville, the same thing applies. The hon. member, I presume, paid for it when it came to his notice that their time had been charged against the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There was never any account presented to me.

Mr. KYTE. Then it is not paid yet, so it is all the worse for the hon. gentleman. The hon. member for Richelieu desired the use of some men to do work upon his house. He went to the person having charge of these men, who consented that they should go and work upon his house. The time was kept in the same manner in which it was kept in the case of the hon. member for Grenville, and when the work was all done the bill was presented to the hon. member for Richelieu, and he paid the bill, in the same way the member for Grenville would have paid the bill had it been presented to him. Now, with regard to the paint that the member for Richelieu borrowed from the employees of the government at Sorel, the situation is exactly the same as in the case of the hon. member for Grenville in borrowing the acetylene gas and borrowing the engine, with this difference, that there is no testimony that the member for Grenville ever paid the value of the acetylene gas or the rent of the engine. The member for Grenville said that he needed an engine for some special work in his factory, he could not get another one anywhere else, and he went to the Superintendent of the Marine and Fisheries Department in the town of Prescott, he borrowed an engine, and used it as long as he had any use for it, and then returned the engine to the government. I submit that is the exact set of circumstances in respect to the hon. member for Richelieu. It is true, as the Minister of Justice pointed out, that the member for Richelieu did not return the paint in specie, but he returned it in kind. The person who had control of paints in Sorel swears that he kept an absolutely correct account of the material, and after the work was done he made out a bill for the material, he gave it to the time-keeper, who handed it over to Mr. Papineau, and the moment the member for Richelieu ascertained the value of the material that had been used in his house, he gave instructions to have it purchased from the same manufacturer, and he paid the bill, thereby returning to the department at Sorel every penny's worth of material that had been loaned to him. Now, I submit that the circumstances surrounding the transaction in which the hon. member for Grenville was connected are on all fours with the charges made against the member for Richelieu. The member for Richelieu got men from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to do work for him, for which he paid. The hon. member for Grenville, in equal good faith, I presume, got men from the Department of Marine and Fisheries at Prescott, to do work for him, and I am free to admit that if he did not pay for it, it was not his fault, but he would have paid for it if the bill had been rendered to him. Now, there was no hon. member in this House who stood up in his place in 1908, and charged that the hon. member for Grenville had been guilty of fraud, perjury and malversation, in his dealings with the government in the circumstances I have detailed. If the member for Grenville feels that he has not violated the spirit or the letter of the Independence of Parliament Act, and if hon. gentlemen surrounding him on the opposition side of the House feel convinced that the member for Grenville did not violate the Independence of Parliament Act, then I ask them, in all fairness and in all honour, how they can ask this House to censure the member for Richelieu in like circumstances. Taking the argument used by hon. gentlemen on the opposition side that were addressed to you, Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, and taking particularly the arguments used by the member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), and the member for West Elgin (Mr. Crothers), every censure and every condemnation addressed by them to the member for Richelieu, might apply with equal force and weight, against the member for Grenville, and I think it would put their casuistry and their talent for making fine distinctions to a severe test to convince you that while the member for Grenville has not violated the Independence of Parliament Act and has done nothing for which he should be censured, the member for Richelieu has done something for which he should be censured and condemned under the same circumstances.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I would not probably have said anything in this discussion, were it not for the remarks

which the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte) has made concerning myself. I cannot conceive that any hon. member of this House, if he had read the evidence as he should have, would have got up and made the statements the hon. gentleman has made about me here to-night. He has produced the evidence, as he states, in this case, and the hon. member admits that he did not read the evidence, he only read part of the evidence.

Mr. KYTE. I read the statements that were germane to the case.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When I asked the hon. member to read the balance of the evidence he said that he couldn't do it, that he hadn't it. It is not here now, he has only got the one sheet of the evidence. He had not read the evidence of Mr. Noble. Mr. Noble is one of the leading officials of the Marine and Fisheries Department, he was stationed at Prescott at the time, and was living there every day, and the hon. member, if he read Mr. Noble's statement, would see that he denied absolutely the statements made by the hon. member for Richmond. Mr. Noble stated that he had never heard anything about these repairs until it was brought up at that committee. Now, let me state how this thing happened. The hon. member read my evidence, and I denied the whole of the affair, and there was nothing to prove that my evidence was different. Let me tell the House now how this little matter of mine happened to come up. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is here now, we are face to face and we had better have it out. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that at that time there were investigations going on in the Public Accounts Committee concerning his department. We all know that there were very serious charges against the Marine and Fisheries Department. The minister was up there defending the department, as he should. We had charges there so serious that if the people of this country knew of them, I do not believe they would tolerate this government for one minute. What did the Minister of Marine and Fisheries do in that case? He sent his private secretary out to Prescott and kept him there a week or two as a private detective, to see if he could not find some evidence. After a week or two he got two of these witnesses, the evidence of one of whom the hon. member was reading. He is a man whose oath would not be taken in any part of Prescott or in any other part of Canada, a man who, was himself kept out of jail by his friends. That is one of the men, and the minister has him there yet. Both are men whom you can buy for $10 at any time. But when you get to Mr. Noble, a man of honour, he denied the whole thing. Mr. Noble said he never heard of it. The caulkers spoken of were not regular government officials, they were only there for two or three weeks, they were brought there from Davis & Sons, of Kingston, and after they were dismissed and were returning to Davis Bros. I had two men for one day each, or $6, and I paid that to Mr. Noble because he paid the men, as they were going away. I never heard of anything being done on my yacht, and I believe that not one dollar's worth of work was put on it; had there been anything put on it, I am sure the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, with the venom he had against me, would have produced the evidence. I defy the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to say that he ever produced an account or rendered an account to me; he never rendered an account, and the account that man swore to was something like one gallon of paint, a few pounds of nails, something like $3.80. Then they charged me, in order to bring up a fraudulent account, with part of the ways that were built some years before and which are there yet, for which any man knows I would not be expected to pay anything. That was charged up to make a fraudulent account. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows that I was in the Public Accounts Committee every day until this one day, when I had to go and attend a meeting in my county, and then he sprung on this false evidence when I was not there to ask questions. The evidence he read was given when I was not present. I never like to strike below the belt. At that time the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did strike below the belt, he took advantage of me when I was not present, and I do not believe there is another man in the House or another minister who would have stooped to such a mean, low trick as he did.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then after that, Mr. Speaker, what did I do? I went to the Minister of Marine.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think those words 'mean low trick' are not parliamentary.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish to use any unparliamentary language, and, of course, if that is out of order, I will withdraw it. But when the Minister of Marine did such an act as that on me, I told him there and then that I would certainly do what I hated to do, I would expose him. Well, Sir, this man Lanctot——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville)——who has been accused of theft.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This man Lanctot, the member for Richelieu——

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you on a point of order. Has the hon. member the right to call an hon. member 'this man Lanctot'?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I withdraw that; I said that hon member for Richelieu. I apologize for using his name in that way. I said, this hon. member for Richelieu has been accused by members who have spoken, of theft, common theft. Every person knows that means a common thief.

Some hon. members. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Hon. members have accused him of common theft, and that has not been disputed from the opposition side. He is accused of taking men and materials and never intending paying for them.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That has been mentioned by members who have spoken, that he never intended paying. Compare the member for Richelieu with the Minister of Marine and see how these things happen. I want the Prime Minister to understand how these things happen in the Marine and Fisheries Department. I was one of the first to bring out the fact that the Department of Marine and Fisheries was being robbed by a lot of thieves, and, after the investigation, the Prime Minister had to admit that, according to the evidence taken before the Royal Commission, that was practically the case. The Prime Minister assured this House that he was going to have a change in the department, that he had appointed the Hon. Mr. Brodeur as minister, and we were going to see a change; that department was going to be run honestly from the date of his appointment. The Prime Minister knows that that gentleman became Minister of Marine and Fisheries after we had shown up robbers and thieves in that department. He continued those men on his patronage list and they received favours and were paid amounts by that department. After the minister's unfairly taking advantage of my absence we moved for papers in connection with the expenses of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries because it was shown up to us that this gentleman had left Ottawa with the Minister of Finance; they took the same train, they took the same boat to and from England, yet the expenses of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries were three or four times that of the Minister of Finance. No man disputed the expenses of the Minister of Finance. We all knew that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who has, beyond doubt, put up this job on me to-night, and got another man to make these statements, put his hand in the public chest and took out a certain amount of money for his expenses. The Prime Minister will not deny that. I think he received some $8,000 altogether for his expenses to England; he took that money out and returned to Canada in October or November. On January 8, three or four months after, when Mr. Taylor, the member for Leeds, asked the question how much his expenses were, the answer was given and seven or eight days afterwards the Minister of Marine and Fisheries refunded $600 or $700 of the money he had in his pocket that belonged to the people of Canada. Would that ever have been paid if we hadn't brought it up in the Public Accounts Committee? The money would not have been refunded, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries would have kept the money and he would have been carrying it around until this day. That is what happened in his case. There was a precedent why the member for Richelieu should do these things. We showed up how the Department of Marine and Fisheries was running and the minister knows that right there at Sorel where he had put a man on as time-keeper of his own when it was brought to his attention that this man was padding the lists and robbing the country, a common thief stealing the money and putting it in his pocket, and after the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had sent one of his own appointees, a good Liberal who reported to him that this man had been thieving, and that he was a common thief, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries promoted him and gave him a better salary and sent him down to Quebec to another job.

Mr. BRODEUR. Who?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It was Roy. You know him well because you put him there, and you knew he was robbing the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Marine knows that down there at Sorel they have been breaking up the buoys right on the dock and selling them for scrap iron; robbery and common thievery going on there all the time and there is nothing to stop it; going on there with the consent of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. SPEAKER. That is exceeding the limit of debate.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I make the statement that he knows it, and I cannot take back what I know is true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member cannot say that thieving is going on with the consent of the minister.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, Mr. Speaker, I say with the knowledge of the minister. He knew well enough what is going on, it is in the public press that it is going on, and he knows it. That is what is going on in the Marine and Fisheries Department. Look at the statement that was brought up here that the Prime Minister was ashamed of the other night. There were $23,000 expenses for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That was shown.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was it not read out $23,000 for the Marine and Fisheries department?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That might be the total expenses for the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And some $8,000 of that was for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries himself.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I read it in the official statement.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). $4,800.

Mr. TALBOT. What about the acetylene case?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Marine and Fisheries is trying to attempt to trump up a charge against me of that kind, and take advantage of me in that way, but so far as I am concerned I want to state here, so far as this little matter of mine is concerned, I never in my life went to any official or any member of the government and asked them to allow one man to be employed by me. In fact, the evidence shows that I said I would not allow any government official to have anything to do with my property. There is not an official there that will swear that I ever asked him to put on any government officials for me. I never did, and I never had any account rendered to me because the statement was not true. I think this Sorel affair is one of the most outrageous things ever done in this country, and I think it is unfair for the Minister of Marine to put up this gentleman here a few minutes ago to try to get out of this thing in this way. So far as I am concerned, I believe that this affair in connection with the member for Richelieu is one of the most disgraceful things that ever took place in the history of this country. I cannot believe for one minute that the right hon. the Prime Minister is satisfied with the way the Department of Marine is going on. The Minister of Marne has all his government officials at Prescott, and I have told him there is not any doubt at all but that there has been the same kind of thievery going on there in the same way right along.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But, if I wish to say what I think, I do not believe the minister cares whether it is going on or not as long as it benefits his party. That is the way I put it, because it is all his own political friends who seem to get these favours. And so it is all along the line. We have cases up there in the Public Accounts Committee that witnesses are keeping away because, as I believe, they don't want to expose the minister, so much graft is going on in that department. The Prime Minister surely must take cognizance of all those things going on there. If these statements are true in the press that he is going to appoint this man on the Supreme Court——

Som hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville)—where it requires a gentleman who will judge a case honestly.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, shame.

Mr. REID (Grenville)—I think the Prime Minister is going pretty far if he does it. So far as the Minister of Marine is concerned there were other cases that really on account of the feeling we have towards him and others we did not investigate. Why, when he was appointed Minister of Marine the Prime Minister knows well the statements that were going around this House about the position he occupied before that. Will the Prime Minister look up and see that while he was Speaker of the House the amount he charged up to this government were such that no other Speaker of the House or any half dozen of them ever spent so much.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). We have a head of the Marine and Fisheries Department, and we have a right to discuss these matters in connection with the man in charge of that department. I do not blame those fellows that are stealing from and robbing the Marine and Fisheries Department so long as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries either from ignorance or knowledge is willing to let it go on. It is going on there, and it is either through his ignorance or within his knowledge, and any member of this House judging by his past experience from what we have seen can judge which it is. So far as I am concerned, I have my own opinion and every other member can have his opinion. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), men from Quebec, men who

know the situation, don't hesitate to say that the public thieving and robbery that is going on at the Sorel works is publicly known all over the district of Montreal, and that being so surely the Prime Minister must know it. Is he going to allow this to go on? When I brought this matter up about the Marine Department a few years ago he stood up here and said he was going to clean out this department, going to purify it, and what is the record now? I tell him that if the previous minister, the late Hon. Raymond Prefontaine, could stand up here to-night and see the way this department is going on since he left it, he would be ashamed of the government for running it the way they have been doing since. The record of it is something awful. We can bring it before the Public Accounts Committee, but there is no notice taken of it. I tell the Prime Minister that if he is going to allow things to go on as they have been going on in that department his time will be limited.

Some hon. MEMBERS. We have heard that before.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I believe the Prime Minister thinks that the people will not stand for robbery. Will the Prime Minister say that the people will stand for robbery?

Mr. DEVLIN. I rise to a point of order. I do not wish to interrupt the hon. member, but for the decorum of this House it is time we should have your ruling Mr. Speaker, whether an hon. member of this House may be permitted to say that with the knowledge of a minister, whether the Prime Minister of the country or the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, thieving is going on, and thereby saying that the minister may be mentioned as a party to the crime, because—

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow the hon. member to make a speech.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Sit down.

Mr. DEVLIN. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker, on my point of order. I say that any member of this House who charges a minister of the Crown with knowingly allowing thieving to go on in his department is making a statement that the minister himself is guilty of theft, and such a statement should not be allowed in the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. I did not hear any such statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). With regard to what the hon. member has stated about thieving and robbery going on at Sorel, the hon. member for Jacques Cartier made a statement in this House this afternoon, on his responsibility as a member, that it was going on.

Mr. TALBOT. That does not prove that it is true.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It has been stated in this House that it is going on, and we have proved beyond a doubt that it has been going on. I made a statement in this House that it was going on, and the Prime Minister took me to task, and I proved it. He appointed Judge Cassels to inquire into it, and it was proved that it was going on. Why did the gentleman who made that statement not make some charge against me? No man ever made a charge against me, because they knew that it was not true; and another thing—they never sent me any account.

Mr. TALBOT. We are not built that way.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish to refer any more to this matter. I did not intend to make any statement on the affair, but it does seem to me pretty small that the Prime Minister, through his Minister of Marine and Fisheries, would put up a member to try to bolster up such an outrageous case of robbery and theft as this is, by citing my case. I do not think the Prime Minister would believe for one minute that I would be guilty of trying to do what these men say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not care what the gentlemen behind him say. I have that confidence in the Prime Minister, at any rate, that he would not think I would do anything of that kind. The hon. member has asked me something about the little question of gas. Well, to the best of my knowledge and belief, after questioning Mr. Fraser and the other gentlemen there, the value of the gas used—because I think it was used only one day—was about 50 cents. I explained at the time that the company I was connected with had given the government a right-of-way over our property for their railway, which they have got to-day, and I believe that right-of-way was worth anything from $1,000 to $3,000, and they never charged them a cent. The company also gave the government the use of their wharf. The dredging they talk about, was, it is true, in front of a wharf owned by this company, but it was done for the advantage of a wharf alongside owned by the government. I did not want it; I was not using that wharf; but the government boats were using it, and the dredging was in front of the company's wharf for the purpose of enabling the government boats to go to the wharf that was beside the wharf owned by the company

with which I was connected. It was done for their sole benefit. After that, down comes this private secretary, Mr. Wiallard, sent by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, to see if he could not get up some cock-and-bull story for the purpose of injuring me. Well, I came before the electors, and the people there, including Liberals, were disgusted that any government would do so mean an act against any member. They could not believe it was true, and at the next election, although the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, as I understood—because I heard on what I considered pretty good authority—sent some thousands of dollars in to try to defeat me——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman should not make that statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well, I withdraw it, if the Minister of Marine and Fisheries says it was not so. But notwithstanding that fact I had the largest majority I ever had, although more money was used against me than I believe was used at any other election, and I can judge from the rumours, of the source from which it came. I did believe that the evidence we had in the Public Accounts Committee would have some effect on the Minister of Marine and Fisheries; I expected that we would have a better management of that department, but I must confess that knowing all the departments, even the Public Works Department, which the public think is so bad, in my judgment the Marine and Fisheries Department is the most disgracefully run department in the whole government. If there is robbery and thieving going on in the departments, that department is the worst of them all. Now, I do not intend saying any more. I simply rose because of the remarks made against me. I am not a bit afraid of what the minister or any member of the government or any member of this House can do against me in my constituency. I was born in that county, I have lived there all my life, I have run five elections there, and I am satisfied that I can run another, even with the whole government against me, and I can have as big a majority as I had at the last election.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). I thought, Mr. Speaker, that we had met here to-night for the purpose of discussing the question which is now before the House—the report which has been made and which has been proposed by the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), and the report which has been proposed by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk). I find, however, by the speech which we have just heard, that we have gone absolutely out of the way and out of the rules which are generally followed in such cases. I want to say immediately to the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), that when he says that I had something to do with the statement which has been made to-night in connection with the investigation which took place some years ago, or, to use the expression which he employed several times, that I had put up the hon. member for Richmond (Mr. Kyte), he is making an assertion which is absolutely unfounded.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I had it several days ago that you were going to do it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never spoke to the hon. member for Richmond in regard to it. I never mentioned the matter in any way, shape or form, to that hon. gentleman or to anybody else, and I am surprised at the statement of the hon. member for Grenville because he cannot show that anything of that kind came from me in any way whatever. When he makes that erroneous assertion I say that he does something which is absolutely unfair and uncalled for. However, I do not care very much, and I am glad that the hon. member has seen fit to speak of the administration of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, because since I have had charge of the administration of that department I have tried to conduct its affairs in such a way as to enlist the confidence of the people.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You have not done it.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have done it not only to my own satisfaction but to the satisfaction of all fair-minded men in this country. I admit that at one time the department was under a cloud. What did I do? I took the necessary steps to investigate everything connected with the administration of the department. When the Civil Service Commission came into the department, I said to them that they could examine everything, and I put at their disposal all the papers which were in the department. Later on, when they stated that there were some frauds, or some general charges against the administration, or against some officials of the department, I asked my colleagues to appoint one of the most eminent judges in this country to investigate thoroughly the affairs of the department. If we had been afraid of any wrong-doing I never would have recommended such an investigation. But, I had the best lawyers in the country, I had one of the most eminent judges to be found in Canada, to investigate the affairs of the department, and when that investigation was over and when it was found that some

people were guilty of wrong-doing, I did not hesitate for one moment to recommend to my colleagues the dismissal of those officers who had violated the rules of honesty and rectitude. With regard to the statement that stealing and thievery are still going on, I may say to the hon. member for Grenville and the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) that I will always be disposed to do everything in my power to put an end to anything of that kind. The hon. member for Grenville says that there are steals going on still in Prescott. What would be the duty of the hon. member for Grenville in such a case as that? The hon. member for Jacques Cartier also stated this afternoon that in September or October last, he knew there was something irregular and illegal going on at Sorel. What would be the duty of these hon. gentlemen? Are they not obliged, like ministers of the Crown, to see that the administration is honestly carried on? If they know of something wrong in any branch of the public service is it not their duty as members of the House to advise the minister of the wrong-doing, or to get up in parliament and say what has been done? The hon. member for Jacques Cartier stated this afternoon that he was advised in September or October last that there was something wrong in Sorel. Why did he not come and tell me? Why did he not advise the minister what was going on? The hon. member for Grenville states also that there is some thieving going on in Prescott. If the hon. member knows that, it is his duty to get up and state what is going on and to give me the particulars in order that the guilty parties may be punished.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I will tell the minister why—because the minister, up in the Public Accounts Committee, defends these rascals instead of prosecuting them.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. member has the audacity to state that I am protecting rascality——

Mr. REID (Grenville). Sure, you are.

Mr. BRODEUR——when I dismissed and suspended no less than 29 officers of the service who had been found guilty by a Royal Commission I did this under my sense of duty and the next day the Montreal 'Gazette,' which is a respectable paper, praised the action which I then took. I say now that if there is thieving, if there is stealing in some parts of the department, it is the duty of any member to see that these steals are put a stop to and to denounce these things. My hon. friend can bring his facts before the Public Accounts Committee, he can state the facts to the minister and he will always find that I will take the necessary steps to prevent any stealing or wrong-doing. I may say in connection with this matter that some time ago a member of the opposition, anxious, I am sure, that the administration should be honestly carried out, brought to my notice something which was wrong and I immediately advised the necessary inquiry with the view of punishing the guilty parties. I may inform my hon. friend that in spite of everything that he has said to-night against me, I will always receive any information which he will give in that respect and he may be sure that the necessary steps will be taken to put an end to any wrong-doing which may be disclosed. The hon. member for Grenville has thought fit to refer to all sorts of things with which I have been connected. I say that I am not afraid to put my record before parliament and before the country. My record is just as good as that of any member of this House. I have been trying to do my duty and I think I have done it. I have punished and dismissed culprits, I have sent to jail persons against whom I have been able to secure convictions and I will punish wrong-doing so long as I have anything to do with the administration of the public affairs of this country.

I do not want to discuss at any great length the question which is now engaging the attention of the House. But, perhaps I may be permitted to say a word or two as to the circumstances which surrounded that question. In the month of May last, the hon. memeber for Richelieu seeing that he could not get workmen in Sorel to paint his house went to the time-keeper of the shipyard to ask if he could procure the services of some men for this purpose. There is no great harm in that.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly not. What harm could there be so long as there is no fraud, and the public service does not suffer? Some hon. members opposite say this cannot be. I say, on the contrary, that sometimes it is even a good thing to do in order to retain the services of men who are employed in the government works there. The men employed in the government works in Sorel are generally very good men, and fulfil their duties in a very satisfactory manner. But there may be times in the year when there is not so much to do, and, if we have a chance to secure work for our men elsewhere, it means that we shall be able to retain their services. I do not see how it can be stated that the mere fact that the member for Richelieu asking for men to work on his house is a very bad thing. Some time ago we had a case where we did not absolutely need the services of a certain man, but had we dismissed him he would have gone elsewhere and we would have lost the services of a man we could not easily

replace. We found some work for him outside the yard, and I say in such a case there is no harm in it, on the contrary, it is to the advantage of the yard.

Mr. BARKER. Did the minister continue to pay that man?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. But when I made my first proposition I had in mind the suggestion of some hon. members opposite that this should not be done in any case. I say that sometimes it should be done. The circumstances under which the hon. member for Richelieu made his request for men were these: His wife was, unfortunately, very ill. He was unable to stay in Sorel, but had to remain with her at Saranac Lake, where she was being treated. He asked the foreman whether he could not get some men, and the foreman, Mr. Champagne, answered that he could get these men. In June a few days' work was done. Mr. Lanctot was absent most of the time. A few days' more work was done in July, but properly speaking, the painting was done in September and October, and finished in November. So far, there is certainly no harm. Mr. Lanctot asked the foreman painter Mr. Pagé where he could get the paints for his house. It was suggested that he could get them from Cyrille Labelle & Co., but on that remark the foreman said that he did not know whether it would be possible to get all the paint from that firm, that there might be some qualities that they would not have. Mr. Lanctot said that in such a case Mr. Pagé could supply the paints and he would see that they were replaced. Mr. Pagé agreed. That is all that was done. As to the men there was no agreement except that they were to be paid by Mr. Lanctot. Nobody suggested the contrary; nobody suggests that Mr. Lanctot was not to pay these men. The best evidence is that during the progress of the work Mr. Lanctot asked several times for his bill. What was done in this case by Mr. Champagne? Mr. Champagne did what I consider a very irregular thing, but under circumstances which I think it only fair the House should understand. Mr. Champagne had known other instances of men being set at work outside, and he had paid these men, having the money from the person for whom they were working. But Mr. Champagne was severely criticised, so he tells us, and some of the men insinuated that he had put some of the money in his pocket which otherwise would have gone to them. To protect himself, without the knowledge of Mr. Lanctot and without the knowledge of the officers of the department, he kept these men on the pay-lists, but without any intention of defrauding anybody. He had no intention of stealing the money or doing anything wrong; he acted as he did simply for the purpose of protecting himself against such insinuations as has been made against him. And when the work was finished his statement of account was sent to Mr. Lanctot, and immediately a cheque was returned for an amount, and the transaction was consequently closed.

Now, with regard to the paint, it was understood that the paint should be taken from Mr. Cyrill Labelle, but at the same time it was agreed between Mr. Pagé and Mr. Lanctot that if the latter could not get all the paint he required for his house, he might get it from the department. Mr. Pagé was the foreman of the painters. We put at his disposal from the stores a certain quantity of paint which is not charged to any particular work, because this paint has to be mixed, and when it is mixed it is used on different works. Mr. Pagé renders every week an account to the shipyard cost clerk stating the amount he has spent upon such and such a work. In that way he has at his disposal a certain quantity of paint, and out of that he took a small quantity to be used on Mr. Lanctot's house. It was understood that the paint was to be returned, it has been returned, or has been paid for. So far as the money is concerned, it cannot be said that there was any theft, or any conspiracy amounting to a crime. The hon. member for Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty) has tried to show that there was theft under the circumstances, and that word is also to be found in the charges made by the member for Champlain. But I am convinced, and I am sure the majority of the members of this House are convinced, that there was no theft in the circumstances which have been proven. What constitutes theft? There must be an intention to steal, to defraud. Was there any intention shown to defraud in these circumstances? Certainly not. Was there any intention of stealing? Certainly not; it cannot possibly be said that any crime has been proven. What is the situation today? A minority report has been brought down signed by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) and the member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). Do these two hon. gentlemen in their report intimate that there was a crime, that there was robbery? Not at all, they simply state that it was a violation of the Independence of Parliament.

Mr. BARKER. We said it was unlawful.

Mr. BRODEUR. But they do not say it was a criminal offence, they do not say that there was theft, they do not say that the charges made by the member for Champlain have been proved. The member for Champlain charges that there was a theft committed. The hon. member for Hamilton does not say that, and I would be greatly

surprised if he should now say that there was theft under the circumstances. How does it come then that these charges of theft are now being made? The Minister of Justice showed conclusively that there was no violation of the Independence of Parliament Act, and after his speech the member for Ste. Anne's discovered that the motion made by the member for Jacques Cartier could not stand criticism. Then hon. gentlemen opposite started these charges of theft and robbery. Well, I say there is absolutely nothing in the evidence which would justify the charge on the part either of the foreman or of Mr. Lanctot. Why is Mr. Lanctot being prosecuted to-day? Why have these charges been made against him? Of course, we should not refuse to receive information, no matter from what source it comes. Who brought these charges against Mr. Lanctot? Who are the men who have been surrounding the member for Champlain and urging him on to make these charges against the member for Richelieu? It is well known that if Mr. Lanctot had been willing to get the Department of Marine and Fisheries to make a certain contract with a certain gentleman whose letters are filed in this case, if Mr. Lanctot had been willing to support the contentions of the man who wanted to blackmail the department, who wanted to get a contract with the department that we were not willing to make, there would have been no charges against Mr. Lanctot. Hon. members of this House who have followed the investigation know that a certain gentleman was applying for a contract with the department, he wanted to sell us some machinery that we did not need, and I informed the hon. member for Richelieu that we were not going to purchase that machinery. This man's name was Lamoureux, and Mr. Lanctot informed him that the department was not going to purchase his goods, that they were of no use to us.

Mr. PAQUET. At what date?

Mr. BRODEUR. Some time in the month of September and October, also in November. Then, what does Mr. Lamoureux do? He writes a letter to Mr. Lanctot on the 23rd of November, 1910, page 185, of the evidence. This is what he says:

My Dear Adelard,—What news will you bring me Saturday? You will have seen the minister, I suppose. I count on your bringing me a favourable reply.

If the minister refuses to grant me what I ask of him, after having made promises to me, and having heard what he has said to me, if he refuses, I say, I declare to you, my dear Lanctot, that I will be obliged to attack strongly and to bring to light things about which I feel reluctant. My determination has reached its height, whatever may be the consequence.

Do your best, my dear Lanctot, because a refusal will certainly have grave consequences. You have enough in hand to make the minister give in, if he keeps his word, and what he has written, as I have no doubt he will.

Yours truly,

(Sgd.) J. O. LAMOUREUX.

Here is a letter which speaks for itself. He states in his letter that I made him some promise to purchase his machinery. I saw the man some time afterwards and said: On what do you rely in stating I have given you a promise? You know I have been refusing all the time to purchase these goods, because we do not need them. He said: It is true, but I have done it in order to induce Lanctot to do still more towards you and to induce him to work more strongly in my favour and to represent me. He felt it was only just to write me the following letter:

If from the letter which I addressed to Mr. Lanctot, our member, on the 23rd November, 1910, the inference was drawn that I was making malevolent insinuations against you, I state that my thoughts were not translated properly.

I had not the slighest intention in the world of attacking or tarnishing your reputation. On the contrary, I have never ceased to regard your reputation and your character as absolutely unattackable, and. in addition to that, Mr. Minister, I have no reason to doubt your perfect honesty.

Perhaps my letter was not sufficiently precise for those whose interest it is to alienate from me your esteem. However, it appears to me evident, in its entirety, that the hard words it contains are for him to whom it was addressed, and not for you, Mr. Minister, because I have always thought that if I did not obtain that which I asked, it was because Mr. Lanctot did not take the interest in me that I had hoped from him. Several times he showed himself very reticent.

If in my letter I speak of promises and of encouragements that you could have given me, it was the object of stimulating the zeal of Mr. Lanctot and of proving to him you were not as strongly opposed to my requests as he wished to make me believe.

Once more, Mr. Minister, I have never for an instant doubted your perfect honesty, and I have never wished to tarnish your reputation.

These explanations would have been unnecessary, I am convinced, Mr. Minister, had not the persons interested in depriving me of your esteem sought to draw from any letter a meaning which I had no intention of conveying.

I am confident, Mr. Minister, that my explanations will satisfy you and that you will continue to believe in my best consideration and most respectful sentiments.

Your humble servant,

(Sgd.) J. O. LAMOUREUX.

Mr. LENNOX. A regular patent medicine letter.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a very significant letter. Here is a man who some time ago stated that if a certain contract which he was expected to make was not consum-

mated, he would make some revelations and he said the minister had given him a promise. Then he writes a letter stating that he did that just to induce Mr. Lanctot to work more strongly for him. That explains to a very large extent the charges which were later made in this House. I do not know if the member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) is here or not, but if he is here I suppose he will admit that this man Lamoureux has been one of those who have approached him and induced him to make these charges against Mr. Lanctot. Who are the other men who had instigated chiefly these charges against Mr. Lanctot. Two men were in the service in Sorel whose services we had been obliged to dispense with. These men come later on and say: We worked at Mr. Lanctot's house for a couple of months. One of them said he had been working there for four months and that he was being paid by the government during all that time. Honest man! Did he come and tell his superior officers that he was at the same time working for the government and also for Mr. Lanctot. That he was stealing from the government? Why did he not go and say to the director of the shipyard: We are in receipt of money from the government which we do not earn. No, but afterwards, when they were dismissed and sent away from the work of the department those men went to see my hon. friend from Champlain (Mr. Blondin) in connection with the men who wanted to blackmail Mr. Lanctot and they started these charges which are now made against Mr. Lanctot.

Mr. BARKER. Does the hon. minister not know that every material fact spoken of by these witnesses has been admitted by Pagé and Champagne?

Mr. BRODEUR. It has been stated several times here by members who have spoken on the other side that the member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) should not be blamed for anything in connection with the charges which have been made before this House. I say the hon. member should have stated when he made his charges that the amount had been paid by Mr. Lanctot. It was a very important fact, why did he not state it? He simply took the statements of these men Lamoureux, who wanted to blackmail Mr. Lanctot, Douaire and Proulx, who had been dismissed from the service of the department. Of course every member is free to take evidence from any person, I admit that, but at the same time I think the word of those men who had been dismissed from the public service for cause should not be received and accepted so readily and more especially that charges of this serious nature should not be brought against fellow-members of this House upon such testimony. I am sure the members of this House should be convinced now that the charges made against Mr. Lanctot were not well founded, that he did not violate the Independence of Parliament Act, and that he did not commit any theft or crime as suggested by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) and the hon. member for Elgin (Mr. Crothers). Under these circumstances I say that we should clear the hon. member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot) of the charges which have been made against him.

As the House is aware, the hon member for Richelieu (Mr. Lanctot) was placed in a very trying position. He was obliged to be absent from his city a great deal in order to be with and to nurse his wife, who was very ill. In that situation, he had the sympathy of every man in Sorel, every man was willing to help him; and because some men may have been a little indiscreet in the way they extended sympathy to him, I say that we should not, under the circumstances, do anything which would add to his anxiety.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Speaker, I will refer in the first place to the words that the hon. the Minister of Marine has just uttered. He tells us that he asks nothing better than to be duly informed of what is taking place. For my part I shall not fail to tell him of the abuses and thefts committed, especially at the Sorel works. I hold here a certain number of affidavits concerning those frauds, and there are many others. The abuses referred to have taken place within a year at the Sorel yards, and the minister should know of them.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) The hon. member is doubtless aware that six accused persons have been arrested.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) But have you held an investigation such as will satisfy public opinion? I may tell you that had such an investigation been held the hon. member for Champlain (Mr. Blondin) would never have pressed his charges.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) An investigation was held two years ago.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) It was not a complete investigation. In any case I could, if necessary, produce some fifty affidavits concerning the abuses taking place at Sorel; if I may be allowed to do so.

Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) If the hon. member will hand me the affidavits in his possesssion, I will hold an investigation immediately.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) We on this side of the House do not want Mr. Lanctot's

head; we require an investigation satisfactory to the public and which will throw light upon the doings of certain government employees at Sorel. I might mention certain names, in fact I will do in the course of my remarks. A certain Mr. Oscar Champagne—for there are several of the name—who checks and prepares pay lists, is said to have answered: 'I do not want to have anything to do with the payment of the men, as I would be accused of not giving them their full pay.' That the government would pay them and Mr. Lanctot refund the money. Men's services have been loaned and honestly so to certain persons in Sorel. There is nothing to be said against that. There is, for instance, the case of Amable Lussier, who secured the services of government painters; he paid them himself and they did not report on such days as having worked for the government. Might not Mr. Champagne have said to Mr. Lanctot: If you want painters you will get them, but you must pay them yourself. An appeal to sentiment is made on the ground that Mr. Lanctot's wife was very ill when the work began. I fail to see why this is constantly brought before the public. A man of courage would not resort to such means for the purpose of attracting sympathy and condoning actions of which the public cannot approve. Concerning the illness of Mrs. Lanctot, I sympathize with the member for Richelieu, but I do not approve of the tactics which consist in calling attention to the illness of the lady in order to attract sympathy to himself. Mr. Lanctot's wife should not be called in to protect him.

At all events, was the hon. gentleman constantly at Saranac lake? Was he not at Sorel on June 3 when the work began? He spent most of his time at Sorel. There was no such pressing haste as has been contended and he might easily have seen Mr. Papineau and made arrangements with him to obtain more men. It is established that Mr. Papineau was only two days absent, May 28 and 29. It will not be believed that the member for Richelieu might not have met him had he so wished.

The organization of the Sorel shipyards should be known. We should be in a position to decide whether it is imperfect or incomplete. There are legions of employees there.

The investigation which has just taken place has given us and the public much information. If, as I have just remarked, the organization is not perfect, it is at least complete in this sense that there are numerous employees of all classes and kinds. It is not perfect because it has been found wanting in a very simple matter.

Mr. Louis G. Papineau is the manager of the Sorel shipyards. His assistant is Mr. H. A. Terreault.

Mr. PAQUET (L'Islet). (Translation.) Will the hon. member allow me to ask whether the member for Richelieu made any effort to see the deputy manager of the Sorel works on finding that the manager was absent?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) Not the slightest. On May 28 or 29 he called at the office of Mr. Papineau who happened to be absent at Montreal. He made no effort to see Mr. Terreault, nor did he seek to meet Mr. Papineau on his return.

Mr. Alfred Baril is the accountant. Mr. Norman Massé is keeper of the stores in which the materials employed in construction work at Sorel are kept.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. (Translation.) Does the hon. member know anything against Mr. Baril?

Mr. NANTEL. I will hand in affidavits against Mr. Baril and if I am not mistaken I can get several.

Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé is foreman of painters. Mr. Arthur Lavallée, his assistant, distributes the paint for different works. Mr. Cecil Doutre is the purchasing agent.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Doutre does not reside at Sorel.

Mr. NANTEL. Whether he resides at Montreal or at Sorel he is supposed to form part of the staff. Mr. Oscar Champagne is time-keeper; he also prepares the pay lists. The branch dealing with the cost of construction is under the direction of Mr. Ulric Latraverse, with Mr. Albert Prudhomme as assistant. Both have books to keep; by means of statements furnished by other branches, they are in a position to compute the cost of all construction or other works in the Sorel shipyards. Mr. Désiré Champagne is paymaster. Mr. Cuthbert Champagne is keeper of the 'punch' by means of which the men register their time. Mr. Napoléon Badeau is foreman of the wood construction. Mr. Gendron is foreman of day labourers.

There are a number of other employees whose names I will not mention. Each man working at the Sorel shipyard is given a number and every different work is also numbered. The organization cost $42,000 and it is now found defective. It was devised by one Falconer and supposed to be excellent.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. Does the hon. member contend that such a sum was spent for that organization or that Mr. Falconer appointed those employees?

Mr. NANTEL. It cost $42,315.02 to establish a good system of book-keeping and instruct the assistants.

We find therefore at Sorel an army of employees, managers, assistants, guardians,

time-keepers, foremen who rub up and seemingly interfere with one another. All are bound to protect the property of the government and of the people at Sorel. However, in spite of this complicated machinery there was found to be, in the year of grace 1910, a man, a lawyer by profession, who succeeded in having his house painted and by government materials, tools and men and at the cost of the government. The work was begun as soon as the house was ready to be painted, i.e. the 3rd June, 1910, and was finished only on the 21st November following.

During that period of about 23 weeks, government men and government paint were used for that private work. Until the 21st November seven or eight men at a time worked there and were paid regularly by the government every two weeks. An extraordinary feature is that the government was officially informed of this only on the 22nd November, 1910, by a statement of the wages of painters and labourers accompanied by a cheque for $375.62, addressed to Mr. L. G. Papineau, the manager. The statement was handed in by Jean Baptiste Pagé, who was not the official book-keeper but assumed those duties for the occasion.

Mr. Papineau must have been very much surprised on receiving such a statement and cheque! Until then the government was kept in the most absolute ignorance concerning the painting of this now notorious house. The cheque covered the payment of wages only and not the cost of material. The matter now being known, steps were taken to recover the cost of paint and other material, and Mr. Papineau determined the mode in which this recovery should be made. He decided to obtain the paints from a Montreal firm—the Mount Royal Colour & Varnish Company—to the amount of $81.60 and to return it in kind to the government. Mr. Papineau gave his personal cheque in payment. The goods reached Sorel on December the 12th, 1910 and were stored by the department on the 13th.

The hon. member for Richelieu repaid Mr. Papineau the amount of his personal cheque and also the cost of transportation. But how was the whole of this 'tour de force' managed? for in reality it is a 'tour de force.' Very simple and the matter as a whole shows the true value of the army of government employees at Sorel.

The hon. member for Richelieu spoke first of all to Mr. Oscar Champagne, the timekeeper, whose office is next to that of the manager, Mr. Papineau and of Mr. Terreault, the assistant manager. He said to him:—Mr. Papineau is not in his office, can you send me painters as my house is ready to be painted? With pleasure, replied Mr. Champagne. The member for Richelieu met Mr. Jean Baptiste Pagé, foreman painter, as he left Mr. Champagne's office, and repeated the same request; can you send me any painters? With pleasure replied Mr. Pagé, if Mr. Papineau consents.

Some time later, between the 15th and the 20th May, according to some witnesses, between the 15th and the 30th, according to others, but in any case before the month of June, as the painting began on June 3, the member for Richelieu had asked Pagé for paint and material, requesting him to keep a seperate account, as all would be returned. It was not more difficult than that. That is all. Nothing was done towards seeing Mr. Papineau, although he was absent from Sorel only on the 28th and 29th May, two days in all. It was not worth while to see him or his assistant. Neither Jean Baptiste Pagé nor Oscar Champagne cared to see Mr. Papineau and submit the case to him.

Thus, from the 3rd June to the 21st November, government paint, material, brushes, were abundant, painters, and even labourers flocked the house in question.

It has been attempted, in the course of the investigation, to prove that it was not possible to find painters at Sorel; but laborers at least could be obtained.

At all events, from June 3rd, all the government employees were placed at the disposal of Mr. Lanctot without anything being changed or disturbed in the routine of the yards. Painters and labourers registered each day as if working for the government, when they could; when they could not do so themselves, Cuthbert Champagne, the complainant guardian of the 'punch' registered for them, having been so instructed by his namesake Oscar Champagne. Then Oscar Champagne, who alone with his pal Jean Baptiste Pagé knew what was going on, prepared his pay list regularly and, each fortnight, and painters doing the private work of the member for Richelieu, were paid by the government,

As I have said, each work bears a special number and all the employees engaged upon it are also numbered, so that it is quite possible, if the rule be observed, to compute the cost of each undertaking. The director of construction work can give, at any time, a statement of the cost of any one undertaking. In the present case that was not done. For the work in question was carried on outside of the knowledge of the manager, Mr. Papineau; it was kept secret from him and done behind his back, although his office was next to that of Oscar Champagne and the house in question a few yards away from his own residence; the whole according to a secret and collusive understanding between the hon. member for Richelieu, Oscar Champagne and Jean Baptiste Pagé, under the higher direction of Mr. Baril.

Nothing of this private work, conducted by two subordinate employees of the government, appeared in the regular books of the department at Sorel. J. B. Pagé, foreman, appears to have noted the men's work in his personal note book or on loose sheets which he handed to Oscar Champagne. The latter kept them in a private drawer and manufactured or falsified the pay lists every two months, making it appear that the men had really worked for the government. In this manner was prepared the account of $375.60 handed to L. G. Papineau on November 22nd, 1910, with a cheque for $375.60 bearing the same date, which was charged and deposited in the Federal Treasury on January 11th, 1911

Mr. TALBOT. Is my hon. friend now reading from the evidence?

Mr. NANTEL. Is that what you are anxious about?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes, because you have no right to read your speech.

Mr. NANTEL. It is an extract from the evidence. In any case, I am in the hands of the Speaker.

At the Sorel shipyards, in order to obtain material from the stores, paint, for instance, a written requisition is required. It appears that in spite of this rule, the foreman may obtain large quantities of paint and in fact it is from what friend Jean Baptiste Pagé had in hand and which he had obtained for other purposes and other works, that he furnished the member for Richelieu with the material for painting his house.

J. B. Pagé appears to have noted on a blotter the amount of paint and material so furnished, the value of which amounted to $81.60. But, most unfortunately, the blotter was lost as soon as the account had been prepared and it has been impossible to find it. Had it been lost beforehand, what would have been the position of the member for Richelieu? It is evident that this matter of paint was not an ordinary one and that it required all the influence that a government member of parliament may exercise over government officials at the Sorel shipyards to persuade them to take the chances they did.

It will also be admitted that in computing the cost of this undertaking, the bookkeeping we have had before us is very crude and rudimentary when we reflect upon the fine organization obtaining at Sorel. Quite plainly Messrs. J. B. Pagé and Oscar Champagne are by no means official but rather under the circumstances officious accountants.

If they were acting in good faith and anxious to do everything openly and above board as is their boast, why did they not proceed in the usual manner prescribed for every undertaking in the Sorel shipyards? If it was desired to paint the house of the member for Richelieu, why was not a special number given to the undertaking? So much paint might then have been requisitioned for and charged against the number assigned to the work. All the statements would then have been transmitted to Mr. Ulric Latraverse, who, immediately after the completion of the work, would have stated: the cost is so much, neither more nor less. The matter would have been clear, clean and no more said.

But it is contended that this was a loan of men and of material. During the investigation, Mr. Amable Lussier told us that on a certain occasion, the department had loaned painters to repair his premises. But he paid those men himself; there was no connivance between the men and their foreman to register as if working for the government. He also paid for the material.

Mr. Napoléon Badeau, superintedent of wood construction and foreman of carpenters, also loaned men to Mr. Lanctot, but he made sure that they did not register as if working for the government.

Speaking of Mr. Badeau, do you know, Mr. Speaker, that if Mr. Badeau had not been superintending the wood construction at the Sorel shipyards, if in his place there had been a man less anxious to do his duty, less scrupulous, a man in fact of the stamp of Pagé and Champagne, instead of having to pay the cost of the paint only at the house in question, the carpentering and woodwork would have come in as well. If you doubt it, listen to Mr. Badeau's deposition at the investigation; it is the evidence of an honest man. And really, had a minister of the Crown not testified therein, I would say that Mr. Napoléon Badeau is the most honest man heard before the committee.

Here is an extract which I find at page 179 of the printed evidence:

Q. You knew that Mr. Lanctot was building a house on George Street, at Sorel, in 1910.—A. Yes, sir.

Q. Had Mr. Lanctot previously spoken to you with a view of obtaining men from you?

Mr. Laflamme, K.C., attorney for Mr. Lanctot, objects to that question as non pertinent to the charges referred to the committee.

The objection is maintained by the president.

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot go to your place and ask you to send some of your men that were working for the government, to work at his house, and did you tell him that you would send those men only on the order of Mr. Papineau; did Mr. Papineau give the order and did you send the men?

Objected to by Mr. Laflamme as illegal.

Allowed by the president.

A. What do you ask?

Q. Did Mr. Lanctot go to your place and ask you to send some men to work for him, and did you answer him, that you would do so only on the order of Mr. Papineau; did Mr. Papineau give the order and did you send the men?—A. Mr. Lanctot asked me if I had

what he wanted. I told him I had it not at the time, but that it could easily be prepared. I told him then, that to have what he wanted, he would have to ask Mr. Papineau first.

By Hon. Mr. Bureau:

Q. On that occasion, did you send some men at Mr. ——?—A. I beg your pardon, the men have been paid at Mr. Lanctot's house, because I told these men not to have their tickets punched before leaving; I also told the puncher not to punch their tickets.

By Mr. Macdougal:

Q. What did he ask for?—A. He asked me to send some timber first——.

Q. Go on with your answer. What did he ask you to send, first?—A. He asked me to send some timber. I told him that I could do so only with the permission of Mr. Papineau.

Q. Did Mr. Papineau give the order, and did you send the timber?—A. I never heard about it, after that.

Q. How long after that did you send some men?—A. The men were sent about that time.

Mr. Laflamme declined to cross examine the witness.

I am surprised that we have been allowed to make that proof before the committee, because we were not given much latitude by the president and the majority of the committee. They constantly objected to all circumstantial evidence, and to every thing that could throw some light on the intentions of the people concerned. The moment we tried to bring in such a proof, we were called to order. We were not allowed to speak about anything else but paint. Every time we tried to bring in some other subject, we were promptly brought back to the paint, under the pretense that the investigation was to be restricted to the painting of Mr. Lanctot's house.

When we offered to prove that men in the employ of the department had removed Mr. Lanctot's furniture into his new house, after it had been painted, the committee promptly closed the mouth of the witness Arthur Cayer, who had been summoned expressly to prove that charge. The question not being allowed, the witness had to withdraw.

It is true that the painting has been done in broad day light, as it is so inconvenient to paint during the night; but it is equally true, that outside of a few intimate friends, as J. B. Page and Oscar Champagne, nobody knew that the wages and the paint were paid for by the government. All were under the impression that the wages were paid regularly by the proprietor of the house, as well as the materials furnished by the department. If Mr. Papineau had not been under that impression, if he had had the least doubt on that point, and had not put a stop to such practices, he would have proven himself to be as dishonest as J. B. Pagé and Oscar Champagne. Mr. Papineau became aware of the state of things, only when he received the bill.

Mr. NANTEL

Mr. TALBOT. He was living right opposite.

Mr. NANTEL. I admit that, and if the hon. member for Bellechasse's intention is to convince the House, that Mr. Papineau was looking at the skies, not to see what was going around, it is his own business.

On the timekeeper's list, exhibit No. 2, Alfred Douaire is credited with only 15 days work at Mr. Lanctot's house, during September and October, but he actually worked during July and August—48 days in all. He said so himself under oath, and the fact is corroborated by A. E. Payette, Henri Proulx and Alfred Thibodeau.

Louis Paul is credited with 20 days' work, and it has been proven that he worked one month, or 26 days. But hon. gentlemen opposite do not mind a few days more or less; they give no importance to such small matters. It is also stated at page 49, that Arthur Plante has worked for two weeks, but his name is not even mentioned in the bill.

It would appear that the paint furnished by the department only amounted to $81.60, and no charges are made for the plant. The wages paid to the painters are said to be $375.60. Mr. Lanctot admits that all the paint required for his house was taken from the workshops of the department, with the exception of the doors and windows, which had been painted the winter before with materials bought by Mr. Lanctot from Mr. Rivet. That paint cost $13, and the workmanship, $12. If you compare the two cases, you find a wide difference. But, a few pounds, more or less of paint, the brushes and all other necessary tools, what is that for our hon. friends opposite?

If the hon. member for Richelieu cannot find in the city of Sorel a single labourer to remove a telephone post, in front of his door, without making application to the government, it might seem strange to us, but for hon. gentlemen opposite, it is another small matter unworthy of notice.

In fact, the whole transaction itself is only a small affair, a common incident, such as happen every year at the department's workshops at Sorel. But the important thing is the principle implied. The gist of the inquiry is that in 1910, at Sorel, the hon. member for Richelieu succeeded in having his house painted with materials belonging to the government, by men in the employ of the government, at the expense of the government, without the knowledge of the superintendent of the workshops, by means of a secret understanding, of a conspiracy between himself and two inferior officials of the department; that the government became cognizant of the thing, only when the work was completed, by the reimbursement of part of the wages and the return of the materials by Mr. Lanctot, when complaints began to

be heard on every side and public opinion forced him to make restitution.

Long before that, on the 24th of September, and on the 17th of October the government had been notlfied that irregularities and wrong doings were going on at Sorel, and disclosure was threatened. If we had been given the least latitude before the committee all that would have been proven.

What is the name to be attached to such a transaction? Shall we call it an irregularity, a fraud, a conspiracy with intent to defraud, an abuse of influence on the part of a member of parliament, a violation of the Act on Independence of Parliament? I do not care what you call it; the transaction is there and it required to be investigated.

Was there intent to defraud, from the beginning? Naturally we were not allowed to prove any kind of intention. We have been strictly limited to the brutal fact. All the people concerned might have a conscience of a special kind, a crooked conscience, and it is possible that they said to themselves: All these things belong to the government; we are the government; the government is ours, let us help ourselves. The officials helped themselves, everybody helped themselves, and the member for Richelieu was given help.

But if you look closely into the matter, you can easily find ample proof that every thing was premeditated and so arranged before hand that if the member for Richelieu had been insolvent, if, for one reason or another, he had not been in a position to pay the bill, the government would have lost every cent. If such a thing had happened, what name would you put on the transaction? You would call it embezzlement; there is no other qualification for it. The cashier who takes the money of the bank for his own use and promise to return it, do not act differently.

If, at the beginning of November, before the 20th, the government had ordered an inspection of the books at Sorel, if they had sent some one to take stock at the workshops, they would have come across that painting contract at Mr. Lanctot's house. If J. B. Pagé and Oscar Champagne had lost their note-book before preparing their statement, what would have happened?

Such transactions would necessarily disturb the bookkeeping of any large establishment. What confidence can we have in the bookkeeping of the department? What guarantee have we that the cost of a boat built at those workshops is as stated when sufficient materials to paint a whole house can be taken away for several weeks without the knowledge of the government?

Things were so arranged before hand that all those concerned had an interest in keeping the matter concealed. Return of materials and payment of wages was sure to arose suspicion and make trouble. They were all interested in keeping the matter secret and in making no payment.

On the 6th December, when the hon. member for Richelieu wrote his letter, the paint had not been returned. It was pretty well known all around Sorel that those faithful public servants, J. B. Pagé, Oscar Champagne and others, committed to the safe keeping of public property, were allowed such privileges as having a canal built on their premises, a kennel for their favourite dog, a carriage or a yacht painted and taken out of the river at the end of the season; all that with the materials belonging to the government and with men in the pay of the government. But the painting of a whole house was out of the ordinary, and it is to the hon. member for Richelieu that honour is due for the change.

Now, has the hon. member for Richelieu violated the Act of Independence of Parliament, chapter 10, R. S. of Canada, sections 14 and 15? I say yes.

A bargain, a convention, a contract has been entered into between himself and certain officials of the department, in their individual capacity, if you like, whereby the house of the hon. member was to be painted with materials belonging to the government and by men in the pay of the government. Later on, the government, in accepting the reimbursement of the wages and the return of the materials, has ratified the bargain.

Has the hon. member for Richelieu been benefited by that bargain? Has he derived from it any advantage or favour? Again, I say yes, and it has been proven.

Could any advantage result from that transaction? Yes. Was that advantage of such a nature that the hon. member could be influenced by it? Yes. If instead of having to pay $500 or $600 to another party, he could have that work done for $300, is that an advantage and a favour? And was not that favour of such a nature as to influence his vote in this House? If a member of parliament buys a property from the government under the real value; if he pays, say $8,000 for a property valued at $10,000, does he not derive a benefit and if such benefit does not constitute an infringement of the Act of Independence of Parliament, I am at a loss to know what it is.

Moreover our critics are not directed so much against the hon. member for Richelieu, as against the general system in vogue at the workshops of the marine department at Sorel. The investigation that we asked for, was not in the doings of the member for Richelieu, but in the general administration of the department. The first resolution that we intended to submit was asking for a general investigation ; if there is any doubt about it I can produce the original

document, but that demand would have been rejected and the hon. member himself would have been the first to stand in his place and tell the House that things in the workshops of Sorel were as clear and limpid as the waters of the Richelieu river. As a last resort, we decided to carry the war into Africa.

Mr. TALBOT. In what part of Africa ?

Mr. NANTEL. The hon. gentleman is eminently witty, but his sallies may become tiresome, in the long run, and he is apt to say things that he would not dare to repeat outside of this House. He may rest assured that I am not in the least intimidated by his more or less absurd interruptions.

We have been hampered on every side in this investigation. All circumstantial evidence has been eliminated ; we have been denied the right to prove any fact likely to throw some light on the intentions of the parties interested. The committee would not hear the witness Arthur Cayer, who was ready to say under oath that he had removed the furniture of the hon. member for Richelieu into his new house during the time he was in the employ of the government and that he was paid by the government and also that his wages had never been repaid to the government. In the course of the investigation it was incidentally disclosed that during the summer of 1910, some painters in the employ of the department, had done some work at the church of Sorel, and immediately, a motion was made and carried by the majority to have that part of the evidence rejected.

If it had been clearly proven that high officials in Sorel, are trafficking behind the back of the government that they are selling at low prices or giving away articles taken from the stores of the department, that they are doing odd jobs for their friends and receive money or favours in exchange ; if I say, these charges had been proven, it would have required but one step further to prove the main object of the investigation.

If it had been demonstrated that in the workshops of Sorel high officials entrusted with the safekeeping of public property, are nothing else than thieves pilfering upon the government for themselves and their friends, and if it had been demonstrated afterwards, that the hon. member for Richelieu had dealings with those thieves, it would have been in the nature of throwing light on the whole transaction and of making known the intentions of the bargainers. But we were not allowed to do it. At every step, the heavy fist of the majority would come down upon us, and restrict us to the painting of the house.

It is by mere accident that the evidence about the church, as I stated a moment ago, came out of the bag, in spite of the exertions of those who were keeping watch around the witness box, to see that the truth could not escape. That witness, Napoléon Badeau, has lent some men to the hon. member for Richelieu, but he saw to it, that their tickets would not be punched, as if they had been working for the government, and he saw to it that they should be paid by the right party. That man Badeau received other requisitions from Mr. Lanctôt. He was asked for some timber, but he insisted upon having the authorization of Mr. Papineau, and heard no more about it after that. The member for Richelieu did not bother him any more; he knew then what kind of a man he was.

Complaints about all those wrong-doing at Sorel were made long before the 24th of September. When the money was refunded the clouds were gathering and the storm was on the verge of bursting. I am informed that in other transactions, quite independent of the one we are dealing with, moneys were refunded in anticipation of an investigation. It was no use to try to prove those things to show the intention of the parties. The big fist of the majority was always there, ready to crush all effort in that diretcion.

We are not after the head of the hon. member for Richelieu. We want a thorough cleaning of those modern Augean stables known as the Sorel workshops. We want a complete investigation by a commissioner who, instead of trying to conceal the truth, would direct all his energies and his ability to find out the truth, the whole truth.

I intend to read a few of the affidavits that I hold in my hand so that the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who is asleep at the present moment, can read them to-morrow in the Hansard. I will begin by the affidavit of Mr. Henri Proulx, taken before Mr. Bourgeois, on the 23rd of December last. The fifth section says:

5. That since the 20th of November last, about twenty men employed by the government, at the same dockyards, have, to my knowledge, made written declarations, charging high and low officials of the Department of Marine, at St. Joseph de Sorel, with theft of cement, in some cases, in other cases, of timber, of paint, varnish, &c., hardwares, &c., and above all with directing the men in the employ and in the pay of the government to do different works for the benefit of private citizens, and on all these charges, the public is asking an investigation.

Mr. TURCOTTE (Quebec). Is that affidavit before the House?

Mr. NANTEL. No, but I will lay it on the table.

Mr. TURCOTTE. I rise to a point of order. I object to the hon. gentleman reading papers that are not regularly before the House.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has the right to read these papers.

Mr. NANTEL (reading).

6. That since it is rumoured that there will be an investigation. I have been solicited and supplicated, night and day, by the said Mr. Adélard Lanctot, and by others; they wanted me to destroy or to handle to some party interested in their suppression, the written declarations made by myself and by others, and of which I was at the time the guardian.

Mr. TURCOTTE. I ask that the motion and the amendment now before the House be read, to see if these documents have any relation to the said motion or amendment.

Mr. SPEAKER. According to the Rules of the House, the motion can be read only at the close of the debate.

Mr. NANTEL (reading):

7. That during those trying times, one of the head clerks, in the store of the government was suspended, but he threatened to disclose all what he knew against the other officials and he has been reinstated since three days.

8. That the watch word amongst those who feel that they might be affected by the investigation, is to reimburse as quickly as possible the price of the materials and the wages of the men, and as a man cannot be a good judge in his own case, I know one of them who thinks he is as white as snow, because, a few days ago, he sent a few dollars to the government in settlement of an enormous debt.

9. That in the interest of Justice and of the country an investigation is necessary; if it is not granted the losses will be immense.

Mr. GEOFFRION. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that that affidavit is a forgery?

Mr. NANTEL. I am not aware of it, and I deny it.

Mr. GEOFFRION. The hon. gentleman makes a mistake. He is alluding to the witness Lambert.

Mr. NANTEL. The part I am reading is the one I was not allowed to read before the committee, because it did not concern the hon. member for Richelieu.

Mr. TURCOTTE. I rise to a point of order. I ask for the application of rule 20, of the Rules of this House, which says:

Any member may require the question under the discussion to be read at any time of the debate, but not so as to interrupt a member while speaking.

Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman is out of order, and I invite him to take his seat.

Mr. NANTEL. I will now read sections 5 and 6, of the affidavit of Alfred Douaire:

5. That during the time that I was in the employ of the government and receiving good wages for the time I was spending at Mr. Lanctot's place, by order of my chief, Mr. J. B. Pagé asked me one evening, about 8 o'clock, to help him to carry away a box several feet long, made in the workshop of the government, and beautifully finished; in fact, I did help him to carry the said box at his own residence, and I have never seen it since.

6. That about the 5th October, 1910, I was ordered by J. B. Pagé to glaze three double doors at Mr. Adélard Lavallée's place, at Sorel; he told me then: Go and register as if you were present; get your card punched before leaving, and I done so. I was paid by the government for that work that took considerable time.

An hon. MEMBER. Who gave that affidavit?

Mr. NANTEL. Mr. Alfred Douaire; a man that you have dismissed.

An hon. MEMBER. He had a grudge.

Mr. NANTEL. If nobody had grudges, there would never be any investigation, and it is the grudgers that defeat the governments.

I come now to the affidavit of Herménégilde Lambert:

1. That I have been in the employ of the Dominion government at their shipyards, situated at St. Joseph de Sorel, from 1900 to 1910, inclusive, that is to say ten consecutive years, the first four years as caulker, and the six last as overseer of labourers. I have given up that work on December 28 last, and have not taken it up since, although, I have been offered an increase of salary of fifteen cents per day.

2. That while I was thus in the service of the said governement, especially within the last three years, Mr. Alex. Gendron, then and still of the labourers' department, head man, and consequently my superior, has often instructed me to send sometimes one, sometimes two and sometimes three of the men under my orders and in my gang to work at Sorel for private parties, especially for Alfred Baril and Oscar Champagne, two high officials at the time, and still in the same department, and for Adélard Lanctot, M.P., to carry on works and repairs at various buildings.

3. That on receiving these applications, I sent the number of men required to work for the benefit of these persons, and when each foreman was called to give to the head foreman the time of these men, I said to Mr. Alex. Gendron: 'I have one, or two or three men who have been working at Sorel for the above mentioned.' Then Alex. Gendron, when he was present, and Adolphe Joubert, his clerk representing him, when the latter was away, would say: 'Do not mention the absences which go unnoticed; these men have punched and will be paid by the department.'

4. That Mr. Oscar Champagne, employed in the government stores, has had turf taken at St Joseph's Pointe to Sorel to grade his property and embellish the grounds around his house at Sorel, which work was done by André Cotnoir, a man in the employ of the government, who worked between three and four days, while at the same time having their

cards punched every morning and getting their pay from the government, at the knowledge of the said Oscar Champagne.

5. That in the course of the summer of 1910, that same Mr. Oscar Champagne caused to be drawn, by the government teams and by men in the government pay, iron pipes taken from the government and had these carried to Sorel and utilized for a tunnel in a stream going through his property, and that this whole expenditure has been supported by the government, which is the looser in this last instance of about $200. That to my knowledge instructions have been given to the men entrusted with the drawing of the pipes to do so in such a way that the great Chief Papineau should have no knowledge of it. As a matter of fact, the drawing was effected about seven o'clock in the morning previous to Mr. Papineau's arrival.

6. That in every instance where time or material was thus embezzled, urgent departmental work was interfered with.

7. I am free to acknowledge that Mr. L. G. Papineau (great chief) of the department, is an honest man.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. Who gave that affidavit?

Mr. NANTEL. Horménégilde Lambert.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. I might inform my hon. friend that that question came before the department some months ago. An investigation was held, and it was proven that the pipes in question had been sold to that man by Mr. Papineau himself. That is all the scandal that there is in it.

Mr. NANTEL. If the investigation had not been held ex parte, we could probably get more out of it.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. That man Lambert has been dismissed.

Mr. NANTEL. Yes, he is another grudger. Here is now the affidavit of Henri Proulx:

I, the undersigned, Henri Proulx, painter of the city of Sorel, solemnly declare that J.-B. Pagé, foreman in the section of the painters at the government workshops, at St. Joseph de Sorel has been guilty of numerous grave irregularities, and among others, the following:

I charge J.-B. Pagé with having worked three days at the church of St. Joseph and St. Michel, on the time of the government, and during the time he was paid by the government; also

I charge J.-B. Pagé with having worked at least two days, at the premises of La Banque Nationale, on the time of the government, and during the time he was paid by the government; also

I charge J.-B. Pagé with having made two large signs for the Banque d'Hochelaga, and two signs for Mr. Adélard Lavallée, lumber merchant, with paint taken at the stores of the government, on the time of the government, and during the time he was paid by the government.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose that the hon. gentleman who has just read that affidavit takes the responsibility of the charge therein, that a man in the employ of the government has worked for the church of St. Joseph?

Mr. NANTEL. I take the responsibility of what I say, but just now I am reading from affidavits that ought to open the eyes of the minister and of the department and urge them to take immediate action.

I charge J.-B. Pagé with having sent me, Henri Proulx, to Mr. Pierre Paulhus to paint a carriage with paint taken from the store of the government, during the time I was paid by the government; that I was there in the company of J.B. Pagé, and when the question of the price came up, J.-B. Pagé said it would cost Mr. Paulhus nothing, as he, Pagé, liked to help friends; also

I charge J.-B. Pagé with having lent brushes belonging to the government for painting a hotel and a house, the property of Mr. J. D. Guevremont; also

I charge J.-B. Pagé with having sent me, Henri Proulx to Mr. Edouard Gauthier's place, to 'imitate' and varnish three doors with materials belonging to the government and that I have been paid by the government; also

I charge J.-B. Pagé with granting at least ten days leave to Omer Fortin, so he could organize a demonstration; and with granting a three days leave to F. X. Pagé, Théodore Hémond, Arthur Péloquin, Alphèche Champagne, Henri Proulx and myself, to organize the same demonstration, on the time of the government and during the time we were all paid by the government. The said demonstration was on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of the said J.-B. Pagé.

I charge J.-B. Pagé with having given paint and gold in sheets taken from the government store for the decoration of the hall in which was held, on the 10th August last, the aforesaid celebration; also

I charge J.-B. Pagé with giving money to Adélard Letendre and sending him to the town to buy liquors, on the time of the government; also

I charge J.-B. Pagé with giving orders to two men to break through a window at the building No. 10, on the government dockyards, expecting to find liquors in the building and and have the keeper dismissed.

Delphis Mongeau declares:

That during the summer of 1910, I saw men in the employ of the federal government carting away, in a wagon belonging to the government, with a horse belonging to the government a certain quantity of iron pipes and cement; that the said articles were deposited at the further end of the property of Mr. Oscar Champagne, also in the employ of the government; that afterwards, the same men laid the said pipes on the button of a brook on the property of the said Champagne, so as to make a drain, a work of considerable importance for the said Mr. Champagne.

Now, here is what Andronique Sénécal has to say:

I, Andronique Sénécal, carpenter of the city of Sorel, solemnly declare that I have worked

at the residence of Mr. Oscar Champagne, time keeper, in the Department of Public Works at Sorel, and that I have been paid by the government as it can be shown by a pass for the ferry, signed and delivered by Champagne, on the 3rd May, 1909. One day, I made repairs to doors and cupboards, at his residence; at another time I made repairs to a fence and installed a wire 70 or 75 feet long, on the said fence. I worked there, at least three days.

I further declare that I worked three days at Mr. Adélard Lanctot's residence, to repair the fence and that I have been paid by the government.

I further declare that I worked once at the residence of Alfred Baril, accountant of the Departement of Marine and Fisheries, when he was living above the store of L. T. Trempe. Later I worked at the house were he presently resides, on George Street; Joseph Bérard was working with me. We laid carpets and oil cloths, put on mouldings to hang frames, and built a kennel for his dog. I also set the furnitures in place, in the house. We must have worked at least two weeks. I declare that during all the time I worked for Champagne, Lanctot and Baril, I was paid by the government. I remember that when I was working for Mr. Baril, it was pay day, and Baril told us that he would get the money for us, himself. He did so, and Baril and myself signed a receipt on a printed form, furnished by the government, the same as the one we have to sign when we are on sick leave.

One more affidavit; it is from Elie Sénécal:

2. That during the month of September, 1910, one of my customers told me that he would not buy any more cement from me at 65 cents per bag, as he could buy much cheaper at the government store at St. Joseph de Sorel. I immediately called on M. Norman Massé, an official at the government store and asked him if it was true that they were selling cement, and that they had sold high grade cement for 30, 35 and 40 cents per bag. Though I had put that question politely, M. Massé got very mad and told me that it was none of my business, that as long as a liberal government would be in power, himself and the other liberal officials would do as they please, without having to account, &c., &c.

Up to that time I had always considered M. Massé as a friend of mine, and when I saw him in such a bad humour, I suspected that he had already been annoyed, or expected to be in trouble about that matter, and that there was some truth in it. I called on several contractors and they admitted that they had bought cement from M. Massé at the government store, much cheaper than I was selling it. I notified the federal government of what was going on, and we exchanged several letters that I did not keep on file, except those herein inclosed.

Mr. Cecil Doutre was sent here and made an informal investigation, but took good care not to examine me nor the contractors that are using cement, although they live quite near the government store. A few days after that, Mr. Massé was suspended, but he was soon reinstated, because he was threatening to make damaging disclosures against the other officials. From the above facts, and from other information I have had since, I am in a position to state and I do state that I would not have lost the trade of several customers of mine, during the summer and fall of 1910, if they had not been in a position to buy cement at the government store at a much cheaper price than I could afford to sell mine.

3. I also declare that I was told by Mr. Alfred Désorcy, known also as 'frère Désorcy' labourer of St. Joseph de Sorel, that in 1910 he was in the employ of the government, under Mr. Lindsay, foreman of the labourers, and that himself and seven other labourers had loaded two cars of good timber belonging to the government and taken from the dock yards of the government, that the two cars were afterwards coupled to an engine and sent to Mr. Lindsay's place, at Sorel. That statement of Mr. Désorcy, is corroborated by a great number of citizens who declare that the government have lost the price of these two carloads of timber.

4. I declare further that since Mr. Desbarats left, there is an inconceivable lack of discipline and that the time of the men is very loosely kept. It is to my knowledge that Mr. Massé has supervised and directed the repairs to his house, Augusta Street, at Sorel, and has absented himself from the government store during a considerable space of time, on that account. It is to my knowledge that he has done the same thing, in 1910, when he made repairs to his other house on Ramsay Street, at Sorel. It is also to my knowledge that he is interested in the manufacture of cement blocks, at the corner of Augusta and Acadie Streets, at Sorel; that he represents for several insurance companies, and that by reason of these numerous occupations, he deprives the government of a good portion of the time that he should give to his regular duties. It may be said, also, that several other officials, give a good portion of their time to personal business.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. As to that man Sénécal, I might say to my hon. friend that he was challenged to make good his charges against Massé. Some correspondence took place, and I can show it in this House. Upon being challenged to prove those accusations, he has never been able to do it. We had an inquiry and that inquiry has shown the contrary.

Mr. NANTEL. You have had an inquiry behind closed doors. That is not sufficient nor reassuring for public opinion.

Evidently, in Sorel, the government is considered something as personal. Those people are saying: We are ourselves the government. Everybody helps himself, and we must not be surprised if the hon. member for Richelieu has been helped.

Once more, the hon. member is not attacked. The public wanted an inquiry into all those things where it would be represented and where it could have the right to be heard. I am not asking for an inquiry before a committee of the House, because I am sure that would not be the

way to get at the truth. There is too much partisanship. I admit myself readily that I am not without fault in that respect.

The only way to get justice would be an inquiry before a royal commissary who would examine all those facts. Such an inquiry would give satisfactory results.

Hon. Mr. BRODEUR. Am I to understand that my hon. friend has read all the affidavits that he had?

Mr. NANTEL. I have read several of them; I will submit them to the House. I can have fifty more if it is necessary, and it will be a pleasure for me to submit them to the House.

Mr. D. A. LAFORTUNE (Montclam). (Translation). Since this discussion has been opened, we are witnessing, Mr. Speaker, a somewhat strange spectacle. I understand how the hon. member for Terrebonne has been able to draw certain conclusions from the evidence submitted, but what I cannot make out is about the hon. members on the left who have preceded him, because they do not agree with him. Before proceeding any further, I will beg leave to read the conclusions of the minority, so as to see if the hon. gentlemen will concur in what the hon. member for Terrebonne has just said.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has signed the report jointly with the member for Hamilton East, has said: 'We conclude, moreover, that the said Adelard Lanctot, by the acts and proceedings as aforesaid, has violated the independence of parliament.'

What can the hon. members who have signed that report say as against the declarations of the hon. member for Terrebonne? He has just said that the independence of parliament has not been violated. Still, those hon. members have read the same evidence and they are in presence of the same proceedings.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to draw your attention on the accusations brought against the member for Richelieu. The thing is very serious, and when the hon. member for Terrebonne says that he has nothing against him, I must confess I do not know what he means. But it is he who is accused; it is he whom they are seeking to ruin; it is he who is accused of being a thief, a highway thief, who is accused of robbery.

Does my hon. friend for Champlain know what is meant by such a word? If he knows the meaning of it, he has been somewhat rash in his accusations. Because his hon. friends who have discoursed this afternoon and to-night have objected to reach those conclusions, they say that it is due to a mistake if the English text contains that word.

Has my hon. friend ever read the Criminal Code before using such a word? Let me draw his attention on section 445 which defines the word 'Robbery':

> Robbery is theft accompanied with violence or threats of violence to any person or property used to extort the property stolen, or to prevent or overcome resistence to its being stolen.

If the hon. member for Champlain had read those articles of the Criminal Code he would not have dared to make such a charge. As he did not know the meaning of it, I will readily forgive him. He has never studied the laws of his country. He is more versed in the 'pills' of his profession.

An hon. MEMBER. He is a notary.

Mr. BLONDIN. I have never practiced medicine. I ask my hon. friend to withdraw that word. I am a notary, not a doctor.

Mr. LAFORTUNE. Well, I will change the formula. If you are a notary, you are the more guilty, because notaries are acquainted with the law, perhaps not the criminal law; but in any case, your colleagues are ashamed and reject that accusation. Your colleagues have just told you that you were not right in accusing the member for Richelieu of robbery.

Mr. BLONDIN. Whom do you mean?

Mr. LAFORTUNE. The learned member for Terrebonne has just said who it was. Before signing a mandate of that kind one must be careful. When a plaintiff goes before a court of justice in a case of robbery, the judge does not proceed before having had a preliminary inquest. In the present case such a charge cannot be substantiated, and not a single member of the left has even attempted to do it.

We have heard of theft, of breach of trust, of malversation. I have listened attentively to all that has been said. I have studied the evidence, I have read and reread it and I say that not a single reasonable man acquainted with the criminal law would pretend that the evidence is sufficient to lay ground for an accusation of robbery. I challenge anybody to prove that the evidence on file would be accepted by a magistrate. The hon. member for Richelieu may have been perhaps imprudent, but I repeat that nothing has been proven to substantiate an accusation of robbery. All that is only a false pretense and we all know what is meant by that.

Let them read the law, to know what is meant by false pretenses. Evidently, those hon. gentlemen who had a grudge against the department now attack the member for Richelieu and make him pay for the bad temper that they feel. We have the admission of one of your own men. My hon.

friend of Terrebonne has just declared that there is no grudge against my hon. friend of Richelieu, but rather against the Marine Department. Then, why don't you behave like brave and courageous men, and don't you lay a direct accusation against the hon. Minister of Marine, with your own seats at stake.

If it is true that this department is as corrupted as you say, and that infamous things are there going on, you ought to have enough courage to make a formal accusation against the hon. minister whom you are seeking to ruin in public opinion by insinuations rather than direct accusations, because you know very well that you would not be able to prove them. In your ill-temper, you throw yourselves on the back of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier . . . I beg pardon to my learned friend, it is he himself who goes for the hon. member for Richelieu.

The hon. member for Champlain ought to have known that my hon. friend of Richelieu had pledged himself to reimburse the government, and that therefore there could not have been neither a theft nor an intention of theft. I understand that his declaration has been made too late, but it was nevertheless too daring. If you examine the evidence, you can see that the declaration of reimbursement has been made at the very origin of this transaction, before anything had yet been delivered. I say that in such a case, it is impossible to prove an accusation of theft. Nobody who has studied criminal law would dare sustain such a pretension. There must be, for a crime, an intention of criminality. Now, in this circumstance, there has never been any intention of theft. I prefer the declaration of the member for Terrebonne who tells us that the intention was primarily to have a general inquiry into what is going on in the Marine Department at Sorel. But then, why now call the member for Richelieu a thief, a highway robber? After the spectacle that they have given us, I am sur I should have good reason to doubt their sincerity.

They say that because Mr. Pagé and Champagne have proceeded irregularly, it follows that the member for Richelieu is a thief. Even if Pagé and Champagne had acted as the member for Jacques Cartier has said they have ; even if they had had no right to act as they have done; even if they had acted with imprudence and without authorization, should the conclusion be that there has been a theft? But every day our courts are asked to waive illegal contracts, things that there was no right to do. Should we perforce come to the conclusion that those persons are thiefs? It is an easy thing to say, but the proof of it is another affair.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier says that the evidence of Pagé is not to be believed. That is what he says, but where is the proof of it? Who was it that doubted the sincerity of that witness? Where can you see in the inquiry that the declaration under oath of that witness has been contested? One should never forget the principle that the evidence of a witness holds good, so long as the regularity or the sincerity of a witness has not been contested. Where can you see in the evidence that his sincerity has ever been questioned ? You are proceeding against this witness 'ex parte.' But why not give him the chance that is not refused to the greatest criminal to pay his debt. That is agreed, on the floor of the House everything is allowed when it comes to proffer an accusation; but outside of this House, you would not dare to make a charge of perjury against this very same man.

They say that the work was done at Mr. Lanctot's house, next door to where lives the inspector-in-chief Mr. Papineau, and that no permission had been obtained from this gentleman. Would that constitute a theft? Even if Mr. Papineau had not been consulted; even if it had been shown that Champagne and Pagé had gone beyond their powers, and that they had no mandate to act as they have done, would that constitute a theft? If all those who overstep their powers had to go to jail, I know some people who would not be here. If, for instance, the member for Champlain admits that he has exceeded his mandate; if he was asked to justify this accusation; if he was told: you have been imprudent, reckless, you have acted wickedly in proffering such an accusation against the member for Richelieu, what would he answer to that?

I hear some of those hon. gentlemen laughing. You can laugh, but the wife and the children of the member for Richelieu are not in the same agreeable mood.

Mr. PAQUET. I make a call to order. If we want to uphold the dignity of the deliberations of this House, I must ask the hon. member for Montcalm to please address himself to the Speaker and not to members.

Mr. LAFORTUNE. I have just said to the hon. member the accuser that he could have a laugh over what he had done, but that the one he has accused is not in the same mood, since this wicked accusation has been made against him. He will never be able to repair the wrong he has done to that family. I have no doubt whatever that the member for Richelieu will be exonerated; but the result of that wicked accusation which has been hawked about every where, and which stand in bold letters, in the press of the country, as a splendid advertisement for the member for Champlain, the result, I say, will be an incalculable wrong for the member for Richelieu, a wrong which the member for Champlain will never be able to repair for himself and his family.

They say that the work had been going on next door to Mr. Papineau. Well, the member for Richelieu who had asked Champagne and Pagé to do that work had a right to believe, from the answer received from those two men, that they had permission to do the work. Nothing could be more natural and more logical. When those men came to do that work, it was because they had had the permission of Mr. Papineau.

When an officer or a civil servant is asked to do a thing, if he answers : Very well, but I will ask permission of my chief. And if on the morrow I see that man at work, my conclusion is that the necessary permission has been granted.

They say that Mr. Papineau is an honest man. Others are in doubt or unwilling to say so. Who is to be believed ? The necessary conclusion is that Mr. Papineau knew what was going on, and that the member for Richelieu was in no necessity, as was said, to make further inquiries about it, since the men he had asked for were at work.

Mr. PAQUET. Will the hon. member allow me to ask him a question ? Has he read that part of the evidence of Mr. Papineau, in which he declares that he has no knowledge of what was going on ?

Mr. LAFORTUNE. We hear, as an accepted fact, of the frightful things that are going on at Sorel. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has not been very affirmative on that point, but the member for Terrebonne went farther than that. He told us that abuses and frauds were going on there. But we are not obliged to believe all that. It is easy to throw accusations to the wind. When I am studying a case, I read the evidence and the affirmations made ' ex parte ' have to be controlled.

I may be allowed, I think, not to entertain the same opinion. The people in Sorel are just as respectable as anywhere else. They are honest and industrious. You say that there are scandals going on, but you show no proof of that.

At the time that those hon. gentlemen were in power, the finances of the country were in a sore plight. But now that we have a liberal government, millions of dollars keep flowing to us and this year we have a surplus of thirty millions. You have never been able to show as much. Those hon. gentlemen are still going through the same dreams and they think they are still in power. They should not forget, however, that we are in power since 1896, and that is why the millions keep coming to us.

The member for Jacques Cartier has said: There has been nothing entered in the books. That is a gratuitous affirmation and one which must be taken subject to verification. The evidence shows the contrary. Books have been kept, and statements regularly made every night. Why not state the true facts ? It is true there was no ledger ; there was perhaps no ledger. But for that kind of work, there is no necessity of books in double entry for the time of the men and the few materials which were brought there.

That is then a gratuitous affirmation, and we are not obliged to accept his 'ipse dixit'. I would rather rely on the evidence.

My learned friend has said it is a trick. We are playing no tricks, in our party, that is something to new for us. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier may know a good deal about tricks. Well, let him keep the patent of it, if he has it.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who is a professor at Laval, must be acquainted with that part of the law where it is admitted that the sending of materials, to the knowledge of those who possess them, does not constitute a theft and does not justify a writ of imprisonment. You can come to the law firm to which I have the honour to belong since five years, and you will be told that such an accusation cannot be deemed sufficient to get your man arrested. There may have been an imprudence, but when it comes to a question of having a man arrested, to ruin that man and to deprive him of what is most dear to him in the world, one must look at it twice before leaping.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has just declared, in contradiction to what the member for Elgin has said a moment ago, that there was no conspiration. The member for Elgin says : They are conspirators. Who is to be believed ? When in doubt, there should be no condemnation.

When I see that the accusers themselves do not agree, I cannot help having serious doubts. One says white the other says black. If there has been conspiration, then I ask where is the fraud? I have no need to remind you that fraud must not be presumed. Who has proven it? Where is the witness? Is it not the accused who has to prove his innocence; but it belongs to the accuser to show where lies the culpability of the one he accuses. The proof then lies with you. If you cannot show that proof, then the accused is acquitted. What you say is not sufficient to prove that it is the truth. Where is the witness who has shown that there had been a theft or an intention of fraud, or even the existence of a false pretense? On the contrary, the intention to reimburse has been expressed at the very origin.

That the accused may have been imprudent, I concur with you in that. I belong to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I have been present at all the meetings of this committee. I have listened to what has been said in this House. I have read all the evidence, and I say

that is simply a case of imprudence that that does not transgress the independence which a member must possess. But to allege that my hon. friend for Richelieu must perforce be a thief, that he has committed highway robbery, that he has taken possession of things under false pretenses, you will read that in the 'Devoir', but it is not true. It is a doctrine which has no currency. It may be heard in partisan papers, in speeches of small importance, but it is evident that my hon. friend for Richelieu has incurred neither censure nor blame, as those hon. members of the left would fain have us believe.

Can it be said that the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, who has signed the minority report, is this time in the right? I do not mean that he is not habitually in the right. A man cannot be acquitted nor forgiven because of his intention to reimburse. There are a great many criminals in our penitentiaries who would gladly reimburse, if they could be liberated on that chance. But in these cases, it is paying after the accusation has been proved, and after sentence has been pronounced. Even if a convict would be ready to pay, that would be too late. He could thus satisfy his conscience, but for human law it would be too late.

I have some experience of it, Mr. Speaker. Every day, there are men arrested and condemned, who regret what they have done. They are always ready to reimburse what they have stolen, but it is then too late. That is the principal laid down by the member for Jacques Cartier. But we cannot proceed by analogy. In the present case, there has been neither arrest nor conviction, and everything had been paid before a complaint had been laid against him. Not a day passes, in our police courts, but that a denunciator complains of a transaction, and pretends that there has been fraud and false pretenses. What does then the magistrate? He does not deliver a writ of imprisonment. He has the accused brought before him. He asks him explanations, and if a discussion follows on the transaction the magistrate puts definitely the question and says to the individual: There has been a misunderstanding between you, you have obtained certain things under false pretenses, are you ready to return them? But certainly, will answer that individual. After that, could my learned friend get a writ against the one of whom he complains and who had no intention to steal. Never, and that is what occurs every day. Montreal is a large judiciary centre, the largest there is in our country. A great many denunciations and complaints are made there all the time. Not a week comes but justice has to intervene, and magistrates deem it their duty to settle those disputes without arrest.

The member for Jacques Cartier has declared that Mr. Lanctot's house had been painted at too cheap a price. Where is the proof of that? On the contrary, have we not, in the evidence, the proof that the full and whole value of the work has been paid? That the amount paid by the member for Richelieu has been declared by disinterested men, and men knowing something about painting, to be fully sufficient to repay the government for what had been advanced, and more. But let us say that it was not more.

I have to call into question the affirmations of those gentlemen of the left. In order to be convinced, one must need have the truth of the facts. What we have to do here is to exercise our judgment and to appeal to our experience. Now, can we conclude, as has been said, that there was a theft. Not at all. We are ready for the fray, and we can keep it up with our friends of the left benches, because we are just as experienced as they are. The legal evidence which is submitted to us does not prove the accusations which have been brought. Indeed, after having heard the eloquent speech delivered this afternoon by the hon. Minister of Justice, no more doubts can subsist. Here is indeed a talented and superior man. He has shown that the independence of parliament had not been transgressed. He has shown that as clearly and peremptorily that two and two make four.

The hon. member for Terrebonne is not sufficiently versed in law to destroy that demonstration. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier would be the only one to try it, but without any hope of success.

I say that when those hon. gentlemen came to talk of malversation, of theft and of fraud, they are not serious. They have admitted that the one they wanted to reach was the hon. Minister of Marine. Here we can have an idea of the sincerity and frankness that the member for Terrebonne has put in that declaration.

The hon. member for Jacques Cartier has pretended that my friend of Richelieu has conspired. Let us suppose it is true. Well, Mr. Lanctot is guilty. But why has he conspired? It has not been proved that there was a reward for him. Now, crime is always proceeded by a motive of gain, interest or profit which the criminal will derive or hopes to derive from his act. What was the interest of the member for Richelieu in conspiring? Conspirators do not go into that game for pleasure, they never do Mr. Speaker.

The hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) has shown surprise at the accusation laid against him. He was real mad. Yet, that

was only a small matter. But, when it comes to others it is a considerable affair. He has been asked several times to tell what he knew about gasoline. That was not agreeable to him. He said he paid for what he had got, because he does not admit that he got anything from the government. He has even said : You accuse me wrongfully, and you are wrong in trying to pick that quarrel with me, because I have given to the government a value of nearly three thousand dollars. How generous of him to thus give three thousand dollars to a liberal government. How is any one to believe that he has ever given three thousand dollars for a railway in which he had no interest.

Here is indeed a man whose declaration may well be called into question. A man who is at war with the Minister of Marine, whom he accuses of graft and theft. He went even so far as saying to the Prime Minister : Be careful, do not call Mr. Brodeur to the Supreme Court, that would be a disgrace.

As the hon. Minister of Justice has so well said, we are here the members sitting as judges in this cause. The preliminary inquiry, which goes on before the magistrate, has taken place before the committee. Five men have been charged to make the preliminary inquiry and to examine the facts. And when we see men having the merit of the members for Welland, Verchères and Richmond, I say to the two others : You have talent and merit, but partisanship makes you see with eyes that are not the eyes of truth, and all that because you cannot get the inquiry that you ask for. It is not fair to thus throw revenge on a member of this House, and all that because the government has not deemed expedient to grant them what they ask for.

The member for St. Anne has not dared to speak of the independence of parliament, and he had good reason for it. The member for St. Anne must have looked askance at all those who have spoken about independence, as for instance the member for Jacques Cartier.

As has been said by the member for Verchères, when that gentleman did judge convenient to leave the bench of magistrature in order to sit here as a member of this House, he had the good sense to cast his vote in favour of drawing a pension of $4,300 a year as an ex-judge, and he has done well not to broach that subject. He was unwilling to speak about independence, because he was not without reproach in that respect.

Two weights and two measures, one for friends and the other for adversaries.

I have listened with attention to what the hon. member for Elgin West (Mr. Crothers) has said. He has expressed himself without the least gentleness and without caring in the least whom he might hurt. He had said to the House that this was a fraud and that there had been false pretenses. If he had opened any book upon criminal law or our own code, he would have seen what is meant by the word theft, and then he would not have spoken as he did. How can any man pretend that there have been false pretense when there is nothing to sustain an accusation of that kind.

He has quoted extracts of two papers which have taken our defence, and particularly the Montreal 'Herald'. He has said that this was an important paper. I assert that the 'Hearld' has not then interpreted our sentiments. Besides, I must say that I have no fondness for a paper published by Mr. Walsh, who is always to be found in company with Mr. Henri Bourassa.

Mr. PAQUET. What about the 'Pays'?

Mr. LAFORTUNE. That is another case of disappointment.

Mr. Walsh bestows praise on Mr. Henri Bourassa. He is there in bad company. The 'Herald' has not then acted as a liberal newspaper should have done.

He has also quoted the Ottawa 'Free Press' What does that paper know about the evidence? What legal knowledge does he possess, that we might be prone to lay the opinion so luminously expressed by the hon. Minister of Justice. Here is a jurist whose life has been spent in the study of law. Could the publishers of those papers say the same thing? They may have acted in good faith, but I deny the legal authority of those papers. I say that they have not the necessary aptitudes nor the legal experience which would entitle them to throw blame on what has been done in the present case.

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend was saying that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not approving that, the intention being here to have one believe that the Prime Minister was not in full agreement with his colleagues. It is a case of one can't have too much of a good thing. They ought to know that there are no traitors among us in the cabinet; that among us all are jointly and severally liable.

The hon. member for Elgin says all the contrary to the hon. member for Jacques Cartier. He says that there has been a conspiration. This is a new attack. He also sees false pretenses. There is not a word of that in the evidence. But those gentlemen, one after the other, have a new accusation to bring forward. If they were before a jury, I am sure they would not meet with much success. They would not get many convictions. We have heard about some malcontents. I remember so well what has occurred when the hon.

Minister of Marine was dismissing men in the employ of the government in Sorel. The next day, Conservative papers were denouncing him with violence. I will repeat here to-night to the hon. minister what I have told him elswhere. His mistake has been to tolerate too long old Conservatives who are there, playing knaves to the devil. If, on March 8, 1892, Honoré Mercier has fallen from power, it was due to the traitors who were conspiring against him. I say then to the hon minister: Be firm, be just, but do not give to your adversaries an opportunity to overthrow you, that is their function, and that is what they will do on the first occasion.

The two gentlemen who have signed the minority report have no more merit, experience or honour than the three members of the sub-committee who have signed the other report. Why would we accept the minority report? Could those gentlemen have, by adventure, a monopoly of probity, merit and legal experience? They say that the evidence shows such and such a thing, and that the House is bound to accept that opinion. Their conduct does not authorize us to believe that they are worth more than the others.

According to the hon. member for Terrebonne, there should be a general inquiry into the Sorel shipyards. If the government was appointing an impartial royal commissary, he would approve him. But, in order to have a commissary who would enjoy the confidence of those gentlemen of the left, it would be necessary, I suppose, to chose him in their ranks. If he was a liberal, they would criticise and paralyze him. The choice of a commissary would have to remain with them. Otherwise, he would be no good.

According to the hon. member for Terrebonne, Pagé and Champagne are frauds, and it follows naturally that my hon. friend of Richelieu must be guilty. What a nice way of reasoning! What a fine logic! If something could have been proven, it would be very different. But there is nothing in the evidence against Mr. Lanctot. according to the member for Terrebonne, Champagne and Pagé are thieves who have delivered goods from the Marine stores at Sorel to the member for Richelieu. It appears that they have had a dog-kennel built up, a cart painted, and a sewer-drain dug up.

How terrible, a dog-kennel! It appears that a cart has been painted. Just imagine such a scandal, coming after those of the Curran bridge, the Louise Basin and McGreevy. Those gentlemen of the left benches have so long lived among scandals that they see scandals everywhere. But those scandals were precisely the reason that made them lose the power. It was because they had put under the ban of public opinion that they were forced to give up the power. They cry out to-day against scandals. They should keep quiet, because they could never find anything to equal what they have already done.

The hon. member for Terrebonne has admitted that, in themselves, those alleged scandals were insignificant, but that the question of principle was very important. Indeed they have principles. Their principle is to come back to power as soon as possible, but they will not see that day yet for a long time. And then we will see what their principles are. But we will denounce your principles.

It is very tedious to be in the opposition, when one is used to power, but those gentlemen of the left had better be comforted, because it will be at the very least 15 years before they get out of it. The public will be gracious to them only when the men he has been used to shall have disappeared and when others will have taken their place.

The member for Terrebonne has read a good many affidavits. It is an easy thing to get an affidavit 'ex-parte,' which is taken in the back-ground. But, Mr. Speaker, you cannot recall the past of any one without hearing what he has to say. The greatest criminals have the right to say to their accusers: Bring down your charges, meet me in a court of justice. But, 'ex-parte,' you could heap up lots of things against me which could not be accounted for. And why should we mention those things in this House, when they have been denied.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that I have answered categorically to those hon. gentlemen of the left.

I have not left anything without an answer. I noted carefully all that was said. I noticed in the first place their discrepancies, the lack of unanimity. People who are in the right necessarily agree ; truth by nature is simple and indivisible. So I note in the first place their lack of agreement and of consistency ; their lack of sincerity. I have the proof of this in the last words of the member for Terrebonne ; it is not Mr. Lanctot who is guilty ; but if we are making such a fuss about the matter, it is because we were refused the investigation we asked for. The member for Richelieu will be exonerated of all wrongdoing; he will return home carrying his head high. But I say to these hon. gentlemen, have you the right to make of the good name and honour of your fellow-members a subject of laughter ? To-morrow, on meeting him, you will be the first to extend the hand of welcome.

I shall conclude, Mr. Speaker, by saying to the member for Champlain, who is the immediate and direct cause of the wrong done to this man : You will never live old

enough to make up for this, and the responsibility of it all will rest on you. He will find out that the harm done to others is very often avenged on one's own family, and if he himself is not made to pay the debt, his own people will bear the burden of it ; for the responsibility he has assumed in respect to that family is enormous, he may never be in a position to liberate himself in this connection.

I shall leave the learned member with that to ponder over, and as for us we shall fulfil our duty.

Mr. E. PAQUET. (L'Islet) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune) has claimed for himself the monopoly as it were of sincerity and patriotism. As to that he is greviously in error, and I for one shall undertake to look into this matter guided solely by the dictates of my conscience as a member of parliament and a citizen of Canada.

However, at this stage of the discussion, I cannot think of going over the whole ground once more and of making a thorough review of the facts connected with this unfortunate affair. I shall merely with the leave of the House, offer a few remarks and protest with all my might against the report of the majority of the committee on privileges and elections.

On March 6th, 1911, Mr. P. E. Blondin, member for Champlain, stated in the House of Commons that he had reason to believe that some varnishing and painting had been done by men in the employ, and with material the property of the Department of Marine at Sorel, for the benefit of Mr. A. Lanctot, member for Richelieu. The charge was to the effect that, in the carrying out of such work, there had been wrong-doing, abuses, frauds, and embezzlement resorted to. It was charged that the hon. member for Richelieu had unlawfully, in 1910, had men in the employ of the government to do work for his own benefit. Painting and painters' supplies, the property of the government, had been paid for out of the public funds of Canada, and the hon. member for Richelieu, it was stated, had profited thereby. The hon. member for Richelieu asked for an investigation into such charges.

On that same day, the hon. member for Richelieu acknowledged that, in the year 1910, he had had some painting done at his house by the men in the employ, and which supplies the property of the Department of Marine at Sorel; but that he had paid the salaries of the men and the cost of the supplies. There is one important point in respect to which the whole committee agreed; and it is this, that such work done for the benefit of a private citizen, was done outside the knowledge of the Department of Marine, of the superintendent or deputy superintendent of the yards at Sorel.

In thus endeavouring to protect the property of the government against one of his fellow-members and the men in the government's employ at Sorel, my hon. friend from Champlain has fulfilled a patriotic duty. He is entitled to the gratitude of the people for having thus endeavoured to do away with abuses which are a humiliation for parliament, degrade the dignity of parliament and tend to make fraud and embezzlement rampant among public servants.

The committee was entrusted with the task of determining in what measure the hon. member for Richelieu, in his capacity of representative of the people, was affected by the charges and revelations of his colleague from Champlain.

The supporters of the government have not given expression to the slightest regret in connection with the wrong-doing, the abuses and the frauds, the existence of which nobody dares deny. They have got out a report which grievously pains those who are intent on doing away with the worst frauds committed in the handling of the people's money. Let us look into some of the facts.

It appears from the evidence that work was done at the house of the member for Richelieu at the expense of the government and by men in the government's employ.

True, Mr. Lanctot refunded in November and December last the salaries paid to the painters and the cost of the supplies; but it is a crying abuse that a great public administration should be transformed into a private undertaking for the benefit of a private citizen or a member of parliament. However, the majority of the committee have not a word of blame for the hon. gentleman from Richelieu.

In the yards at Sorel, Mr. L. G. Papineau, superintendent, and Mr. H. A. Terreault, deputy superintendent, are exclusively empowered to order any work. The hon. member for Richelieu acknowledges Mr. Papineau's powers; nevertheless, in Mr. Papineau's absence, he applies for men and supplies to officials in the employ of the government who are without authority and have not been empowered by their superior officers to comply with the wishes of the member for Richelieu. The latter gentleman gets painters and supplies. Mr. Papineau spends the summer at Sorel, but Messrs. Lanctot, Pagé and Champagne, abstain, as guilty people, to apprise him of the work being carried on at Mr. Lanctot's house. In so doing was not Mr. Lanctot attempting to procure men and supplies outside the knowledge of the authorities.

If Mr. Lanctot was anxious to obtain men and supplies from Mr. Papineau, why did he apply to Mr. Pagé previous to March 29? Why did he call on Mr. Pagé previous

to calling on Mr. Papineau? Why did he not apply to Mr. Terreault, deputy superintendent? The hon. member for Richelieu is a barrister. He is acquainted with the law, and is aware that servants such as Messrs. Pagé and Champagne have no right to lend men or supplies the property of their employers without the knowledge and consent of the latter. Such action has brought about the falsifying of the pay lists for the Sorel yards, the falsifying of the accounts of the Department of Marine, and the infringement of all rules relative to the relations of chief and subaltern in the yards there. All of these transactions are clandestine. Why did Messrs. Lanctot, Pagé and Champagne go secretly about it? From June until November the people's money was used to pay for work done on behalf of the hon. member for Richelieu. What a sorry lesson of righteousness given to the people of Canada. Official publications do not supply us with any information enabling us to know with certainty that the amount reimbursed by Mr. Lanctot corresponds to that paid out on his account by the government. We have to rely on the word of men who falsified the pay lists. Is that satisfactory? However, the majority of the commission did not have a word of censure as regards the member for Richelieu. According to the report of the majority, Mr. Lanctot paid full value. On the other hand men have sworn that accounts had not been faithfully rendered to the Department of Marine. Thus, Alfred Douaire, painter is recorded as having worked only 18 days at the Lanctot house, while he swears he worked there for eight weeks. His evidence is supported by that of Henri Proulx and by that of Alfred Thibaudeau. However, the majority of the committee entirely lose sight in their report of the evidence of that honest man. Questioned as to his reasons for having this work done by men in the employ of the government, Mr. Lanctot stated, among other things, the lack of available help. Now, the evidence shows that there was at the time, at Sorel, other painters which were not in the employ of the government and who would have been in a position to do the work at the house of the hon. member for Richelieu. Some of these painters even applied for the job, but were refused.

In answer to Mr. McDougall, Mr. Cartier, painter, stated: 'Mr. Lanctot came to me at the place where I was working—I was painting a house for Mr. Baril—and I applied for the job right there.'

Mr. Payette stated under oath that he was in a position to paint the house of the member for Richelieu. Such facts have no meaning in the minds of the hon. gentlemen making up the majority of the committee.

In 1910, Mr. Lussier, merchant at Sorel, got painters in the employ of the government and paid for them. Why did not the hon. gentleman follow the example of that citizen? In spite of evidence as to facts of the most grievous character, the majority state that the charges made by the hon. member for Champlain have not been supported. According to their report, Mr. Lanctot, in dealing with employees of the government which he supports, to his own advantage and to the detriment of the public, has not done anything contrary to the dignity of his office. What an example of dishonesty set out before the eyes of young Canadians!

That is a new easy-going principle enabling the servant to dispose of his master's property. Fortunately that obnoxious principle is condemned and repudiated by the newspaper men of the old liberal school.

I shall read the following extract from the majority report of the commission.

(Text.) Your committee feel in view if the very serious nature of the charges made that they should express an opinion on the propriety of Mr. Blondin making the charges in the manner he did. Your committee do not wish to state that Mr. Blondin did not believe there was truth in the allegations, or that he did not act from a bona fide belief in their truthfulness, but the committee think that before making so serious a charge against an honourable member of the House of Commons, he should have made some independent inquiry to verify the truthfulness of the charges made and, which he apparently did not do. The Minister of Marine was called as a witness. His evidence as to this is on page 189 where he says he had information that no fraud had been committed and that all labour supplied by the shipyards had been paid for and all material supplied had been returned and which information he would have been pleased to give Mr. Blondin had he applied for same.

Your committee think that if Mr. Blondin had made these inquiries he would not and should not have made these charges.

(Translation.) My friend from Champlain has fulfilled his duty with prudence and enlightened patriotism. The member for Richelieu, the Minister of Marine and the Prime Minister of Canada had long been aware of the facts which were brought to the attention of the House on March 6. As far back as December 5, 1910, the hon. Minister of Marine had in his possession statements of a very important nature. At the time, men in the employ of the government were charging one another with thefts and graft. Cases of fraud and embezzlement were being ventilated. Why did not the hon. member for Richelieu and the hon. Minister of Marine make a clean breast of the whole matter previous to March 6?

How can the government newspapers and their supporters in this House decently cast aspersions on the hon. member for Champlain, when it is known that Sir Wilfrid Laurier, on January 18 wrote in the

following terms to a staunch liberal at Sorel, Mr. Albert Thibodeau?

Dear Sir,—In answer to your letter of the 16th instant, I have the honour to inform you that if any wrong doing has been carried on at Sorel, it is not the intention of the government to prevent such facts from being made public, on the contrary. Should there be any information in your possession, or in the possession of anybody else, as to what has been going on, the greatest latitude will be given you to make such facts known in the manner you think fit to do so.

Such words justify my hon. friend from Champlain.

Why did not the hon. Minister of Marine on March 6, show the lawfulness of the conduct of the member for Richelieu? Had he not at the time an exceptional opportunity for defending the hon. member? Let us be candid about it. The hon. minister entrusted with the honour and dignity of this department, was unwilling to take upon himself the responsibility of refusing an inquiry. He agreed to it, no doubt, as the best safeguard under the law against abuses and frauds. In granting this inquiry, he joined hands with us towards effecting a work of justice.

The supreme tribunal condemns with the utmost severity the men who favour by their silence administrative acts which smack of fraud and theft. We are called upon to pay taxes. However, the majority of the commission were not big enough to condemn abuses and show their gratitude towards the member for Champlain who has thrown light on a system of frauds bearing heavily on the country's finances. Their verdict does not contain even a gleam of hope for those who are anxious that grafting officials in the service of the State be done away with. They have only insults for a member who is unwilling to grant his protection to offenders against the common law. A little more, and the majority would have dubbed with some high sounding title the hon. member for Richelieu, together with Messrs. Pagé and Champagne. A little more and that majority would have branded as an unworthy citizen the member for Champlain who concerned himself with the interests of the Canadian people.

Important documents, solemn declarations were handed to my hon. friend from Champlain by respectable citizens. He would have betrayed his mandate by remaining silent, and the hon. member for Champlain is no traitor. The majority of the committee have whitewashed the hon. member for Richelieu. I refrain from congratulating them in this connection. At this very moment, independent newspaper men, whether Liberal or Conservative, unhesitatingly condemn the verdict of the majority of the commission. They refuse to cast aside the principle that public funds should be applied exclusively to public ends.

Here is what I find in a good liberal paper, the 'Witness,' in its issue of April 7, 1911:

All the same, the evidence, though severely restricted, has been largely read, and people have formed their own opinion of government as carried on in Canada, and find it very hard to understand the exculpation given to the administration of the shipyard at Sorel. It is time the Marine Department was turned inside out. It is, we are repeatedly told, about to pass into the hands of a new chief, a man of action and in more robust health than Mr. Brodeur. If this be true, Mr. Lemieux has a task before him that will make or mar him.

(Translation.) Then we have 'La Patrie' of April 6, 1911:

Now, government supporters, who necessarily have the upper end whenever the committee come to a decision, after conscientiously looking into the facts, which in any case are undeniable, pronounced this judgment, which will remain as a monument in the history of this country:

(1) Mr. Lanctot is exonerated from all blame.

(2) There is no exception to be taken to the system in vogue in the shipyards at Sorel, to lend to all comers men and material which are government property and paid for out of public funds.

(3) One thing only should be condemned; that is the charge brought forward against Mr. Lanctot; one man only should be frowned upon, that is Mr. Blondin whom the majority of the committee condemn most severely.

We believe that the parliament buildings never before witnessed such a farce.

On April 20, the 'Herald,' unable to control any longer its indignation expressed itself as follows in an editorial entitled 'The shoe on the wrong foot.'

(Text.) He seems to be content to prove that he paid for the painters' time and replaced the materials used on his place. He does seem to recognize that it was unworthy of him as a member of parliament to arrange with subordinate officials, without the knowledge of their superiors on the spot, even, to have men working for him whose services were all the time being charged to the Crown and presumably apportioned against some work that had been ordered by parliament. If Mr. Lanctot cannot see the unworthiness of that, he ought to be in some other role than that of a Liberal party leader. Certainly no government, Liberal or other, can be maintained in this country on the principle that its supporters in parliament are justified in such enterprises.

(Translation.) It is generally known that the 'Herald,' the largest English liberal organ in the metropolis of Canada, is the organ of the hon. Minister of Agriculture. The latter gentleman is aware that I have towards him feelings of great respect, on account of his honesty and his

untiring industry. He cannot doubt of my sincerity.

According to 'La Patrie' that editorial of the 'Herald' has caused a profound sensation. It is the legitimate and undisguised condemnation of the conduct of the hon. member for Richelieu.

It is interesting to read the following extracts from 'La Patrie,' of April 21:

It is an objectionable means of forwarding the interests of a party to approve doings of its members which the law and mere common sense show to be worthy of condemnation.

If the Committe on Privileges and Elections had, while granting to Mr. Lanctot the benefit of attenuating circumstances, condemned the abuses which the investigation clearly showed to have been committed, public opinion might have approved their stand.

But by obstinately closing their eyes to abuses, by even giving evidence of boldness and stupidity to the point of censuring Mr. Blondin for having drawn the attention of the House and the country to such facts, the majority of the committee have discredited themselves in the eyes of the country at large, and merited the condemnation even of liberal members.

I shall quote further an extract from the organ of the liberal party in this city. The 'Free Press' published the following on April 25:

(Text.) But what he should have done the moment the charge was preferred against him was to have resigned his seat and appealed to his constituents for re-election. He could then have been re-elected by acclamation; whether he could do so now is another question.

Where a member of a party in the control of the public business places himself, wittingly or unwittingly, under the penalties of the parliament Act there is only one course open for him to take, and that is what Mr. Lanctot should have done.

For him to now ask a majority of the House of Commons to excuse his fault is to ask many of them to cancel their own records, and we do not believe that they will do so.

If Mr. Lanctot has committed a breach of the parliament Act, his is the offence.

Why should the Liberal party as a whole accept any share of his blame?

(Translation.) I am glad to say so, Liberal papers give evidence of a spirit of fairness which overrides the judgment of the majority of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Conservative members of the committee aforesaid did not wait for the expression of such feelings of indignation to condemn the hon. member for Richelieu. They have assumed a patriotic duty and risen above mere considerations of friendship to condemn the deeds of Mr. Lanctot. I heartily approve of the report of the minority, and, if the House will allow me, I shall read the conclusions of that judgment which will surely be sanctioned by public opinion:

(Text.) It is our conclusion from the evidence that Mr. Adelard Lanctot, a member of the House of Commons, knowingly and unlawfully did procure the employees of the government of Canada to do certain work for him and on his behalf in the year 1910, he then being a member of the said House, and by collusion with the servants of the government did procure the payment of such labour by and out of the public moneys of the Dominion of Canada for his own purposes and benefit, without lawful right and contrary to the public interest.

That he did furthermore, knowingly and unlawfully, cause and procure certain materials, the property of the government of Canada to be delivered to himself for his own benefit and use, he then being a member of the House of Commons, and with such intent and purpose did collude and contrive with the servants of the Dominion of Canada to whom the said materials had been entrusted for use in the works of said government to so deliver the same to him by unlawful misappropriation, contrary to their duty and obligation to the government and contrary to law and the public interest.

And further it is our conclusion that the said Adelard Lanctot, by the acts and proceedings aforesaid, did infringe the independence of parliament.

(Translation.) That investigation of a decidely narrow scope has brought to light what is possibly a mere sample incident in the management of the government yards at Sorel.

Is not the government property in that city in the hands of officials unworthy of the confidence of the Canadian people? There public servants have transgressed the most commonplace notions of equity. Their moral responsibility is not so great if they are the unfortunate victims of that political pressure which bears as heavily as lead on the shoulders of all throughout our province.

The hon. Minister of Marine confines building materials, goods and the management of men in his department to the care of officials who have falsified entries in the public records. And if the House, approving of the principles of the majority of the committee, refrains from condemning the abuses found rampant at Sorel, and censures the patriot anxious to cut out the diseased parts, then, will not these officials commit to-morrow deeds still more obnoxious.

According to the solemn declaration of Mr. D. Peloquin, several men in the employ of the government at Sorel, charge one another with stealing cement, timber, iron, paint and particularly the time of government men who are sent out to do work for private parties while drawing pay from the government. Within the last two years, the government must have lost at Sorel more than $50,000 on account of frauds and thefts.

It would be an easy matter to obtain numerous statements giving evidence of

graft and thefts at Sorel. As stated in 'La Patrie'.

Public rumour points to a large number of schemes still unrevealed, whereby building materials and other goods belonging to the shipyards have become the property of private parties without the government being paid for them. Following on the evidence taken under oath, it is imperative that a thorough investigation should be made into the inside management of the yards at Sorel. It is a matter of doing away with thefts, and the voice of consicence should just now be heard in preference to that of the petty interests of political factions.

I attach the greatest importance to these remarks of 'La Patrie'.

The Minister of Marine cannot hope to appease the fears and suspicions of the people by entrusting officials of his department with the task of carrying on an investigation in this connection. Our national life suffers from abuses, thefts and dishonesty in the handling of public funds.

The government should appoint a Royal Commission to thoroughly overhaul the management of the Sorel yards. Confidence in the Department of Marine should be restored by finding out who are the wrongdoers and punishing them for their crimes. But let us not strike the men who are courageous enough to point out abuses and thefts. It is not a secret inquiry I am asking for, but rather a public investigation, for publicity is the terror of criminals.

Mr. P. E. BLONDIN (Champlain) (Translation) : Mr. Speaker, I shall be brief, not wishing at this late hour of the night to give my opponents an opportunity of charging me with a further offence, that of prolonging the debate. I regret that the right hon. Prime Minister should not be in his place, as I would have liked to put to him a question which can properly be answered only by himself ; and I cannot refrain from expressing my surprise at the indifference shown by the right hon. gentleman in respect to this debate ; I wonder whether pangs of conscience have not tardily induced him to abstain from playing a part in the criminal farce which is going on here just now.

The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries is bold enough to insinuate that I should have made inquiries from him before making these charges. To this my answer will be very brief. He was in the House when I made my charges. Since he had in hand, according to his contention, the proofs of the innocence of the member for Richelieu, why did he not then rise in his seat and make known these proofs? I would have withdrawn my charges and an investigation would not have been required.

But Mr. Speaker, that contention of the minister's is merely blundering and trickery on his part. The evidence has shown that, even had the minister been willing in good faith to carry on with me a private inquiry, he would not have discovered anything ; for they had been very careful to cover up all their tracks, and the books which we might have looked into would not have supplied any information, for they were falsified. I challenge the minister to contradict me when I say that even at the present time he is not in a position to carry on a thorough investigation, the documents having been destroyed and the books falsified.

I realize that I am not to discuss the evidence, the facts, or the report of the committee in this case wherein I stand as one of the parties, but I wish to protest with all my might against that part af the majority report which reflects on me personally, and attempts to make me play the part of the guilty party in connection with this inquiry.

The political bias of the hon. gentlemen supporting the government, their blind and vicious partisanship has prevented them from seeing for themselves the stupidity of the course they took in an effort to show me in a bad light ; but public opinion voiced in the newspapers throughout the country, to whatever party they belong, and even in some of the most influential of the liberal organs, has finally recalled these hon. gentlemen to a sense of decency and caused them to pass silently over that shameful part of their report.

This eveniug not a single one of them dared to make reference to that part of the report; they remained silent as they are all ashamed of it, and have heard the whole country condemning them; and these same gentlemen who yesterday were threatening to eject and lynch me, have no longer a single word of condemnation, and stupidly keep their mouths closed while I throw out to them from my seat the expression of my contempt.

The supporters of the government have exerted all their efforts, their eloquence and their intellectual resources, to throw a red herring across the trail, with a view to inspiring sympathy on behalf for the member for Richelieu, and restricting this whole debate to a petty question of dollars and cents. But they will not succeed in misleading the honest common sense of the Canadian people; they will not mislead this clear-minded, far-seeing and honest judge, who, long before the ridiculous attempt of to-night, severely condemned the member, the department and the methods which I denounced. Let these hon. gentlemen opposite make up their minds that this question by far surpasses all of them, from the smallest to the greatest; it implies the most important of our principles of government,

that of the integrity of parliament and the honour of the nation. That is the true scope of this debate; and it cannot be reduced a single inch.

Let those who listen to me and stare at me from the government side, listen to this: I have for Mr. Lanctot all the sympathy and all the regard which a member of this House owes to a fellow-member; I have for hon. gentlemen on the other side, as well as on this side, all the respect which they are entitled to, but let me say one thing: whenever that sympathy conflicts with my bounden duty, I shall not hesitate for one moment to sacrifice it and trample it under foot; and whenever they stand between me and the fulfilment of my public duties, as well as the dictates of honesty and of my conscience, they may rest assured that I shall run them down without any compunction.

And if they will allow me to repeat it, it is not here a matter of discussing Mr. Lanctot, or the Liberal party or anybody else in this House, but solely the good management of public affairs and the honour of the nation.

An hon. member who has to do with criminal matters in the district of Montreal, the member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune), has attempted to play on the emotions of hon. members, in the midst of the stupid things making up his farcical speech; he hurled at me maledictions, omens of ill, as an old-time sorcerer might have done, and called on me to make amends for the tears for the shedding of which I am to be held responsible. He forgot for a moment—an unusual occurrence—the position he is entrusted with. Appearing from day to day, as he does, before the criminal courts, on behalf of the Crown, to have all offenders punished, what would he answer were I to ask him to make amends for all the sorrows he thus causes from day to day, he who is constantly arguing for the imposition of penalties, corporal punishments and even the capital punishment.

Now, I am aware that the right hon. Prime Minister will be here shortly and that he will vote in favour of the motion to whitewash the member for Richelieu. May I request of him to state to the country if, in so voting, he means to condone in every respect the conduct of the member for Richelieu, and whether he intends to inform by to-morrow the thousands of public servants, the representatives of the people, the public men who will read the report of this debate, and whether he wishes to have it repeated in all the homes and families throughout the country, that it is a lawful thing to embezzle the public funds and property for the benefit of individuals, and whether he is ready to throw the august mantle of the Prime Minister of Canada to cover up such wrong-doing, provided the moneys which have been taken are subsequently returned?

House divided on amendment (Mr. Monk).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Armstrong,	Middlebro,
Arthurs,	Monk,
Barker,	Nantel,
Barnard,	Paquet,
Best,	Perley,
Blain,	Porter,
Blondin	Price,
Borden (Halifax),	Reid (Grenville),
Burrell,	Rhodes,
Chisholm (Huron),	Roche
Cowan,	Russell,
Crosby,	Schaffner,
Crocket,	Sexsmith,
Crothers,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Doherty,	Smyth,
Donnelly,	Sproule,
Edwards,	Stanfield,
Elson,	Staples,
Fraser,	Stewart,
Gilbert,	Taylor (Leeds),
Goodeve,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Henderson,	Thoburn,
Herron	Thornton,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Lake,	White (Renfrew),
Lennox,	Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Lortie,	Wright.—56.
McCall,	
Magrath,	

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Allard,	McAllister,
Allen,	McCoig,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	McCraney,
Beauparlant,	McGiverin,
Béland,	McIntyre,
Brown,	McKenzie,
Bureau,	McLean (Huron),
Carrier,	McMillan,
Carvell,	Marcile (Bagot),
Champagne,	Martin (Regina),
Chew,	Martin (Wellington),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Meigs,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Michaud,
Clarke (Essex),	Molloy,
Congdon,	Murphy,
Currie (Prince Edward)	Neely,
Delisle,	Oliver,
Demers,	Pardee,
Devlin,	Parent,
Douglas,	Paterson,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Ecrément,	Proulx,
Emmerson,	Prowse,
Ethier,	Pugsley,
Fielding,	Rankin,
Fisher,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fortier,	Richards,
Gauvreau,	Rivet,
Geoffrion,	Ross (Middlesex),
Gervais,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard	Roy (Dorchester),
Gladu,	Roy (Montmagny),
Graham,	Rutan,
	Savoie,

Hunt,	Schell,
King,	Sealey,
Knowles,	Seguin,
Kyte,	Sinclair,
Lachance,	Smith (Middlesex),
Lafortune,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Sperry,
Lapointe,	Templeman
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Tobin,
LeBlanc,	Tolmie,
Lemieux,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Loggie,	Turcotte (Quebec county),
Lovell,	Turgeon,
Low,	Warburton and
Macdonald,	White Victoria,
MacNutt,	Alta.)—98.

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Harris,	Beattie,
McLean (Sunbury),	McCarthy,
Borden(Sir Fred.),	Northrup,
Harty,	Osler,
Clark (Red Deer),	Maddin,
Wilson (Laval),	Forget,
Mayrand,	Lewis,
Conmee,	Kidd,
Papineau,	Daniels,
Turriff,	Meighen,
McColl,	Wilsox,
German,	Macdonnell,
Smith (Stormont),	Lancaster,
Bickerdike,	Clare,
Black,	Haggart (Winnipeg),
Miller,	Bristol,
Fowke,	Bradbury,
Guthrie,	Campbell,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Cash,	Jameson,
Talbot,	Owen,
Hodgins,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Gordon (Kent),	Currie (Simcoe),
Major,	Boyce,
Martin (St. Marys),	Ames,
Law,	Foster,
Verville,	Broder,
Nesbitt,	Marshall,
Todd,	Lalor,
Robb,	Worthington.

Amendment negatived.

Main motion agreed to on same division reversed as recorded.

Mr. PARDEE. The hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries, the hon. member for Stormont (Mr. Smith) and the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) have not voted.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am paired with the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart).

Mr. TALBOT. I am paired with the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Owen). I would have voted against the amendment.

Mr. SMITH (Stormont). I am paired with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). I vould have voted against the amendment.

Mr. BLONDIN.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-day?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Bills, and, if we have time the reciprocity discussion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Not the Bank Act?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. PERLEY. It would be convenient to the members on this side if they knew which particular Bills would be proceeded with.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All Bills with the exception of the Bank Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 4.42 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FRIDAY, April 28, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I deem it my duty to call attention to an article which appeared yesterday in the Toronto 'Telegram,' in which direct reference was made to me. The article is a long one, and I need not read it all. It will be sufficient to read the matter which has reference to my name. The article proceeds to say that on the 2nd of March this letter was addressed to me:

My Dear Sir Wilfrid,—I see that you are having troubles of your own by the defection of the 'young Napoleon' on the trade question and in other ways. The other ways are the more serious. Only in one instance in the history of Canada has the trade question played a part in making or unmaking a government, and that was in 1878. Even then, as you will know, there was contributory negligence on the part of the government.

Clifford Sifton's defection on the present occasion will not count against your government. He is a squeezed lemon politically, and without patronage, controls no following.

Neither your government nor any other government will fall, except from weakness on the inside. That was what happened to the Tories in 1896. Ministers of the cabinet had become corrupt and the McGreevy-Langevin scandal, aided by the Manitoba School Bill and cabinet crookedness, did the rest. Recently evidence had come to me that one of your colleagues is a grafter and a boodler. I shall be in Ottawa for a few days, and am willing to submit the evidence to you as Tarte was willing to submit his evidence of the Langevin-McGreevy boodling to Sir John Macdonald. Should you see fit to take im-

mediate action it would go no further. The alternative would be to place the document, letters and photographs of cheques, &c., in the hands of the opposition.

On the receipt of that letter, I instructed my secretary to send the following communication to the gentleman who wrote it:

Ottawa, March 3, 1911.

Dear Sir,—I am instructed by the Prime Minister to inform you that he will be in his office at 10 o'clock to-morrow, Saturday morning, and ready to see you.

Yours very sincerely,
E. J. LEMAIRE,
Private Secretary.

The gentleman in question waited on me, as stated in the rest of the letter, several times. Without committing my memory as to the number of times, I know it was more than once, but the tenor of each conversation between us on these occasions was of the same nature. The gentleman in question, with whom I had in former years friendly relations, but with whom I have not been in communication for many years, called on me and gave me the name of one of my colleagues and said that he had lost the confidence of the party, particularly in his own province, that he was a boodler and a grafter, and for these reasons should go out of the government. I said that I had no reason to doubt the honesty of my colleague, who was not only a colleague but a personal friend, and that I would not accept the alternative he mentioned, namely, 'should you see fit to take immediate action it would go no further; but the alternative would be, to place the documents, letters and photographs of cheques in the hands of the opposition.' I stated to my informant that I would not take any such action as he suggested under such terms, that I had the fullest confidence in my colleague, that I believed in his honesty, and that if it were shown that my confidence were misplaced, he would have to take the consequences. My informant was free to take such steps as he pleased, to place the papers and documents in the hands of the opposition and do anything he pleased with them. If my colleague were then proved to be dishonest, he would have to take the consequences, but if not it was my duty to stand loyally by him. This is the gist of any conversation that took place between us. This is the position I take and I leave that position in the hands of parliament and the country.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to inquire of the right hon. the Prime Minister what his intentions are with respect to attendance at the approaching Imperial Conference and Coronation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say that I deem it my duty to attend the Conference, not only because I have been invited, but because in the last Conference in 1907, the permanency of the Imperial Conference was assured. It was decided that it should meet every four years and be attended by the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the Colonial Secretary, the Prime Ministers of the self-governing dominions, and such members of the cabinets as should be selected. It is now over six weeks since I have taken my passage on the Virginian to sail on the 12th of May, and it is my intention to sail on that day unless prevented by public business. I have come to the conclusion that should my presence here be required, as indeed there is every indication it may be, it will be my duty to forego the privilege of attending the conference. My first duty is to Canada, but I still hope that nothing will prevent my sailing on the 12th of May.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In order that our own position on this side may be made quite clear, I now move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing the subject which my right hon. friend has just alluded. I am very happy indeed to concur in the hope which he has expressed that he may be enabled to attend the approaching Imperial Conference. As we all know, it was originally designated as a Colonial Conference, and in its original idea consisted of the Prime Ministers of the self-governing dominions and the Colonial Secretary or some other member of the British government. The Prime Minister has referred to the circumstance that the conference was made permanent in 1907; that is entirely correct. But there was a further change made. It became an Imperial Conference instead of a Colonial Conference in its designation; and while the Prime Minister of each of the self-governing dominions is necessarily a member of the conference, other members of the governments of the various dominions who previously were admitted purely on suffrance, have now become members of that conference when so designated by their respective governments. It is quite true that the vote is by government, that is, each government has one vote, as I understand it; but nevertheless, other designated members of the governments of the various dominions are admitted, in addition to the Prime Ministers, to full rights as members of that conference. The present constitution of the conference is set forth in a resolution which was unanimously agreed to by the Imperial Conference of 1907. I will read a portion of the paragraph which relates to the constitution of this conference.

That it will be to the advantage of the empire if a conference, to be called the Imperial

Conference, is held every four years, at which questions of common interest may be discussed and considered as between His Majesty's government and his governments of the self-governing dominions beyond the seas. The Prime Minister of the United Kingdom will be ex-officio president, and the Prime Ministers of the self-governing dominions will be ex-officio members of the conference. The Secretary of State for the Colonies will be an ex-officio member of the conference and will take the chair in the absence of the president. He will arrange for such imperial conferences after communication with the Prime Ministers of the respective dominions.

Such other ministers as the respective governments may appoint will also be members of the conference—it being understood that, except by special permission of the conference each discussion will be conducted by not more than two representatives from each government, and that each government will have only one vote.

Now the House will observe that the Prime Minister of Canada is ex-officio member of that conference, he is the only member of this government who occupies that position in the conference. I need not dwell upon the importance of the position of the Prime Minister in the latter day development of parliamentary institutions, both in the mother country and in the various self-governing dominions. The development of those institutions has been along very much the same lines, whether in the mother country, in Canada, Australia, or New Zealand. One feature of the development of parliamentary institutions in modern times has been the increasing power of the cabinet as distinguished from that of parliament, and within the cabinet, the increasing power, importance and influence of the Prime Minister. It is perfectly obvious, therefore, that the presence of the Prime Minister of Canada is entirely necessary at the approaching conference, if this country is to be represented as it should be represented in that conference. In his absence, no definite or important action can very well be taken; it will be a question of reference to the Prime Minister after the conference is over, and in my humble opinion the absence of the Prime Minister from the approaching conference would be a blow at the continued existence of this great factor in the solution of Imperial problems. Now the Prime Minister has alluded to possible reasons of public urgency on account of which it is within the bounds of possibility that he will not be able to attend that conference. It is quite true that we have matters of very great importance pending before parliament at the present time; it is equally true that we on this side of the House do not see eye to eye with hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House with regard to one matter of very great moment which is now

occupying the attention of parliament and of the country. It is only right to say in passing that the particular subject to which I allude is the proposal of the government for closer trade relations with the United States of America. These proposals were not introduced into this House until the 26th day of January last, nearly two and a half months after the session had opened and parliament had commenced business.

Now, there are three courses which would permit the Prime Minister to attend the approaching Imperial Conference. If the present session of parliament should not have come to a conclusion at the time when it will be necessary for him to leave, he could proceed to the conference, leaving his colleagues in charge of the business of the House; that is one alternative as to the desirability or expediency of which I am not so good a judge as the Prime Minister himself. I frankly concede that that is a matter upon which it is his right, his duty, to exercise his own judgment. In the second place, he can bring the session to an end, leaving some of these very important matters unfinished and letting them stand over to another session. It has already been intimated to us that the Bank Act will not be pressed at the present session. If that is to stand over to another session, there can be no particular reason why the proposals for closer trade relations with the United States should not also stand over until another session. I do not wish to enter into any controversial observations with regard to that, I only mention it as another alternative which is open to the Prime Minister in that regard. Then in the third place, he can adjourn this session of parliament for two or three months, or whatever length of time may be sufficient to enable him to attend the Imperial Conference and the coronation. After the coronation and after the conference, the session can be resumed; and I desire to say now that for the purpose of facilitating public business we would be prepared to give interim supply to such an extent as the public interest would demand, in case the Prime Minister should see fit to follow that course.

So far as reciprocity is concerned, I have already stated that we do not see eye to eye across the floor of this House. Our own attitude with regard to that is one of uncompromising opposition, for the reason that we have no doubt that the results of these proposals, if they should be carried into effect, would be disastrous, not only to Canada, but to the empire. I am not uttering that as a controversial observation, but merely for the reason that I desire to make our attitude perfectly plain.

Then in addition to the Imperial Conference, there is another great occasion which

will occur in the month of June, on the 22nd I think, that is the coronation of his most gracious Majesty King George V., an occasion of great importance, not only to the mother country, but to every dominion of the empire; and I would say in conclusion that in my opinion it would be doubly regrettable if Canada were not represented at the coronation by the Prime Minister of this country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I entirely agree, and everybody will agree, that under existing circumstances, under the present conditions to which the British Empire has attained, the Imperial Conference having been adopted as a permanent feature of our relations, it would be unfortunate that any of the Prime Ministers of the self-governing dominions should not be present at that important event. If it is not possible for me to attain to that, the fault will not be mine. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has been kind enough to make several suggestions which would allow me to go to the conference, but each involving this principle—that it must agree with the view of the opposition. He offered three alternatives. The one thing that separates us, apparently, is the trade agreement with the United States. The hon. gentleman has stated that he and his friends offer an uncompromising opposition to that agreement. I may tell him that on this side we offer an uncompromising support of this agreement. He thinks it would be a bane to Canada and a possible danger to the empire. We think it would be a boon to Canada, and the danger to the empire we do not regard as serious. What I have in mind which may force me not to go on with my present plan of attending the conference is this: As I stated more than six weeks ago I obtained my passage. It never occurred to me at the time that there would be any possibility of my not going. But, Sir, since that time rumours have come to us which have been afloat about the corridors of this House that the opposition will not allow this measure to go through. It is well known that the rules of this House are the old rules of the British House of Commons in 1867. Those rules then were not abused. But in Great Britain abuses arose; the rules were taken advantage of by a minority to block legislation which, in the view of the majority, was necessary for the good government of the country. So, I would like to say, it is in the power of the opposition here to block legislation almost indefinitely. I have said that it has come to us that the opposition have such an intention. The corridors have been full of these rumours. I have not paid any attention to these rumours, nor have I attached any importance to them. But I have in my hand the report of a speech delivered yesterday in the city of New York by one of the most important members of the opposition in which we are told practically that the opposition will not allow this agreement to be carried into effect. That is what the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) said yesterday:

> The government of to-day in Canada has introduced the measure into parliament. It therefore stands pledged to carry it and if it fails, it loses the reins of power, which will be taken up by its opponents. You can therefore easily understand how strong is the feeling of the supporters of the government even though they disapprove of the measure, to consider it the lesser of two evils and to vote for it rather than vote the government out.
>
> It is therefore altogether probable that, if the government can force the measure to a vote, it will be carried. On the other hand the opposition can, if it sees fit, probably prevent a vote. There are 300 items which will give opportunity for illimitable discussion. We have already granted supplies up to the first of June, but money cannot be spent for public purposes unless first voted by the parliament. If we would decline to pass further estimates, the public treasury would be emptied on the first of June. Public officials would have to borrow instead of receiving their salaries and public works would be at a standstill. This, of course, in any event, would be only a last resort not to be adopted unless considered absolutely necessary; but at the same time every one will admit that if the opposition felt that any measure was of such tremendous importance as to seriously affect, perhaps directly, the future history of our country, it would then be justified in refusing to grant any supplies or pass the measure until there had been an appeal to the people.

I do not know how far the hon. member for East Hastings has the right to speak for the opposition, but if I am correctly informed he is voicing the decision of the caucus held only a few days ago. If such be the temper of the opposition, I think it will probably make it necessary for me to resign my determination to go to England, and stay in Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to make just one or two very brief observations in reply to what the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has said.

Mr. SPEAKER. Any hon. member who wishes to speak should speak now, for under the rules of the House, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) speaks to close the debate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Prime Minister has alluded to the fact that he took his passage six weeks ago, and he intimated some surprise that the conditions to-day are not what he expected at that time they would be at this date. At least that was the impression I took from his remarks, and I do not desire to misquote him. If, in making that statement

he alludes to the debate which has been proceeding from day to day for some time upon the proposed trade agreement with the United States, then I would like to inform him that hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House have been taking their turn in that debate, and have had their fair share in it. Although I have not taken the trouble to compute the columns of 'Hansard' that have been occupied by the two sides of the House respectively, I venture the statement that if the right hon. gentleman were to make such research, he would find that as much of the time of this House had been taken up by his own supporters as by hon. gentlemen on this side.

Some hon. MEMBERS. More.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am corrected by hon. gentlemen beside me who say that more time has been taken up by hon. members on that side of the House. I do not need to go that far; I say that up to the present time the debate has proceeded regularly on both sides of the House, and there was no occasion for the Prime Minister to make what I regarded as an insinuation in expressing surprise that the debate has been so protracted. I would like to say to him further that he did not meet in a very gracious spirit what I regarded as a pretty fair and even generous offer on my part. I said to him that we would consent to the adjournment of this House for two or three, or four months, in order that he might have the opportunity to attend the conference, and the coronation. But I said something more; I said that we would consent to grant such interim supply as would provide for the public necessities of the country in the meantime, and until the session could resume. And the only answer to that offer, is an insinuation from the Prime Minister, and a quotation from some newspaper containing an alleged report of remarks by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup). Well, it does not strike me that that is exactly the spirit in which such an offer should be received.

I would like to quote to the Prime Minister from the observations of his own Minister of Finance in 1907 when this same question was to the fore. The hon. Minister of Finance said:

> There are duties to Canada which can best be performed in Canada, and chiefly in the parliament of Canada; but there are also duties to Canada which can be performed in other parts of the world, and notably in the capital of the empire.

I think this is an occasion when the Prime Minister of Canada might have regard, not only to trade relations with the United States, but to trade relations with this great empire to which we belong What are the subjects which are to be debated at the conference? They are some eighteen in number.

> Merchant shipping and navigation laws.
> Cheaper cable rates.
> All-red route.

A special object of consideration by the right hon. gentleman.

> Imperial Court of Appeal.
> State-owned Atlantic cable and telegraph lines across Canada.
> Imperial representation.
> Commercial co-operation for the encouragement of British manufactures and shipping.
> Emigration and the position of labour exchanges.
> Co-operation between the naval and military forces of the empire and the status of Dominion navies.

There is also the subject of naturalization, although it is suggested that the question of uniformity of naturalization laws is essentially a technical one, and as such may more properly be remitted to a committee of the full conference sitting as a subsidiary conference. Nevertheless, that all-important subject of naturalization is one which should command the attendance of the Prime Minister of Canada in order that the anomalies which now exist, and which exercise a disintegrating influence upon this empire, may be removed at the earliest possible moment.

The Prime Minister suggests the importance of this trade agreement with the United States. I am willing to concede that from his point of view. We, on this side of the House, entertain a precisely contrary view, and, under the privileges of parliamentary institutions in this country, we are entitled to the full expression of our view, and we propose to exercise that right. We have been told by ministers of the Crown that the honour of this country has been pledged to the President and government of the United States of America in connection with that agreement. Well, I do not propose to deal with the controversial aspect of that question except to say that I do not know when the people of Canada gave any mandate to the Prime Minister or the government of this country to pledge the honour of Canada to these proposals. But, I would like to say to the right hon. gentleman that if the honour of this country is pledged to the United States in respect to this matter, it is also pledged to the empire in respect to all the matters which I have just enumerated. It would seem to me that the question which must present itself to the Prime Minister is whether or not our trade and other relations with the United States of America are more important in his mind than our trade and other relations with this empire

of which we form a part. I have made an offer to him which is as reasonable an offer, I think, as could be made by any man standing in my place, under which he can attend the Imperial Conference, and go on with his determination, if he persists in it, to force these reciprocity proposals through this House. I have made that proposal to him for two reasons; because I know that his trade proposals appeal to him, but, on the other hand, because our relations to the empire and the importance of Canada's representation in the Imperial Conference appeal to us on this side just as strongly, and more strongly than his trade agreement appears to him. Therefore, conceding to him his right to attempt to force this agreement upon us by his majority if he is in a position to do so, I assert that, without any interference with that right, he would also be able under my proposal to charge, as Prime Minister of Canada, the duty which he owes not only to this country, but to the empire as well so long as he continues to act in that capacity. Under these circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the Prime Minister will reconsider the intimation which he gave in the concluding portion of his remarks and that Canada, at the approaching Imperial Conference and at the Coronation as well will be represented as it should be represented by its Prime Minister.

Motion to adjourn negatived.

DISTRIBUTION OF SEED GRAIN.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. HERRON. I wish to draw the attention of the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and I had hoped also that of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), but I am sorry to see that the Minister of the Interior is not in his seat, to a matter that has come to my attention in connection with the supply of seed grain to settlers in the Northwest. I received a communication to-day from a settler in my constituency complaining of the quality and cost of the seed grain supplied by the government to settlers in that vicinity. I have here a sample of the wheat which was supplied, and I suppose that the sample would be one which would appeal more particularly to the Minister of Agriculture. I have also a complaint with reference to the price. As I understand this grain is supplied through the Department of the Interior, and their officials in the Northwest, and the complaint made to me is to the effect that this wheat, laid down at Gleichen, a station on the main line of the Canadian Pacific railway near Calgary, at a cost of $1.25 per bushel is of a rather inferior grade, and from my own knowledge of wheat, grading and price, I would say that it would grade probably No. 2 Northern, and not more than that if it was clean which it is not. It is tainted very badly with weed seeds. I am not capable of judging whether they are of the noxious kind or not, but I presume they are. The wheat is mixed very badly with weed seeds. For the last two or three years wheat of this quality has been sold at the stations in the locality where this wheat is supplied at 75 cents, or at the most, 80 cents a bushel. It seems to me that this is entirely too much to pay for that quality of seed wheat. My correspondent has not given me very full information regarding the seed. Whether it was purchased in Manitoba, or in some of the western provinces, or in Ontario, I have no means of judging. But I think that the two points which I have mentioned, quality and price are worthy of consideration. I shall be glad to hand over the sample to the Minister of Agriculture, and see if he would not consider that it was very injurious to the interests of the Northwest to have seed of that quality supplied and distributed among the farmers of that country. I think the Minister of the Interior would be justified in investigating closely the price charged because, as far as I am capable of judging, it is much above the standard price.

Mr. FISHER. As this seed is distributed to the settlers with whom the Department of the Interior is in close touch, the whole work in connection with the distribution is managed by the Department of the Interior. I have not, therefore, the information at my command at the moment to reply to the hon. gentleman, but I would be very glad if he would let me have a sample of the seed he has, and I would consult with my colleague, the Minister of the Interior, and investigate the matter.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that the Fisheries Act, chapter 45 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, be amended by enacting that in the province of British Columbia no one shall engage in the manufacture of oil or other commercial products from sea-lions, hair seals, sharks or dog-fish, nor operate a salmon cannery or salmon curing establishment, except under license from the minister; that the site of reduction works must be approved by the minister; that operations must proceed within one year from issue of the license for which annual fees shall be required; that the annual fees for a lobster fishing license be increased and based on the total number of pounds of canned lobsters; that the annual returns to the minister by the owner or manager of a lobster factory, through the inspector of fisheries of the district, shall furnish more details and be submitted not later than the 31st day of

May, each year, and penalties for failure to make such returns shall be imposed; and that licenses must be obtained for maintaining lobster pounds, with an annual fee for the same.—Mr. Brodeur.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). In this resolution we first ask for a provision authorizing the government to enact that in British Columbia no one shall engage in the manufacture of oil or other commercial products from sea lions, hair seals, sharks, or dog-fish, without taking out a license from the department. This has been asked by some people who are willing to take up that industry. So far nothing has been done with regard to the reduction of sea lions and similar mammals. I think we should encourage any person or company willing to start works for the purpose of destroying those mammals, which are a menace to the food fish generally. It has been suggested to us that such a thing could not be done unless we could establish regulations by which the reduction works could be established at a certain distance, one from the other, in order to give each factory an area large enough to ensure a catch which would maintain the reduction works. We have now similar legislation in regard to the whale fisheries, no whale reducing works may be established within a certain distance of an existing reduction works. By having power to license reduction works we can at the same time determine the area within which they may fish and the distance at which other works may be established. This legislation has worked very satisfactorily in connection with the whale fisheries. We are now asked to apply the same regulations to reduction works on the British Columbia coast for the handling of sea lions, hair seals, sharks and dog-fish. The fee proposed is a nominal one, $1. I think there should be no objection to that proposal.

The second proposal is to authorize the government to impose a license upon salmon canning or salmon curing establishments. Some years ago we had in British Columbia a very extensive commission which inquired into the whole question of fisheries in that province. That commission recommended that the salmon canning establishments should be licensed, and the owners of these establishments have themselves asked for the imposition of a license. The license fee proposed is $50. This license is the result of the unanimous recommendation of the commission, and it is accepted, as I have said, by the cannery establishments themselves.

The other change is with regard to the annual fee for lobster fishing establishments. This proposal is the result of the report and recommendation of the Committee on Marine and Fisheries last year. Lobster fishing licenses were the subject of a great deal of discussion in the maritime provinces. For years there were complaints that the regulations were not sufficient and that amendments should be made. The House referred the whole question to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. The committee sat during the session of 1909. A very long inquiry was then made by the committee, and they suggested to the government that during the recess a commissioner should be appointed to visit the different portions of the maritime provinces and continue the investigation, securing especially the evidence of the fishermen. Dr. Wakeham was appointed to make this investigation. He went through all the maritime provinces and made a report, which has been submitted to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. The committee at the end of last session recommended some changes in our regulations. These changes have all been carried out by an order in council passed in September last, which was amended some months later with regard to a certain feature. The commission recommended the increase in the licenses which I am now proposing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To what extent is the industry of manufacturing oil from dogfish carried on?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the maritime provinces we have dog-fish reduction works exploited by the government at three places. But in the province of British Columbia there are to-day no dog-fish reduction works, properly speaking.

Mr. CROSBY. Will the minister give us some information with regard to the dog-fish reduction works in the maritime provinces—how they are carried on, what is the general result, and under whose charge are they being conducted?

Mr. BRODEUR. In the maritime provinces there are three places where dog-fish reduction works are being carried on—Canso, Shippigan and Clark's Harbour. At each of these places we have an establishment under the control of a superintendent. We purchase the dog-fish from the fishermen, and from them produce two by-products, oil and fertilizer. The fertilizer is offered for sale at a very low price to the farmers, and any balance that is left is advertised for sale. The same procedure is followed with regard to the oil, which we sell at the price offered to us.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Is it the intention of the department, after this system is introduced, to offer a bonus for the establishment of works for the manufacture of oil as it did for the establishment of the fertilizer works?

Mr. BRODEUR. We are not proposing any bonus, because we hope that the people

who are willing to go into the business may make it a success, as in the case of the whale fisheries.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The reason I ask is that it is very essential to the prosperity of the fisheries in British Columbia, particularly those in the vicinity of the Fraser river, that such works should be encouraged. The sea-lions particularly are increasing there to such an extent that the object which the minister has in view will not be accomplished if there are only one or two of these reduction works, or if the work is carried on on a limited scale with the idea of making a profit for the proprietors rather than with the idea of giving the utmost freedom in the reduction of these pests to the salmon fisheries. If the hon. minister had the authority, he might do as he has done in the case of the salmon fisheries, so restrict the number of licenses as to create a monopoly, which has not operated to the best interests of the industry. I would like to hear the minister say in this connection that he will not restrict the number of these places, but that subject to the proper regulation every person who wishes to engage in this industry shall have an equal chance with every other person.

Mr. BRODEUR. I agree with my hon. friend that it is very important that some of these reduction works should be successful, as these dog-fish and sea-lions are a great nuisance to the salmon fisheries. The intention of the department is not to restrict these establishments in such a way that there would not be a sufficient number of works to deal with all the dog-fish that might be found in some localities. I know that in the locality my hon. friend has mentioned this pest has caused considerable disturbance to the salmon fishery, and I am willing to take the necessary steps to encourage any establishment for its reduction.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). This clause refers also to the licenses of the salmon canneries and salmon-curing establishments. Does it differ in any respect from the present regulations governing the salmon fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at all. There was some doubt as to whether or not it would be necessary to have regulations to authorize us to collect these sums, and this is to give us power for that purpose.

Mr. FOSTER. Are the dogfish on the Pacific coast similar to those on the coasts of the maritime provinces?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they are supposed to belong to the same species.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that scientific authority as well as individual taste have decided that dog-fish is an excellent food. Of course the finest way of getting rid of dog-fish is to make it a popular article of diet, so that fish dealers and fish eaters will be spurred to activity to exterminate the species. The times change in that respect; a few years ago the suggestion to eat sword-fish would be treated something like a suggestion to eat the swords themselves, but sword-fish to-day is a somewhat luxurious food and sells at a high price. Dog-fish are most disreputable looking animals when you see them, and when you put them through a process which is not curative, they are worse than ill looking; but if dog-fish are good to eat you have solved the problem of their continued existence. Has the minister made any efforts to educate public opinion up to getting dog-fish off the index expurgatorius and put on the edible list.

Mr. BRODEUR. I understand that efforts were made some years ago to can dog-fish, but those engaged in the industry put them on the market labelled as whitefish, and although we had no legislative authority to prevent that we discouraged it, in the fear that it would compete with the excellent whitefish of the Great Lakes, and give our excellent whitefish a bad name. I should mention, however, that the intention of those who engaged in the trade was not to sell the dog-fish in Canada, but in a foreign market. Since we have established dog-fish reduction works to make oil and fertilizer, the fishermen who formerly disposed of dog-fish for canning find a ready market for it at the reduction works, and that no doubt has some influence on the discontinuance of the experiment.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to the minister that you might almost as well hang a man as give him a bad name, and when you set up a public enterprise for turning dog-fish into manure no decent Christian wants to have anything to do with a fish that seems to be fit only for that particular purpose. I would suggest that the minister should change the name and call it, say, Pisces Canadensis, and start it off with some fair chance of making a success of itself. Has the minister himself ever eaten any dog-fish?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. FOSTER. I have no doubt the minister is prejudiced against it because it is called dog-fish, and you might just as well call it some other name because no one wants to eat dog if he knows it. The scientists say it is a fine fish and it teems in our waters. Why, if you were to see a shoal of dog-fish after you, down off Grand Manan, you would run more quickly than if you were in the Niobe with a hostile

fleet chasing you. The minister should, I think, take away the bad name of the thing and give it a start in life, or rather in death.

Mr. BRODEUR. Dog-fish is of course inferior as compared with our other commercial fishes, and being destructive of the superior fish we started reduction works to make some economic use of the dog-fish and to diminish their numbers.

Mr.FRASER. Did the whitefish suffer in competition with the dog-fish?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. The whitefish is a product of the Great Lakes and is not found on the Atlantic coast, so that there was no competition between them. But the canned dog-fish were put on the market under the name of whitefish.

Mr. FRASER. Not by the department.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, no; quite the contrary. Some one started in the maritime provinces an establishment for canning dog-fish and they labelled it as whitefish.

Mr. FOSTER. I really think the minister might arrange it in this way: There are practically no whitefish in the maritime provinces. There are a few in some of the lakes, but they are not a commercial quantity. If a fisherman goes up through the lakes and spends a fortnight, he may get enough whitefish to feed him for that time. These fish can never compete with the whitefish of Manitoba, nor would they be likely to compete with the whitefish in Ontario. But let the minister give them some other name—say: 'Sea Whitefish' or 'Maritime Whitefish,' and let them go.

Mr. BRODEUR. But foreign countries which purchase our fish will not be able to make the distinction between sea whitefish and the other.

Mr. FOSTER. Foreign countries do not buy our whitefish.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they are being sold in foreign markets—in the United States they are sold in large quantities. Besides, this is not within our jurisdiction. We have nothing in the law which would authorize us to give the fish a particular name. So far as that is concerned we have no inspection law. It is much to be desired that we should have inspection law, and that is a matter which is engaging, I understand the consideration of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. FOSTER. I would have the fishery experts make a thorough investigation of it. Let us understand the quality and see if anything can be done.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think if the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) could see and smell the dog-fish of British Columbia waters the fish would lose a champion, and I do not think that by any other name it could be made to smell sweeter. For the information of the hon. gentleman I may explain that dog-fish are not regarded on the Pacific coast as valuable except by the Japanese, and they will not use them if they can get any other fish. Any measure the minister can take for the extermination of the dog-fish will be very heartily welcomed by those engaged in the fisheries, on the Pacific coast. I would like to ask, going back to the section in connection with the licenses for salmon canneries or salmon curing establishments, whether the minister proposes to make under these regulations a uniform fee for establishments of whatever capacity, or whether he has it in mind to accede to the request of petitioners to him that exception should be made in favour of establishments, curing establishments particularly, carried on in a semi-private way by one or two fishermen. I may remind him, that, as I am informed, he has been petitioned on this subject, and it has been represented to him that hardships are worked on men who wish to cure fish within their own establishments by compelling them to take out a license and pay a fee equal to that paid by a large establishment.

Mr. BLACK. Before the question of the dog-fish is passed, I would like to say a word or two on behalf of that fish. I have had some experience with the dog-fish on my own table and in other homes. I consider the dog-fish one of the best edible fishes we have. Its flesh is fine in appearance, and is of excellent taste, comparing, I think, with the salmon. There is nothing against the dog-fish except its very nasty name, given to it by some ignorant fishermen. It is a bad thing to have a bad name, as some people know, and its bad name is the only thing that I know of—except its lack of beauty—that is the matter with the dog-fish. I have had it served to guests at my table without letting them know what it was; and after receiving high encomiums on its taste I have told them it was dog-fish—and then they were sorry they had breakfasted. But we have no better food fish in our waters, in my opinion, than the dog-fish. Its liver is very valuable for the production of oil which is equal to cod liver oil for medicinal purposes, and its yield is to cod as five to one. The odour of the oil of the dog-fish liver is bad, but that odour is very easily taken out, so that dog-fish liver oil and cod liver oil cannot be distinguished one from the other.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask a question. Am I right in thinking, in refer-

ence to the oil taken from the dog-fish, that it is not suffused through the flesh of the animal, but is in the liver?

Mr. BLACK. I have never noticed any rank taste in the flesh. It is an oily fish, but the oil in the liver is not that in the flesh. If it was not for the name, it would be a food fish, there is no doubt. It is something like our Intercolonial railway, which was named by foreigners before confederation, a railway between 'the colonies' of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec—'don't you know'—and the name has stuck to it ever since. I am afraid it has been a hoodoo to it all along.

Mr. BRODEUR. In answer to the question of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), it is not our intention to fix different license fees for different sorts of canneries. The fee of $50 seems to be a very small one, and I think could be paid by all the canneries that will be established.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think the minister does not understand. I referred to the inclusion of salmon canning and salmon curing establishments in the same sentence. I speak particularly of salmon curing, which, as the minister knows, is different from canning. A man may carry on salmon curing in his back shed, but not salmon canning. I know the case of a man who attempted to carry on salmon curing in his own premises on a domestic scale, simply by his own labour, and was confronted with a demand for a heavy license fee, the same as if he had a large commercial establishment. It is on behalf of the salmon curer that I was appealing to the minister, and I think his case is deserving of consideration.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is the first time, I think, that the matter has been brought seriously to my attention. I will look into it and see if it is desirable to make the changes to meet the cases mentioned. But I believe the hon. gentleman will admit with me that it is important that we should have some control over these establishments, and the only way we can do it is by license.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That is correct, but it is a hardship for these men who have facilities for curing to be told that they must not carry on this operation unless they pay a prohibitive license fee. I would like to refer again to the restriction of the number of establishments. I understood the minister to say that it is not the intention to make any change in the present regulations as to salmon canning. If I understand it, there is a restriction in the number of salmon canning licenses, which works out in this way—the men presently engaged in the salmon canning have formed themselves into an absolutely close corporation and no person aggrieved by the operations of the combine can start any new establishment, because when he applies for a license he is informed by the local officials that the policy of the department is to give no more licenses. The department takes the ground that it is not to the advantage of the industry to have a greater number of canneries. While an argument may be made on that score, yet the minister will see that when, in the only field of production of this class of salmon, he limits the licenses to persons already having canneries and licenses, he creates a monopoly. I would like to ask him whether he is prepared to make his regulations more elastic, and to consider each application for a license on its own merits, without regard to whether or not that man has been in the business before.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend will see by the regulations we have passed on regard to the canneries that the public is absolutely protected. If there was any suspicion, or any ground for a monopoly by which the fishermen could be in any way affected, of course we are authorized to issue other licenses. But it was represented to the commission, when the commission sat in British Columbia, that the number of canneries which were then existing on the Fraser river especially was large enough. I do not know whether that is correct, my hon. friend is more familiar than I am with the condition of affairs there. He can tell the committee whether he thinks the number of establishments there is sufficient or not. At all events, that was the report made by the commission, and as a result we acceded to the request that no more licenses should be given, on one condition, namely, that if we found that there is a strong suspicion of a monopoly existing, we will certainly exercise the power we have of giving new licenses in order to prevent a monopoly which would be detrimental to the industry itself.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister doubtless knows that at present there is a monopoly, whether bad or ill, I will not discuss now; but there is an absolute monopoly of the salmon canning industry in British Columbia, allied with the Alaska salmon canners, thus creating an industry protected on all sides by the government that is, perhaps the most profitable industry in connection with fisheries any where in the world. The profits are very large, very easily and quickly made, and with very little risk. I know that the fishermen are subjected to injustice on the Canadian side because of the

existence of this monopoly. We think we are superior to the United States in the matter of monopolies and trusts, but they must yield the palm to us in connection with the salmon fisheries. On the Washington side the monopoly is not so complete, as there are quite a few of what are known as independent canneries, which are always available to fishermen who wish to sell their catch to them. The effect on the Washington side is to make the price to fishermen very much larger than it would be otherwise. I do not think that any person except those making financial profits by this operation would suggest to the minister that the fisheries are protected in any way by restriction in the number of licenses to be issued, and there is no reason to suppose that there would be any greater number of fishermen, or any greater quantity of salmon caught, if there were more canneries than there are at present. I do not suggest that there are not enough canneries to can all the fish to be caught along the Fraser river, because it is the work of a very short time to duplicate or to increase to an indefinite quantity the capacity of any cannery. But since no new person can get a canning license, the minister fosters a monopoly which works detrimentally to the men who ought to get whatever benefit may be legitimately derived as their reward for catching the fish.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am surprised to hear that there is a monopoly in the Fraser river. My hon. friend is aware that so far as the Fraser river is concerned, there is an association called the British Columbia Packers' Association which is a very large one. I do not know whether it is successful financially.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). They are getting on very well indeed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I always understood that of course they are controlling a very large number of canneries on the Fraser river, but there are also some independent canneries. I do not know whether the independent canneries are as large as those under the control of this association.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The independent canneries to which the minister refers are largely the work of Scotch capital. The independent packers' and the British Columbia Packers' Association are combined in another association called the Fraser River Canners' Association, which includes both the British Columbia Packers' and those he terms the independent canners.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend says that all those canneries are in that association.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). They are all in the Fraser River Canners' Association.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the information we have in the department.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). They control the buying price and the selling price.

Mr. BRODEUR. The information we have in the department is to the effect that there is a British Columbia Canners' Association, and outside of that an independent canneries, and of course the general association of which my hon. friend speaks, the Fraser River Canners' Association. The information we have in the department is to the effect that all the canning establishments of the Fraser river are not included. I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this matter to my attention, and we will look into it.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to make it plain to the minister that the Fraser River Canners' Association is not an investing association at all, but it is an association in which the British Columbia Packers' Association, the great organization there, combined with the independent canners under the name of the Fraser River Canners' Association, with their separate officers.

Mr. BRODEUR. I thought the Fraser River Canners' Association had disappeared, and became merged into the British Columbia Canners' Association.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). No, it is the other way about. The British Columbia Packers' Association was organized with Toronto capital, by Henry Doyle, seven or eight years ago. Outside of that, the canneries controlled by the Bell-Irving interests have continued to exist, and there is also the St. Mungo cannery on the Fraser river, established by Scotch capital, and which never sold out to the British Columbia Packers. But they are all joined to form the Fraser River Canners' Association, with a paid secretary and an office in Vancouver. From that central office all these canners fix the price at which they will buy and sell their salmon. They are allied with the Alaska Packers' Association and with the operators of the canneries on Puget Sound. The proprietor of several canneries on Puget Sound is the manager of the British Columbia Packers' Association. The minister will see that there is an absolutely close ring—I was going to say, but that is regarded as an offensive term.

Mr. BRODEUR. Cordiality.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Yes, an absolutely close association so that

they can impose whatever condition they like upon the fishermen as respects the price of fish, and the quantity to be taken. That is another point which might well engage the minister's attention.

Mr. BRODEUR. Who is the secretary of this British Columbia Canners' Association?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). My last information was that it was Mr. W. D. Burdis, of Vancover. He has been secretary of the Fraser River Canners' Association for several years. I have not heard of any change.

Mr. BRODEUR. The information we had in the department was that Mr. Burdis was secretary of the Fraser River Canners' Association, but that it had changed its name to the British Columbia Canners' Association.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Was that this year?

Mr. BRODEUR. About a couple of years ago.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I got a circular from them last year and my information is certainly direct up to the close of last year. They have an absolutely close buying and selling combine. It is well known to all engaged in the business out there. Another way that the minister's kindness to this monopoly affects the fishermen is this: When there is more than the ordinary run of fish our fishermen are absolutely prohibited from getting any advantage from that by the limitation placed by these canners upon the number they will take from each boat. As the minister knows, no other canners are allowed to come in, and no other licenses are issued. There are no canneries in reserve to be opened up if there is a glut of fish. There comes an extraordinary run, and every man out fishing will receive 500 or 600 fish in his boat, but when he goes to the cannery wharf he receives notice, and it is the same with every cannery, that the managers have placed a limit of 200 to each boat. That means that they can sell 200 to the canners and must absolutely destroy the other 400. The fisherman cannot even throw the fish into the river because that is against the law.

Mr. BRODEUR. Could he not sell them to the independent canners?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). There are no independent canners because they are all in this buying and selling combine. On the American side he can sell them to the independent canners, but on the Canadian side he can not. The result is that the fisherman is at the loss of all these fish, and the community loses this valuable product which has to be destroyed because of the regulation of the canners. That goes on every season, and it is the cause of very great heart burning to the fisherman that after he has made an exceptionally large catch he finds that he is deprived by his government of any opportunity of selling the fish he has caught.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is a matter over which we have no control except by way of granting new licenses. We have the power to grant new licenses. If we found that the Fraser river could stand more canneries, and that fishermen were obliged to destroy their fish we would be willing to consider very seriously the granting of new licenses. But, as to the refusal of some of the canners to take more than a certain quantity of fish, that is a matter over which we have no control.

Mr. GOODEVE. Granting for the sake of argument that there is absolutely no monopoly, I would like to hear from the minister what he considers the advantage to be in leaving to a certain number the privilege and right to enjoy a natural resource such as that of our fisheries. It is the encouragement of monopolies of that kind that starts the growth of those enormous trusts that have been of such vital injury to the United States. Not only do these monopolies exist with respect to the fisheries, but with respect to timber and all natural resources of that kind. What is the supposed advantage? Why should I not be able to go down there without any question at all, merely as a matter of absolute right under the statute, and say that I want a license, tender my money and get it? Why should ten men have the right to erect canneries, and the eleventh man be shut out in a supposed free country such as this? What are the reasons for such a regulation?

Mr. BRODEUR. These regulations have been framed upon the report of the Fisheries Commission which sat a couple of years ago, and came to the conclusion that such regulations were in the interests of the fisheries. It may be that the argument of my hon. friend would apply just as well to the case of our regulations generally, or to the restrictions which we have made with regard to the preservation of the fisheries. We adopt regulations for what purpose? For the purpose of protecting the fisheries, for the purpose of preventing the destruction of what I consider a national asset. It was represented to us that if the number of canneries was larger than the requirements of the Fraser river it would mean that perhaps at some future time, not very far distant, the fisheries there would be destroyed. This is a measure which has

been adopted for the purpose of protecting the fisheries, but if the fisheries are not treated fairly by these canners, we have the power, under the existing regulations, to prevent any such injustice being done to the fishermen by granting new licenses. Every man will have to apply, and his case will be considered.

Mr. GOODEVE. The minister has not answered the argument at all. As he has said, he has made general regulations for the fisheries, and if that is so the whole country should be treated alike. In this particular case the canners already in business, and who are supposed to know the conditions advise the commission that it would be in the interest of the fisheries to adopt these regulations. Of course they give that advice, and it would be very foolish of them not to. That is the whole argument of the minister now. Then he says that if he finds that those who are in the business now are not able to take all the fish, he may consider the question of letting somebody else in. As my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) has pointed out, it is an easy matter for the canners already established to enlarge, double or quadruple their capacity, and still hold the monopoly. It is not only unfair to the people of Canada, but it is the very beginning of the most vicious system that it is possible to introduce into any country. The evil of this system has been pointed out by your own Dominion Conservation Commission, and I think that one of the first duties of that commission is to direct attention to this grave danger to the people of Canada. If you take this very question now, the whole cry, from the President down, is that they, through monopoly, have practically destroyed and wasted the natural resources of the United States, and the argument of the minister this afternoon is exactly that argument. I am taking a general stand regardless of details, not going into that question at all, that it is a very vicious system whereby you allow a limited number of men to have the absolute, and sole right of such an enormously profitable industry, and a natural resource that belongs to the people as a whole, a food producer as is suggested by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) who is vitally interested.

The hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) has made out an absolute case. I was down last summer and he had the courtesy and kindness to drive me around to see some of the canneries which were open. Some of them were closed down as it was towards the end of the season. He called my attention to fishermen coming there bringing fish and at that time, he said, unfortunately these canneries were not taking all the fish of these men, only a limited number because there were too many offering, there happened to be an extra late run, they were getting a large number of fish, some of which were being destroyed. That should not be allowed, the regulations should be absolutely general. You cannot place this industry on a par with liquor licenses where there is considered to be a certain evil and, therefore, you limit the traffic, that does not apply here. Here is a food for the people at large, a natural resource belonging to the people, and you say to a certain limited number of men, I do not care whether it is a monopoly or not, that they shall have the sole right to carry on this industry. They thus get established, they grow stronger every season, they accumulate more wealth and power to build up the very trusts which are recognized as an evil in every country in the world, and which we are endeavouring to fight against. I claim that it is the duty of the minister not only to take it into his serious consideration, but absolutely to have free trade as far as establishing these canneries is concerned. My hon. friend has made that point clear in regard to curing. He points out: Here is an individual fisherman with enterprise who by frugality and industry has got an extra boat or has been successful and undertakes to cure a few fish and start to build up an industry. That is the way we have built up all our industries throughout Canada. But immediately the regulations of the department step in and say to him: Unless you pay the full license of one of these great trust magnates, you are not allowed to cure a single fish. In other words there is a penalty on their enterprise, and the enterprising fisherman is immediately choked off. That is a fair argument. My objection to the resolution is that it takes over the power to continue that monopoly and increase it. What is going to be the advantage of a regulation giving certain ones and only certain ones a license to manufacture, for instance, this oil and not allow everybody to enter into that industry? Why have they not all the same free right? Why bring in a resolution providing for an enactment to place them in exactly the same position as you have already placed the fish canning and curing industry? In other words, you are going to make a complete monopoly of the fisheries of British Columbia. The individual fisherman cannot can or cure and now you take power to enact that no man can make oil unless he gets a license, and thus to make a hard and fast, hidebound monopoly of fishing in British Columbia. What is the ground for the proposed monopoly? The hon. member for New Westminster has pointed out exactly how it works and is bound to work

on the general principle and I object to that principle because it is vicious.

Mr. BRODEUR. The principle which we adopted concerning the whale fisheries, which we are now proposing to apply to the sea-lion reduction works is based upon the experience of Newfoundland. Newfoundland some years ago started whale reduction works on a very large scale. There was no restriction at all, every one could go and catch whales in every part of the gulf, and in a few years there were the number of reduction works and the consequent fishing became so extensive that the whale fishing was practically destroyed. In order to avoid a repetition of that in Canada we thought it well to adopt this law which was passed some years ago by which we took power to license the reduction establishments for whales and to declare in the statute that a certain area of the Gulf would be practically at their disposal. Reduction works were established at Seven Islands on the north shore. We would not then allow license to another establishment within 100 miles of Seven Islands. Of course if one was established beyond 100 miles they would have the right to go and fish any place in the Gulf, but that was a restriction that prevented the destruction of whales and promised good financial results to the reduction works themselves. In spite of that protection it was found in a few years that this establishment which was licensed at Seven Islands was not a success financially and it had to close. I am informed, however, that it will likely be reopened very soon. If we had permitted at that time every company to go there and carry on the fishery there would have been no success financially, and besides that we would have destroyed the whales, although, of course, it is not of great importance that the whales should be destroyed On the British Columbia coast there are companies or a company which is applying for permission to reduce sea-lions, hair-seals and sharks. This company is willing to go into business, but they say that if they start business in a certain area then in a few years, when they have made a success, some one else may establish himself alongside of them and they may lose the capital invested. Consequently they ask us to establish regulations by which reduction works would not be established in the same area so that the same thing would happen as in the Gulf. It is thought that with some restriction the companies will likely be successful. This is a new industry which would not be started unless they had this protection which they are seeking. I think it worth while to give them an opportunity to start these works. That is the reason for the policy we are now introducing.

Mr. GOODEVE. I cannot see why the principle of the survival of the fittest should not apply there as in the general trade and business of the country. The minister himself said that even when they granted this restriction in the case he named, the industry was not a practical success. He seemed to think that might yet be made a success. There should be a general regulation so that every man would have an equal opportunity. If you insist that it is in the interest of the public to give monopolies of this kind, then you must, to be logical, and in order to secure for the fishermen fair value for their labour, regulate in some way the prices in connection therewith—in other words, regulate the trade. That has certainly not been done, and the neglect to do that leads to the evils that we see on every hand. I do not think that any man who has studied the question fails to realize that the creation of monopolies of this kind has brought about very great and evil results, and that is my chief objection in a general way to this resolution.

Mr. BRODEUR. When my hon. friend applies the word 'monopoly' to the legislation now proposed, I must tell him that that expression is absolutely uncalled-for. The regulations will provide that the licenses shall be for every 50 miles of coast. As there are about 7,000 miles of coast in British Columbia, that certainly could not be considered as a monopoly. So far nobody has been willing to go into the business; but some enterprising men are willing to go into it. It may be a failure or it may be a success; we do not know; but they ask us to give to them the same regulations as we are giving with regard to whales, and we think their request is a fair one, and is not to be considered as one for a monopoly.

Mr. GOODEVE. I am not saying that the resolution itself is a monopoly, but I say that it may lead to a monopoly. I am only pointing out that that has been the practical result in similar cases, in order to warn the hon. minister of the great danger of legislation of this kind, and that it must be very carefully considered. If he finds that there are sufficiently logical reasons advanced for it, then he should be careful to hedge it about with other restrictions and regulations that will protect the general public and the fisheries themselves. I think the hon. member for New Westminster has laid down the basic principle, which is that the actual producer, and not the manufacturer, if I may use that word, is the one we must protect. It is the million fisher-folk in the North Sea that makes the fisheries valuable there, and it

is the fisher-folk on the Pacific coast that we should carefully protect.

Mr. BRODEUR. The preservation of the fish too.

Mr. GOODEVE. Yes, because without the fish we would not have the fisher-folk. But the great danger is that in protecting the fish you may be protecting men whose interest is to become a trust or a monopoly as against the fisher-folk.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have the same regulations in British Columbia with regard to the whale fisheries, and so far we have not had sufficient applications for licenses to cover the whole coast.

Mr. TAYLOR. (New Westminster). The minister mentioned a certain application that had been made to him for permission to go into this industry. I would like to know if he has given any promise to those people that no matter who else is refused a license, they will get one.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never made any such promise.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). They are going it blind, then?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, they are going to apply if this legislation is passed.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). And the minister feels in honour bound to give them a license?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Then the minister creates a monopoly at once.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at all.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminister). Because if you have 7,000 miles of coast line in British Columbia, and one license is allowed for every 50 miles, the minister will not contend that each 50 miles throughout the whole province is of equal value to every other. There must be a choice. For instances, so far as the dog-fish and the sea-otter are concerned, a site that would be infinitely more valuable than any other would be one at the mouth of the Fraser river. Surely the minister has some order of value of these sites. If there are a dozen applications, those persons to whom he has already committed himself will get all the valuable sites, and the rest of us who want to take part in this industry will be told to go away off and choose locations where there are no fish. I think the minister will see that he has told the committee too much, because these regulations are actually laid down to suit certain interests who have promised to go into this business. I think the minister should promise that if he issues these licenses he will put them up to competition so that everybody will have a chance. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries controls only his own department; but as a member of the government he has to do to a certain extent with other departments, and if he will assure us that regulations of this kind will be acceptable throughout all the departments, that might make a difference to some of us. For instance, I know I have a sympathetic listener in the Minister of Inland Revenue, and I would appeal to him. He and I are engaged in the same business, that of producing newspapers. We are bothered by the fact that as soon as we get our business established, some other fellow comes into the field and starts another newspaper and cuts down our profits. Besides the extraordinary size of some of these papers is having an appreciable effect on the supply of pulpwood. If the Minister of Inland Revenue could assure us that he would apply to the Department of Trade and Commerce or some other department, or take authority to limit the number of newspapers, so that we might make whatever profits we chose to make, we might look with a more kindly eye on the proposed fishery monopoly. I do not say that we would; but we are all human, and if the minister should tempt us in that way, there is no knowing what might result in the way of softening our opposition to this proposition. But, joking apart, if the minister is going to limit the number of these licenses, he should advertise for tenders for them.

Mr. GOODEVE.

Mr. BRODEUR. If two applications were made the proposition of my hon. friend might be very well considered, but we have never had more than one application and this did not refer to the Fraser river which my hon. friend does not consider a good place for dog-fish, or sharks, or sea-lions. I do not know a good site would be found at the mouth of the Fraser river, but if an application comes from there it will be considered. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), will find that as in the case of the whale fisheries, everybody will be fairly treated and no favouritism shown.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). What is the present position of the lobster fisheries in British Columbia?

Mr. BRODEUR. We have no lobster canneries so far in British Columbia.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). This resolution merely anticipates that there will be lobster fisheries in British Columbia?

Mr. BRODEUR. It refers to the Atlantic coast, but of course it is a general law for the whole of Canada.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That is what it is intended to be, but I under-

stand the English language and the resolution only applies to British Columbia.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill itself will remove any doubt on the point.

Mr. CROSBY. I have been struck with the logic of the arguments advanced by the hon. gentleman from British Columbia. The minister stated there were about 7,000 miles of coast line in British Columbia, and that he intended to grant a license for each 50 miles. Of course, there must be extents of that coast where it would not be worth while placing a factory in 500 miles for any kind of fishing, and the location of a factory must depend on the conditions as to fishing, &c. The fact that you have 7,000 miles of coast would not at all indicate that you would have one applicant for each 50 miles. If an application can be had to establish an industry on that coast would it not be fair to specify a limited time, say three years, for the monopoly, if it is to be a monopoly.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is only one year.

Mr. CROSBY. That would relieve the difficulty somewhat. I understood the minister to say that in Newfoundland they have restrictions on the whale fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. I said quite the contrary, and I believe that is why several reduction works have had to be closed.

Mr. CROSBY. When the whale fisheries were first established on the Newfoundland coast and the Newfoundland-Labrador coast, some of those engaged in the industry earned as high as 150 per cent, and some of course earned nothing. People should have an unrestricted opportunity of going into that class of business if they desire to take chances, and I do not think the government need worry itself much about that. The success of the business will depend on the experience, and on the brain and energy that is put into it. When the whale fishery was first established in Newfoundland people were rushing into it with their money just as into a gold mining enterprise, and the chances of gain or loss were about the same. Some became rich, and some lost.

Mr. BRODEUR. What percentage became rich?

Mr. CROSBY. Some of the Scotch firms that went into the business did well and others failed to succeed. The whale business is not now as profitable as it was because the fish are not now so plentiful as they were formerly. The resolution says that the annual fee for lobster fishing licenses shall be increased and based on the total number of pounds of canned lobsters. I did not know that there was any charge previously for a lobster fishing license.

Mr. BRODEUR. The existing legislation provides that the license fee shall be $2 per 100 cases or packages or fraction thereof.

Mr. CROSBY. I know that, but what I said, was that I did not understand the lobster fishermen had to get a license.

Mr. BRODEUR. Lobster establishments have. There is a difference between the lobster establishment and the lobster fishermen. The lobster fisherman has no license to can lobsters—that privilege was taken away from him years ago?

Mr. CROSBY. When I asked the minister if the lobster fishermen had to pay a license, he said. 'yes.'

Mr. BRODEUR. I misunderstood my hon. friend. The lobster fishermen pays no license.

Mr. CROSBY. The resolution is wrong in that particular.

Mr. BRODEUR. The Bill——

Mr. CROSBY. I have before me only the resolution as it appears on the Order Paper, and that is what we are discussing, as I understand. This resolution speaks of curing and canning. Everybody knows there is a great difference. It is quite right that there should be a license for canning food of any kind. But I cannot see why there should be a license for curing fish by smoking, pickling, or otherwise. No license is exacted for this at the present time, and I do not see why there should be any.

Mr. BRODEUR. There has been a mistake in drafting the resolution. What was intended was the cannery license and not the fishing license, for we do not propose to compel the fishermen to pay a license. So, I would propose to strike out the word 'fishing' in the eighth line of the resolution, and substitute the word 'cannery.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CROSBY. I call special attention to this question of curing fish. No license should be imposed for this, and I must strongly oppose any such thing.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under the existing legislation, section 35 of the Fisheries Act, it is provided 'no one shall at any time can or cure,' and so on. Section 36 determines the license which is to be paid for canning or curing. The two words are used, and we propose to leave them as they are.

Mr. LOGGIE. It is limited to salmon curing or canning.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, lobster curing or canning.

Mr. CROSBY. In that case, of course, the word 'curing' in this connection means nothing, for there is no way of curing lobster except by canning. But from the resolution it might apply not only to British Columbia but to other provinces. In that case, the inclusion of the word 'curing' would be of great interest to all who are interested in the fisheries of the maritime provinces or eastern Quebec, for in these places there is practically no salmon canned, it is all sold fresh, or cured by being smoked or otherwise. It would not be fair to ask the fishermen to procure a license for curing fish when the fish speaks for itself when it is presented to the customs.

Mr. BRODEUR. The first part of the resolution deals with the cannery establishments of the province of British Columbia only, and the latter part deals with lobster licenses and nominally covers the whole country, so, in practice it affects only the maritime provinces for only there are lobster canneries in existence. The first part of the resolution uses the words 'curing or cannery,' but this applies only to British Columbia.

Mr. CROSBY. If that is settled, then, I have only a word in regard to the increase of the cost of the licenses. I take it that this license is not intended as a revenue producer, but is merely a nominal fee intended to give the government practical power of regulation. Of course, the increase quoted is not very great, but still it is an increase. Behind the lobster cannery is the lobster fisherman, and the higher you make the fixed expenses of the charges of the cannery, the less the establishment can afford to pay the fisherman. I would suggest that the minister should not increase that fee if he can see his way clear to do so. Then I would like to ask the minister how far we are going to increase these licenses, and whether we are going to do as was suggested in the Marine and Fisheries Committee, and as our fishermen desire, so that a man who catches a lobster will have the right to can that lobster if he wishes. For my part I never could see how a limitation of the number of canning factories, or any other kind of factory, was going to protect the fisheries. I can understand fish in the sea being protected by limiting the number of fishermen, or by using less destructive methods of fishing; but I never could understand how the limiting of the number of canning factories was going to preserve the fish in the sea. Therefore, I stand for as free a regulation as possible regarding the canning of lobsters. I think that a lessening of the number of factories would have no effect on lessening the catch, or on the yearly production of lobsters. When the number of factories is small they frequently force a man who catches a lobster at a certain port to carry it to another port several miles away where he can ship it fresh. At the time of the change there were a number of factories located in different parts of Nova Scotia, and no doubt in Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, which, when this regulation came into force, simply closed up some of their factories, and said to the fishermen: If you want to sell your lobsters you must bring them to Charlottetown, or you must bring them to Canso, or you must bring them to Yarmouth. Therefore, the lobster fisherman was handicapped from the fact that competition was not keen enough. My hon. friend whom I see opposite is a canner of lobsters, and he knows what a nice thing it is to have that privilege exclusively. I do not blame him for that, but I am speaking for the mass of the fishermen generally. I do not forget the canner altogether, but he is quite able to take care of himself.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may tell my hon. friend that the monopoly he speaks of—

Mr. CROSBY. I would not call it a monopoly.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the restriction which exists in regard to lobster licenses has disappeared by the regulation we have adopted. This question engaged the consideration of the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, and they came to the unanimous conclusion that the restrictions which existed until then should disappear. In the last two years I have changed the regulations in that respect, as they are only departmental regulations, and I gave the privilege of acquiring a license to a number of fishermen combining together who applied for it. Several applications were made, and have been favourably considered. I will tell the reason why the increase was made, and I am voicing the unanimous finding of the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, of which I think my hon. friend is a member. That committee unanimously recommended that, in order to afford additional protection to the lobster fisheries, we should exact a little larger tax upon the canners. I suppose my hon. friend must be pleased to see that we are imposing a larger tax upon the canners, which was the unanimous recommendation of the committee.

Mr. CROSBY. I am not in any way opposed to the canner, I want him to get all the advantage he can. But I do say that if the canner has to pay $5 for a license, he is certainly going to take that out in the price he pays to the fishermen. But I wanted to know more particularly why this additional tax was put on, if it is not intended for revenue purposes, and I

do not think it can be. Why should we increase it at all? I think it would be better to leave it as it was before.

Mr. BRODEUR. It was in order to give additional protection to the fisheries.

Mr. CROSBY. I have a letter from Mr. John Berrigan, in the eastern part of Halifax county, who made application for a canning license to the overseer of fisheries there. Mr. Berrigan has written to me that he had not had any response to his application for some time. Perhaps the department would know whether that license has been granted.

Mr. BRODEUR. The superintendent informs me that he has not heard of any such application.

Mr. CROSBY. I will send the letter to the minister.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. BRODEUR moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 185) to amend the Fisheries Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second times.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved the second reading of Bill (No. 104) to amend paragraph (l) of section 2, and paragraphs (n) and (o) of section 9 of the Post Office Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) be good enough to give a brief explanation of the nature of the proposed Bill?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Mr. Speaker, I have already given an explanation of the purpose of the Bill, but as it was given some weeks or even months ago, I will be pleased to repeat it. This is a Bill which will bring officially under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department a new device called The Automatic Stamp Vending Machine. This automatic stamp vending machine has been in use in England, in Germany and in Australia for a certain number of years. I think the invention is an Australian one. The box can be well described, as it has been described by an authority on post offices in England, as a conscience stamp vending box. The reason why this box is called a conscience automatic stamp vending box is because, when you put a cent in the slot, if it is a false coin, the box rejects it. If it is not a current coin of the country it also rejects it, although it might be a good coin in the United States or in England. It is really a remarkable invention. The machine has been in use in Great Britain for a few years. It is aimed to facilitate the sale of stamps in large establishments and in post offices to prevent any rush at the wickets where stamps are sold. For instance, we have already placed in some of the post offices, at Toronto, Montreal, Ottawa, Vancouver and in some of the large hotels, some of these stamp vending machines and the results have been simply marvellous. The benefits accruing from that invention are two-fold. First of all, it prevents a rush at the wickets in what are called rush seasons. At Christmas, it may be, or at Easter, when a huge number of cards and letters is sent through the mails, the public cannot afford to wait. Secondly, it saves to the Post Office Department the large commissions which are being paid to stamp vendors. That, I must say, is a secondary consideration because after all we must expect that those who sell stamps for His Majesty must be paid a certain commission. The purpose of the amendment herein is to enable the department to place at the service of the public, as experience warrants, a device for the automatic sale of stamps. Let me take the first amendment to the Post Office Act. As my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is aware a postal box in the street is, according to the Post Office Act, a Post Office by itself. It is defined as such and when we have couriers who are charged with the responsibility of carrying the mails from one office to another, it often happens that on their route they have to take the mails from one, or two or three, or five of the boxes erected on the way. This stamp vending machine can be placed in the street and in the lobbies of large hotels, like the Windsor in Montreal, the Russell in Ottawa, or the new Grand Trunk hotel when it is opened, and in all the large hotels in the country. The moneys deposited in these boxes will be collected by our couriers under certain conditions that will be imposed by the department. Subsection (l) of section 2 defines a post office to embrace any building, room, post office, railway car, street letter box, &c., and the purpose of the amendment is to give street stamp vending boxes the same status. I hope I have made myself clear on that paragraph. Paragraph (n) of section 9 of the Post Office Act empowers the Postmaster General to establish and provide street letter boxes or boxes of any other description for the receipt of mailable matter whenever he deems it necessary and the purpose of the proposed amendment is to give the Postmaster General power to establish and provide boxes for the sale of stamps or other post office supplies whenever he deems it necessary. That is in order to see that the definition of the powers of the Postmaster General cover this additional case in the Post Office Department. Subsection (o) of

section 9 of the Post Office Department empowers the Postmaster General to grant licenses, revocable at pleasure, to agents other than regular postmasters for the sale to the public of postage stamps and standard envelopes. My hon. friends will know what standard envelopes mean. It happens that in the Post Office Department we sell to some large firms envelopes which are already stamped. This is in order to facilitate the business of large stores and it is very useful to the public. The purpose of this amendment is to allow of greater flexibility which will redound to the advantage of the department. These licenses, as stated in the section of the Post Office Act to which I refer, are revocable at pleasure. We wish to take away the words 'revocable at pleasure' and for this very obvious reason.

The stamp vending boxes can be purchased by the department, and placed here and there in the country; we have already purchased 50 as a trial, but our inspectors, and our superintendent of post offices, Mr. Ross, state that in certain sections of the country, especially where we have lumber camps, we may have difficulty in getting a regular post office, or even a regular agent for the sale of stamps to lumbermen. My officers say that we might well give the company which manufactures the boxes the privilege of installing those boxes in those remote sections of the country, the company to draw what commission we would pay to agents having stamp vending licenses. Of course the license will always be revocable whenever the Postmaster General, or the officers of the department find it necessary to revoke it, but the company state that they will have difficulty in establishing their business on a firm basis, if the words 'revocable at pleasure' remain in the statute. I am explaining now the three amendments connected with this new machine. I must say that in the opinion of my officers this will be a great public utility. In our cities we have established some on trial, and the results have been simply marvellous. I have here a memorandum from one of my officers:

The Automatic Stamp-Vending Machines will not only prove a great convenience to the public, but in many cases, they meet an an actual necessity. They may be placed at any point where people require stamps in considerable numbers. They can be attached to pillar boxes on the street, in the halls of hotels, at railway stations, or in public buildings, and they are always available. Where access can be had to any of these machines, no person desiring to post a letter, and having the money to buy a stamp, need go disappointed. At any hour of the day or night, at times when even the hotels or drug stores are no longer available, owing to the lateness of the hour, these machines are as ready to do business with poople wishing to post letters as at mid-day. A very great advantage is that it fits in so completely with the habits of the people as regards correspondence. It is the universal practice to put off the posting of one's letters until the mail is ready to close. There is a rush to the stamp vendors, and in spite of every willingness to sell the stamps required, the vendor is unable to accommodate many who apply to him. With automatic sellers near by, the situation is relieved for the vendor, and those desiring stamps are able to get what they want in time to post their letters to catch the outgoing mail.

In the principal cities of Great Britain they are a boon to the public. There is a single box in Liverpool that sells on the average over 2,500 stamps a week, and another in Edinburgh from which the average issued is over 2,800 a week. In the crowded business sections of London, Glasgow, Dublin and Belfast, these automatic stamp sellers are doing thriving businesses to the great advantage of the public in these great centres of population. These machines are simple in construction and not liable to get out of order. One has been in use in the British House of Commons for two years, and has worked during all that time without a single failure.

A peculiar and very valuable feature in these machines is that they reject all spurious or foreign coins without operating the machine.

In 1908, the parliament of Canada authorized the reduction of the rate on drop letters, that is, letters delivered in the city where they are posted; in cities, from 2 cents to one cent per ounce. This reduction has immensely increased the number of letters posted in our cities, and as a consequence the department is grateful for the opportunity which this device offers of serving the public better with the stamps which they want in such largely augmented numbers.

The machines have been set up experimentally in Ottawa, Montreal and Toronto, and have given the utmost satisfaction. Two were placed in the exhibition building in Toronto during exhibition week and were worked at full pitch without a hitch. These machines quite outdid the British average mentioned. On one of the exhibition days, one machine sold 1,500 stamps, while a day or two later another machine sold 3,300 within 14 hours. The British high average, it will be remembered, were 2,500 and 2,800 in a week.

Mr. CROSBY. If a man wanted to buy a one cent stamp, and put in a five cent piece, would he get back four cents in change?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, but from my own experience I can tell my hon. friend that if you put a 25 cent piece in, the machine will reject it.

Mr. CROSBY. Then I understand that this box does not give any change, but it is necessary to have the right coin to put in the slot?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. What is the method of getting one of these boxes? For instance, suppose a hotel-keeper wanted one?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I intend to have special regulations for the leasing of these boxes. Of course, we must be very careful of them, because they are somewhat costly. We must for our climate have a strong metallic box, and we cannot give them away to every Tom, Dick and Harry. They are intended for the benefit of the public in large centres of population, at such rush centres as large hotels and railway stations, and also at remote points such as lumber camps, where we have no agents. I had an application from a large firm in northern Ontario for one of these boxes, and I am just awaiting this legislation in order to place them in some of the lumber camps. It may be asked why we did not adopt a Canadian invention. The officials have been examining these machines for years, and they find the British pattern far the best. It is an Australian invention, and has been adopted by the British authorities and is used on the continent in large centres.

Mr. PERLEY. Do I understand that only Canadian cents can be used?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. PERLEY. If a man put in five cents he would not get it back?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It would be returned to him, but he would not get any stamps. It is for one-cent and two-cent stamps—until the happy day comes when we shall require the half-cent stamp, as advocated by my hon. friend from Halton.

Mr. HENDERSON. I was just going to ask the minister whether he has made any provision for the half-cent stamp which we require in the towns?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Later on.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time, and House went into Committee thereon.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 45) respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—Mr. Ecrément.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE. THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 172) respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—Mr. Barker.

Bill (No. 162) respecting the Alsec and Yukon Railway Company.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 167) to incorporate the Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 168) to incorporate the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 180) for the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.—Mr. Rhodes.

Bill (No. 181) for the relief of Pauline Winslowe Saunderson.—Mr. Carvell.

Bill (No. 182) for the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 183) for the relief of Frances Whittington Truesdell.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

The hour for Private Bills being exhausted the House resumed in committee on Bill (No. 104) to amend paragraph (l) of section 2, and paragraphs (n) and (o) of section 9 of the Post Office Act.—Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before six o'clock I explained the various sections of the Bill, but if hon. members desire to ask any questions, I shall be glad to give any further information I can.

On section 1—'Street stamp vending box.'

Mr. HENDERSON. It seems to me it would be proper to have a definition of the words 'street stamp vending box.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. We must provide something in the Act to bring this box under the purview of the Post Office Department. The ordinary post office box is a post office for the purpose of the Act, and we wish to have the same declared as regards to the stamp vending box.

Mr. BARKER. So that, for instance, in case there should be a robbery it would come within the Act?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many of these vending machines are leased, and what amount of money is to be paid?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The machine is not leased but sold to the department. In certain cases machines are not under the entire supervision of the department. This applies to boxes located in distant districts, for instance in lumber camps. The Minister of Labour has several requests from people in lumber camps asking that they should be given the benefit of these boxes because nobody could be appointed postmaster in the deep recesses of our Canadian woods. The machines will be neither leased nor purchased by the department, but authority will be given to the company supplying the boxes to place them under our direction and the company will

be held to act as our agents. As my hon. friend is aware, each box is provided with a roller of stamps. The company will buy the stamps from the department, and we will pay to the vendors the ordinary commission we pay to stamp vendors.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the cost of a box?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think $25 is the cost of the box with one slot. But Dr. Coulter, the Deputy Postmaster General and Mr. Ross, of Toronto, have stated that the experiments we have made this winter with the boxes have shown that the public prefer the double box, one that will sell both one cent and two cent stamps. These double boxes cost about $40 or $50; I can give the exact figure on Monday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many does the minister intend to place?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We will have to create districts, and the demand, whatever it may be, will be met. The public desire to have devices to save time as much as possible. With the increase of population and the extraordinary expansion of letter writing, we have to meet that demand of the public. I do not say how many boxes. I suppose for the first year we will have two or three hundred. But at all events, we will have a sufficient supply.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is this a Canadian invention?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is a British invention, and I said before six o'clock, that it was the best invention known up to date. That is the opinion of the British experts. At the same time, I may say for the benefit of Canadian inventors that we are not wedded to this particular box, and if they can find a better one we will adopt it. It is a conscientious box. We have never seen a box yet which would give back spurious coin or foreign coin. In this one, if you do not put in a Canadian penny or a Canadian cent, the box rejects it automatically. I intend to bring one of these boxes next week up to the House for the inspection of members. In Australia, in Germany, it has been adopted by the postal authorities. Last year when I was in Liverpool the postmaster showed me one of these boxes which collected, I do not know how many pounds a day.

Mr. KNOWLES. The minister has told us about a machine which will sell stamps for the amount of money, one-cent or two-cents, dropped into the box. Probably the minister knows that in the west there are no coppers nothing but silver money. I would ask him whether he has considered the need of a stamp vending machine that will sell stamps for a five cent piece or a ten cent piece? There is perhaps greater need in the west of such a machine than in the east, for the reason that accommodation provided in the west in a very short time becomes inadequate, and something that would remove the congestion from the stamp vending wicket in the post office building would in a great many towns be much more of a necessity than it is in the east, on account of the more rapid development.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The object of this legislation is precisely to meet that contingency, namely, that in the west, and in cities where there is a rush at certain seasons, we may assist the post office authorities by placing this box in the lobbies. It helps them both in mailing letters, and it saves the government the commission we have been paying to vendors of stamps. With regard to giving change, this box is not adapted for that, but this is the latest device. If later on another better device is found which will sell stamps for a five or a ten cent piece, we will adopt it.

Mr. HENDERSON. Has the minister committed himself to take this machine from only one particular firm, or may he purchase elsewhere if some other invention came out?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly. We are not wedded, as I have said, to this particular automatic machine. I have simply described the latest machine as being the best one yet discovered. But if in the future a Canadian inventor—and there are many Canadians working in that line—discovers a better device, certainly we will adopt it. The same with the rural box. We have adopted the red box called the 'King Edward' box, which, according to experts, is the best up to date box. But if a better one can be found we will certainly adopt it. At present the American authorities have accepted our rural box because they think it is the best.

Mr. KNOWLES. I did not speak of a box that would return the change. What I had in mind was a machine which would return the stamps for five, ten or twenty-five cent piece thrown into it. In the west where we have no coppers, we cannot buy stamps in a less quantity than five cents worth.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Many men are working on this device daily, and if my hon. friend will come to the Post Office Department he will see a number of new devices.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). The fact that this machine has a conscience will be no embarrassment to the government, I hope. Is there any way by which immoral literature can be rejected?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, it does not deal with literature.

On the preamble,

Mr. HENDERSON. The Postmaster General will remember that for several years past I have drawn his attention to the fact that in the cities drop letters were reduced from two cents to one cent. This saving was given to those who reside in the cities where there is a street delivery, and I think it is only fair that in rural sections the people should be given an equivalent. I see no better way of doing it than for the minister to give the same reduction on drop letters to people living in country villages and towns that he gives to those living in the cities. The people in the cities have the benefit of a free delivery, but in the country the people have to go to the post office for their mail matter. Yet they have to pay the same postage on a drop letter that is paid in a city where the letter is delivered at the door of the person to whom it is addressed. The minister told me a year or two ago that after he had a year's experience in the working of the one cent drop letter in the cities, he would be prepared to consider the propriety of accepting or rejecting my proposition. I have waited now patiently for more than two years, and I think it is time the country people should get this little benefit. Merchants send out a great many circulars, and half a cent on each circular would, in the course of a year, amount to considerable money. You may say that the government wants the money, but the government is rich and the revenue is abundant. It seems to me that this is something that the Postmaster General might meet the demand of the country in, by giving a half cent rate to medical men, lawyers, merchants and any others who had occasion to mail a good many letters; in fact, give this reduction to any one. There will be no difficulty in buying half cent stamps. If a man could not get a half cent stamp he could buy two and use the new machine the minister might require to have an additional roler so as to turn out half cent stamps.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That difficulty could be got over.

Mr. HENDERSON. That difficulty could be got over. Can the Postmaster General tell me if he can get over the other difficulty?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend is very persistent in his efforts for further reduction of the postal rates.

Mr. HENDERSON. I beg my hon. friend's pardon; in the rural section we have not had any reduction for a long time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend must not forget that when Sir William Mulock was in office some years ago, he reduced the rate from three cents to two.

Mr. HENDERSON. But that did not apply to the one cent rate.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A further reduction was made three years ago by myself for drop letters in cities. As to a half cent rate for the rural sections of the country, I may say to my hon. friend, without committing the government or any one, that I am seriously considering this question. Of course, it is a question of revenue and I must be very careful. I must be—well, let me say—conservative in this regard, but, when the proper time comes, if it is at all possible to meet the desires of the rural community, I will certainly be only too happy to grant the reduction. I am seriously considering the matter, but it is not one of the things that can be done in a haphazard way, and we must consider whether the reduction we are giving the people in, for instance, rural mail delivery, and other facilities which we provide, all of which must increase the expenditure, can be supplemented by a further reduction. It is true the revenues are abundant and increasing every year, but at the same time we must not lose sight of the fact that two cents is a very low rate. There is no country in the world where the people pay so little for the carriage of newspapers—one quarter of a cent a pound. Again I say I am studying this question with my officials. I know that the more you reduce the rates the more you are apt to get larger revenues. That is my experience, and that is why I have always been advocating a fair reduction of rates. It has meant for the Post Office Department larger revenues. If we had cheaper rates for cables I think that the cable companies would receive larger revenues. That is my policy and it is the experience of the experts we have in the Post Office Department.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister refers to the fact that in country places rural mail delivery is being introduced. But the reduction that I have referred to would have no connection with the rural mail delivery. Where I ask for a reduction is where a letter is dropped into the post office and taken out of the same post office, the result being that the department is not put to any expense to carry it to any other place. I think the matter is a very simple one and one that should appeal especially to the Postmaster General. If he could reduced the postage to half a cent to such men as general merchants, I have no hesitation in saying that

he would find that he would get just as much revenue out of the half cent rate as out of the cent rate, because I believe they would make a great deal more use of the post office. I am glad to know that the minister has this under his serious consideration. I hope it will become more serious and it will not be long until we realize something out of it.

Mr. KNOWLES. I desire to make a suggestion to the hon. Postmaster General which I hope he will also take under his favourable consideration. It is in regard to the correspondence which members of parliament have during recess. I do not know whether this matter has been brought to the minister's attention before, although I think that probably it has. I can see no reason why members of the House of Commons, carrying on correspondence during the recess upon public business, should not have the facilities of the mail just as well as during the time that the House of Commons is in session. If anything I believe that the correspondence of members in regard to public business is larger during the period of the recess, because, while the House of Commons is in session a member is in Ottawa and goes to the departments personally, and it is because he is away from Ottawa that the correspondence between himself and his constituents increases. I think the thing is right, and that it is in the interest of the member giving the best possible service to his constituents. It necessarily follows that if a member of parliament in carrying on correspondence with his people, has these facilities to which, I think, he has a perfect right, they will get better service; not that any member is going to refrain from writing to his constituents for the sake of the cent or two postage that it may involve, and I do not know that it makes a great difference in that respect, but in this world with most men every dollar counts and it is scarcely fair to ask members to bear this charge themselves. It is nothing more than fair that the country should provide him with these facilities. Of course the question occurs as to how a man is going to draw the line. I do not think that any great practical difficulty is presented by that question. We know that in the United States they have a penalty envelope, that is an envelope specially prepared for that purpose. I do not know that members of the House of Representatives or Senate use it, but I know that the Post Office Department does issue certain penalty envelopes which certain public officers residing away from the capital use. I do not know what the penalty is, it may be $40 or $50 for improper use, but that is immaterial to the principle of the thing.

Mr. HENDERSON.

I do not think that there will be any danger of members of parliament failing to correctly draw the line as between correspondence on public business and corresponence on their own private business. As one who has a large correspondence—and I think all western members have, as I have no doubt all members have—I would suggest to the minister that it would be only doing what is fair, and following the principle that is already adopted while we are in Ottawa to make provision that members of parliament carrying on correspondence in connection with public business with their constituents should have the same facilities during twelve months in the year that they have while parliament is in session.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will take the suggestion of my hon. friend under very serious consideration. Of course, it has no reference to the present Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the minister aware that during the past few days there has been some slight interference with the mails that are coming to the House? I understand that a number of papers which should have been delivered this morning in the Library and in the Senate library did not arrive either by the morning or evening mail. Possibly the minister will make some investigation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As my hon. friend is aware, the post office in the House of Commons is not under my jurisdiction. It is under the jurisdiction of the committee on internal economy. I am sorry to hear that there has been some mis-sent mail matter, but I will inquire. I found not very long ago that it took more time for a letter mailed in the House of Commons in the evening to reach the Post Office Department next morning than it took for a letter mailed in Montreal to reach my department. I saw the Speaker about it and found that the officers of the post office here closed the mails when the House adjourned, and the mails sometimes were sent only next morning from the Ottawa post office, while they could very well have been sent by the Toronto train until half past eleven at night, and the westbound train from Montreal passing through Ottawa about five o'clock in the morning. The Speaker was kind enough to call the postmaster, and to instruct him, with the help of one additional clerk, to keep the bag open until the early hours in the morning so as to give members the benefit of having their mails sent by those trains. As regards the error of this morning, I will inquire at once and see where the trouble lies.

Mr. HENDERSON. A great many members of this House get copies of their

speeches from the Printing Bureau, where the type is already set up, for distribution through the post office. There is a provision in the regulations to this effect:

Members of either the Senate or the House of Commons may during the recess of parliament send by mail free of Canadian postage all papers printed by order of either House.

Will the minister inform me whether a member could during the recess send these copies of his speeches free of postage from the post office where he lives, in case he could not get them from the Bureau until after the House had prorogued.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is another regulation which permits a member, within a certain time after prorogation, I think a fortnight, to mail public documents, bluebooks, &c., from his home office.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think he can do that all the year round.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As regards the case mentioned, I will look into it and see if I can accommodate the members in that respect. Of course, it is better to have the mailable matter sent in bulk from Ottawa, and distributed from here. If necessary, we can provide some regulation which would meet the contingency mentioned. The trouble is that it might be abused; but of course we must believe in the honour of every member of the House of Commons, and I think I can frame a regulation that would meet the case.

Mr. HENDERSON. If we could have the King's Printer stamp his impress on the copies, then I am quite sure the present regulation would be sufficient.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to call the minister's attention to a fraudulent use of the mails in western Ontario. In yesterday's London 'Free Press' there is an article in which it is stated:

Letters are finding their way from the United States to all parts of Ontario, offering counterfeit money for sale. These 'greengoods' men choose farmers principally for their victims, and in the letters, picture 'easy money' that can be made if the recipient of the letter will communicate with the man who has the goods.

If the minister would call the attention of the authorities in western Ontario to this matter, it might be of some service.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SEED CONTROL ACT.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 167), respecting the inspection and sale of seeds.—Mr. Fisher.

On section 1,

Mr. FISHER. This Bill was considered by the Committee on Agriculture, and with the exception of one or two small amendments it passed that committee unanimously.

Mr. HENDERSON. Is the Bill now as recommended by the Committee on Agriculture?

Mr. FISHER. Exactly.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the object of exempting by the operation of sections 6 and 7, certain classes of persons mentioned in section 5?

Mr. FISHER. It is so that farmers may sell to their neighbours without coming under the operation of the Act. That is a provision of the old law.

Mr. JAMESON. I presume that the object of this legislation is to prevent the use of seed which is not pure?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly.

Mr. JAMESON. Does the minister think that by the exception he makes in section 5 that will be accomplished?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, because the neighbours who buy from a farmer have had an opportunity to see the crop growing and they know whether the seed is clean or not. But the dealers sell the seed to purchasers who have no means of knowing how it was grown. This provision has been in the Act since its inception.

Mr. HERRON. Does the case mentioned this afternoon come within the meaning of the Act, so that if the peeople sell wheat for seed, containing a certain percentage of weeds——?

Mr. FISHER. Any grain sold for seeding purposes comes under the operation of this Act.

On section (10a), a name on a paper of seeds must state name and year when filled.

Mr. FISHER. This is an amendment proposed by the hon. member for Peel (Mr. Blain), and accepted by the committee.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT.

Bill (No. 153) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards the weight of a bushel and a bag of certain articles.—Mr. Fisher—read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would the minister explain what changes have been made?

Mr. FISHER. Artichokes were not included in the original Act at all. Beans are the same, 60 lbs. to the bushel. Beets

were 60 lbs., and are now made 50. Bituminous coal is the same. Blue grass seed is the same, 14 lbs. Carrots were 60 in the old Act, and they are now made 50. Castor beans are the same. Clover seed is the same. Hemp seed was 49, and it is now made 44. Lime is the same, 70 lbs. Malt is the same, 36 lbs. Onions are the same, 50 lbs. Parsnips were 60, and are now made 45. Potatoes are the same, 60 lbs. Timothy seed is the same, 48 lbs. Turnips were 60 lbs., and are now made 50. All these changes were made at the request of the Vegetable Growers' Associations of Ontario and Quebec. They explain that the weights in the old Act were so high that the ordinary measurement never came up to the weight. They say that the weights now adopted are reasonable, and are in accord with the ordinary measure of a bushel.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand that the weight of lime is left where it was before. Has the minister ever had any test made as to whether that is the correct weight of a bushel of lime? I remember it was formerly 80 lbs., and I think that was made at the suggestion of some member of the Senate, but it was reduced at my suggestion, and I was wondering whether the minister has ever had it confirmed.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot say that I have officially. I have myself purchased lime and weighed it, and I know it was very rare that you could get a bushel of lime that weighed 80 lbs. I think 70 is the correct weight.

Mr. HENDERSON. We had a test made in this way: I weighed a bushel of lump lime, and then took a bushel of fine lime and threw it in along with the larger pieces, and of course the smaller lime disappeared amongst the larger lumps, but, strange to say, it made no difference in the weight.

On subsection 2,

Mr. SEXSMITH. You provide that a bag of potatoes shall weigh 80 lbs., unless a bag by measure is specially agreed upon. Is that the legal standard?

Mr. FISHER. There is no legal standard to-day for a bag of potatoes, except in the province of Ontario. This will make 80 lbs. the legal standard all over the Dominion.

Mr. HENDERSON. The minister knows that 90 lbs is the correct weight.

Mr. FISHER. I always expected to get 90 lbs. if I bought a bag. But at the same time it has been 80 in the province of Quebec for a long time, and now we make it 80 all over the Dominion. Many representations were made, both to myself and to the Department of Trade and Commerce, asking that the weight be made 80 lbs.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Has 90 lbs. been the legal weight in Ontario?

Mr. FISHER There was no legal weight in Ontario.

Mr. HENDERSON. I assume the minsiter knows why it was made 80 lbs.? In the province of Quebec it was made 80 lbs. because that was the weight of an ordinary bag of potatoes, and that weight was made to conform to the size of the bag. In Montreal I think they use a great many sugar bags, and the farmers who fill them with potatoes find that a bag will hold 90 lbs. So they made the weight 90 lbs. in order to conform to the size of the bag. Under our former legislation that weight was confined to the province of Quebec, and I am not sure but that it should be confined there still, and let 90 lbs. be the legal weight of a bag of potatoes.

Mr. FISHER. There have been a good many smaller bags in use of late years in other parts of the country than Quebec. Strong representations were made from farmers outside of Quebec to reduce the weight of a bag of potatoes to 80 lbs. The regular two-bushel grain bag, which is the well known cotton grain bag, holds two bushels of grain, and will hold 90 lbs. of potatoes if it is well filled and shaken down. But there are many smaller bags used now, and grain is now nearly all sold by weight without reference to bags. Grain is now put into any kind of a bag, whereas it used to be put generally into a two-bushel bag. Now bags vary in size. I know they are with us and I think they are all over the country. There is no fixed standard of capacity for a bag and it, therefore, has been thought well by people who are interested in this trade that a bag of these different things should have a fixed weight. It is proposed that a bag of potatoes shall be 80 lbs.

Mr. THORNTON. The invariable rule has been that a bag of any kind of roots or fruit should be a bushel and a half. Now you depart from that with regard to a great many of the articles that are mentioned in this list. It will deceive the public greatly if this change is made. The change with regard to the weight of a bag of potatoes is a very drastic one.

Mr. FISHER. The only standard that there ever has been for a weight of a bag of any of these articles has been with respect to a bag of potatoes in the province of Quebec. Until now there has been no standard weight for bag of any of these articles.

Mr. THORNTON. What was the practice?

Mr. FISHER. It varied in different parts of the country. I think that in Ontario a bag of potatoes was usually a bushel and a half, or 90 pounds, and in other parts of the country it was not. In the maritime provinces I believe it was 75 pounds, while in Quebec, by the law of the land, it was 80 pounds. These people have requested that it be made uniform all over the country at 80 pounds.

Mr. THORNTON. As far as potatoes are concerned, it is going to lead to very serious difficulty as between buyers and sellers if that rule is adopted.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I agree with my hon. friend from Durham (Mr. Thornton). The standard rule in the province of Ontario, as long as I can remember, has been 90 pounds for a bag of potatoes. The minister says that the ordinary cotton bag used on the farms has to be filled up and well shaken down to hold 90 pounds of potatoes. He has evidently not weighed many potatoes in ordinary cotton bags, because they do not require to be shaken down to get a weight of 90 pounds. But there is a flour bag which is used on the farms, and in order to put 90 pounds into that it has to be shaken down and tied very closely. It will cause a great deal of confusion for some time, throughout Ontario, at least, where the public have been so accustomed to dealing in a 90-pound bag of potatoes, if you adopt 80 pounds as the standard bag it will practically compel the farmer, who sells a bag of potatoes as a bag, to sell by weight. The old standard measure of a bushel and a half to the bag was considered correct, and no doubt was correct. In our part of the country they buy potatoes by the bag at 90 pounds, and it will cause confusion if you bring about this change.

Mr. FISHER. These weights have been fixed upon representations of people interested who have come to us from time to time. A delegation came down to see the Minister of Trade and Commerce in regard to this Bill, and these are the weights fixed upon by them. I have received a great many representations in the way of correspondence which I have transferred to the department of my hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce, because, this being an amendment to the Inspection and Sale Act, it comes under his department. I have had a great many representations from different parts of the country, a good many, I think, from Ontario. I do not remember just now where they all came from, but I am sure that some came from Ontario, asking for this change.

Mr. THORNTON. Who comprised the deputation?

Mr. FISHER. They called themselves the vegetables growers of Ontario and the vegetables growers of Quebec.

Mr. THORNTON. Not farmers?

Mr. FISHER. No, they were not farmers.

Mr. THORNTON. Were the dealers interested in the same way?

Mr. FISHER. I think the dealers would be in that deputation. This will not hurt the farmer. It is the purchaser, not the farmer, that will be hurt, if anybody is hurt, because the farmer will be able to sell 80 pounds as a bag in future instead of 90.

Mr. THORNTON. The only objection I can see to it is that it will cause confusion and hard feeling between buyer and seller.

Mr. FISHER. Of course, it may take a little time for the new standard to be understood, but evidently there has been a very positive request for this from the people who seem to be concerned in the trade.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I do not see that it is a great detriment to the farmer, but hundreds of thousands of people will be buying potatoes all over Ontario, they will not know that this new standard has been fixed for the next five years, and they will think that they are getting 90 pounds when they buy potatoes from the grocer, whereas they are only getting 80 pounds.

Mr. NESBITT. Will they not soon adjust themselves to the new conditions? It does take a good sized measure of potatoes to weigh 90 pounds. As a matter of fact, dealers will accustom themselves to this change, and the price will be fixed accordingly.

Mr. FISHER. These weights were also submitted to the officers of the Experimental Farm, Messds. Grisdale and Macoun, and they tested and approved them.

Mr. SEXSMITH. How would they test the weight of a bag? They could test the weight of a bushel, but I do not know how they could test the weight of a bag of 80 pounds.

Mr. THORNTON. What measures did they use in testing the bag?

Mr. FISHER. Of course, for the bushel, they took the regular bushel measure. The first part of this clause provides for the weight of a bushel. I do not know how they tested the weight of the bag.

Mr. THORNTON. What is the size of the bushel with which they made this test?

Mr. FISHER. It is the regular standard bushel. The Inspection and Sale Act says what the bushel is.

Mr. HENDERSON. 2,142 inches, is it not?

Mr. FISHER. I am not sure.

Mr. HERRON. I can understand that if you provide for the use of the bushel measure in filling the bag, it will work all right, but if you do not I am afraid it will result in a great deal of inconvenience. A farmer will not be able to determine very accurately what quantity of potatoes he has in his sack except by having a pair of scales on the farm. A bushel measure is a very cheap article, and he can easily determine the quantity of potatoes that he is putting in the bag with the aid of the bushel measure.

Mr. FISHER. He requires to use scales just as much now as he will if this Bill is passed. The standard of practice in the province of Ontario, I believe, has been 90 pounds, and the 90 pounds is now required as absolutely as the 80 pounds will be.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think this may cause great confusion, and that great publicity should be given to the changes made before the Act is put into operation. The coming into force of the Act should be postponed until some future day, perhaps a year from next January.

Mr. FISHER. The proposition to postpone the coming into force of the Act is a reasonable one, but I think that next January would be a sufficient delay.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The other would be only one crop of potatoes.

Mr. THORNTON. Does it fix the weight of a bushel of apples?

Mr. FISHER. No. I would suggest that we should pass the other clauses of the Bill which are not controversial and leave it in committee until I have an opportunity of consulting the Minister of Trade and Commerce on the question of deferring the coming into operation of the Bill. I have not had charge of the drafting of the Bill.

Mr. SEXSMITH. We should have some definite promise that it will not be brought into force until the 1st of January.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot promise that myself.

On section 2, existing Act repealed,

Mr. FISHER. The royal assent was given during this session to a Bill introduced by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., (Mr. Carvell) fixing the weight of a barrel of potatoes at 165 pounds. The Minister of Trade and Commerce thought it best to include that enactment under this Bill, and so avoid confusion, and this has been done. This fixes the standard at that weight.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the legal weight of a bag of potatoes in the United States?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know.

Mr. JAMESON. If we are framing our legislation on the American legislation in this matter, we should know just what their standards are.

Mr. FISHER. I shall find that out.

Mr. SEXSMITH. Eighty pounds to a bag, and 165 pounds to a barrel seems inconsistent.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there is any interchange between the bag and the barrel.

On section 3, weight of barrel.

Mr. HENDERSON. You determine the size of the barrel by the number of pounds. Could you not give the capacity of the barrel by giving the height, and the diameter at the top and middle as with apple barrels?

Mr. FISHER. The reason that the size of the apple barrel is fixed by measurement is that apples vary greatly in weight, according to variety. The summer varieties of apples weigh 10 pounds per barrel less than the winter varieties. That difference does not exist with potatoes.

Mr. SEXSMITH. How is a man buying a barrel of potatoes to know that it is a legal barrel?

Mr. FISHER. If he had any suspicion he would have to weigh it.

Progress reported.

FOREST RESERVES.

Bill (No. 85) respecting forest reserves and parks, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. OLIVER. The major portion of the provisions of this Bill are already contained in the Forest Reserves Act. The most important differences between the Bill and the Act are that provision is made for placing all present forest and park reservations under the provisions of the Forest Reserves Act, and then setting apart, within those forest reservations, park reservations with regard to which the regulations look to the enjoyment by the people of the natural advantages and beauties of those particular sections of the reserves, while the regulations regarding the remainder of the forest reserves look rather to the exclusion of people from them.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the hon. minister pardon me? I think this is too important a Bill to proceed with in so thin a House. I do not see the men here on either side who are sufficiently acquainted

with the matter dealt with in this Bill to deal with it intelligently, and we might as well leave it entirely in the minister's hands and let him put it through himself. If he has some other measure of less importance, I would suggest that he take it up and let this stand to come up in a full House earlier in the day.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite appreciate the point of view of my hon. friend, and I do not wish to minimize the importance of the Bill. I would like to say another word. Besides the provisions which I have mentioned, there is another important feature of the Bill. It sets apart by legislation the Rocky Mountain Park Reserve, extending along the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains from the boundary until it is crossed by the boundary between British Columbia and Alberta

Mr. THORNTON. Will it be entirely in Alberta?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes. There is a reservation over a great deal of that country, by order in council passed last year; but since that time a careful examination has been made for the purpose of drawing what might be called a fairly scientific boundary between what is properly the park and what is not the park, and this Bill asks that this new boundary be adopted as the boundary of the park which will be set apart by legislative enactment.

Mr. THORNTON. Has the Conservation Commission recommended this Bill or been consulted in the matter?

Mr. OLIVER. The Conservation Commission recommended the setting apart of the reserve on the whole of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and the Bill is in accordance with that recommendation. I am not aware that the commission made recommendations in regard to any other section of the Bill, because the Act now on the statute-book, which this Bill follows, with the exceptions I have mentioned, was in force before the Conservation Commission came into existence.

Mr. ROCHE. Does this Bill interfere with the present boundaries of the Duck Mountains reserve, the Riding Mountains reserve or the Turtle Mountains reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. I was going to say that besides that reservation, which will include the present reserves of the Kootenay Lakes park, the Rocky Mountains park at Banff, and the Jasper park, a careful examination of the other reserves created by the Act of 1906 has been made, and as a result of that examination there have been some alterations in the boundaries, which I would of course be prepared to state to the House at length. There have been some considerable additions made, in some cases small portions have been taken out of the reserves, and in one case, the Manitoba reserve has been dispensed with altogether, and a considerable area of the Donald Forest reserve it has been decided to throw open to settlement. The legislative features of the Bill are not important, as they do not differ materially from the provisions of the Act now on the statute-book. At the same time, I do not wish to minimize the desirability of the full House having a complete understanding of the Bill, and therefore, in deference to my hon. friend, I would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the minister any map of the proposed reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I have a map which shows all the reserves, with all the alterations and additions, which I can leave on the table for the information of the House between now, and the future consideration of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do these reserves on the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains comprise pretty nearly all the eastern water-shed of the Rockies?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, I think they do. In setting apart the reservation we were guided by the principle that land at an elevation of 4,000 feet and over was not suitable for agricultural purposes, though it could still be used for grazing, because the grazing right does not involve alienation of the surface.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not intended to dispose of the timber on the reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not open to the ordinary demand for timber, but the timber is to be disposed of at the option and on the responsibility of the department when it is mature. The idea is that the timber shall be administered with a view to preservation reproduction rather than to profit but it is not at all intended that the timber shall not be used.

Progress reported.

DOMINION LANDS ACT — ORDERS IN COUNCIL APPROVED.

The House went again into committee to consider a proposed resolution that certain orders in council under the Dominion Lands Act, chapter 20 of the statutes of 1908, are approved.

Mr. HENDERSON. This seems to be a pretty big proposition to be taken up at a quarter past ten on Friday night when we were here till five o'clock this morning, and especially when there are only one or two men in the House who can reasonably

be supposed to have any knowledge of the matter involved.

Mr. OLIVER. This matter was brought before the House some time ago, and, at the request of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), all the orders which approval is asked for were printed, and, of course, have been in the hands of members for several months. I do not wish in this case either to minimize the importance of the matter for which the approval of the House is asked; but I do think that in this as in other cases the House would be warranted in giving its approval, having had an opportunity to fully study these orders. I think that the formal action of the House is all that should be necessary, because the orders have been in operation and the House is well informed as to the facts.

Mr. DOHERTY. I quite recognize that the orders in council have been before us for some time. I got a copy of them quite two months ago. I went over them then and it did strike me that there were some matters of considerable importance and which it might be desirable from my own point of view to have some information. I consulted the representatives of western constituencies better informed in these matters, and they agreed with me. I made some notes on the subject at the time. But I have mislaid that one copy of the resolution. I sent several times for another copy, but was told it was impossible to get them. We are not now in a very good position to take up this resolution, and, in the second place, the western members who are the men really interested in these things are not numerously represented here to-night. I think it would be well not to press the matter under the circumstances.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why were so small a number of copies printed?

Mr. OLIVER. I think there was an ample number printed for the use that was contemplated. But as this document contains all these orders it may have been found convenient to give them out for general information, and the number of copies printed that would have been ample for the use of the House was not at all sufficient for the more general circulation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose I must have received a copy, but I confess I did not know that they were distributed. The statutes, if I remember correctly, require that the resolutions shall be passed before the expiration of the session. So it is not really very urgent.

Mr. OLIVER. No, it is business that I wish to have disposed of if possible, but I would not wish to force it.

Mr. HENDERSON

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the hon. gentleman send a copy to the member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty)?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Progress reported.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENT.

On order for second reading of Bill (No. 107) to amend the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. OLIVER. This is a Bill for making minor amendments to the Dominion Lands Act, which authorizes the leasing of school lands for revenue purposes towards the school funds. Up to the present time we have been leasing school lands, and there is a question as to our statutory authority to do so. It was thought well to make statutory provision to that end, and a clause was prepared for that purpose. Since notice was given of this Bill, circumstances have arisen that have made it desirable to secure certain other minor amendments to the Act. I now wish to withdraw this Bill, and at the same time to give notice of the introduction of another Bill of the same name, but which would contain certain other additional provisions, in all cases making minor amendments which are considered necessary to the successful operation of the Act. I move, therefore, that Order 18 for the second reading of Bill (No. 107) be discharged.

Motion agreed to.

ERRORS IN FRENCH VERSION OF INLAND REVENUE ACT.

Bill (No. 132) to correct certain clerical errors in the French version of the Inland Revenue Act—Mr. Templeman—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. In the French version of the Revised Statutes, clause 252, the word 'huit' has been substituted for the word 'quatre.' The consequence is to impose an inland revenue tax of eight cents per gallon instead of four cents. We wish to use the word 'quatre.' This section also amends the French version of section 356 of the said Act by inserting after the word 'loi' in the sixth line thereof, the words 'est coupable d'un acte criminal et,' which words have been left out of the Act.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was much surprised to see in the report of the Secretary of State so extraordinary a number of errors made in the French version of the statutes. I cannot understand why they should occur so frequently. I think there were in that report two pages of errors in

recent statutes. It does seem a remarkable thing that the word 'huit' should be substituted for the word 'quatre' in the French version, and it seems equally remarkable that the very important phrase which the minister has quoted should be left out at the end of a section. I would like to know the meaning of it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is only one explanation, that is defective translation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not a translation at all when these important words are left out. But what I cannot understand is how they should occur so frequently.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I cannot account for it on any other theory than carelessness somewhere, and I suppose on the part of the translators.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems important that whatever authority is charged with the supervision on this work should see that greater care is used in making the translation. Perhaps the Secretary of State can tell us how it is that these errors occur.

Mr. MURPHY. I cannot give my hon. friend any other information than what he possesses. If there are errors in the printing, it is the fault of the printer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some of these errors are attributed in some way to the Printing Bureau. The Secretary of State will remember that in his report there is a long list of errors, I think two pages. I do not know whether they are attributable to the translators or to the Printing Bureau.

Mr. MURPHY. They are attributable to the translators, and they were discovered by the officials of the Printing Bureau in reading the proof.

Mr. DOHERTY. Are the English and French editions of these statutes issued simultaneously?

Mr. MURPHY. Almost.

Mr. DOHERTY. After they are printed, is anybody in a position to compare the two versions and see that they have been printed identically? Is there any system by which these translations are compared? We should not be running the risk of sending out two laws disagreeing with each other.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The question raised by the member for St. Anne is an important one. Are the statutes passed in this parliament in English and French at the same time, or are they passed in English and a French translation made afterwards? Is there an English version and a French version of statutes at the time they pass this House, and the Senate, and at the time they receive the assent of the Governor in Council? It seems to me that is what should be done. Both languages are the languages of legislation in this country.

Mr. FIELDING. Bills of course are always required to be printed in both languages, and in practice they are. So that at the time, parliament enacted it with that general amendment. I should think that there is no reason why these should not be published in both languages at the same time. Mr. Speaker, who has the supervision of this matter, informs me that he will have a memorandum prepared giving an explanation of this error, and that he will be able to bring it before the House on some future occasion. There is no doubt that is a clerical error in translation.

Mr. JAMESON. This appears to be a Bill to amend the revised statutes of 1906 for the purpose of correcting an error that has occurred in the French version. I would like to ask the minister when it was that this error was discovered, when he first knew of it and why this delay has occurred in bringing in this amendment to make the necessary correction?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Personally I have only known of it for the last six months. The Deputy Minister called my attention to it six months ago and he thought it was necessary to amend the French version. How long my deputy has known of it I do not know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They have been paying eight cents?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No; four cents.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PROHIBITION OF OPIUM AND OTHER DRUGS.

Consideration of amendments made by the Senate to Bill (No. 97) to prohibit the improper use of opium and other drugs.—Mr. King.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the amendments?

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). These amendments do not affect in any way the principle of the Bill. The first amendment is the insertion of the words 'shall be guilty of a criminal offence' in a number of the sections. The law as it stands states that a person doing

certain things shall be liable to summary conviction and to a certain fine. The senators thought that it would be just as well to put in the words 'shall be guilty of a criminal offence.' I do not think that they are absolutely necessary, but the Senate seems to think that they will make the meaning clearer and as the prevention of certain evils is the object sought their insertion of these words is in line with the purpose of the Bill I do not see that there can be any objection to it. The second amendment is to section 5 of the Bill, and it is the insertion of the words 'or to a bona fide wholesale druggist' after the word 'dentist' in the 15th line. Section 5 prohibits the sale of certain drugs to any person other than a physician, veterinary surgeon or dentist, except upon conditions prescribed by the Act. It seemed advisable to the Senate to allow the same privilege, in the matter of sale, to a bona fide wholesale druggist and, therefore, they inserted these words.

Mr. DOHERTY. Would not the words 'a druggist carrying on business in a bona fide drug store' cover that?

Mr. KING. A wholesale druggist might not have any drug store at all; he might simply have a place of business and for that reason he comes within a different category. The remaining amendment is to the schedule. The Act specifies certain drugs in the schedule which it shall be unlawful to sell except under certain conditions. These drugs are cocaine, morphine and opium. The Senate thought it well to add, after the words 'cocaine' and 'morphine,' the words 'or any salts or compounds thereof.' That addition was made on the advice of the medical adviser of the Conservation Commission and also on the advice of the director general of public health. The intention of parliament in inserting cocaine and morphine was to deal with these two particular drugs and it was felt that unless the words 'or any salts or compounds thereof' were added a violation of the intention of the Act might result. Then, the Senate provide in addition the words 'eucaine or any salts or compounds thereof.' Eucaine is a comparatively new drug much the same as cocaine and has much the same effect. It is in the nature of a powder which, I believe, is snuffed by people who use it and which has the same destructive effect as cocaine and opium. As these amendments, and particularly the last one, strengthen the Bill, and as they carry out the intention of this House, I am of opinion that they should be agreed to.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Are these not covered by section 14?

Mr. KING. No; section 14 says that the Governor in Council may add to the schedule of this Act any alkaloids, derivatives or preparations of the drugs named. Eucaine is not one of the drugs named. On the other hand I suppose that any salts or compounds of the drugs named could be added by order in council, but they are I think better specified comprehensively in the Act itself. The Senate thought it better to specify salts and compounds generally in the Bill.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The section which I have here says that the Governor in Council may add any compounds or substances.

Mr. KING. The hon. gentleman has the Bill as introduced but not as passed. The Bill as passed was changed in some particulars. We confined the list of drugs to cocaine, morphine and opium.

Mr. DOHERTY. I suppose that we can assume that the senators all know what eucaine is, because I must confess that I have no knowledge what it is.

Mr. KING. The suggestion has come from the medical adviser of the Conservation Commission which has to do, enough other things with the conservation of human resourses.

Amendments agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 10.42 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MONDAY, May 1, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION — HON. FRANK OLIVER.

On the orders of the day being called:

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I desire to call your attention to a matter which was brought to the attention of the House on Friday last by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Prime Minister referred to an article which has appeared in a Toronto paper in which no names were mentioned. Since that time articles have appeared in other papers in which my name is mentioned. I have not yet had an opportunity to consider these articles, but I hope to be able to make some observations in the matter to-morrow.

CORONATION CONTINGENT—LT.-COL. LANDRY.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I notice a paragraph in 'La Patrie' of Saturday about the commanding officers of the Coronation Contingent in which it is stated that Hon. Mr. Brodeur and Hon. Mr. Lemieux objected so strenuously in council to the appointment of Lt.-Col. Landry that Sir Frederick Borden was forced to appoint another commanding officer belonging to the Liberal party. I may say that this paragraph, from beginning to end, is without foundation in fact. Lt.-Col. Landry is a personal friend of mine, indeed a college mate of mine. His name never came before me in connection with this matter, and I had nothing to do with the selection of the commanding officer of the Coronation Contingent; in fact, this is the first time I have heard his name mentioned in this connection.

INQUIRIES FOR RETURNS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) whether or not the return I spoke of the other day has been prepared?

Mr. MURPHY. It has. I have signed it, and I thought it would have been here. I will see that it is brought down before the House rises.

Mr. FOSTER. I desire to ask the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) if he has yet given the additions which were asked for in relation to the curator's report?

Mr. FIELDING. There were some supplementary papers, which I thought had been submitted to the House. But, I find they have not been. I will have them printed to-morrow.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) if the remainder of the return that was asked for—part was put as a question and part stood as a notice of motion for return—in relation to trade statistics of the most favoured nations and the tariffs on goods going into those countries, is yet ready?

Mr. MURPHY. I have not this yet, but I will have inquiry made this afternoon about it.

NORTH ATLANTIC FISHERIES — ARBITRATION AT THE HAGUE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to mention to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) that I receive occasionally inquiries from different parts of the country for copies of the Hague Award in pamphlet form. People who are instructing students in constitutional law, libraries and institutions of various kinds in different parts of Canada would like very much to be furnished with copies of this award. I would suggest that it be printed, if that has not already been attended to. I think it is eminently desirable that copies of so important a pronouncement should be available for persons in this country who are interested.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I thought this would be included in the sessional papers. I should think it ought to be. But I will make inquiry.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I made some inquiry, but could not learn that it had been printed. My hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) tells me that he understands it has been printed.

Mr. FOSTER. What have we in the way of records of the extended proceedings of the Hague Conference? To what extent are they available?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not say how many copies we have, but I know we have a full report. I will inquire as to the number of copies.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. As to copies of the award of the tribunal at the Hague last summer, I have already distributed a very considerable number of copies of the award and proceedings, to every library or institution that has applied to me, and I still have quite a number of copies on hand which I shall be very glad to distribute as necessity may arise.

Mr. FOSTER. For myself personally I should like very much to have a set of this, as a matter of record.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are we to understand that the Hague Award has been printed and distributed, and that copies are available?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The award may have been. I will inquire.

NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill was before the committee on Friday, and my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) asked that it should be allowed to stand.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to have it stand, for the same reason that I have mentioned, that my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) is not here, and he is attending to it. I move that

the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

GRAIN GROWERS' GRAIN COMPANY, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Rutan.

On section 12, authorized objects or purposes of the company.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does this clause permit the company to deal in options?

Mr. STAPLES. I would like an explanation from the member who has the Bill in charge, whether this legislation is similar to that incorporating other grain companies that hold Dominion charters; and also I would like to know whether, under this Bill, the Grain Growers' Grain Company will be permitted to deal in options?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This Bill comes from the Senate. It has not been looked into, and I think perhaps the committee had better rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

JUDGES APPOINTED SINCE 1896.

Mr. LENNOX:

What are the names of the gentlemen appointed as judges by the present government of Canada since they came into power in 1896, the residences of these gentlemen at the time of appointment, the positions to which they were respectively appointed, and in each case where the appointee had a predecessor in the position during the time which the position was vacant?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The information asked for in this question would be so voluminous that it had better take the shape of a return. It will take some time to obtain the information as to the residences of the gentlemen appointed, and the date of their appointments.

COOL CHEESE CURING AT BROCKVILLE.

*Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Has the government sold the cool cheese curing room at Brockville? If so, at what price?
2. Did the government sell the machinery and fixtures with said building or separately? If separately, at what price?
3. What was the total cost of said building and machinery?
4. What was the total loss on said building and machinery?

Mr. LENNOX.

Mr. FISHER:

1. Yes, $1,241.42.
2. There was no machinery in the building except an elevator which was sold with the building. The lumber consisting of cheese shelves and some tools, chairs, &c., was sold separately, as follows:

Building	$1,075 00
Lumber	116 77
Tools, chairs, &c	19 65
Total	$1,211 42
From former sale of shelving	30 00
Total	$1,241 42

3. $7,553.26.
4. $6,311.84.

In addition to the above revenue from the disposal of the curing room, there should be included about $150 worth of lumber, weighing scales, cheese truck, which the department removed previous to the sale, which is being held for other purposes.

PRICES OF FARM PRODUCTS IN FOREIGN MARKETS.

Mr. LAKE:

What was the average price of beef, mutton, butter, and eggs for export at Buenos Ayres, Bahia Blanca, Sydney, Melbourne, Christchurch, Dunedin and Auckland, respectively, for each of the months of October, November and December, 1910, and January and February, 1911, or at such of these ports for which information is obtainable?

Mr. FISHER:

As the meat and butter exported from Australia and New Zealand is shipped to Great Britain on consignment, there is practically no export market in these countries for these products as the price is absolutely controlled by the English market. As a consequence the papers published in Australia give prominence to English market reports for butter and meats, but print very little information regarding local prices. A similar condition obtains in the Argentine. Great Britain is the market for their frozen and chilled meat which is either consigned or is sold by resident agents of the packing companies.

A few prices of butter and eggs in Australia and New Zealand have been taken from publications received from those countries. The Adelaide quotations have been taken from the report of the manager of the government produce export department as given in the journal of the Department of Agriculture of South Australia. The Sydney and Christchurch quotations have been taken from the Canterbury 'Times,' Christchurch, and the Auckland quotations have been taken from the Auckland Weekly 'News':

AUSTRALIA.

Adelaide—

Date.	Creamery Butter. per lb.	Eggs. per dozen.
1910.	Cents.	Cents.
Oct. 1..	20—22	14½
Nov. 1..	19—21	15
Dec. 1..	19—21	15
1911.		
Jan. 2..	19—22	17
Feb. 1..	22—25	17

Sydney—

Date.	Factory Butter per lb.	Eggs per dozen.
1911.	Cents.	Cents.
Jan. 12..	19½	..
Jan. 19..	19½	..
Feb. 2..	19½	..
Feb. 23..	19¼	..

NEW ZEALAND.

Christchurch—

Date.	Creamery Butter per lb.	Eggs per dozen.
1911.	Cents.	Cents.
Jan. 13..	24	20
Jan. 17..	24	20
Jan. 17..	24	20
Feb. 8..	24	26
Feb. 17..	25	22
Feb. 24..	24	24

Auckland—

Date.	Factory Butter per lb.	Eggs per dozen.
1911.	Cents.	Cents.
Feb. 21..	25	26

If the desire is to compare prices in these countries with prices in Canada it should not be forgotten that the months composing Canada's winter season would be in the Antipodes, the summer.

Mr. PATERSON:

STATEMENT showing the Quantity and Value of Butter and Mutton Entered for Consumption in Canada from the Undermentioned Countries, during the Months of October, November, December, 1910, January and February, 1911; showing also the Average Price of these Articles at Places of Export.

ARTICLES.	MONTHS.	AUSTRALIA.			NEW ZEALAND.		
		Quantity.	Value.	Average Price.	Quantity.	Value.	Average Price.
		Lbs.	$	Cts.	Lbs.	$	Cts.
Butter	October	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
	November	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	
	December	66,080	15,578	23·57	19,600	4,815	24·57
	January	108,416	25,542	23·55	92,400	24,303	26·30
	February	15,008	3,000	20·00	181,826	41,813	23·00
Mutton and lamb, fresh.	October	213,050	14,208	6·66	.....	.....	
	November	180,962	12,191	6·73	.....	.....	
	December	174,379	11,646	6·68	.....	.....	
	January	125,676	8,521	6·78	.....	.....	
	February	136,379	8,761	6·43	.....	.....	

Argentine, Nil. Beef and Eggs, Nil.

RECIPROCITY AND TRADE WITH FRANCE.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. If the proposed reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States becomes law, will the rate of duty on any of our imports from France be in any way affected? If so, upon what articles and what will be the extent of the increase or decrease of the duty in each case?

2. What was the quantity and value of this class of imports, affected as aforesaid, during the last financial year?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. Under the proposed reciprocity arrangement between Canada and the United States there is no increase in the rate of duty on any imports from France. The duties on the following imports of French origin are decreased under the said agreement, viz.:

Item No. Canadian Tariff.	Article.	Rate under the Arrangement.	Rate under French Treaty.
17	Cheese.....Per pound	Free.	cents.
72	Garden, field and other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., canary, hemp and millet seed, when in packages weighing over one pound each (not including flower seeds, flax seed, or seed of timothy or clover.....	Free.	10 p.c.
Ex. 109	Peanuts, shelled.....Per pound	1 cent.	2 cents.
Ex. 112	Peanuts, unshelled..... "	½ cent.	2 cents.
Ex. 711	Cotton seed oil.....	Free.	17½ p.c.
Ex. 711	Glycerine, crude, not purified.....	Free.	17½ p.c.
Ex. 711	Asbestos, crude, not ground.....	Free.	17½ p.c.
Ex. 711	Mica, unmanufactured, or rough trimmed only, and mica ground or bolted.....	Free.	17½ p.c.
Ex. 711	Bran, middlings and other offals of grain used for animal food (but not more than 17½ per cent ad valorem)..Per 100 pounds	12½ cts.	17½ p.c.

2. The following statement shows the quantity and value of this class of imports, affected as aforesaid, during the last financial year, viz.:

STATEMENT SHOWING THE IMPORTATIONS OF THE UNDERMENTIONED ARTICLES FROM FRANCE UNDER THE FRENCH TREATY, DURING THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1911.

—	Quantity.	Value.
		$
Cheese.....Lbs.	126,393	28,242
Garden, field or other seeds for agricultural or other purposes, n.o.p., canary, hemp and millet seed, when in packages weighing over one lb. each (not including flower seeds, flax seed, or seed of timothy or clover).....	.....	6,912
Peanuts, shelled.....	Not separately enumerated.	
Peanuts, unshelled.....	"	"
Cotton seed oil.....	Nil.	Nil.
Glycerine, crude, not purified.....	Nil.	Nil.
Asbestos, crude, not ground.....	Nil.	Nil.
Mica, unmanufactured or rough trimmed only and mica ground or bolted.....	Nil.	Nil.
Bran, middlings and other offals of grain used for animal food.....	.....	116

WOLFE ISLAND CUSTOMS OFFICER.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Has any person been recommended for the position of customs officer on Wolfe Island? If so, what is the name of the person, by whom was he recommended, and when?

2. Is it the intention of the government to appoint a customs officer on Wolfe Island? If so, when?

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. PATERSON:

1. There is no recommendation in this matter on the official files of the Department of Customs.

2. There are two Customs officials now on Wolfe Island. It is not the intention of the government, at present, to appoint another Customs officer on that island.

MR. FRANK THIBODEAU.

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. What is the present salary of Mr. Frank Thibodeau, postmaster of St. Maurice, county of Champlain?

2. How much does the government pay him for the carriage of the mail between the post office of that parish and the station of the Canadian Pacific railway?

3. How much does the said Frank Thibodeau receive from the government for his services as assistant guardian of the booms on the St. Maurice?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. $174 per annum.

2. $112.50 per annum.

3. $900 per annum, as boom-master on the Three Rivers station.

LIEUT.-COLONEL D. C. F. BLISS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Is Lieut.-Colonel D. C. Foster Bliss in the Militia Department? If so, in what capacity and at what rate of pay?

2. If so employed, is he the same person of similar name who was some years ago retired from the militia?

3. By whom was the reappointment of this officer recommended, and why was he originally retired from the militia service?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (a) Yes.

(b) As a temporary employee, compiling certain records of the department.

(c) $116.10 per month.

2. Yes.

3. (a) By the Quartermaster-General.

(b) On account of reduction in the establishment of lieutenant-colonels in the Ordnance Store corps. His services being no longer required in the permanent force.

MOUNTED POLICE—PAY AND ALLOWANCES.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina):

1. What are the rates of pay of constables and non-commissioned officers of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police?
2. What is the value of clothing, provisions and other privileges furnished at the public expense?
3. Is extra pay allowed for special services?
4. Under what conditions are pensions allowed, and what deductions are made from pay towards the pension fund?
5. In general terms, what is the annual value of pay and allowances to constables and non-commissioned officers?
6. Has any difficulty been experienced in obtaining recruits for the police force? If so, what is the cause of such difficulty?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Constables, 60 cents to $1 per diem.
Corporals, $1.10 per diem.
Sergeants, $1.25 per diem.
Staff-sergeants, $1.50 to $2 per diem.
2. Constables, $335 per annum.
Corporals, $335 per annum.
Sergeants, $340 per annum.
Staff-sergeants, $345 per annum.
3. (a) Extra pay is granted to members of the force serving in the Northwest Territories and Yukon Territory, as follows:
Constables, 50 cents per diem.
Corporals, 50 cents per diem.
Sergeants, 75 cents per diem.
(b) Working pay to artisans, clerical staff, &c., not exceeding 75 cents per diem, in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, and not exceeding $1 per diem in the Northwest Territories and the Yukon Territory.
(c) Working pay at 25 cents per diem is granted to constables guarding prisoners employed at outdoor labour.
4. Constables and non-commissioned officers are entitled to pensions for life after the completion of 20 years service, or after 15 years, if incapacitated from the performance of duty by infirmity of mind or body. No deduction is made from their pay towards the pension fund.
5. The annual value of pay and allowances to constables and non-commissioned officers, is as follows—exclusive of extra or working pay included in answer No. 3:
Constables, $554 to $700.
Corporals, $736.50.
Sergeants, $796.25.
Staff-sergeants, $892.50 to $1,075.
6. No difficulty is experienced in obtaining recruits, but the higher rate of wages obtainable in the west induce a number of our best men to purchase their discharge, thus causing a wastage in strength and the necessity of engaging new men.

256½

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. LENNOX:

In addition to some $31,000 odd paid the engineers who investigated as to the circumstances connected with the building and collapse of the Quebec bridge, what other moneys have been paid or expenses incurred for investigations, surveys, tests, experiments, engineering, drawings, plans and specifications, advertisements and assistance of all kinds, whether professional or otherwise, in connection with the building of the new bridge and the preparation for letting the work; the whole to be furnished in reasonable detail under the several general headings according to the various classes of expenditure, and brought down to a specified date and to as late a date as possible?

Mr. GRAHAM:

	Amount Paid.
Chairman and chief engineer, engineers, principal assistant engineer, assistant engineers, chief draughtsman, calculators, tracers and clerk for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909 ..	$ 32,498 71
Stenographer	457 50
Bell Telephone Company	77 05
Travelling and office expenses ..	3,510 78
Instruments and incidentals, office furniture and advertising	1,584 78
Pennsylvania Steel Co. for nickel steel bars, &c	1,157 03
Total	$ 39,286 05
Less—charged to surveys, and inspection, railways, sale office furniture to Transcontinental Railway Commissioners, cash on hand by Quebec Bridge Company when taken over by the government	3,463 64
	$ 35,822 41

The above is all set out on Page W—75, Auditor General's Report, Volume III, 1909.

	Amount Paid.
Chairman and chief engineer, engineers, principal assistant engineer, assistant engineers, chief draughtsman, calculators, tracers and clerk, inspectors, &c., for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1910	$ 74,403 35
Travelling and office expenses ..	11,898 33
Bell Telephone Company	139 00
Phelps Johnson, advising with board of engineers, and other outlay	507 70
Services for boatmen	134 00
Illinois University, Urbana, U.S., testing nickel steel joints	660 00
Instruments, incidentals, office furniture, advertising, &c	3,143 05
Sullivan Machinery Co., for river and shore boring, and drilling	19,606 00
Legal expenses (services)..	1,296 59
Total	$111,788 02

The above as set out on Page W—51 and 52, Auditor General's Report, Volume II, 1910.

	Amount Paid.
Chairman and chief engineer, engineers, principal assistant engineer, assistant engineers, chief draughtsman, calculators, tracers and clerk, inspectors, &c., for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1911	$ 96,403 94
Contractors' estimates (substructure)	95,268 30
Advertising	2,426 76
Incidentals	351 41
Total	$194,450 41
Grand total up to March 31, 1911	$342,060 84

CANAL AT ST. PETER'S, CAPE BRETON.

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Is it the intention of the government to construct a new canal at St. Peter's, Cape Breton? If so, when is the work to be commenced?
2. Is the old canal to be abandoned? If so, for what reason?
3. What is the estimated cost of the proposed new canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. $150,000 has been voted by parliament for this work. The details have not yet been decided on. It is estimated that the entire cost of the work will be in the vicinity of $300,000.

CANADIAN REPRESENTATIVE IN FRANCE.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Has the government provided for the replacing of Mr. Fabre for the representation of Canada in France?
2. Who has been appointed for the said representation, and has the government appointed several or only one person?
3. What salaries have been fixed for the person or persons appointed?
4. When will the new functionary or functionaries enter upon the performance of their duties?
5. Besides the fixed salaries will they have a provision for expenses?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. Yes.
2. Senator Roy, of Edmonton, has been appointed.
3. The salary is $8,000.
4. Immediately.
5. He receives no other remuneration than his salary.

FEDERAL AFFAIRS AT PILES.

Mr. BLONDIN:

1. Has the government received complaints, petitions or notices respecting the administration of federal affairs at Piles, county of Champlain, during the summer and autumn of 1910, and especially a petition of the citizens of Piles, of date 5th August, 1910, requesting a general and public inquiry into federal affairs at Piles? If so, has the government taken action on this petition, and has such inquiry been granted?
2. If so, who represented the government at such inquiry, and what was the result?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.
2. A report has been made by Mr. Roy, the engineer who was appointed to make inquiry. I should say that the hon. member who asks this question (Mr. Blondin), has withdrawn his seal of confidence which was attached to his letter, and therefore I intend to bring down his letter and also the petition and report of Mr. Roy, and lay them on the table of the House.

PENNY BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole on Thursday next, to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend chapter 31, Revised Statutes, The Penny Bank Act, and by such amendment authorize the Minister of Finance to fix and determine the rate of interest that shall be allowed and credited half-yearly on the amounts from time to time at the credit of the accounts of penny banks, incorporated under the provisions of that Act, in the government savings bank or post office savings bank, the rate so fixed and determined not to exceed one per centum in advance of the rate then payable to depositors in the government savings bank or post office savings bank.

He said: I beg to say that His Excellency the Governor General, having been made acquainted with the subject matter of this resolution, recommends it to the consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 177) to amend the Indian Act. —Mr. Oliver—read the third time.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the Indian Act passed?

Mr. SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well it has gone through very slick. I have been waiting and watching for it. I would not care to have it go through in that way unless I had an opportunity of moving an amendment to it. We discussed the question the other day, it was up again and the last impression I got from the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) was that he had said that as these points were brought up he would move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again. The com-

mittee must have sat again; I did not know that. Probably it might be taken as not being read the third time

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If my hon. friend did not know that the third reading was moved we can recall it and take it up to-morrow.

Mr. OLIVER. I would just like to say that my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) is in error. At one stage of the discussion we did decide as he says, but at the latter end of the discussion we decided to have the Bill reprinted for the third reading, and then, if the hon. member from Montreal. St. Anne, (Mr. Doherty) did not find any objection, it would go to the third reading. I supposed that my hon. friend had no objection, or else there would have been something said about it. I do not wish, however, under the circumstances, to press the third reading.

Mr. FOSTER. All the more so as the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne, is not here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will take it to-morrow.

Mr. SPEAKER. With the leave of the House Bill (No. 177) stands for third reading.

WAYS AND MEANS—FESTIVAL OF EMPIRE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BURRELL. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to read a couple of press despatches and call the attention of the government to a matter of some interest to all Canadians. The first despatch is as follows:

FESTIVAL OF EMPIRE.

Canada's Piece Cut Out as Objectionable to Americans.

London, April 25.—It was learned to-day that it was in consequence of communications between London and Washington, and hints to the Canadian committee, of which Lord Strathcona is president, that a decision is reached to eliminate from the coronation programme Canada's principal contribution to the pageantry 'Festival of the Empire.' The piece which has been in course of preparation at the Crystal Palace, and which called for 600 performers, entitled 'Chateauguay, where Canada was held for the empire,' was intended to represent the defeat of the invading American force in 1812 by a handful of Canadians.

After consideration it was thought that the pageant might wound the susceptibilities of American visitors to the coronation, and it was also suggested that a feeling might be caused in the United States that would endanger the conclusion of the proposed Anglo-American arbitration treaty. Rather than make either event possible the authorities decided to abandon the spectacle.

In a later despatch among several which I have here there is an extract from the London 'Standard' which reads as follows:

The Canadians have an incontestable right to occupy a very prominent and honourable place in the commemoration of the great deeds of empire. This particular incident, a happy selection in many ways, was not a British but a Canadian victory, which was to be fitly celebrated without the least wish to wound American sentiment. We cannot but regret that the scene has been omitted from the pageant at the last moment.

I do not know whether there has been an official programme of the Pageant of Empire issued, but I am sure that it is of interest to all Canadians to know what form Canada's participation in that great spectacle will take and I am also certain that it would be a matter of great gratification to all Canadians to know that the battle of Chateauguay was to be represented in the festival. The House is familiar with the details of that celebrated episode, one, not only of the most brilliant and most heroic, but one of the most decisive battles, with Lundy's Lane, in the whole war of 1812, a war, Sir, which we all know was one distinctly of defence when Canadians of all nationalities met for the common defence of their homes, their soil, and their institutions. I am not going to refer to the details of that encounter but we know perfectly well that it was less than a thousand French Canadians who, under de Salaberry, the gallant leader of the French Canadians, and the equally gallant Macdonald of Glengarry, who, by superior strategy and valour, defeated an overwhelming force of Americans at that time. As I have said, it was a war, not of aggression but of defence. This is literally true as far as Canadians are concerned, and I feel that every member of the House, and every Canadian, recognizes now that it had the most beneficent influence upon Canada's future, because, for the first time, that war, whatever its unjustifiable features may have been, welded together French, English, Scotch, and Irish. All were animated by one common spirit and by the noblest patriotism. I am quite sure that we all agree that stirring incidents of this kind which mark the special epochs in our national development should be commemorated and recognized by all Canadians. It has been finely said that as Canadians look down the corridors of time they will always see the flashes of the musketry and cannon of Lundy's Lane and hear the bugles blow which drove the invaders from

the woods of Chateauguay. For these reasons, it is a matter of great regret that a decision has been come to to eliminate a spectacle of this kind at the Festival of Empire, where all races and all portions of the empire will be represented to celebrate the empire's heroic deeds. Neither can I think the House will come to the conclusion that the reasons given for the elimination of the pageant of the battle of Chateauguay are sufficient. We know that in New England there was a general condemnation of that war and I feel sure that the American people have long ago buried any feeling of animosity they entertained at one time. I might point out indeed that our good friends on the south of the line, for whom we have the kindliest feelings, occasionally, not only celebrate victories on their own soil, but come over to ours. In my own town many of our American friends have come over and celebrated the fourth of July right under our noses and on our own territory, and none of us felt any the worse for it. I am inclined to take with a grain of salt, the idea of wounding the feelings of the American people by celebrating the battle of Chateauguay. No Canadian would resent the fact that the Americans celebrate the battle of Bunker's Hill, if they desire to commemorate their own national achievements, and I am sure our American friends would take our celebration of the battle of Chateauguay in the same spirit. If we are to admit the principle that we cannot celebrate national achievements because it hurts the feelings of somebody then we might just as well cut out all celebrations of the kind. I take it that the government has been consulted with reference to these great pageants, and I would like the Prime Minister or the Minister of Agriculture, who sometimes has charge of these things, to explain how it is that an historic event of this kind, dear to the heart of every Canadian and recognized as an noble achievement in Canadian history, is to be eliminated at a time like this when every great deed in the empire's history is to be held up to the admiration of our people.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). The Battle of Chateauguay is one of the historic events in which Canadians have always taken pride, but I may inform my hon. friend that the pageants at the Festival of Empire are under the control and management of the committee in London, and the Canadian government has not been consulted with reference to them. What information we have on the matter is such as my hon. friend has seen in the public press, and whether that is correct or not I cannot say. We are taking part in the Festival of Empire but not in any of the particular pageants which have been proposed by the authorities of the Festival in London. I believe that Lord Strathcona is a member of the executive or management of the Festival of Empire, but just what part he has taken in regard to the pageant I do not know. Whatever he has done in that respect he has done as Lord Strathcona, and not as the High Commissioner for Canada.

Mr. BURRELL. Am I to understand that the government of Canada has not contributed, financially or morally or in any other way?

Mr. FISHER. We are contributing for the general expenses of the Festival of Empire, and possibly part of that may be devoted to the pageants, but the money is put into the hands of the committee in London for their purpose, and I do not know how it has been distributed. We are erecting a Canadian building which will have an exhibit of Canadian products and Canadian resources.

Mr. BURRELL. If the government is very anxious as to how the public money is expended it does seem to me that in an event of this kind they might insist on being consulted.

Mr. FOSTER. I am very glad that my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) has brought this up. When I read the news item, it struck me as rather—I scarcely knew what word to express it—but I felt that Canada had hardly been used right. History is history, and those who are in charge of pageantry by which history is supposed to be truthfully delineated ought not on such an occasion as this to omit one of the most important and illustrious events in our Canadian history. It does not seem to me that the people of the United States would be likely to be in any way offended by this pageant being carried out true to history. I should not like to think so ill of our friends on the south of the line as to think they would take the least umbrage at seeing a truthful delineation of Canadian history. It seems to me that the omission is pandering to a rather mawkish kind of sentimentality.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Has my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) read the American school books upon the Battle of Chateauguay?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not represented in them as a Canadian victory.

Mr. FOSTER. Then still less should they take objection to it. If my right hon. friend has read the old school books and old histories he probably may have read the new, and he will find that in the last ten or fifteen years the version of these

old occurrences between ourselves and the United States has been very greatly modified in being more true to the fact.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not read the new books, but I know that in the old American school books the Battle of Chateauguay was never represented as a Canadian victory. For my part, I agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) that this should not be a reason to eliminate the true character of that battle, for I believe that the Americans understand that history is history as has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). But the matter has been decided; it has not been referred to us, and really officially we have nothing to do with it. We contributed our money to the Festival of Empire which was placed in the hands of the London Committee and perhaps the committee has decided in this way. Had I been a member of the committee I would have decided otherwise.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to call the attention of the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to a fact of very great importance to the administration of justice in the province of Manitoba. It will be remembered that some little time ago, while I was discussing the St. Peter's Indian reserve and asking for a Royal Commission to investigate that matter, the Minister of the Interior referred me to the government of Manitoba and said that if there was any prosecution or any investigation it should be made by the government of Manitoba. Other speakers on that side of the House made the same statement. The province of Manitoba guarantees all titles issued under the Torrens system and before the Registrar General of Manitoba can guarantee those titles he must be satisfied that the titles are good. The Indians allege that this surrender was obtained illegally and that the lands, after they had been given to them, were taken from them illegally. Consequently the Registrar General refuses to issue titles until there is a thorough investigation which will place him in a position to say whether or not the title is vested in the present holders. To that end, the government of Manitoba have appointed a Royal Commission for the purpose of determining whether or not the titles are good, and whether the Registrar General would be justified in guaranteeing them. To enable the commission to arrive at a proper conclusion it is necessary that they should have the original documents regarding this surrender. Serious allegations have been made by the Indians. On the strength of these allegations I myself stated in this House that forgery had been committed in the signing of receipts for the patents. This matter cannot be established unless the commission has the original documents. The counsel for the Royal Commission has written to me the following letter which I wish to place on 'Hansard':

Winnipeg, Canada,
19th April, 1911.

Dear Sir,—I have the honour to inclose you copy of letter written by me as counsel for the Royal Commission appointed to investigate the surrender of the St. Peter's reserve addressed to the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior. I also inclose you his reply thereto. Both letters are self-explanatory.

It is absolutely essential that the commission should have production of the original documents in regard to the surrender of this reserve, and since the Minister of the Interior suggests that an order of parliament should be obtained I take the liberty of requesting that you should move for an order of parliament for production of the original documents in connection with this matter before the Royal Commission. Will you be kind enough to advise me of the result.

Yours truly,
H. W. WHITLA,
Counsel for the Commission.

Geo. H. Bradbury, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

I have here a copy of a letter written by the counsel for the commission to the hon. the Minister of the Interior:

Winnipeg, Canada,
12th April, 1911.

Dear Sir,—By order of the Executive Council of the province of Manitoba a commission has been appointed to investigate and report upon the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve.

The commission has instructed me as counsel to request the production of the records of the Indian Office in relation to that particular reserve. Upon application to Mr. Semmens this morning he stated he would require some authority before he could permit either an inspection or production of the documents. I therefore take the liberty of writing you to ask if you will be good enough to instruct Mr. Semmens, or the agent in charge of the Winnipeg office, to permit an inspection by and to produce to the proper agent of the commissioners all the documents relating to the surrender of the Indian reserve. Trusting that you will see your way clear to give this necessary authority,

I am, yours respectfully,
(Sgd.) H. W. WHITLA,
Counsel for the Commission.

Hon. Frank Oliver,
Minister of the Interior,
c/o Royal Alexandra Hotel,
City.

H.W.W./R.

The Minister of the Interior replies as follows:

Winnipeg, April 12, 1911

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 12th of April to hand requesting inspection by a commission appointed by the government of Manitoba of

papers connected with the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve.

In reply I beg to say that until otherwise advised, I am not aware that the government of Manitoba has authority to request an inspection of the documents in question.

All documents connected with the transaction of business by the government of Canada can properly be produced for inspection on an order of parliament or of the courts.

I would suggest that the commission take this means of securing the inspection desired.

Yours faithfully,
FRANK OLIVER,

H. D. Whitla, Esq.,
Box 1556, Winnipeg, Man.

Mr. Speaker, my object in bringing this matter before the House is to have these documents produced. I realize that if I place this motion on the order paper, it may be days or weeks perhaps before it is reached, and as my only object is to facilitate the work of this commission—and I am sure that the minister must be as much interested as I or any other man in Canada to see that this matter is cleared up—I would ask the minister if he would accept an order of the House for the production of these papers.

Mr. OLIVER. The facts in connection with this matter are as my hon. friend has stated. I am not desirous of in any way impeding the work of the commission appointed by the government of Manitoba, but, having a certain responsibility in regard to the custody of the documents, I would ask my hon. friend to let the matter rest until to-morrow, when I will be able to give him a definite answer.

EMIGRATION FROM CANADA TO UNITED STATES.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I wish again to direct the attention of the government to the subject of emigration from Canada to the United States to which I alluded last year. At page 5524 of 'Hansard,' of last year, I set forth a statement which appeared in the annual report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States. It appeared from that report that the total immigration into the United States from Canada during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1909, was 96,520, and that, after eliminating certain portions of that immigration which could not be properly classed as actual immigration from Canada to the United States there was found to be a total immigration into the United States from Canada of 61,038, according to the returns made to the Commissioner General of Immigration of the United States and as embodied by him in that report. I also called attention to certain rather important statements in his report of that year, in which he gave reasons why the immigration into the United States from Canada had increased in so marked a degree during the twelve months covered by his report.

I have now the report of the Commissioner General of Immigration for the United States which gives the returns up to June 30, 1910. According to these returns the emigration from the United States to Canada during the twelve months mentioned amounted to 116,377. The report classifies that emigration as follows: United States citizens, 78,697; Canadian citizens, 15,203; other aliens, 22,477; making a total of 116,377. During the same period the emigration from Canada to the United States, according to this report, was as follows: United States citizens, 22,832; Canadian citizens, 44,328; other aliens, 27,336; making a total of 94,496. If these statistics are correct, the balance of immigration into Canada from the United States over the emigration from Canada to the United States was a little less than 22,000, which result, I am bound to say, is one that I would hardly have expected. I do not know whether the hon. the Minister of the Interior has any observations to make on these statistics; I do not know whether they are accepted by the government as accurate. There does not appear to be any official information available in this country as to the number of persons leaving Canada for permanent residence in the United States. In other words, although we have very full, and I believe very complete statistics of immigration into this country, I do not know that we have any statistics of emigration from this country to the United States or elsewhere. Am I correct in that regard?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, there may be difficulties in the way of obtaining and preserving such statistics, of which I am not aware, but otherwise I would be very much inclined to think that we might very well follow the example of the United States and compile and publish statistics not only of the immigration into this country, but of the emigration from this country. That is done in the United States in a very complete way. Not only do they keep statistics of all the persons leaving that country, but they classify them as United States citizens, Canadian citizens, and other aliens, so far as those statistics relate to emigration from the United States to Canada. Similarly they divide the emigration from Canada, to the United States into three classes—United States citizens, Canadian citizens, and other aliens. I am bound to say that I think it would be greatly to the advantage of the country if we knew at the present time, as we do not seem to know, from what provinces of Canada, and in what proportion from those

provinces, this very large emigration of nearly 95,000 persons has gone during the fiscal year ended the 30th of June, 1910, if the figures of the United States Immigration Department are to be accepted as accurate. We know that at one time there was a very considerable emigration from Canada to the United States, especially from certain of the eastern provinces. We had been led to believe that that emigration had almost wholly ceased; but if these figures are even approximately correct, it is evident that our belief in that regard was not based on a very sure foundation, because it is rather astonishing to find that in a single year no less than 94,496 persons have left Canada for permanent residence in the United States, and that these figures comprise 44,328 Canadian citizens in addition to 22,832 United States citizens, and 27,336 aliens not being citizens of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. How do their figures of emigration from the United States to Canada compare with our figures?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is a little difficult to compare them on account of the difference in the fiscal year. They give their figures for the year ending the 30th of June, while our figures are given for the year ending the 31st of March. In the United States returns they are given by months. I do not know whether or not ours are so given. However, I thought the matter worthy of some attention from the government, and, therefore, I have brought it to the notice of the House. I would be very glad if the Minister of the Interior would give us any observations which would indicate whether or not these figures are to be accepted as substantially accurate, and, further, whether there are in his opinion any serious difficulties in the way of inaugurating a system by which statistics of emigration as well as immigration may be compiled in this country in the future, for the information of parliament and the people.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no doubt a considerable reciprocity in population between Canada and the United States, and has been for many years, and will continue to be. We try to keep account of the people coming from the United States to Canada with the intention of residing in Canada. We think our figures are accurate or fairly accurate; but it must be quite evident that figures calculated as ours must be, cannot by any possibility be absolutely accurate; they can only be approximately so.

Mr. FOSTER. How do our figures of immigration coming from the United States agree month by month with the United States figures of emigration from the United States?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not give my hon. friend a statement that would have serious value; but I am under the impression that there is a wide divergence between the figures, and it is easy to see how that divergence might take place. We may have one standard of calculation, and they may have an entirely different one. We may consider a person an immigrant, whom they would not rank as such. Their system may be more comprehensive than ours.

Mr. FOSTER. Is the basis the same?

Mr. OLIVER. I am satisfied that the basis is not the same.

Mr. FOSTER. In what is the difference?

Mr. OLIVER. I am not able to give my hon. friend detailed information; I am speaking subject to correction in a general way. When the estimates were up for consideration, this matter was brought to my attention, and I pointed out to the committee then that it was quite possible to secure such information for Canada as was already secured for the United States. It would mean a very considerable increase in the cost of our immigration service and would not produce any immediate or direct beneficial result. So, up to the present time, we have not asked parliament for an appropriation to enable us to make such a count and calculation. It is a serious question for parliament to consider whether the value of the information would be equal to the cost. For my part I think that, up to the present time, we have been well advised to spend our money and energy in dealing with the people who are coming, rather than with the people who are going. We were not able to prevent them from going or we would do so. But by spending our money as we have been doing, we have been enabled, certainly, to bring people here and this has resulted in our material benefit. If a count of people going could reasonably be expected to result in the formulation of a policy that would prevent their going, I could see a sound reason for the expenditure. But unless and until some such policy is in near or further prospect, I should think it was a matter to seriously consider whether we could afford to put the money into the service or not. It will be understood by the House that people move sometimes because of the conditions in which they live, but most generally because of the conditions in the place to which they are going. That is to say, we attract people from the United States and Great Britain, and from other countries of Europe, not so much because of the conditions surrounding those people at home, as because of the advantages they hope to gain in coming to our country. So, the people who leave Canada for the United States,

we may reasonably presume, do not leave so much because of the conditions in Canada as because of the expectations they have of conditions in the United States. That being a matter that is not in our control, we cannot be sure that we should be able to frame a policy that would have any serious result, even if we had the information. That is the view that the department has held up to the present time. We are prepared, of course, at any time, to take stock and count of the people who are going out, if parliament is so minded, and is prepared to supply the necessary funds.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that the minister (Mr. Oliver), if he will consider the matter a little, will see that there are a number of good reasons why we should have this information which we evidently lack, according to the figures and statements which have been made and presented by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). It is quite as important in its own way to know the stream of people that is leaving us, and from what quarters of the country it is leaving us, so as to get at the reasons for the stream going out from the country, as to know what population is coming to us, and the sources from which it comes. It seems to me there are strong economic reasons for our knowing that state of facts, in order that we may find out the causes of the outflowing stream. I do not think it would involve a great deal of added cost. You have your customs house officers and immigration officers, and they take charge of the stream that comes in, they trace it, number the individuals and forward their reports to the department. The places of ingress into the country, other things being equal, are the places of egress from the other country. Immigrants coming into Canada generally come with effects, and they have to pass the customs, so it is not difficult to keep count of them. Emigrants from this country also take personal effects, and they have to pass the customs line on the other side, and so it is not difficult to number them. But there is another consideration. We are buoyed up by the favourable information of one side only. Every year the minister tells us: Everything is going well; we are spending a great deal of money, but we are getting in many immigrants, settlers who are just that much added to the country.. But it would be a dffierent tale if the minister were to come down and tell us of the number that have left Canada. I do not recollect the numbers shown by our figures who have come in from the United States last year. But suppose we call it a hundred thousand,—I do not think it was one hundred thousand. We have been going on with the idea that we have attracted to us from the United States one hundred thousand people, and so are that much better off. But up comes the United States official—and their officials are well trained and their statistics far ahead of Canadian statistics—who says: Yes, you did get somewhere near one hundred thousand people from the United States, but ninety-four thousand came into the United States from Canada, so that the net gain is very small. We have been pluming ourselves upon despoiling our neighbours of a number of their eligible cultivators and other inhabitants, but it seems to be without any real reason. Now, does not the minister think that in the interest of true knowledge and for the purpose of obtaining complete statistics, which will set forth all the important facts on both sides—and these statistics alone are valuable—we should go far enough in the direction proposed to enable us to get the real results? My hon. friend has stated that in former times great numbers of people went from Ontario and also from the maritime provinces to the United States. The platform orator on the Liberal side says that all this is stopped, and that the stream is now coming from the United States towards this side. But that, it appears from the figures the United States are publishing is a misrepresentation, and when we subtract one figure from the other there is very little difference between the streams; the reciprocity in population which my hon. friend talks about, seems to be about on an equal basis. I think, therefore, the minister should get his statistical branch an order so as to be able to keep account of the population going out and the sources from which it goes, as well as keeping a similar account of the population that comes in. For it would be a great advantage, if a certain stream was going, for instance, from Quebec, or from any other part of Canada, to inquire into the cause for this movement of population. Knowing the reason, and desiring our country to increase in population, not only the Dominion statesman, but the provincial statesman as well, will have a basis for their policies and can plan their work with a view to offseting the movement of the people from our country. Certainly, as it looks, now, it is impossible for us to say whether we are gaining in population as between ourselves and the United States. Certainly, as it looks to me, it is impossible for us to say whether we are gaining much as between ourselves and the United States.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not quite agree with my hon. friend that our statistics are less valuable and reliable than the Ameri-

can statistics. I think we have very good statistics.

Mr. FOSTER. What I intended to say was that our statistics, what we have of them, may be very good; still we are away behind in statistical work as compared with the United States. That has been clearly shown within the last two months.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to correct the impression my hon. friend has given to the House. We have no statistical branch in our department. The work of our agents is either to induce immigration or to facilitate immigration, and the statistics we gather are merely an incident. The United States, on the other hand, has a statistical branch for the purpose of gathering statistics. We are prepared to establish a statistical branch if parliament orders it. But we have not been authorized to do so, we have not the money to establish it, and we can only get the information such as my hon. friend suggests when parliament gives us the money for that purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the United States has a distinct statistical branch?

Mr. OLIVER. They have a very much more elaborate service than we have, and the collection of statistics is an important feature of their service. The collection of statistics is a serious part of their immigration service, whereas it is merely incidental in ours.

Mr. PATERSON. The figures quoted by the leader of the opposition did not seem to us as if they could be correct.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Rather unexpected.

Mr. PATERSON. I think so. I do not know what other statistics we could get, or how they might be collected. But you can approximate. If their method is to count every one that goes into their country, of course you get a very large number.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the minister will look at the United States immigration report of a year ago, he will obtain full information as to just how they make it up. There were seven classes I think last year, and in making the calculation I did at that time, I omitted three or four of those classes as not properly coming within the general principle of immigration from one country to the other. But taking the four remaining classes last year, I think about 67,000 of actual immigrants went from Canada to the United States. I merely desired to say that full information is given in that report as to the methods they use, and the principles they have adopted in compiling these statistics.

Mr. PATERSON. This question was up a number of years ago when I was on the Agricultural Committee, and then we found great difficulty in reconciling the statistics of the two countries. We had our reports, of so many coming into Canada and so many going out; and actually those reports showed that not only had we lost every immigrant that came into Canada, but we had lost a lot of our actual increase as well. I merely wish to say to the leader of the opposition that if they connect with this statement he has read any account of settlers' effects, it will not prove anything conclusively, because settlers coming to us from the United States might bring with them a larger quantity of effects, and they might be worth a great deal more than effects going from our country into the United States. Now we have the value of household effects returned in our exports going to the United States. These export entries are made by parties who are leaving our country, we collect from the customs the export entries made by the men who are leaving the country. These are declared by the parties going away, and they are supervised by our officers. I only give this as a kind of a rough test to show that there must be some difference in the way the figures are collected in the two countries as read by the leader of the opposition.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there a record kept of settlers' effects exported?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes. I say the figures are not conclusive with reference to the number of individuals, but they must be of value as showing that there is a much larger proportion of immigrants from the United States into Canada than from Canada into the United States. For instance, last year, of household effects, there was entered by parties leaving Canada to go to the United States, $2,076,137; while the value of settlers' effects entered as coming from the United States into Canada was $7,613,553, nearly four times as many. Now I say the figures read by the hon. gentleman are not conclusive because they may be varied by circumstances. I cannot think myself that there is anything like the proportion of people leaving Canada to reside permanently in the United States that there is of people coming in from the United States to reside permanently in Canada.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have reason to know that the methods of classification to the south of us are very different from those adopted on this side of the line. It is no use for any one to say that there are not people going from Canada into

the United States to reside permanently, as there have been for years. The restlessness of our people would perhaps be one reason. However, whatever the reason may be, there is at times a movement towards the United States. It must be borne in mind that at certain seasons of the year there is a stream of emigration particularly from the maritime provinces, to the other side of the line, and recognized by our people as a movement into the United States, men going temporarily to engage in various occupations. From my own county I know that every spring a good many people, particularly from among the French Acadians, go over into Massachusetts and other New England states to work in the quarries, to engage in farming operations, while they leave their families at home. There are others who go early in the spring to engage with the Gloucester fishermen. They go from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, and during a certain season of the year they are engaged in fishing on board the American ships and sailing under the American flag. They then return. There is an annual stream returning every autumn. Many men who become involved financially in connection with their property go away, engage in certain occupations, make some money, come back and pay off their debts. This fact is perhaps within the knowledge of every member from the eastern provinces and from the province of Quebec. In the fall the men who go from our northern counties in New Brunswick to the state of Maine to engage in lumbering operations can be counted by the thousands. But, they return in the spring. Under the methods pursued by the United States authorities, those whom I have named are classified as immigrants into the United States. Necessarily there must be discrepancies between any record which we may have, or any estimate which we may make, and their record of this incoming and outgoing population. There are unquestionably some who permanently leave the maritime provinces and settle in the United States. That must be so because I believe there are perhaps more Nova Scotians in Boston than there are in the whole city of Halifax. But that has been going on for years and there is this movement back and forth, which is temporary in its nature but which is calculated to mislead.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), mean that these men would be classed as immigrants into the United States when they go into the United States, but that they would not be classed as emigrants from the United States when they return to Canada in the autumn? I am speaking altogether of the United States classification.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think that is the case. They do not keep a record of those that are coming back.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Oh, they do keep some record, because they set it all forth in their statistics, but it may be that they adopt a different principle in one case from that which they adopt in the other, although one would think that they would adopt the same principle.

Mr. EMMERSON. I can speak from personal knowledge with respect to that. The movements from the maritime provinces towards the United States are either over the Maine Central railway or by the steamship lines leaving St. John, Yarmouth, or Halifax. The American authorities take a minute record of every one who goes in through any of these channels. I know, as a matter of fact, that in going, particular inquiry is made of each passenger, of every one who may be on board the train or on board the steamer, but on returning, when they leave Boston or Portland or any of those ports, a record is not taken of those who come back into the maritime provinces. I know that for a fact, and I think it explains in a great measure many of the difficulties that present themselves in thinking out the question or in attempting to reconcile the apparent differences. I can quite appreciate what my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), has said. We are led to believe that there are a great many coming into Canada, or at least that there have been during the last few years. If it were true that there were those leaving our shores, in great numbers to settle in the United States we might well pause to inquire just what is the net gain that we are making. It would be a very desirable thing, I am sure, to have this record if one could be accurately secured, but it becomes a question of the expense and of the ultimate value of such a record.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. While I in no manner at all challenge the honesty of the statistics of the United States in regard to the exodus of Canadians to the United States, the older members of the House remember, and are fully aware that the accuracy of those statistics was more than once challenged on the floor of this House. Some twenty years ago or thereabouts, the subject of the exodus of Canadians to the United States was one of constant debate in this House. The numbers of Canadians who were then going to the United States was very large, undoubtedly. But I remember distinctly that on a certain oc-

casion—and I am sure that if my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) taxes his memory, he will remember it also—that Mr. John Henry Pope—I just forget the year exactly, but it was about twenty years ago, when he was either Minister of Agriculture or Minister of the Interior—had a special inquiry made into this subject of the exodus from the province of Ontario to the western states. At the beginning of a session, when the matter was again brought up, he gave the result of his inquiry and it was shown that the statistics which were given by the American authorities—I will not say were not reliable—but were altogether contradicted by the inquiry which was made under the authority of Mr. Pope. If I had the time I am sure I could lay my hands upon this volume of 'Hansard,' although I am quite sure that my memory is absolutely accurate in regard to my statement of what occurred on that occasion.

Mr. BLAIN. I think the question the House has been discussing for a short time, introduced by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), is a very important one. I remember that last year when my hon. friend the leader of the opposition directed the attention of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) to this important question, he startled the House, and, I think caused some surprise among Canadians in every part of Canada. For the last ten years we have heard a great deal of discussion in this House with respect to the large number of people who are pouring into Canada, and during the last four or five years we have had special emphasis placed upon the fact that a very large number of people are leaving the United States and coming into Canada to pursue their agricultural interests. I take that to mean that the agricultural interests of Canada are in a very much better condition than the agricultural interests of the United States. We have been told in this House from time to time that there is practically no class of people leaving Canada, and going to the United States now. In listening to the discussion the other day I noticed that the hon. member for Compton (Mr. Hunt) said in his speech:

> A great many young people in my country are selling the old homesteads and moving across the line.

I suppose then we are to take it, Mr. Speaker, that there are a good many young Canadians leaving Canada still. When I have read the statistics showing the large number of people coming into Canada from the United States I have wondered that this was not a greater cause of alarm to the American people. I was very much surprised that the newspapers in the United States, Congress, the Senate and leading men generally, have not taken up this question more earnestly than they have. The answer, I suppose, is in the figures which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has presented to the House. They are in a position to know whether they are getting in a sufficient number of people to offset the exodus. The Commissioner of Immigration has been questioned before the Agricultural committee with regard to this matter, and his answer always is that it is practically impossible to keep any record of the large number of Canadians that are going to the United States, but the Minister of the Interior now tells us this can be done if it were not for the expense. In my opinion a reasonable sum of money would be well expended to ascertain actually whether we are the gainers or the losers. Year after year parliament is being misled if the figures given by the leader of the opposition are approximately correct, and I think they are. The Minister of the Interier must no longer delay a thorough investigation into this matter, and if his department requires a small statistical branch for that purpose, parliament would willingly vote the money. After every census we are disappointed at the showing, even though we know a great number of people have come into Canada during the previous ten years, and I have no doubt this is due to the fact that while it is true we are gathering from the United States, it is also true that we are sending in return some of our best people. The Minister of the Interior and the Prime Minister himself should take into consideration the providing of means to ascertain how many Canadians are leaving our shores and going to the United States, so that a remedy may be applied.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When we were discussing the vote for immigration this question was discussed by members on this side of the House, and I think we demonstrated to the satisfaction of the Minister of the Interior that there should be proper means taken to discover how many Canadians go to the United States year after year. Years ago the Liberals reproached the Conservative party because so many Canadians, and especially those from the maritime provinces, left Canada for the United States, but I believe that the same conditions prevail to-day, and probably in a more intensified form. I understood the Minister of the Interior to tell us when discussing the estimates that he thought the present statistics were unreliable and that steps should be taken to ascertain the real facts, but he seems to have forgotten that promise. The figures given by the Minister of Customs are likely to be explained by the fact that the Canadians who are going to the United States, especially from

the maritime provinces, are young men and young women, the best of our land, while those who are coming from the United States to Canada come largely to the three western provinces and are farmers who bring with them their implements and their horses and cattle. As they can buy horses in the United States more cheaply than they can in Canada—a point which bears upon the reciprocity agreement—they bring their horses across the line with them and their cattle too. If we had proper statistics prepared I believe it would be found that as many or probably more of the young people of the maritime provinces are going to the United States than ever before. This is greatly to be deplored because we have lots of room for them in the west, and we want them there.

Mr. MAGRATH. I have no brief to speak for the United States immigration officials or the statistics which they present from year to year, and while I am prepared to believe the statement of the right hon. gentleman that some years ago the statistics were not reliable, yet I believe that the influx of vast numbers of Southern Europeans into that country made it necessary that the authorities should take cognizance of that condition and present the fullest information to the public regarding the character of the immigration, so that to-day I regard their statistics very complete. I am not so much concerned about the completeness of statistics merely to record the movement of people. Immigration is the most important question the people of Canada have to deal with because it means the very lifeblood of the nation. The minister has said that if parliament wishes for fuller statistics he is willing to make the arrangements, and to see that they are secured. In my opinion it is absolutely in the interests of the country that he should take such a course at once. If Canada is the great nation we believe it to be, and if we are going to have vast masses of people pouring into our country, it is in the interest of all the nation that figures should be placed before us representing the exact character of that immigration. In the statistics presented to parliament now we are told of a certain number of United States' citizens coming to Canada. We know that the greater portion of citizens are created in the United States just as they are in Canada, that is through immigration. I, therefore, think that the country of origin should be specified. A citizen from some part of southern Europe goes into the United States, stays there a few years and becomes a citizen of that country. Then if he enters Canada we should have information of the race from which that citizen sprung, in other words the immigration from the United States should state if native born, and if not, from whence they originally came. I think it is absolutely necessary that we should have fuller statistics so that the people throughout the country can study these ethnological questions.

Mr. PERLEY. It is patent that the ministers have shown that their statistics are no good, that they have no statistics of any real value, and I do not think anything has been said by any of them to disprove or cast any doubt on the American statistics brought forward by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden). The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) when he rose first, started to say that our statistics were good statistics, but the Minister of the Interior was too quick for him, he rose to interrupt him to prevent him saying something he would be sorry for. He promptly told him that these statistics of the Interior Department were only an incident, that he had no officers to get statistics, and when the Minister of Customs rose afterwards, he did not tell us that the statistics of the Canadian government were good, he had found out that he was mistaken, and was prevented from making a bad misstatement. This merely confirms what was said the other day in a debate regarding statistics about the reciprocity treaty. We then found that this government had no statistics regarding prices, that they never tried to get any, that the American government had plenty of statistics which they have published, and seem to have at their fingers ends. All the information the ministers had was what our good friends on the other side were kind enough to give them.

The Minister of Customs says that this question has come up many times, that he remembers some years ago when he was on the Committee on Agriculture discussing this matter, and he found the statistics very difficult to understand. He said that it sometimes appeared from the figures as if all our immigrants had gone to the United States, and in fact sometimes even part of our natural increase. The member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has partially explained this, but to my mind there is another explanation. I think that many people from Europe who come into Canada nominally as immigrants to this country really come here for the purpose of going to the United States. They are counted as immigrants coming into Canada; our friends the government pass great numbers of them, and when they enter the United States they are counted as immigrants going to the United States. We probably all know of our own knowledge that immigrants have come into Canada and stayed here a short time, merely for the purpose of going to the United States. Why do they come here first? They come here on account of our extraordinary system

of bonusing immigrants and also on account of the fact that the United States is much more careful in the inspection of immigrants arriving in their ocean ports, New York and Boston, than of immigrants entering from Canada at border points. The Minister of Customs has given some figures with regard to settlers' effects which the member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has explained very well. I do not see that these figures disprove the immigration figures which have been quoted from the United States authorities. It is true that many of the immigrants coming into Canada from Europe afterwards go to the United States, and it is quite evident that they will not have, per head, anything like the amount of settlers' effects that the people will who are coming from the western states into Canada, who have been farmers for many years, and who are bringing over all their personal effects. So I do not see that the dollars worth of settlers' effects quoted by the Minister of Customs disprove in any way the statistics which the United States government has provided on this subject. So long as the ministers of the Crown in this House have to admit that they do not know anything about our statistics, that they have no proof whatever that they are of any particular value, just so long they must abide by and agree to these statistics provided by the United States.

Mr. PATERSON. The leader of the opposition did not attach much importance to them apparently.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I said nothing of that kind.

Mr. PATERSON. You doubted them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No, I did not seek to challenge them at all. I asked whether or not their accuracy was challenged by this government, or accepted by them. So far as I know the Immigration Department of the United States government is as well organized a department as exists in the world, and I say that after having made some personal investigation of it, because I went to Montreal on one occasion, and spent two days in examining their methods. I am bound to say that any man who takes that trouble to understand their system will be convinced of the truth of what I have said. I would not for a moment cast a doubt on the accuracy of their statistics, but I do not know the principle on which they frame them. I repeat that the results set forth in their report of last year, and of this year were absolutely surprising to me, but that does not mean that I am challenging the accuracy of their statistics. I would be very sorry to do it.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) says the Americans count every person going into the United States. That is what our officers do with every person coming into Canada. If a man from the United States comes into Canada wishing to buy land, he is counted as an immigrant. We find that last year 103,000 came into western Canada, but if you look up the records to see how many took up homesteads, you will see that only 14,000 did so. A great many of these others who came into western Canada simply inspected lands, looked into the conditions there, and if they were not satisfactory, went back without buying, and a great many bought land, and returned to the south.

I rose principally to protest against the immigration of negroes into western Canada. We, with British Columbia, wish to see a white west. We do not wish that kind of immigrants coming into western Canada, and I wish to protest very strongly against this government allowing them to enter western Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to suggest that we do not meet here another year to discuss this question of immigration and have the Minister of the Interior or the Minister of Customs, ignorant as to whether the same basis of counting is used on the United States side and on the Canadian side. Any clever man, in either of these offices, could go over to the United States and analyse that matter, in company with the officers there, and find out exactly what the differences are, if any. My own opinion is that there is some difference; how far it goes we do not know; but I think it is the first duty of the government to eliminate that lack of information and get to the foundation of fact in reference to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. It affords me a great deal of pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to realize that the ministry realize their absolute incompetence as compared with the American administration with regard to this item of immigration. For years there have been hundreds of thousands of Americans coming into the Canadian west, and they are among the shrewdest of the farming community from the different states. They have come to better their conditions. For years they have had this ninety millions of population to sell their products to; but they have realized that their condition would be better in Canada under the protection that we have had here in the past. They leave the United States and come to Canada with two or three carloads of stuff. When they leave their own states their horses are worth only $108 a head; when they land them in Canada they are worth $130, $140, or $150. Their milch cows which are worth only $40 a head in the states, are worth $48 when they are

landed in Canada. It is the same with their swine, their sheep and any other live stock they have. I do not refer to the conditions that may prevail if my right hon. friend carries through the reciprocity agreement which he proposes, and which we do not propose he shall. These people are wise people; they have been trying to make a livelihood on the other side and have not been successful, and they realize that in Canada they can be successful owing to the protection that they have in this country. They do not want the ninety-million market; they want the market that we have in this country, with the protection that prevails. That is the reason they have been coming here in hundreds of thousands. For that reason, and that reason alone, I would submit to the First Minister that he had better revise his judgment with regard to the farmers of the west and reciprocity. One other matter I wish to refer to, and that is what my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe), has said with regard to the negro immigration into the Canadian west. It is a question that no man in politics desires to touch, for many reasons, but it is a question that every man in Canada in his heart thinks over. It is a great big question on the other side of the line, and we on this side should do everything in our power to keep it there, because it is a question which, in the minds of many of the deep thinkers of the United States, is going to be one of primest importance to the standing of that country inside of a very few years. It is a matter of the gravest importance, and one that is almost beyond the pale of parliament to discuss—not because it is not worth discussing, but because it is of such great importance that it should be discussed absolutely outside of partisan lines and only in the interest of Canada. It is a matter that I do not wish to touch, and that I would not have referred to had it not been referred to by my hon. friend from Lisgar. I almost regret that it has ever been brought up, not only on this occasion, but on other occasions, because the people of that race have a standing in Canada, and have shown their worth, and we can only judge of their failings as a people by what has occurred in the south. For that reason I do not wish to discuss the question here. I would caution the Minister of the Interior with regard to bringing people into Canada from southern Europe. While we on this side of the House approve of all northern European immigration, we absolutely disapprove of a certain class of southern European immigration as detrimental to the west; and when I say that I have only to quote his own words uttered in this House with regard to the Galician immigration. The bread he cast upon the waters at that time will come back to him bearing fruit in as many folds as he likes.

Mr. STAPLES. One matter to which I think the government should pay a little attention, is the special concessions which an immigrant from the south receives from the various railway companies. A man from across the border gets from them a rate of a cent a mile to any part of the west, while a good Canadian who wishes to make the same trip has to pay the regular rate. Now, that is an unfairness to our Canadians. The same would apply to young men who are coming from the maritime provinces. If they wish to come to the west they have to pay the usual rate, unless they can come on a homeseekers excursion such as occasionally takes place, but, of course, it is not convenient for all to come just when a homeseekers' excursion is leaving. So, this is a clear injustice to the Canadian homeseeker who wishes to locate a homestead in the western provinces. The minister should look into this and see to it that our good Canadians at least are given the same consideration as is given to those who come from across the line.

Mr. OLIVER. As this is a new matter, I desire to say a word at once with regard to it. It is a matter which has engaged the attention of the department. We have discussed it with the railway companies,—and,of course, so far as we are concerned, it is in the control of the railway companies absolutely. We have not been able to induce them to do differently from what they have been doing. They have business reasons of their own for the policy they pursue. The alternative appears to be that if attempt were made to press upon them to give the same conditions to our own people as they give to people from the United States, they would simply withdraw the concessions they give to people from the United States.

Mr. HENDERSON. This subject of immigration is one of great interest, but in the discussion of the last hour and a half it has been one of great disappointment also. I have never given great attention to the study of immigration statistics, but, reading newspaper reports, and listening to the statements of the Minister of the Interior, I have been lead for years to believe that we were gaining, through our immigration system, very large additions to our population, and very considerably so from the United States—at a cost to us of a good deal of money. The Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has thrown some light on that matter this afternoon. He has taken the settlers' effects as a

guide. He read from the Trade and Navigation returns showing that last year's settlers' effects from the United States to Canada amounted to $7,613,500, and that settlers' effects from Canada to the United States amounted to $2,076,000. I can well understand the large amount of settlers' effects from the United States into Canada, because the arrivals from the United States in our western provinces almost always carry large quantities of farm machinery, horses, cattle, wagons, &c. But, to my mind, the Minister of Customs may be a little out of the way when he makes the value of settlers' effects the basis of a comparison showing the number of people coming into and going out of the country. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) spoke of the migration from the maritime provinces to the United States. From the character of that migration, I should suppose the people going from the maritime provinces had taken very little with them, whereas the people going into the western provinces from the United States bring a great deal. I think it would not be too much to say that the value of the settlers' effects coming into Canada would be three times as much for the average individual as the value of settler's effects carried by the people from the maritime provinces going into the United States. That may be even a little under the mark. If, for the sake of the comparison, we say that the people coming from the United States into our west bring $3.50 in settlers' effects for every $1 that is taken out by our people going from the maritime provinces to the United States, we find that practically we have an equal movement of emigration and immigration. I am a little afraid that that is really the case,—that we are losing just as much as we are gaining. We shall have to await the census returns to see if that can be verified or not. But it does look as though, while the minister is spending a great deal of money and filling up the western country at what we might call the bung-hole, he is neglecting to see how much is running out of the spout from the maritime provinces. From what has been said this afternoon, I am very much afraid that our net gain is very little. I hope the Minister of the Interior will, even if it costs more, carry out some system of keeping track of the people that go out of the country. It cannot be expected that this is to be done without money; but I am not aware that this parliament ever refuses any reasonable appropriation for any purpose of correct and useful statistics. The subject is so interesting and important, that I am sure parliament would gladly provide the money. I was much surprised to learn that no real account is kept of the people going out of the country as well as those coming in. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) referred to what had occurred about twenty years ago and what was said on the matter. We all remember the howl of Sir Richard Cartwright, particularly with regard to the exodus. He magnified it to such an extent that I believe he got away beyond the bounds. He talked about the people we were losing and about there being a million native born Canadians in the United States at that time. I do not know whether he got his figures from the American returns or not, but I always thought he magnified them, and magnified them for a purpose. He did it to show that the National Policy had failed. And we have the National Policy to-day, with what hon. gentlemen opposite say are improvements made in it by themselves, yet the population seems to be going out of the country as fast as it was then. I merely rise to voice my opinion in favour of the Minister of the Interior taking steps to get for the future more correct statistics than he has been getting with regard to the people leaving the country.

It would be just as interesting to us to know whether we are losing population as to know whether we are gaining it. My opinion is that we are losing about as much as we are getting, so far as the United States are concerned. No doubt the figures furnished us by the Department of the Interior are fairly correct of the number of people coming in from Great Britain and European countries. We are not losing people going across the water. I trust the minister will take the necessary steps to inform us in the future as to the movement of population both ways, not only from the United States into Canada, but from Canada into the United States.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS — RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. W. B. NANTEL (Terrebonne). (Translation.) Mr. Chairman, the circumstances surrounding this reciprocical convention are somewhat special and very interesting. First, the measure came to us in a very sudden and unexpected manner, as is the government wanted to bring upon parliament and the country a bunch of surprises, as if their intention had been to cause us a surprise. In 1910, it was the War Navy ; in 1911, it is the reciprocity. But not a word had been said during the general election of 1908 of these most vital and serious questions. At the very first session, thanks to the German scare, a ghost sprung for a purpose, we are launched at full steam in the military imperialism, and, in 1910, the German scare being over, the

government gave us this famous navy, Canadian at time of peace, British at time of war. In order that the people, especially of the province of Quebec and of the West, should forget the navy, and to distract public opinion, the government brings up the reciprocity.

When the general elections of 1908 were over, and there was no fear of the electorate we went full sail into naval militarism. In 1911 after the famous election of Drummond-Arthabaska, when the salutary fear of the voter began to tell upon the government, they try on something to show that they want to kill commercial imperialism itself. What then of the argument brought during the election of Drummond-Arthabaska, that the government was creating a navy in order to protect our oceanic trade. One more contradiction dont count much with our hon. friends opposite, principally when the cup is full.

Where are those who in Canada, in these last years, ask this reciprocity with our neighbours? The great national policy has caused in this country a great many struggles. Inaugurated in 1878 by Sir John A. Macdonald, modified in 1897, but maintained in principle by this government, as we have been told by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), who knows pretty well, because he, along with his collegues at that time, the hon. Minister of Finance took part in this tariff reform ; this national policy, as I said, had been definitively accepted by the two parties and was giving satisfaction to the Canadian people. New cities were springing up everywhere like magic and existing cities were doubling their population.

Mr. DEVLIN (Wright). (Translation.) Since when?

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation.) I say since both parties have agreed to put in force a policy of protection, of moderate protection, it is true, but at any rate a policy of protection. That policy has developed the local market, surely the most profitable for us, and that market, supplemented by the interprovincial trade, takes up almost all of our natural products, that is to say, about 80 or 85 per cent, for local consumption. So that there remains only about 15 or 20 per cent of our surplus production which is sent over to Great Britain through our improved system of transportation which has cost us a great deal of money, and to the United States despite the walls put up by themselves, for they are absolutely in need of some of our products as raw material to feed their industries, for instance, wood for the manufacture of paper, and our hard wheat for their flour mills, stuffs which they are so badly in need of that they would have gladly taken them from us, with or without reciprocity.

Who are they then who are clamouring for this arrangement? You may be sure it was not the manufacturers, or the farmers of Quebec or of Ontario, still less the fruit growers and gardeners. The fruit growers have insisted that there should not be any change in the tariff. The opinion of manufacturers regarding this arrangement is known. Who then was asking for it? The grain growers in the west alone complained. With, as appetizers, the speeches made by the right hon. gentleman the Prime Minister during his trip through the west last summer. They, to the exclusion of all others, asked that our fiscal laws be changed. To the children of the soil the answer was that they came too late. To the grain growers, born in foreign lands, and who only of late years joined the Canadian household, greetings of welcome were extended. Is that because they seem to be the wards of the financial nabob, of the railroad king, James J. Hill? Quite possible. Their demands have been in the main complied with, and yet they are not satisfied. As a matter of fact, what they are after is unrestricted reciprocity. They are quite outspoken in the matter, adding that they will keep on fighting until they get what they are intent on obtaining. It is clear that these gentlemen have a great pull, and at the time of their visit to Ottawa during the winter, it was contended that they had come under the patronage of Hill, and even that the latter had paid their railway fares.

Now, who are these grain growers, and are they so very much to be pitied? Are they humble toilers of the soil, poor fellows who barely manage to eke out a living, like those who formerly in Quebec and Ontario cleared the bush, wielding at times the axe, and at times shouldering the gun to fight away the Iroquois? Not by any means; they are wealthy farmers who migrated from Dakota and elsewhere, and who, after selling their farms at advanced prices, settled in the Canadian west with a view to securing for themselves larger farms at the rate of $10 an acre.

While travelling through the west, during the autumn of 1909, I came across one of these pure-blooded Yankee grain growers in the vicinity of Calgary. I was in company with a lands agent who introduced me to that gentleman farmer. Instead of painfully cutting and turning over the furrow with the help of oxen, as described by the poet, he had recourse to a traction engine, and over his immense domain, everything was done by steam. He had come in the warm season to put in the grain; in the autumn he was to return to see to the threshing and to figure out his thousands

of bushels of grain before the wintry weather set in, then he would go down south to enjoy a milder climate, in the vicinity of Los Angeles, where he intended to spend the winter and make the most of life, which as he thought, was very short.

Of course, I do not mean to say that all grain growers are as wealthy as this man; but they are not the most to be pitied amongst Canadians. These grain growers should be treated fairly, and their just requirements complied with, in the same way as those of other members of the great Canadian family; but they should not expect us to subvert and disorganize the fiscal system which is found to be satisfactory to Canada.

The treaty of 1854, which remained in force until 1866, gave rise to discussions which lasted eight years. That famous fiscal arrangement which we are called upon to ratify to-day, has more importance than the treaty of 1854, for as a matter of fact, its scope is wider, and why then should we be expected to dispose of it in the space of a few months. We did not hear of this measure until after New Year's. Ratified in the United States by the House of Representatives, it is now before the Senate. As will be seen, matters are being pushed ahead rapidly. Evidently the grain growers who are the promoters of this move, patronized by Hill, who is interested in the passing of the Bill, have a great deal of pull.

The last person to take a hand in promoting this fiscal measure, was Mr. Bryce, British ambassador at Washington. I shall quote from the 'Gazette' of April 24, 1911, the following extract:

(Text).—Mr. Bryce, ambassador of Great Britain to the United States, has been at Detroit speaking in praise of the Canadian reciprocity arrangement. Lord Sackville, one of Mr. Bryce's predecessors at Washington, twenty-three years ago, was sent home for talking too much about United States political issues. The precedent was not a notably decent one, however, and may be barred by the statute of limitations as to such matters. And Mr. Bryce may be privileged.

(Translation.) As may be seen, great interests are involved in this question, and one might surmise that this reciprocity scheme originated in the minds of the President of the United States, and of the British Ambassador, Mr. Bryce, to favour the political aims of the president of the United States and of the Liberol party, as against the Unionist party in England. Must it be understood that the fate, the destiny of Canada is an incident, a side issue in the political warfare going on between the parties in those countries. The United States are in a state of unrest, there is a crisis impending, while here in Canada business is flourishing. Last autumn, in the United States elections were fought on the question of the cost of living. The Democratic party won out against the Republicans. A change of government is about to be affected; a reform is needed to remedy the present state of things, and the government which is about to come into power, is bound to apply that remedy which is the lowering of the tariff. So that, even should that arrangement not be ratified, there would be a change, and the best proof as to that is that, just now, in the United States Congress, they are discussing the free list, that is an enactment allowing the free entry of goods corresponding practically with that implied in this famous agreement. Consequently, it is likely that had we delayed, we might have obtained, without making any concessions ourselves, the advantages secured through this treaty.

In Canada, where everything is satisfactory, shall we, to help on our neighbours who need medicine, take the same medicine, though in perfect health? For the sake of our neighbours, shall we run the risk of contracting disease?

Now, this agreement is being made with a government about to fall from power. It is a foregone conclusion that before long, there will be a change of government, and as a consequence a change in the tariff, as the Democratic party are on the eve of taking hold of the government. In the meantime, we are going here to considerable pains in view of a state of things which is not at all likely to last very long, a state of things as problematical as a game of bluff, played by these parties in the United States to get hold of power.

An agreement has been gone into with a government which possibly may not be in a position to meet its obligations. True, the House of representatives has approved this agreement, but should the Senate reject it, it would mean to Canada a setback even more humiliating than those we have experienced in former times. Should not our plenipotentiaries have waited a little while and make sure that the government which was a party to this contract would be in a position to carry out their promises?

As I stated a moment ago, this famous question of reciprocity, as well as that concerning the navy, has never been submitted to the people at the general election of 1908. Have we a mandate to settle that reciprocity business? We have at most a general mandate, but no special mandate, since the question has never been submitted to the people. I know that parliament has the right to do anything it pleases. My professor in constitutional law taught that parliament was able to do anything except changing man into woman. Formerly, party leaders made known to the people, in a general election, their policy,

the important measures which they proposed to submit to parliament. It is no longer the fashion to-day. The high art consists in not revealing anything to the people, in going through an election in sphinx-like fashion. By-and-by, vital issues are submitted to parliament, as, for instance, the question of the navy and that of reciprocity; then supporters are whipped into line, the benefits of patronage are dangled before their eyes, and everything goes. Later on the electors are acquainted with what has been done, with the heavy expenditure incurred, and the disadvantages incident on a withdrawal from the position taken are emphasized. If the people approve of what has been done, so much the better; all is well that ends well. If the people withhold their approval, well, at any rate, the party will have enjoyed the exercise of power, four or five years in the meantime. That is a simple and practical device. If, in 1908, when, in his most touching tones, he appealed to his compatriots in Quebec, praying that they allow him to carry through his undertaking—the National Transcontinental railway—the Prime Minister had requested them besides to empower him to provide the country with a war navy and to conclude a treaty of reciprocity with the United States would the results have been the same? To say the least, we are justified in having our doubts as to that.

But this agreement is either good or bad. If it is really beneficial, why has it not been concluded for a given period, and why has it not been safeguarded against, put beyond party warfare and intrigue, especially on the other side of the frontier? The treaty of 1854 was passed for a period of ten years; otherwise, our neighbours would not have been long in denouncing it. Enlightened by past experience, our plenipotentiaries, if they were satisfied that they were making a good bargain with uncle Sam, should have laid down a fixed date, ten or twenty years, and thus secure to us the benefit of it for as long a period as possible.

Who then requested for either country the privilege of abrogating the treaty at will? Was it the representatives of the United States or those of Canada? That would be interesting information. Our plenipotentiaries, always careful to withhold from us information in this connection, have not told us about it. If such a clause was included at their request, they certainly blundered, since they were satisfied that the bargain was beneficial to us.

Stability is indispensable in tariff matters and treaties. The weak point in this arrangement is its unstable character. How should Canadians be expected to make preparations for taking advantage of that market, seeing that our neighbours are at liberty to shut them out at a moment's notice?

The mere fact of our making the best of the opportunity offered might be sufficient reason in he eyes of our neighbours to deprive us of that market. It should be evident to all of us that the Americans, having abrogated the treaty of 1854 because they considered that, all things taken into account, we had the best of it, do not make this offer for our own sake. The fact that no definite period is indicated shows that our representatives themselves who concluded the arrangement did not have absolute confidence in that measure and accepted it as something doubtful, and rather risky as regards any benefits it might confer upon us. It is an experiment, implying some risk and uncertainty, and in exchange for that risky and uncertain prospect, we are asked to give up what we possess as a certainty. That fiscal arrangement is a medicine which our plenipotentiaries are desirous that Canada should take, though in good health, while they are themselves unable to give the assurance that the medicine will give good results, or even is perfectly safe. All they can say, is that should the medicine turn out to be noxious, we shall give up taking it.

Another grave defect of that agreement, consists in discriminating against certain classes of the people, refusing to some of them the protection which it ensures to others in such a way as to develop antagonism and cause friction, and that should make it short-lived, if ever it is fit to live. For instance, it refuses protection to the market gardener while it grants it to the grain-grower. Every one knows that there is a great deal of capital invested in market gardening. Market gardeners are actually manufacturers, but this agreement withdraws all protection from them.

However, it is stated that a market of one hundred millions is going to be opened to us. That is all very fine, but it should not be lost sight of that the Americans are a people of producers and exporters of products similar to ours, and on a larger scale than we are ourselves. Without referring to any statistics, I may state, relying on those previously supplied, that the United States are about the country which exports the largest quantities of products similar to those we produce ourselves. Moreover, this agreement opens our doors to twelve other countries against which we are protected for the present by our fiscal laws. True heretofore our trade intercourse with these twelve nations has not been very extensive, but who can foretell what extension such trade may not take when free entry to our market is given them?

The object of the Americans in showing such generosity in this trade arrangement, was to draw to their country our natural products, the raw material, such as pulp wood, wood pulp and our hard wheat, which they cannot do without. Under that trade

arrangement, we are running great risk of injuring our local market and interprovincial trade.

For instance, who does not realize to-day the importance of our local market? There is no need of statistics for that object; it is enough to be a consumer, to supply oneself on the Montreal market or elsewhere, to know that the prices which farmers sell at to-day are exorbitant and have reached their top limit. It is not within the memory of a man that from $13 to $15 has been paid for a hundred pounds of pork, $12 for a hundred pounds of beef. The prices of these products could not therefore be higher. If, under this arrangement, it is hoped that such prices will be further increased, then woe to the workingmen and consumers in the cities.

On the other hand, the farmer may suffer from a fall in prices though the competition of products from the Argentine, which is one of the countries to which we give free entry under this arrangement, and which through the conservation of meats in cold storage compartments, will be in a position to cater to our markets, with the result that our farmers may be obliged to sell their own products a little cheaper. To this our opponents answer that the agreement under consideration will have the effect of enabling our farmers to get higher prices, while consumers will get commodities cheaper. These two contentions are difficult of agreement. If sane reasoning cannot show the absurdity of such a stand, it will of itself fall to the ground. If the farmer gets a higher price, surely it must be that the consumer is made to pay that higher price. Nowadays production is very costly, because labour is expensive. Farm help is very dear just now, and there is no means of extending farm operations unless there be more help available.

A few days ago, the hon. member for Montcalm (Mr. Lafortune), while acknowledging that this agreement might interfere with certain occupations, such as that of the market gardeners, contended that the latter, might alter their system of farming and grow hay, for instance, in accordance with the new system advocated in this House; that of the continous growing of hay on the same land.

But those good people who formerly accepted literally the teachings of the Minister of Agriculture surrounded by his agricultural lecturers, and who, in accordance with such teaching, devoted their whole attention and energy to market gardening or to dairying, would be obliged to alter their convictions and accept the agronomic heresies of that same Minister of Agriculture who has become a political partisan; all this in spite of the opinion of the specialist, Professor Robertson, of MacDonald College, who declares that fifty million dollars' worth of butter exhaust the soil less than one thousand tons of hay worth $14,000. Really, our farmers will be very much perplexed if they understand that the American hay market may be taken from them at any moment, whereas they are always sure of selling at all times their fruit, vegetables, butter and cheese.

This agreement, moreover, is bound to disorganize and injure our transportation lines as between the different Canadian provinces, on one hand, and on the other in communicating with outlying countries, more especially with British possessions and even with the capital of the empire; it will become impossible to complete and improve such lines. In this respect the denunciation of the treaty of 1854, by which our neighbours intended to injure and annoy us, has proved a boon. Had that treaty continued in force, would we to-day have those railways and waterways which cross our territory in every direction? They have cost us much money, but we are proud of them, feeling as we do that they are our best asset. Would we then have made such gigantic progress in the building up of the Canadian nation? I say that we would not. Being deprived of the American market, which was then our only market, we were obliged to count upon ourselves alone. We have created our local and interprovincial markets; we have succeeded in reaching the British market, the most important in the world. There still remains for us much to do in that direction in the way of improving and perfecting our national organization. If the bulk of our produce, by reason of the new state of things that it is wished to establish, take a different direction from that which we have devised—perhaps somewhat in opposition to ordinary geographical rules —where will be, in future, the stimulant required to induce us to extend and improve those transportation lines. It is not plain that there will be none? What will become of the Georgian Bay canal and other works of a similar nature? If this agreement were ratified, the trend of trade instead of being east and west would be north and south; the direction would be changed and our product following the waterways of the great lakes would accumulate at St. Paul for the benefit of Americans and to the detriment of our own transportation.

Such a policy implies free trade in natural products and in certain manufactured articles. It is the first step towards absolute free trade in all products; it is a foretaste of free trade not only with the United States but with all countries. To establish and justify free trade in all products, it would be sufficient to resort to the same process and use the same

arguments which are set forth in support of the present agreement. It is, therefore, a return to the programme of unlimited reciprocity, the only difference being that it is reached by a more tortuous way. As a matter of expediency, now as in 1897, the principle of protection, is apparently maintained. But, in reality, as I have before stated, this agreement is but a disguised return to the free trade programme of 1891, a return to unlimited reciprocity. It is quite plain that not daring to make such a move openly it is sought to attain the same and by indirect means.

The hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neeley) at a meeting of the faithful held at Ottawa, said:

> The manufacturers are not hurt by this agreement, but they realize that once the people taste the sweets of freer trade in natural products, they will demand freer trade in manufactured goods as well.

For my part I believe in the policy of protection, especially in a young country possessing raw material and all the water-power that can be desired; a country, moreover, surrounded by protected states. I cannot accept this agreement, which I consider wrong and dangerous for the country.

Protection saved France, and thanks to protection Germany is threatening Great Britain's commercial supremacy, and even causing the latter some anxiety as to her naval supremacy. I fear those free traders to whom free trade is as a religion. They ardently support the present measure in the hope that it is but the forerunner of a more complete surrender. I have quoted the member for Humboldt. I might also quote the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith). In the course of the debate the hon. member for Red Deer, that paragon of free trade, that proud disciple of Cobden, gave full scope to his free trade ideas under the paternal eye of the hon. the Prime Minister, and as he spoke his chief seemed to drink in each one of his words as if they had sprung from the very fountain of youth. They seemed to make him twenty years younger and bring him back to the times of the 1891 campaign.

In support of this opinion, let me quote from a portion of the letter of Sir Charles Tupper to Mr. Fielding, which is published in to-day's issue of the Montreal 'Gazette,' the title of this article is 'Macdonald versus Laurier' and reads as follows:

MACDONALD VERSUS LAURIER.

> You say that Sir John A. Macdonald was in favour of reciprocity in 1891; but you do not explain that he was fighting a desperate battle to prevent Laurier and Cartwright, who were co-operating with Wiman and Farrer—avowed annexationists—from carrying unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, which involved Canada taking the tariff made at Washington, with its discrimination against Great Britain.
>
> Have you forgotten that the Hon. Edward Blake left his party on the ground that that policy would end in annexation to the United States, which, at that important crisis, you supported? The policy for which Laurier and Cartwright and Wiman and Farrer were struggling.
>
> It is true that in the struggle, which cost Sir John A. Macdonald his life, in maintaining British institutions for Canada, we succeeded. But before the election Mr. Laurier made the following solemn declaration:—
>
> 'I have read the history of unrestricted reciprocity in this way—that every reform has cost to the reformer years of labour, and those years of labour I, for one, am ready to give; and though the Democrats may be defeated in the States, and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party, as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until that cause is successful. I will not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shades of opposition until the cause has triumphed, and you shall never hear a complaint from me. I tell you the Liberal party will never cease from the agitation until they triumph and obtain continental free trade. We are asked, sometimes, gentlemen, what is the programme of the Liberal party. This is the programme of the Liberal party, to obtain a continental freedom of trade. Success will certainly crown our efforts at no distant day. Fixing our eyes steadily on the goal, we shall go on steadily until we reach it—unrestricted continental reciprocity.

Further in the same letter:

> I am opposed to your agreement with the United States, because Mr. Bayard in 1888 assured Mr. Chamberlain and me that the policy of the Democratic party was to remove as soon as they were able the duties on all the articles in your agreement, and President Taft now sees that he can only secure his re-election policy.
>
> We owe nothing to the Republican party, and would gain everything without any entangling alliance, which will, I fear, end in the destruction of British institutions in Canada.
>
> You ventured to claim the prosperity of Canada as due to the Laurier government. You cannot deny that, without confederation and the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway, Canada could not have attained the great position that she has.

Further again:

> Mr. Laurier (now Sir Wilfrid) pledged to tear up protection and triumph on its head and body, succeeded in obtaining power by a Janus-faced policy on the question of race and religion, but not until he had secretly assured the manufacturers that they would be safe in his hands, and then called you to his aid as Finance Minister, and you, having failed in your first effort, which I denounced, succeeded.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. NANTEL. (Translation). Mr. Chairman, when the House rose at six o'clock, I had laid down as a proposition that this commercial agreement was an earnest, a preparatory measure as it were or the coming back to free trade, and in support of this statement, I had quoted extracts from a letter of Sir Charles Tupper, that veteran of Canadian politics who in his 90th year, is by no means willing to allow hon. gentlemen opposite to misrepresent his statements. In support of this view, let me quote a few extracts from a speech delivered a few days ago in New York by the President of the United States, Mr. Taft.

The treaty provides for free trade in all agricultural products; and in rough lumber down to the point planning. It reduced the duties on secondary food products by a very substantial percentage and it makes such reductions on a number of manufactured articles that those engaged in making them have assured us that the reductions will substantially increase the already large Canadian demand for them.

And further on he adds:

We tendered to the Canadian commissioners absolute free trade in all products of either country, manufactured or natural, but the Canadian commissioners did not feel justified in going so far. It is only reasonable to infer, therefore, that with respect to these articles upon which they refused free trade to us, they felt that the profitable price at which they could be sold by our manufacturers in Canada was less than the price at which their manufacturers could afford to sell the same either to their own people or to us. Hence it follows that their refusal to agree to free trade in these articles as we proposed, is the strongest kind of evidence that if we should take off the existing duty from such articles coming into the United States it would not affect in the slightest degree the price at which these articles could be furnished to the public here. In other words, the proposition to put on the free list for entrance all articles that Canada has declined to make free in both countries would not lower the price to the consumer here.

And further on :

It is said that it injures the farmers. I deny it. It is strictly in accordance with the protective principle that we should only have a protective tariff between us and countries in which the conditions are so dissimilar as to make a difference in the cost of production.

The president then entered into an extended argument to prove that conditions of production in Canada were substantially the same as those in the United States. The difference, if any, was in favour of the United States as that had a greater variety of product cotton and corn, and hogs and cattle fed on corn were distinctly better crops in the United States than in Canada, he said, while the difference as to wheat and barley and oats was the same in different parts of both countries

And further again :

He realized he said that the agitation had raised opposition to the agreement. There was one way to clarify the situation, however, and that was to give the agreement a trial. If it were found that there was an injury to the farmers they possessed sufficient control by legislation to cause the ending the agreement, as neither country was bound to continue it indefinitely.

Finally :

There are other natural resources which I need not stop to enumerate, which will become available to us, as if our own, if we adopt and maintain commercial union with Canada, and this is one of the chief reasons that ought to commend the Canadian agreement to the farseeing statesmanship of leaders of American public opinion.

It appears therefore, from this speech delivered by the president, that his intention is to promote free trade between the two countries, not only in natural but also in manufactured products. One of the motives of the agreement is to give Americans free access to our natural resources.

As I am now referring to this question of natural resources, I will remark that this agreement appeals so little to Canada, that the different provinces and more especially three of the most important ones. have adopted restrictive legislation to protect their natural resources.

Let me first mention the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, who have enacted special statutes to protect the export of timber to the United States. And since the present treaty is on its way—it is now being discussed by the United States Senate—New Brunswick has adopted a statute to protect the natural resources of that province against American invasion.

The hon. member for Red Deer, in his speech on this question, spoke enthusiastically of the condition of workmen in Great Britain. He intimated that notwithstanding free trade, British labour is the best paid in Europe.

A most singular fact! If wages are so high in England, why should there be in that country a constantly increasing army of unemployed, offering a most difficult problem for British statesmen? Why are there so many people idle? Why has it become necessary to have recourse to special legislation for the relief of the poor by establishing the system of old age pensions? If free trade is useful in certain respects, it seems also to give rise to many drawbacks. Is not pauperism one of the curses of England? Is it not so serious a problem that statesmen have sought to solve it by the statute voted on

the 1st August, 1908, and which in 1909-1910 costs the country two hundred and eighteen millions of francs and in 1910-1911 two hundred and thirty millions? Therefore, the advantages of free trade do not go without serious drawbacks. England, that predestinated country where free trade, like the River Pactolus, was going to bring prosperity, is also the country in which the government is most at a loss to find new sources of taxation to feed the ever growing budget.

Allow me to quote here a few lines from a very interesting book entitled 'The English Crisis.'

Grave still is the downfall which threatens a nation where the people live almost exclusively in cities. It is impossible to travel through England without being struck with the contrast between the labouring masses in the cities and the peasants. Nothing can be more lamentable than the sight of the populace that assembles in Trafalgar Square in winter or that of the masses that fill the political meeting halls in the populous quarters of London; the men are nervous, pale and stunted, alcohol and tea have dissolved their muscles and made them an inferior race. A gulf growing deeper every day separates this populace from the prosperous and wealthy classes trained in the sports of the public schools, and also from the higher class of working men who enjoy leisure and play football. To find that impression of strength formerly resulting from contact with the Anglo-Saxon, one must travel through the rural districts. There, John Bull survives: the yeoman farmer appears, his pipe between his teeth, his hands in his pockets, his broad sole set flat on the ground, his self-satisfied smile showing his confidence in the strength of his fists and of his jaw. It is not surprising that the founder of the Physical Education and Progress League, Sir Lander Brunton, found in the abandonment of farms for the cities, in the drift to the urban centres the primary cause of the degeneracy of the English race.

Protection, properly applied, more than any other fiscal system is calculated to secure the necessary revenue for the development of our country and for the immense works which yet remain to be accomplished in a young country like Canada. We require a large revenue to complete our transportation lines and our national public works. If this agreement were ratified, the hon. the Finance Minister might be unpleasantly surprised when he came to make up his next budget speech.

He figured that the decrease in revenue would reach $2,500,000; but I believe the amount should be doubled to cover the actual decrease. The more satisfactory arrangement is, the more will the revenue fall, and if we are anxious to carry on existing works or to start others, it will be necessary to get the necessary funds.

But it is contended that the arrangement does not concern manufacturers. There is

no need for discussing that point; it is perfectly well known to what extent manufacturers are effected: they themselves feel the blow aimed at them and the harm it has done. They are moving accordingly, and are eloquently demonstrating the falsity of that contention. They realize the position in which they have been put, and they have reason to be suspicious. The policy of protection, definitely accepted, in 1897, by both parties, gives satisfaction to all, and they are anxious that it should be maintained. An era of prosperity and a great swing of progress had been the result of its application, but this agreement upsets and turns everything up side down. It deprives us of all control over our tariff legislation, and puts us in many respects under the thumb of our neighbour. It does away with the principles laid down by the right hon. Prime Minister who declared on several occasions that there would be no further change or alteration of the tariff without the parties interested being notified in advance, and an investigation carried on by a commission of experts in connection with which all interests affected would be heard. This agreement does away with those principles and radically changes a large part of the tariff, without putting these people on their guard. If it has been possible to effect those changes, many others may be effected in the future.

I say that this agreement will make us utterly dependent on the Americans as regards our fiscal legislation. I see, for instance, among the articles included in the free list, separators and cream separators which were, it is true, on the free list under the statute, but to which, at the next revision, it might have been possible to ensure legitimate protection. I contend that these apparatus should be protected, even should the only result be to prevent the importation into Canada of inferior makes which are sent from all quarters. As long as this agreement remains in force, we cannot think of protecting that industry without the consent of our neighbours, otherwise the whole agreement falls to the ground.

Then again, that arrangement will prevent American industries requiring our raw material to settle down in Canada; they will build preferably within the territory of the United States. That is only natural; but it means a loss of capital to Canada.

Another objection to that treaty is that we are dealing with a people much stronger than ourselves. A people of one hundred millions against one of eight millions; it is a giant dealing with a dwarf. At the first difficulty which may arise, the dwarf will be overcome. Force overrides right very often. It is always unsafe for the weak to associate with the strong; the story of the iron pot travelling in company with the earthen pot should teach us a

lesson; at the first jar the earthen pot goes to pieces. When Canada's population reaches the twenty-five or thirty million mark; when it has completed its system of transportation, and built the Georgian Bay canal, it may then be desirable for us to negotiate a treaty of commerce with the United States. But I believe that until we have reached that point of development, it would be highly imprudent to conclude such an arrangement with our neighbours.

Now, it is stated: this is a new market which is opened to us and we are not in any way deprived of our present markets. That is so, provided this treaty has not the effect of injuring our local market, for this new market can be taken away from us at the very moment when we least expect it. The interprovincial trade is of great value to us, and as evidence I may point out that timothy seed—an article which the farmer cannot do without—is so scarce just now in Montreal that it is selling at $15 a hundred pounds. Why? Because, it appears, the seed sown last year has been shipped to the west to fill orders of the trade in that district. That gives an idea of the importance of the local and interprovincial trade. I believe that if we should lose that market, we would find no equivalent in the one which this arrangement proposes to secure to us.

In respect to loyalty, it is contended that our loyalty to the British flag should not be made dependent on the sale to the Americans of a few bushels of wheat or a few bales of hay, more or less. Quite right. On the other hand, fortunately, the future of Canadian trade, thanks to the energy of our Canadian statesmen, since the abrogation of the treaty of 1854, no longer depends on the sale of these few bushels of wheat or bales of hay to the Americans. Owing to the sacrifices we have made, to the great works we have carried through, we are independent from those who were intent on starving us in 1854. Why should we once more put ourselves at their mercy? We have secured to our products a goodly part of the British market, the best in the world; let us endeavour to retain it and develop it as much as we can.

Are there any who sincerely believe that if the treaty of 1854 had not been repealed, Canada would occupy a position as prominent as that it now occupies. I say no. Had not that treaty been denounced, we would have remained forever under the control of the Americans. That repeal was then beneficial to us. Why should we once more agree to being dictated to by the Americans?

Annexation has been referred to. I for one have no fear of wilful annexation, especially as long as there are in Canada French Canadians having a word to say on the subject, for my fellow-citizens feel that they are fairly dealt with under the protection of the British flag, that their religion, their language and their institutions are secure under the constitution and that they enjoy greater safeguards in the folds of that flag than they likely would in the folds of the stars and stripes. I am aware of all that, but I am also aware that the most prominent of American statesmen who discussed the question of reciprocity in rather reckless fashion made a plea for annexation which should induce us to be careful, and which even statesmen in Germany have considered worth while discussing in their parliament. I am also aware that several of our most prominent Canadians, who are no longer in politics, have pointed to annexation as the inevitable outcome of it all. In any case, if there is no real danger of annexation, it must be admitted that the Americans have not been able to conceal their innermost thoughts in this connection.

However, a real danger is that of the seceding of some of the western provinces, especially if there be no closer control exercised over the character of the immigration going into that part of the country. Americans have been coming into Canada for several years back at the rate of 50,000 or 60,000 per year, on an average. Should those proposals be ratified will the result likely be to attract here a still larger number of Yankee settlers? It seems to me it will. I stated in 1909, on the floor of this House, that this immigration was not of the best and the most desirable type. I say so once more.

Those American railways which have terminals in our country and make themselves at home in our country are another source of danger; they attract our trade as so many suction pumps, and take it to the other side of the line.

A striking fact is that the originator of the policy which is responsible for the two danger points implied in these proposals, the man who more than any other helped to bring them into existence, the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), has seceded from his leader on this very question, and is fighting the government. It is unfortunate that he did not find his Damascus road at an earlier period.

It is contended that the markets which are open to us to-day will continue to be open to us in the future. Yes, provided they are not injured by the new impulse given to our trade in other directions. It is evident that should the bulk of our trade take the direction of the United States in direct line from north to south, along the various railway lines owned by James Hill, acting as so many suction pumps and drawing our wheat towards the

United States flour mills, our railway and steamship lines will be running empty and the companies will soon be tired of carrying on an unprofitable business. It will be found more difficult to undo such a state of things than it would be to prevent its establishment. That is a grevious danger which these proposals will only tend to make worse, a danger to which we should not close our eyes.

The hon. Minister of Finance, speaking the other day at Montreal, said:

> There is a distinct danger that the east and west may be brought into antagonism if not into open hostility.

Further on he added:

> The west is going to dominate Canada and we who live in the east, if we are wise, may as well see that and look ahead.
> What kind of west is it going to be? A wise prudent and sympathetic west, or a rash, reckless and dangerous west.

Yes, the west may turn out to be actually an element of danger, not only from the economic, but from the national point of view. Has not a movement in favour of secession been launched in former days in the maritime provinces for reasons of minor importance if compared with those existing in the west? And the hon. minister wonders what will be the complexion of the west. I say the west will be such as you make it. If you continue bringing into the west Americans by hundreds of thousands, and if you throw them in with other hundreds of thousands of people who have come from all parts of the world, booked at the rate of five dollars a head, a mixture of all nationalities, it is much to be feared that these Americans will remain Americans or will not easily be Canadianized. I think you will hasten and intensify the danger by persisting in that obnoxious immigration policy.

If the east is one day to be controlled by the west, it is incumbent on us to defer and prevent as much as possible that danger, and with a view to making that state of things more bearable, immigration should be more closely scrutinized and a better selection made of those who are destined to rule over us. We should make it a point to direct towards the west settlers from the other provinces of the Dominion; for instance, from Quebec and Ontario, and also from the British Isles, instead of promoting the immigration of American settlers on our soil. If we are bound to be ruled by the west, let us keep an eye on those whom we admit into the country, as foreigners may make trouble for us.

In the midst of that medley of settlers of all nationalities who take up lands in the west, the Yankees who are educated, wily and ambitious, will in the end secure the leadership. Canadianization will progress slowly and may never be accomplished thoroughly and satisfactorily. The stars and stripes will be unfurled as often as the national emblem.

If you give to all these people the advantage of trading more freely with the corresponding States of the Union, than with the Canadian provinces, it is not necessary to peep very far into the future to detect the danger that is awaiting us, to realize its full consequences.

If it is the ultimate destiny of the west to dominate in this country, let us make it our duty to send there only desirable settlers coming from the United Kingdom and from the older provinces of the Dominion. We must deal fairly with those who are there already, but there is no need to spoil them by undue favours the only effect of which would be to give them wrong dispositions. Our aim should be to allure them towards Canada rather than direct them towards the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I will vote against this agreement because I see in it more dangers than real advantages; because the prosperous state of affairs in this country is so general that we are not at liberty to run such risks; because it is desirable, in my opinion, to see the great bulk of our trade to continue by the routes we have opened and maintained at the cost of tremendous sacrifices and energy; because I would rather see the bulk of our commercial transactions done with the people of England than with the people of United States, who at a time that we were in great need of them, have wantonly closed their doors against us, and have put us in the necessity of seeking an outlet for our overproduction upon the English market; because I am satisfied that we will fare better with England than with the United States; because we can always expect fair play from John Bull if we know enough to resist his encroachments, while Uncle Sam might be found wanting in a moment of need. Above all I will vote against this agreement because the electors have not been consulted and have had no occasion to decide upon the advisability of this new policy, no more than upon the naval policy. I consider it a wrong principal not to consult the electorate beforehand upon such important questions, and to appeal to the people afterwards and ask them to ratify what has been done.

Mr. J. G. TURRIFF (Assiniboia). Mr. Chairman, as I represent a constituency that for over 110 miles borders the United States, and one which is settled by 50,000 people, chiefly engaged in agriculture, I feel that I would not be doing justice to the people I represent, or to myself, did I not,

even at this late stage of the debate, express the views that I, and the great majority of my people hold upon this question. This is the most important question that has been presented to the consideration of the Canadian people since confederation. Every government in Canada has been in favour of reciprocity, and has done its best to make an agreement such as we have or are about to accomplish now. I am not going to dwell particularly on what was the attitude of the Liberal party, forty, thirty or even ten years ago, and I am still less concerned as to what was the attitude of the Conservative party on this question during these past years. What we have to consider now, and what we have to decide is whether this agreement that has been arranged between the people of the United States and Canada is good for the people of Canada to-day. If it is we ought to put it into force. If it is not we should not put it into force. That is the question that we have to decide in the very near future. We have had a good deal of opposition developed to this agreement, but it has been developed pretty much during the last three months. I remember very well that when my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) read this agreement to the House hon. gentlemen opposite were surprised, they were pleased and they cheered the Finance Minister almost as much on that side of the House as we did on this.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Not a cheer, not a chirp.

Mr. TURRIFF. Why is all this change being made? Because since that time they have been whipped into line. Now, Mr. Chairman, it has been stated time and again in this House that we should not go on with this agreement because we have no mandate from the people of Canada. I have been through three Dominion elections and on the platform in these elections——

An hon. MEMBER. We will fix you at the next one.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well, if you can do it you are welcome, and I would be very glad to have my hon. friend across the way who has spoken come out, and try it. I was about to say that I have been through three Dominion elections, and on every one of these occasions I advocated reciprocity or better trade relations with the United States. But, I am not the only one to advocate reciprocity or better trade relations with the United States in the last election. My hon. friends opposite did the same thing in my constituency, let me tell you that, Mr. Chairman. The year before the elections, in the fall of 1907, the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), made a tour through the west. He did me the honour of having a meeting in my constituency, at Weyburn—the only meeting he held in southern Saskatchewan —and at that meeting there was a gathering of the clans from east and west, brass bands in attendance, flags flying and everything lovely. In the evening they held a demonstration, and on the principal banner which was stretched across the skating rink were the words 'Reciprocity with the United States.' I am not going to try to make a point against the hon. leader of the opposition, because I do not suppose that he knew anything more about that declaration being put up there than I did. But, it shows that the Conservative party in the west, the year before the last election, which is exactly three and a half years ago now, were in favour of, and advocated reciprocity with the United States. One of the speakers at that meeting referred to the banner, and pointed out the advantages that would flow from a deal of that kind. So, when I say that not only the Liberal party, but the Conservative party have been in favour of that proposition I am stating the absolute facts of the case. It is no discredit to Sir John Macdonald that he did not get reciprocity. He tried his utmost to get it, and it was not his fault that he failed. The failure was due to the fact that the people of the United States at that time were not ready for reciprocity. It was not the fault of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that he did not get reciprocity when he went down to Washington not so very many years ago. Imagine, Mr. Chairman, if you can, the attitude of the hon. member for North Toronto if, this agreement that we have now before us being made available to us by the people of the United States, my right hon. friend the leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had refused to accept it? I can imagine him making this council chamber ring with the denunciation of the party that having an opportunity to get such an agreement for the people of Canada, and would hesitate to take advantage of it.

Let us see for a few minutes who are the people who are opposed to reciprocity. In the first place we have the Manufacturers' Association of Canada; in the second place we have some of the large financial institutions and some of the bankers; and in the third place we have the Conservative party in the House of Commons, not in the country, but in the House of Commons. Let us see to what extent these people are good judges——

Mr. BLAIN. What about the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton)?

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend does not need to ask me about the hon. member for

Brandon. I admire and respect the hon. member for Brandon a great deal more than any member on that side of the House does, and if the hon. members on that side of the House had one-tenth of the political honour and honesty of the hon. member for Brandon it would not be three members, as we have on this side of the House who are not in favour of reciprocity, but it would be three dozen on the other side of the House who were in favour of reciprocity. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see to what extent these people that I have mentioned—the Manufacturers' Association, the financial institutions and the Conservative party in the House of Commons— are good judges of what is good for Canada and what is not good for Canada. You will remember, and every member of this House will have it in mind, that fourteen or fifteen years ago, when the Fielding tariff was first brought in, in 1897, the Manufacturers' Association was up in arms, the financial institutions were up in arms and my hon. friends on the opposite side of the House were up in arms and denounced the Fielding tariff as a tariff that was going to ruin the country, wipe out our manufacturers and, in fact, was the worst piece of legislation that could be put upon the statute-books. Did anything of that kind come to pass? Has not the country continued to progress more and more ever since? The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel), who has just taken his seat, pointed out not five minutes ago that the country was so prosperous that we should not make any changes. The financial institutions took the same course and it turned out that they also were wrong and did not know what was good for Canada. My hon. friends in the House of Commons did the same thing and it turned out that they did not know what was good for Canada. Then, again, when the preference in favour of Great Britain was introduced, every one of these people opposed it in just the same way as being the worst possible that could happen in the interest of the people of Canada, and yet the results were such that even if my hon. friends opposite were in power to-morrow they would not dare lay their sacrilegious hands on that British preference although they opposed it tooth and nail. When this agreement comes into force, as come it will, and when it has been in force for six months, if such an unlikely thing could happen that hon. gentlemen opposite should come to this side of the House, they would no more change that agreement than they would dare change the preference to Great Britain.

I want to say a word or two, and I will be as moderate as I possibly can, to the manufacturers of Canada, and especially to the Manufacturers' Association. If the manufacturers have one great enemy in Canada, in my judgment it is not the Liberal party and it is not this government, but it is the Manufacturers' Association. The Manufacturers' Association have done more to put the people of Canada against the manufacturers than any other individual, or combination, or association could do. Last year, my right hon. friend toured throughout the west, met the farmers, heard their grievances and told them that he would take these matters into consideration. No sooner had he got home than the Manufacturers' Association got up a party to tour the west to counteract the effects that the meetings and delegations of farmers and grain growers might have on my right hon. friend. The result of that was to force the grain growers and farmers of the west to get up the big delegation that came down here last fall to interview the government and try to press home their arguments.

When the delegation from the west was in Ottawa I noticed that hon. gentlemen opposite were very anxious to show them around and to be gracious to them and to say what very fine fellows they were just then. Of course, the delegates were asking for something and these gentlemen opposite thought the government was not going to give it to them, and so they posed as friends of the farmers and the grain-growers. But since this agreement was put before the House which gives the farmers of the west—not all they had asked for in some respects it is true, but in other respects a great deal more than they had asked, and that they had ever expected to get—since then these gentlemen opposite cannot say too much against the Grain Growers' Grain Company which is part and parcel of the Grain Growers' Association of the three prairie provinces. Well, my friends in the west, the grain growers will know how to size up these gentlemen opposite pretty accurately. I want to point out to the manufacturers that this agreement does not hurt them to any extent, and I say further that if there is one class of people on this earth who should favour it and have nothing to say against it, it is the manufacturers of Canada, because, practically, they are left untouched. The result of this agreement will be that the people of Canada will be much more prosperous under it, and will make greater progress in the future than even in the past, in consequence of which there will be a larger market for the manufacturers of eastern Canada. Some people think that we in the west will become a manufacturing people, but personally I do not think so. I think it will always be cheaper to bring manufactured goods to the west than to transport the raw material and manufacture it there, because there is no question that the cost of living is higher in the west than it is in the east, and for many years to come we must be the consuming part of Canada, buying the bulk of the

goods that we use from the manufacturers of Ontario and Quebec. It stands to reason that the more people you have in the west and the more prosperous they are the more goods will the Canadian manufacturer sell. As has been pointed out by the Minister of Finance, there are now two million people in the west, and they consume more per capita than the people of other sections of the country because they earn more and they spend more, and inside of ten years it is safe to say that there will be five million people west of the Great Lakes. Now, if the manufacturers of Canada have five million people to supply instead of two millions or less as at present, look at what advantage it will be to them. I want to say to the manufacturers that it will behoove them to just be a little careful because as hon. gentlemen opposite know the people of the three prairie provinces are to a large extent low tariff people whether they are Liberals or Conservatives,—of which we have evidence by certain motions moved by these gentlemen on the other side,—and if the manufacturers insist on looking for trouble they will be very apt to find it in the end. Therefore, in heir own interest the manufacturers ought to be careful. Why, the grain growers, the farmers and the people of the west generally are the most reasonable people on the face of the earth. They want a square deal; they do not want to be hewers of wood and drawers of water for all time to come. The day has gone when you could make a farmer in the west or in the east either believe that protection protects him, but at the same time they are willing to pay their fair share towards meeting the expenses of the country. There are a good many things on which the tariff must be reduced, but if we get this agreement through and secure the American market for the products of the Canadian farmer, we will have made a great step in the right direction, and the people of the west will be reasonably well satisfied. Let me tell you that if this agreement is not carried into effect there will be a general agitation that will never be put down until there is a reduction of the tariff all around, which would take in a great deal more manufactured articles than this agreement deals with. I speak for the western farmers principally—there are gentlemen in this House who can speak for the eastern farmers—I speak for the western farmers in what I say as to this agreement. It has been stated time and again in this House by gentlemen opposite that the American market is not as good as the Canadian market and will therefore be of no advantage to us. Even supposing that were true we do not stand to lose anything. If the American market is lower than the Canadian market we won't ship our goods there, and we do not lose the British market, nor do we lose our home market. But as a matter of fact that is not so. I lived for twenty years on the prairie right near the American boundary, and I make the statement that from the day the territory of Saskatchewan had a bushel of wheat for sale—I do not speak as to the last two years, because I have no personal knowledge as to that period—but previous to the last two years there never was a year during which at some time of the season the Canadian farmer could not draw his wheat across the line and get for it from five cents to ten cents a bushel more than he could get at home.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And pay the duty?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, and under this agreement he won't have any duty to pay.

Mr. CAMPBELL. And he won't get any ten cents more.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am not going to say that wheat should have been ten cents higher on the American side, but I do say that there has never been a year when the big milling associations and the big wheat exporters and domestic buyers have not been able to put the price down below the actual value of the wheat in Canada, and so, by taking it across the line our farmers got better prices. I know what I am talking about, because I have grown wheat in the west and I have bought wheat and I have sold wheat. I do not say that at all times of the year there is that difference or that there will be that difference in the future at all times of the year, but I say there has been a better market generally all along the border line on the American side than on the Canadian side, and we will get the advantage of that when this agreement is put in force. But wheat is not the only article the western farmers have to sell. They grow a great deal of flax and a great deal of barley in my section of the country, and I will give you an actual incident that has taken place.

About a month ago one of my constituents spent a few days with me in Ottawa. He is a farmer in the western portion of my district, an educated and wealthy man, a young man who went out there twelve or fifteen years ago as a school teacher, who has now made enough money to retire easily if he wished to, although he is still a young man. He told me that last year he had as a side crop 2,000 bushels of flax. Last year it cost him exactly $500 in cold cash to put that flax into Duluth, where practically all the flax from that part of the country goes. There is a duty of 25 cents a bushel on flax entering the United States, and that made $500 on his 2,000 bushels, which went

into the coffers of the United States treasury. If he could have loaded his car on the American instead of the Canadian side of the line he would have got exactly $500 more for his two carloads of flax than he did get. As he said to me in my house: Do you think you are going to make me more loyal to Great Britain or more loyal to Canada by taking $500 out of my pocket on one side crop in one year? He said, the thing is absurd; if I had that $500 I would not bury it in the earth, that money would have been in circulation and a great deal of it would have got back again to the east in payment for manufactured goods. That is only one farmer; I have scores and scores of farmers who raise from 500 to 2,000 bushels of flax. In the southern portion of the district of Regina there are hundreds of thousands of bushels of flax raised and there will be a great deal more in the future, because if you get a market for your flax without paying 25 cents duty, our farmers will grow a great deal more, and the day will come when we will have to grow less wheat. This very season if we should happen to strike a good crop in the west we will have in the three prairie provinces more wheat for export than Great Britain ever bought in any one year.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Oh, go on with you.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend says, go on.

Mr. CAMPBELL. That is nonsense.

Mr. TURRIFF. Last year Great Britain bought 163,000,000 bushels of wheat from all over the world.

Mr. AMES. 250,000,000.

Mr. CAMPBELL. 275,000,000.

Mr. TURRIFF. And we will have, if we strike anything like a good crop, more than that much to export. I am not ashamed to acknowledge if I have made a mistake; possibly I have omitted what has gone in in flour. Even admitting, an my hon. friend said, that Great Britain imported over 200,000,000 bushels, at any rate it will be only two or three years until we have 250,000,000 bushels for export. If we take some land out of growing wheat and put it into growing flax, for which there is an immense market in the United States, it will be better for the land, better for the farmer, and better for everybody.

Mr. THORNTON. Does my hon. friend attribute the better price of wheat in the United States to free trade?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, I do not attribute the better price in the past to free trade, because we did not have free trade in wheat in the United States in the past, but we have had a better price there.

Mr. TURRIFF.

Mr. THORNTON. Was it free trade in the United States that made the better price?

Mr. TURRIFF. I never understood that the United States was a free trade country; I always understood they had a tariff, so I do not see the point of my hon. friend's question.

Turning to the question of barley, in my part of the country they grow a good deal of barley. This same constituent told of another case where he would have made more money under an agreement such as this. Three years ago he had 3,000 bushels of barley for sale. There is 30 cents a bushel duty on barley going into the United States. He had to sell that barley at home, and got 48 cents a bushel, a good price for barley at the station; but if he could have loaded that barley on the south side of the line on that very same day on which he sold it for 48 cents he could have got 70 cents, a difference of 22 cents a bushel.

Mr. THORNTON. If the duty was 30 cents a bushel, why was it not worth more on the American than on the Canadian side?

Mr. TURRIFF. Sometimes there is a difference of exactly 30 cents, sometimes more than 30 cents, and sometimes less than 30 cents; on this occasion it was 22 cents, so that he lost on his 3,000 bushels just $660. So that that one farmer on two side crops made $1,160 less than he would have made under such an agreement as is proposed.

Mr. STAPLES. What is that farmer's name?

Mr. TURRIFF. Frank Moffatt of Weyburn, and any one may write to him and he will confirm that statement.

A further advantage under this agreement and the consequent increased growth of barley would arise from the fact that by growing barley you can very often serve the same purpose as by summer fallowing your land, that is you can clean out the weeds before you sow the barley in the spring. If we had a good market in the west for our barley and flax, as well as our wheat, the farmer would be able to rotate his crops, to keep his farm cleaner and to put it in better shape. In addition to that there are millions of acres of land in the northern part of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta that will never be suitable for growing wheat; the soil is right, the moisture is right, but you are subject to summer frosts. By going into the raising of barley there are millions of acres where you can grow barley and have a certainty of good crop where you would not be at all certain of a good crop of wheat. That will be a very very great advantage

Mr. CAMPBELL. Where are those millions of acres?

Mr. TURRIFF. In the northern part of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What part?

Mr. TURRIFF. Just north of where you live, north of the wheat growing belt.

Mr. CAMPBELL. My constituency runs right to the northern boundary of Manitoba and we grow wheat successfully right at the line, and good wheat. My hon. friend must be talking of some place further north, in the frozen Arctic regions.

Mr. TURRIFF. I was talking of the province of Manitoba as my right hon. friend the Prime Minister offered to make it.

Mr. STAPLES. Why didn't he make it?

Mr. TURRIFF. Because the Prime Minister of Manitoba still wants to keep it as a postage stamp on the map for electioneering purposes. It is not only in grain products that the people of the west will benefit. It is also in cattle. I happened to be in the west not long ago, since this discussion began, and I naturally kept my ears open, on the cars and in the hotels and got into discussion more or less with the people, many of whom I did not know—I did not know either their names or their politics and the general impression through the western portion of the country was that it would be worth $6 or $7 a head to them on cattle that were fit to export to have the American market free.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought the consumer paid the duty under the policy of my hon. friend's party.

Mr. TURRIFF. In this case there would be no duty. My hon. friend does not seem to realize yet the meaning of the agreement.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend was pointing out a few moments ago the amount of money a farmer would make on his barley. What I said was that my hon. friend's party had always told the people of Canada that it was the consumer who paid the duty.

Mr. TURRIFF. I am trying to tell my hon. friend that there would be no duty to pay, and that the farmer would get a better price for his products. Now, my hon. friend is a doubting Thomas, and I am going to convince him, if he can be convinced. I was in Winnipeg less than a month ago, and one rancher from Alberta, not far from the boundary line, made the statement that last fall he had sold between 200 and 300 steers to be delivered at the railway—and let me say here that when cattle are sold in the west, it does not matter to whom they are sold, those for export go to Gordon and Ironsides, and those to be butchered go to Pat Burns. Before this man could get his cattle rounded up, twelve of the steers had drifted across to the American side of the line. The boundary line there is not visible, at least, the cattle do not know when they cross it. On each side of the line there is a Cattlemen's Association, and the association in Montana look after all stray cattle, and, as a rule, every stray animal that is fit for market is shipped to the market at once, in order to get it off the grass, which is wanted for the cattle that are not fit for the market. These twelve stray animals were shipped to Chicago, the freight was paid on them, the commission was paid to the man who sold them and exchange was paid on the money coming back, and this rancher on the Canadian side said that a few months afterwards he got a cheque for the twelve steers, and it amounted to exactly $8 a head more than he had got for the cattle that he sold at home. In the face of these facts, what man is going to say that reciprocity is not good for the western farmer?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am.

Mr. TURRIFF. My hon. friend says he is, but he will have a nice time with his electors. I am delighted to see the hon. gentleman toeing the mark and standing up with his party to vote against reciprocity. I was afraid at one time that our hon. friends opposite from the west were going to vote for it. If they vote against it, I can tell them that many of them will not warm seats in this House in the next parliament.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The fear is mutual. We thought you were going to be with us.

Mr. TURRIFF. I want to say a word or two about some of the bankers. I refer more particularly to the letter written by Sir Edmund Walker. Some ancient said, 'Oh, that mine enemy would write me a letter.' Well, if the Liberal party had sat up every night for a month, I think they could not have made any better literature for themselves than the letter Sir Edmund Walker wrote.

An hon. MEMBER. What about the farmers?

Mr. TURRIFF. I am speaking as a representative of the farmers. If Sir Edmund Walker had given the matter a second thought, he would not have been so ready to fly to the newspapers on the question of reciprocity. If there is any

class of people who have been well treated by all governments in Canada it is the bankers. Just let us see what position they occupy; and I am not going to criticise what has been done for them. I believe it has been in the interests of the country generally to give them what they have been given, but there are some things they have been doing that I think are open to criticism. I am going to give some figures which I have taken from the returns in the Canada 'Gazette' of April 20. I find, after deducting the 5 per cent of the circulation which the bankers have to put up to guarantee the notes of all the banks, that the banks of Canada have at the present moment $77,364,134 of bank bills for which they do not pay one cent of interest, they have also deposits of $278,171,792, that do not bear interest, making a total of $355,535,925 which they get from the people of Canada absolutely free of cost; and they get that money to loan it out to you and me or any one else who has to borrow it, at 6 per cent, and when times get a little hard, they charge us 7 per cent. In addition, they have $533,032,466 for which they pay at the outside 3 per cent. Then they have at the present time invested in the United States $149,477,172. As I have said, I quite believe in the policy of putting the banks in a good position. I think it has been all right to give them that currency free. I think it all right for the banks to take that $149,000,000 down to Uncle Sam's territory and use it to move the southern cotton crop and to loan it out on call loans at from two to fifty per cent according to the state of the market; because I realize that if they did not do that, they would have the money more or less idle at home. But what I do object to is that while Sir Edmund Walker took the millions from his bank and sent them to New York and Chicago to make money for his shareholders without affecting their loyalty or the loyalty of himself, he thinks that the farmer, who puts up that money, cannot be allowed to sell a steer, or a horse or a pig, or a carload of barley, or flax in the United States without becoming a disloyal man, ready to disrupt the empire. Did you ever hear anything more absurd in your life?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Never.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TURRIFF. You are not going to stampede me or rattle me. I got up to say a few things, and I am going to say them. The fact that you like them or the fact that you do not like them will not make any difference.

Now, I wish to take up the question of railways for a minute. The hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel), was very much afraid that the railway traffic was going to be diverted to the south. He said that J. J. Hill had a number of lines built on the American side close to the Canadian boundary, and if this amendment went into force, all our traffic would go into the United States. Well, let us look at the situation for a moment. The Canadian Pacific railway, the only transcontinental line in Canada that is completed, has one road from the west to the east. But how many lines has it west of Winnipeg running from Canada into the United States? One would think, to hear hon. members on the other side talk about the disloyalty of trading with the United States, and the danger of ruining the Canadian Pacific railway, that the Canadian Pacific railway would be very anxious to keep away from the United States. But the Canadian Pacific railway has some seven lines, built by themselves without any assistance from Canada, and without any request from the people of Canada to build them, running from Canadian territory into the United States—six or seven lines west of Winnipeg. And the Great Northern railway and the Canadian Northern railway have each two or three lines running into the United States in the same way. Was it disloyal to build these lines running into the United States? And as to our traffic being diverted to the United States, I just want to say this: The Canadian Pacific railway was largely built by the people of Canada. The Grand Trunk railway is being largely built by the people of Canada. The Canadian Northern railway is being largely built by the people of Canada. The Canadian Pacific railway is the only completed road, and it has the shortest line from the prairies of the west to tidewater. It has a line 275 miles shorter than any American road. And if, with the shortest road and with a railway more than half built for them, they cannot carry this traffic as cheaply as the American lines which would have to pay for every dollar of their construction, then the Canadian Pacific railway ought to lose the traffic. If they want to retain the traffic all they have to do is to lower their freight rates. And look at the position: The Canadian Pacific railway is paying not only interest on its bonds and dividends on its preferred stock, but it is also paying 10 per cent on its common stock which is largely composed of water. The Canadian Pacific railway during the last half year set apart as a rest no less than $10,500,000, and in the previous half another $10,000,000; that is, in one year they set aside $20,500,000 as a rest fund. And last year they paid 9 per cent, and they are to pay 10 per cent in the future. So, I say, all they have to do in order to retain the trade of the country is to lower

freight rates, and I can assure you their freight rates would stand lowering. I heard of one extraordinary instance, and I want to take advantage of the opportunity now to bring it to the attention of the Minister of Railways. It seems to me it raises the question as to whether the Railway Commission of Canada should not be instructed to look into its tariffs and find out if they are not iniquitous, and not wait for the individual who has suffered injustice to bring a case before them. If a merchant or manufacturer in Ottawa wishes to send a carload of goods, half, let us say of class 5 and the other half class 6, he can ship that to any place from here to Halifax or from here to Port Arthur, paying the carload rate on the higher class. But, if he ships to west of Port Arthur, he cannot get a carload rate at all; he has to pay by the 100 pounds. If that is true—and I believe it is —it is iniquitous, and it is a matter for the Railway Commission to take up, not waiting for anybody who suffers the injustice to bring their attention to it.

Now, when I started to speak I promised some of my friends that I would not occupy more than three-quarters of an hour. I have taken up about that time, and I do not wish to take up any more. I am thoroughly in sympathy with the agreement; I believe it is the best bargain the government of Canada has ever made and that it is a bargain that will lead to increased prosperity for the country. I have been seven years in this House and before that I was often in the gallery a listener. And, so far as I know—and if I am wrong my right hon. friend the leader of the House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) can correct me—there has never been a year I think, when hon. members opposite did not come forward with resolutions denouncing the policy of the government, and trying to show that the country was not as prosperous as it ought to be. But, since this reciprocity agreement was introduced, hon. members opposite have changed their tune altogether, and, they declare, like the hon. member for Terrebonne, the country is now so prosperous it would be a crime to make any change. If hon. members opposite are right now, they have been wrong for fourteen years. According to the theory of probabilities they were more likely to be honest when they went thirteen times in successive years in one direction than now when, to suit their political exigencies, they try to make out that this is not a good agreement. If there were no politics in this, not one in twenty of them would be against this agreement. So, I hope the right hon. Prime Minister will go right on with this question, pound it right through and not take back water for a moment. It is the will of the people, and we were sent here to represent the people. We believe that this agreement is a right thing; and for my part I am satisfied that if this agreement is put in force, a new era of prosperity will dawn for Canada, even greater prosperity than we have had in the past; and I believe that Canada will grow and thrive and occupy an even higher position in the great sisterhood of nations making up the British Empire to which we are so proud to belong.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE (Lisgar). My constituency in the province of Manitoba is situated a good deal the same as that of the hon. member (Mr. Turriff), who has just taken his seat. My constituency extends along the international boundary for about eighty miles. The farmers in my constituency can see the farmers across the line receiving a higher price for their wheat, they can see the farmers across the line receiving a higher price for their barley, and as my hon. friend says, they also get a higher price for their stockers. I saw the apparent relief that this Bill would give our people, on the 26th day of January when the Finance Minister unfolded this plan to the House. I saw that it would apparently be an advantage to them, I saw that our people might possibly get a better price for those articles. But let me ask, is this the relief that the people of western Canada have been asking for? Is this the relief that they are entitled to? I say no, not by any means. On account of this apparent relief to the people in my constituency, I received many resolutions from the grain growers asking me to support this proposition of reciprocity. but after listening to the discussion in this House and studying the question for myself, I decided that so far as I was concerned I would not support it. Apparently the people in my constituency wanted it; the men who had voted for me and sent me here apparently wanted it. If they wanted it, and I had decided not to vote for it, what was my duty under the circumstances? I made up my mind to go home and to lay the matter plainly before my constituents, and if a majority of my supporters still wanted it, then I was prepared to resign my seat and allow them to send some one else who would vote for it. In order to ascertain their opinion I held four meetings within the local constituencies in the Dominion constituency of Lisgar and gave every person an opportunity to attend the meetings. After I had held those meetings and explained my position fully, I asked all those men who had voted for me in the election of 1908, to remain, as I wished to go into the matter a little more fully with them, and I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that after I had laid my ideas before them, there was only one man at all

those meetings who stood up and voted for reciprocity, and opposed my stand. Notwithstanding what the hon. gentleman from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), has said, I am satisfied that when the people of Canada understand this deal they will reject it entirely. This government has forced through the Autonomy Bill without submitting it to the people, they have forced through the Grand Trunk Pacific deal without submitting it to the people, last year they forced through the Navy Bill without submitting it to the people, but I want to tell the Prime Minister that the Conservative party in this House will not allow this deal to go through until it has been submitted to the people. We are prepared at any time to abide by the will of the people, and we now ask the Prime Minister to submit this question to the people, and I am satisfied that when he does so we will come back from western Canada stronger than we are now.

The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat has gone into the conditions in western Canada. Who is responsible for those conditions? Why, it is the Prime Minister of this country, who has held the reigns of power during the past fifteen years and has not done one thing yet for the grain growers or farmers of Canada. He has allowed them to be fleeced in every way. Sir, what are the conditions in western Canada at the present time? The beef combine and the pork combine have driven the producers out of business entirely, and that is the chief reason for the high price of those articles in western Canada at the present time. Time and again we have appealed to this government for relief, and they have refused it. Take this cement combine. The government allowed that cement combine to be formed, and helped it through. Our people in western Canada are using more cement every year. In my little town of Manitou we put down cement sidewalks to the value of $13,000 or $14,000 before this cement combine was organized. If we had waited until after the combine had been formed to buy our cement, it would have cost us $1,300 or $1,400 more. My hon. friend from Assiniboia has said that the railway companies are robbing the people of western Canada, and that is true, as every one knows who is acquainted with the conditions. Our people are paying twenty to eighty per cent higher rates than the people are paying on the other side of the line, and the Prime Minister of this country is responsible for it. The wheat combine are manipulating grades and prices and are trimming the farmers, there is no doubt about that. The farmers on the other side of the line get higher prices than we do. Again, the Prime Minister is responsible for that. The implement companies are charging us a third more than they should for our implements, at least we think so. Take a case that occurred at Miami, in the province of Manitoba. Three farmers there who were growing corn wanted to buy a corn binder, and they went to the three different companies who were selling binders in the town of Miami. The Deering Company and the McCormick Company offered to sell a binder for $150. I understand that corn binders are not manufactured in Canada by those companies and these companies import them and pay duty on them. Then these farmers went to the Massey-Harris Company who asked $160 for a binder, the same article, without paying any duty at all. That is the condition of affairs in western Canada at the present time. Is it, therefore, any wonder that the people are ready to grab at anything which looks like relief to them? There is a combine to keep up the prices of every thing they have to buy, and there is a combine to keep down the prices of everything they have to sell. That is the condition the government has allowed to grow up during the past fifteen years. That is the condition the Prime Minister found when he went to western Canada last summer. At every point he was met by a delegation of farmers who asked for relief. But the Prime Minister knew that he and his government were not strong enough to cope with those conditions they had allowed to grow up.

What did he do? Why, Mr. Chairman, he gave us reciprocity with the United States as a cure-all for the troubles in western Canada. The hon. member for North Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) made the statement that he had it on the authority of the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance that they had gone as far as they intended to go in the interests of the producers of this country. Afterwards, when it was put up to the Prime Minister he said, yes, the hon. member for North Oxford had that authority. I want to tell the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Finance that the grain growers of western Canada, the only time they ever had an opportunity of pronouncing upon this proposal, absolutely refused to endorse it. At the time the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance were in western Canada, in 1905, they put this proposition up to the grain growers and they refused it unless the duties on everything were lowered to a revenue basis of 17 per cent. I just wish to read the resolution that was submitted to these hon. gentlemen at that time. This was moved by Mr. Andrew Graham, one of our grain growers in western Canada:

Resolved, that in the opinion of the executive of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the Manitoba Live Stock Association,

the present tariff on dutiable goods be reduced to a revenue tariff of an average of 17 per cent; that all goods at present on the free list be retained thereon with the addition thereto of all kinds of lumber; that in consideration of this reduction to a revenue tariff we are willing to have all agricultural products placed on the free list.

That was the only proposition that the grain growers of western Canada ever presented to the government of this country, and that is a proposition to which the government refused to accede. It is true that the grain growers, when they were here on the 16th December last, presented a resolution to the government in connection with reciprocity, but there was not one word in any way, shape, or form, in connection with reciprocity in the original resolutions passed by the grain growers associations throughout the western country. Reciprocity was never spoken of in connection with these resolutions until the delegation arrived in the city of Ottawa. I am credibly informed that it is an absolute fact that on the arrival of the grain growers from western Canada a certain gentleman visited the Prime Minister and there was hatched the resolution in connection with reciprocity.

I wish to say a word or two with reference to a publication we have in the city of Winnipeg known as the 'Grain Growers' Guide.' Last fall the 'Grain Growers' Guide' came out with an editorial saying that they were going to send a representative to the press gallery in this House, and that this reporter would give an unbiassed report of everything that took place in regard to western Canada during his term here. But, on the 15th of March this paper came out with a very severe attack on the Conservative members from western Canada. They called us blockers, objectors, obstructors, and they almost called us traitors to the people we represent. They also claimed that we had voted against reciprocity. I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman, that if there is one principle that this paper has stood for during the time in which it has been in existence, from the very first issue that came out, it is the referendum and recall. That is one of the cardinal principles of this 'Grain Growers' Guide,' and I thought for one that if we ever had an opportunity of voting for submitting any question to the people of this country we would get credit for it from this paper, instead of what we did receive. I wish to read the resolution that this paper condemned us so violently for voting for. It was moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and it reads as follows:

That in the opinion of this House the said resolutions should not be proceeded with until the electors have had an opportunity of pronouncing upon their merits.

We simply wanted to have this reciprocity deal submitted to the people of this country. That is what I voted for, and that is what we all voted for. But, that did not suit the 'Grain Growers' Guide' and they went for us in the manner I speak of. When it came to the question of the terminal elevators, a question that is of vital importance to the grain growers, my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) moved a resolution, every Conservative in this House voted for that resolution, and every reformer voted against it, but the 'Grain Growers' Guide' never mentioned all the names in connection with that proposition whatever. The same thing took place in connection with the chilled meat trade. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) brought in a resolution in connection with the establishment of a chilled meat trade in this country. Every Conservative voted for it and every Reformer against it, but the 'Grain Growers' Guide' never mentioned all the names in connection with the matter, and how each man voted. They only mentioned the names of those speaking on the different questions. I consider that the 'Grain Growers' Guide' has forfeited the confidence of the grain growers of western Canada. My hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) has said that reciprocity is the most important question that has come before the people of Canada since confederation, but in my humble judgment it is the most important question that has ever come before our people, even including confederation, because as we all know confederation was adopted to unite the different provinces together, and the direct outcome of confederation was the building of the Canadian Pacific railway, which has been followed. through the sacrifices made by the people of Canada during the past forty-two years, by three transcontinental railways which are now almost completed. But, is this reciprocity pact calculated to bind the Canadian communities closer together, is it meant to further build up the interprovincial trade we have established? I say it is not. If it should be carried into effect, Alberta and British Columbia will deal with the western states, Saskatchewan and Manitoba will deal with the Dakotas and Minnesota, Ontario and the eastern provinces will deal with the eastern states, and instead of having our lines running from east to west as now, the outcome will be that our lines will be running north and south. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) also said that both parties in this country have been trying for many years to get reciprocity with the United States. I wish to say that in my humble judgment, what was good for this country between 1854 and 1866 might be a very bad thing for the country in 1911. Canada is a very difficult country to govern; our seven and a half

millions of people are located in a narrow territory, 100 miles wide and 3,500 miles long, and the diversified conditions of commercial interest, and racial distinctions, make it one of the most difficult countries in the known world to govern. But, if we want to build this country up to what we all hope to see it some day, we must in each province be prepared to give and take. We hear from the different provinces a great deal about class legislation. Just look for a moment at what we have been fighting for for western Canada since I have been in this parliament, and what the grain growers asked for on the 16th of December last. They asked for government ownership and operation of the terminal elevators, for government ownership and operation of the Hudson Bay railway, for the establishement of a chilled meat trade throughout western Canada, and these three things alone would cost $75,000,000 or thereabouts. And, while eastern Canada will have to help build up western Canada in these things, there are other things in respect to which the west will help to build up eastern Canada, and there are other things which will be of special advantage to British Columbia, and in which the prairie provinces can assist. We must, therefore, be prepared to give and take in the building up of a great diversified country such as we have in Canada. The Prime Minister has changed his mind a good deal on this reciprocity question since 1899, because in that year he spoke as follows, as reported in 'Hansard':

If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canada would have given many things to obtain the American market; there was a time when the market of the great cities of the union was the only market we had, but these things are past and over now. We are not depending on the American markets now.

That was the idea of the Prime Minister in 1899. The United States left us alone for forty-five years, and absolutely refused to have anything to do with us in trade relations, and why is it they ask at this particular juncture for a reciprocity deal with the people of Canada? The best answer to that question is to be found in the words of President Taft's message to Congress on the 26th of January, 1911, when he said:

The Dominion has greatly prospered. It has an active, aggressive, intelligent people. They are coming to the parting of the ways. In the reciprocal trade agreement numerous additions are made to the free list. These include not only food commodities such as cattle, fish, wheat and other grain, fresh vegetables, fruit and dairy products, but also rough lumber and raw material useful to our own industries. Free lumber we ought to have. By giving our people access to the Canadian forests we should reduce the consumption of our own, which in the hands of a comparatively few owners now have a value that requires the enlargement of our available timber resources.

I think these words of President Taft answer the question a good deal better than I can. I would like to give a short list of the natural resources of Canada that the United States would like to get hold of; it is estimated that we have 500,000,000,000 feet of standing timber; our wheat fields are about 600 miles wide by 1,000 miles long in western Canada; it is estimated that we have 117,000,000 acres of wheat lands, 12,500 miles of coast fishing; 440,000 square miles of fresh water fishing, our coal is estimated at 172,000,000,000 tons, we have produced $260,000,000 worth of gold, our silver mines are the third most important in the world: we have three-fifths of the world's supply of nickel, in 1901 we produced 160,000,000 tons of iron and in 1904 we produced 509,000,000 tons of iron.

We have untold millions of tons of iron. Our water-powers are estimated at 25,000,000, and of fisheries $30,000,000. This is only a partial list for we have in this northern country the greatest undeveloped country in minerals $90,000,000; of timber cut $63,000,000, and of fisheries $30,000,000. This is only a partial list for we have in this northern county the greatest undeveloped country in the known world. It is these natural resources that the United States are after, and these, if this Bill goes through, we will allow them to exploit. Why do they want our natural resources? Theirs are almost gone, they have wasted their natural resources in the past, and now they want the natural resources in this northern country to keep the flame of prosperity going in the United States. Are we prepared to hand over to the United States the prosperity that is coming to Canada? We stand to-day just about where the United States stood 100 years ago, and for my part I say: Keep the natural resources for the Canadian people. They want our hard wheat to mix with their soft wheat to sell in the markets of the world to compete against our wheat. They want our bran and shorts to feed to their cattle and hogs, to compete against our cattle and pork in the markets of the world. But if we want to import any of that same bran and shorts, ground from our own wheat back into our own country to feed our own stock, we must pay a duty on it of 12½ cents.

But some say the United States can do this anyway, by simply taking off the duty. I say if the United States want to do that, let them do it. Why should we pull the rope that will hang ourselves? I am not prepared to do it. But even if they did do that, it would not let in 12 other foreign

countries into our markets, nor would it admit all the British possessions throughout the world into the Canadian market while we have only the one market opened to us. These markets will all be closed to the people of Canada and there will be only the one market for us. The countries which will have the same privileges in our market as the United States under this Bill are the following: Austria-Hungary, Argentine Republic, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia Spain, Sweden, Venezuela and France, besides all the British possessions. In addition to opening our market to these countries, I would point out that we pay in subsidies to steamship companies, plying between Canada and these countries, over $1,000,000 a year, and thus these ships will be able to bring the products of these countries that much cheaper to our markets to compete against our people.

Some say that there is no danger of any of these countries sending anything into Canada. Let us look for a moment at the products shipped by these countries into Canada during 1910, in the face of a fairly high duty:

Article.	Imports.	Canadian duty.
Butter	393,000 lbs.	4c. a lb.
Eggs	884,000 doz.	3c. a doz.
Potatoes	219,000 bush.	20c. a bush.
Cheese	683,000 lbs.	3c. a lb.
Beef (salted)	1,446,000 lbs.	2c. a lb.
Bacon and hams	5,471,000 lbs.	2c. a lb.
Mutton	2,094,000 lbs.	3c. a lb.
Pork (in brine)	8,910,000 lbs.	2c. a lb.
Other meats	1,950,000 lbs.	
Sheep	35,844 head.	25 per cent.
Horses	6,759 head.	25 p.c. over value $50.
Cattle	1,012 head.	25 per cent.
Swine	2,760 head.	1½c. per lb.
Barley	167,000 bush.	15c. per lb.
Oats	38,000 bush.	10c. per bush
Wheat	55,000 bush.	12c. per bush
Vegetables	$1,121,000	30 per cent.

This makes a total of about $8,000,000 worth of those products which we imported into Canada last year. I wish to place on 'Hansard' some figures in regard to the surplus production of some of these countries for 1909, because after all it is what these countries export that will indicate the extent of competition this country will have to face.

If the Chairman will allow me to place these figures in 'Hansard' without reading them, I shall be much pleased.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Chairman has no power in that case. If there is no objection on the part of the House—

Mr. FISHER. There is no objection.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar) The figures are as follows:

EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES.

—	Butter.	Cheese.	Meat.	Eggs.
	Lbs.	Lbs.	Lbs.	Doz.
Denmark	196,639,227	261,240	284,348,288	32,011,645
Australia	55,644,925	193,204	322,958,857	10,359
New Zealand	35,964,096	44,867,984	296,277,054	4,838
Russia	112,437,216	981,144	32,651,460	215,709,833
Argentine	8,799,964	.....	679,570,565	
Sweden	40,019,414	4,620	7,718,198	3,236,457
Norway	8,455,227	264,881	384,682	6,526
Austria-Hungary	.....	.....	24,992,918	
Great Britain	1,032,192	937,440	20,803,449	
United States	2,925,730	3,501,214	620,455,967	4,948,435
	461,907,991	51,011,727	2,290,161,429	255,928,103
Canada	4,615,380	180,859,886	60,669,584	160,650
Canada to Great Britain	2,595,357	179,937,468	59,247,031	33,465
Canada to United States	1,103,837	154,490	452,040	35,732

EXPORTS BY COUNTRIES FOR YEAR 1909.

—-	Horses.	Cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
Argentine.....	4,765	132,450	88,636	33
Australia. ...	7,801	975	5,315	229
Aust.-Hungary.	57,003	147,965	36,736	7,454
British India...	218	.....	.....	.....
Denmark.	22,653	124,903	511	43
New Zealand...	1,602	299	6,987	630
Norway.....	202	16	44	217
Russia.....	82,407	97,715	.....	.....
Sweden.....	3,991	9,767	1,753	301
Great Britain...	121,072	2,360	7,418	745
United States..	27,590	184,957	54,618	11,886
	329,304	701,407	202,018	21,538
Canada	2,762	157,386	111,107	390

IMPORTS INTO CANADA FOR HOME CONSUMPTION FROM MOST FAVOURED NATION COUNTRIES DURING SIX YEARS.

Article.	Quantity.	Value.
Butter .. ..lbs.	2,894,416	685,306
Cheese .. ..lbs.	2,901,815	566,786
Eggs.. .. ..dozens	4,600,534	944,704
Poultry..	.....	276,648
Potatoes.. .. .. ..bushel	1,422,829	926,693
Beef (salted) .. .. ..lbs.	10,610,533	502,831
Bacon and hams.. ..lbs.	35,140,613	4,312,359
Mutton.. .. ..lbs.	6,317,785	440,317
Pork (in brine) .. ..lbs.	51,826,804	4,250,673
Other meat products, lbs.	13,028,060	1,567,251
Cattle .. ..head	45,086	640,514
Horses .. ..head	57,565	2,920,117
Sheep .. ..head	359,447	1,151,022
Swine.. .. ..lbs.	184,779	12,696
Barley .. ..bush.	280,314	174,504
Beans .. ..bush.	307,211	490,343
Buckwheat .. .. ..bush.	6,311	6.177
Oats .. ..bush.	1,168,226	603,264
Pease .. ..bush.	51,241	120,840
Rye.. .. ..bush.	145,920	112,950
Wheat .. ..bush.	373,979	317,748
Hay.. .. ..tons	49,374	853,059
Flax seed .. ..bush.	4,702,090	5,747,612
Apples .. ..barrels	239,647	975,870
Vegetables (except potatoes)..		4,755,908
		$33,356,102

The United States people do not need our wheat for consumption in the United States, because they are exporters of wheat and flour, as we are and will be for the next 50 or 100 years, as I shall show. They are producing more wheat every year. These figures are taken from 'Reciprocity with Canada,' being the White-book of the United States, on page 94. In 1908 the United States produced 634,000,000 bushels of wheat, in 1909, 664,000,000 bushels, an increase of 30,000,000 bushels; in 1910 they produced 737,000,000, or 72,000,000 bushels more than in 1909; so that they are going on producing more and more wheat every year. This proves that they do not need the wheat of our country for consumption. When the Reform orators go through the country saying that they are opening up the markets of 90,000,000 people for Canada, it sounds pretty good to the people throughout the country; there is no doubt about that. But I would like to ask you, Mr. Chairman, what good are the markets of those 90,000,000 people if they are producing the same goods as we are, year after year, only in far larger quantities. If the markets of those 90,000,000 people are good for the farmers throughout Canada, surely the same markets would be good for the biscuits manufactured by the Minister of Customs or for the coal produced in the province from which the Minister of Finance comes. But we find that they do not want the markets of those 90,000,000 people for their own manufactures or the products of their own province. These 90,000,000 people are exporting the same goods that we are, year after year, only in far larger quantities. I wish to state a few of the items that they are exporting at the present time. In 1908 they exported 151,000,000 bushels of wheat, 37,000,000 bushels of corn, 14,000,000 bushels of oatmeal, 2,333,000 bushels of oats, 8,262,000 bushels of barley, $9,303,000 worth of flaxseed or linseed oil cake, and 437,000 bushels of flaxseed. It is true they are not exporting as much raw material as they did in the past; but when you look up the manufactured articles that they are exporting, you will see that they are exporting more and more of them every year. In 1905 they exported $42,000,000 worth of meal and flour, and in 1908 $66,000,000 worth, an increase of $24,000,000. Look at their exports of live animals and meats. Of live animals they exported in 1906 $49,000,000 worth, and in 1909 $22,000,000 worth, showing that they are not shipping as many live animals. But look at the finished article. Of beef, fresh and cured, they exported in 1905 $47,000,000 worth, and in 1908 $51,000,000 worth. Of pork, cured and fresh, they exported in 1905, $106,000,000 worth, and in 1908 $121,000,000 worth, an increase of $15,000,000. The total animal matter exported in 1905 was $224,000,000 worth, and in 1908 $238,000,000 worth. In the face of these figures, I would like to ask what good the markets of the United States will be to us in Canada. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat told us how much better price we would get for our export cattle. I believe that he is very largely correct. For stockers also we would get perhaps a little better price. But take dairy cows, and you will find that they are higher in Manitoba than in North Dakota. The price in North Dakota is from

$33 to $39 per head, while in western Canada the price is from $39 to $41 per head. I would like to ask, is it the proper policy for the people of western Canada, or any other part of Canada, to sell their stockers to the United States? I say it is not. If the government would establish what the grain-growers have asked for, and what the Conservative party in this House has voted for, that is, a chilled meat trade throughout western Canada, they would drive out of business the beef combines of western Canada, and secure for the producers there a decent price for the products of their cattle. This deal will let in the beef trust of the United States. I wish to read what the grain-growers had to say on this question, on the 16th of December last, when they were here. They did not ask for reciprocity for their cattle by any means. They asked for the very opposite of that. They prayed the government to keep out the beef trust of the United States, but by this very deal the government are going to allow the beef trust of the United States to come and get control of the markets of Canada. This is what the delegation of the western farmers asked for, as will be found on page 27 of the report:

> We wish also to draw attention to the danger we are in while we leave the opportunity open for the United States meat interest to capture and control the export trade from our country. We contend that it is a very vital importance, if the Canadian meat trade is to grow and prosper as our natural resources will permit, that Canada must have her own route and equipment. Another serious condition arises when from any cause a crop is of poor quality, and there is not sufficient stock in the country to consume it. Still another complication, due to the poor and uncertain price for beef, is the deterioration of our beef animals through crossing of dairy breeds with them and the tendency to careless breeding of inferior stock.
>
> The farmers, in view of this situation, believe that the remedy for this condition of affairs is the establishment of an export trade in dressed beef.

That is what the western farmers asked for in December last, and you are doing the very opposite. The beef trust of the United States went into the British market a short time ago, and opened stalls throughout England, and they found one of their strongest competitors in a firm called Park Brothers, who could compete with them, and who did compete with them in the selling of meat to consumers in England. The beef trust wanted to get rid of Park Brothers, and what did they do? They started to hunt up where the supply was coming from that Park Brothers were receiving. They went to the Argentine Republic and looked into the conditions there. They found that Park Brothers were getting their cattle from three large ranches in that country, and that they had a contract with these ranches to supply them with meat for five years. But there was a proviso in the contract that if, at any time the ranches were sold, the contract was to be terminated. And what happened? The Beef Trust of the United States bought up these three ranches in the Argentine Republic and put Park Brothers out of business. The meat trust of the United States went to Australia and was going to try and get control there. But the government of Australia met them at the wharf with both hands raised in warning and said: We dont want you; stay away from our country; we want our people to get a fair deal. But this government is satisfied to open our markets freely to the beef trust of the United States. What we need for the beef trade of this country and especially in western Canada is the establishment of chilled meat trade operated and owned by the government, so that our people may be assured of getting a fair deal. They have not been getting a fair deal in the past, but have been robbed time and time again. And, as I have said, this government has been appealed to many times by the beef producers and pork producers of western Canada, but it has always turned a deaf ear to their plea.

Sheep also are higher in price in Canada than in the United States. The price throughout Canada varies from $4 to $7 per head, but in the United States it varies from $3.90 to $5.30. Swine also are higher in Canada than in the United States; the average price throughout Canada is from $10 to $13, while the average price throughout the United States is $10 to $11. The fruit question would be affected by this agreement in a way that would be beneficial to my constituency—no doubt about that. Any person who buys fruit knows that free fruit will be an advantage to western Canada. But, while that is true, it is also true that the fruit growers of British Columbia and the fruit growers of eastern Canada will have to pay their share towards the terminal elevators, and towards the Hudson Bay railway, and towards the establishment of the chilled meat trade. And that being so, surely, the people of western Canada are manly and loyal enough to pay a fair price for their fruit. I was here on the floor of this House when the fifteen hundred fruit growers came into this Chamber and laid their case before the government. I heard them tell about how their work was being ruined by this deal, and I heard them state that they represented capital to the amount of $200,000,000. These men had spent their lives in building up homes and fruit orchards, and they saw that they were to be entirely ruined in

one night by this deal. I heard their explanation that the early fruit from the United States would be shipped into Canada, and in that way would kill the market in Canada. For we all know that when a man goes down street in the early fruit season, if he sees a bunch of grapes or other fruit in the window it looks very tempting and there is no doubt that he will pay two or three prices for it. These fruit men claimed that it was from the early crop they made their money, and that the later crop would only pay expenses. And what did the Prime Minister answer these fifteen hundred Canadians who had come to present their requests to him? Was it what it should have been?—Here you are, fifteen hundred Canadians, and I am the Prime Minister of Canada: I will investigate your case, and if what you say is right I will remedy the trouble. That is not the answer they received. On the contrary the answer they received was: Your doom is sealed; the pact is signed, sealed and delivered to the United States people; you are too late; there is no use in your coming to me, if you want relief you must go to Washington, not to Ottawa. I say I know that the people of western Canada are manly enough to pay a decent price for their fruit and to help these men against competition from the United States.

Then, there is the oats question. Of course, there has not been much discussion of this on the other side of the House, because of course oats are higher in Canada than in the United States. The United States in 1910 produced 1,126,765,000 bushels of oats, and the average price to the farmer in the United States was 34 cents a bushel. We produced in Canada 325,500,000 bushels, and the average price to the farmer in Canada was 35 cents a bushel. They produced in South Dakota in the same year 35,075,000 bushels at an average price of 30 cents a bushel. We produced in Manitoba 41,000,000 bushels of oats, and the average price paid the farmer throughout Manitoba was 31 cents a bushel. So, I do not think there is any use wasting more time on that subject.

There has been a good deal of discussion in connection with the barley trade; the question has been taken up by almost every speaker on that side who has spoken on this measure. It would hardly do for me to pass it by without saying a few words. In 1910 the United States produced 162,237,000 bushels of barley.

The average price paid to the farmer throughout the United States for that year was 57 cents per bushel. The United States exported 8,262,961 bushels of barley. We produced in Canada 45,147,000 bushels, and the average price paid to the Canadian farmer was 47 cents per bushel. We exported 1,446,307 bushels. South Dakota produced 20,727,000 bushels, and the average price paid to the farmer was 51 cents. Western members will recollect that last year North Dakota produced very little barley, and they had none to sell, consequently I am using the figures for South Dakota. Manitoba produced 13,836,000 bushels of barley, and the average price paid to the farmer was 39 cents per bushel, or a difference of 12 cents between the price the Manitoba farmer received and the price the South Dakota farmer received. Now, it looks at first sight as if our farmers in western Canada would receive this extra 12 cents per bushel if the duty was taken off. But I wish to direct your attention to this fact, that while the South Dakota farmer received 51 cents a bushel for his barley, the Minnesota farmer, a state lying alongside South Dakota, received 60 cents a bushel for his barley, a difference of 9 cents in two states under the same tariff. In Montana the farmer received 62 cents a bushel, in Wisconsin 64 cents, in Maine 76 cents, or a difference of 26 cents a bushel between the price in South Dakota and the price in Maine. Up to 1894 the duty on barley going into the United States was 30 cents a bushel. In that year it was changed to 30 per cent ad valorem which meant a reduction to about 15 cents a bushel. Now the very year the duty was lowered on barley going into the United States, the price throughout the whole of the United States dropped 11 cents a bushel. Some may claim that this was because of a large crop that year, and I thought perhaps that might be the case. Therefore, I took the three years before the duty was lowered, the three years during which the duty was lowered, and then the three years after the duty was put back to its former point. Let me read again from the White Book called 'Reciprocity with Canada,' at page 101, where I find that in the years 1892, 1893 and 1894 the average price of barley throughout the United States was 44 cents per bushel; during the next three years, 1895, 1896 and 1897, during which the duty was lowered to practically 15 cents a bushel, the average price was 34 cents a bushel. Then at the end of these three years when the duty was put back to 30 cents a bushel, that is for 1898, 1899, 1900, the price throughout the United States went up to 43 cents a bushel. Now I would ask any fair-minded man what would the price of barley be in Canada the moment the duty was taken off entirely? It is my opinion that we would not receive one cent more for our barley in western Canada than we do at the present time if the duty was taken off. According to the official report of the Board of the Agricultural college, it takes three to three and a half lbs. of barley to produce one pound of pork. The 'Farmers' Sun' gives the average price of Canadian pork for the

last ten years as $7 per 100 lbs. Taking three and a half lbs. of barley to one lb. of pork would give 96 cents per bushel; taking three lbs. of barley to one lb. of pork would give $1.12 per bushel. So according to these undisputed authorities it works out that the Canadian farmer, by feeding his barley, realizes from 96 cents to $1.12 per bushel, in addition to which he has the by-products to enrich his farm.

Now I wish to deal shortly with the wheat question. Most of our friends think there is not going to be much gain to our farmers on the wheat question if this deal should go through. I will quote from the 'Agricultural Year Book' of the United States, and by the way this is where I get the most of the figures that I have given to-night, except when I have quoted from the 'White Book on Reciprocity with Canada and the United States.' And I find by these records that the United States exported in 1906, 127,000,000 bushels of wheat, and in 1908 it exported 151,000,000 bushels. The average price paid to the farmers throughout Canada was 93 cents a bushel ; the average price paid to the farmer of North Dakota is 90 cents a bushel ; the average price paid to the farmer in Manitoba was 80 cents a bushel. Now these figures look as if there would be some advantage to the farmers of Manitoba if they could get this extra 10 cents a bushel. But I wish to remind you that the millers of Minneapolis are no doubt paying the farmers of North Dakota a premium on their hard wheat at the present time. The moment the markets of the United States are opened to the people of western Canada and our 63,000,000 bushels of surplus wheat are thrown upon their markets this price will go down to an absolute export basis. They will no longer pay a premium on hard wheat at the Minneapolis mills. Take the condition at Morden and Plum Coulee at the present time; the Great Northern have branches in there from the United States and they can ship our wheat through in bond, grind it, ship it out again and it will only involve a duty of about one-quarter of one per cent. Do they pay our people as high a price as they pay in the United States? Not by any means. Our buyers in Manitoba are beating them out at every point. At Plum Coulee our buyers ship by the Canadian route about 100,000 bushels while they only ship 20,000 bushels through the United States. If they wanted our wheat and would pay a price of from 8 to 10 a bushel more they could take all the wheat from every point they touch, but they do not do it. I would like the Minister of Agriculture to explain to us—he took very good care not to touch upon it at the time he made his speech—why it is that the farmers in Quebec received $1.19 a bushel for their wheat while the Ontario farmer only receives 89 cents a bushel. If the Minister of Agriculture will explain that I will give way.

Mr. FISHER. I might be tempted to suggest that we have better wheat in Quebec, but I do not suppose my hon. friend will accept that explanation.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I do not know. I would like to have it explained any way because it is something that has puzzled me ever since I have seen the figures. The South Dakota farmer received 89 cents a bushel for his wheat while the farmer in Minnesota, the very next state, received 94 cents for his wheat, a difference of five cents a bushel between these two states without any tariff wall at all. The Washington farmer received 78 cents a bushel for his wheat, or two cents a bushel less than we in Manitoba received for ours. The difference between the price that the Washington farmer received, 78 cents. and that which the Minnesota farmer received, 94 cents, is 16 cents a bushel. There is a far greater difference between these two states in the union than there is in the price that the Manitoba farmer receives and the price that the Dakota farmer receives.

We have had several speeches on this question. The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) touched on the wheat question when he was speaking, and this is what he said in connection with it. You will find it in 'Hansard,' page 3730:

> I do say this, however, that so far as I have been able to examine the matter—and I have looked into it with some care—I cannot see any reason why we should expect any very great increase in the price of wheat for exportation to the United States. There may be a reason, and there may be an increased price, but I am not able exactly to find out how it will come about.

Neither am I. I would like to quote also my hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Molloy). He represents the next constituency to mine, he knows the conditions in Manitoba just as well as we do, and he has gone on record in connection with this wheat question. What does he say? 'Hansard,' at page 4267, he uses these words:

> I do not pretend that it will increase the price of wheat to the Canadian producer, but I say it will maintain the present prices.

That is as far as he would go. That is as far as any man can expect to go with reference to this arrangement, but I want to tell you, Mr, Chairman, that I am not satisfied with maintaining the price at the present figure. I want to see the Manitoba farmers and the farmers of western Canada get a better price, and the way to do that is by the government owning and operating the terminal elevators. It will mean

two or three cents a bushel on all the grain grown in western Canada. More than that I have no hesitation in saying that if the government will own and operate the Hudson Bay railway it will add from four to six cents to the value of every bushel of grain we grow in western Canada. These are the things that I have voted for in this house; these are the things that hon. gentlemen opposite have voted against on every opportunity. In 1905 the amount of wheat produced in the three western provinces was 84,000,000; oats, 78,000,000 bushels; and barley 16,000,000 bushels. In 1908 the production amounted to, wheat, 147,000,000 bushels; oats, 197,000,000 bushels and barley 31,000,000 bushels. The increase in these three years was, wheat, 63,000,000 bushels; oats, 119,000,000 bushels, and barley 14,500,000 bushels. Saying nothing about the amount that we exported in 1905, but taking the amount of the increase alone, put these surplus products on the markets of the United States, and I want to ask you Mr. Chairman, or any fair-minded man, where will the price go in the United States? It is bound to go down; there is no doubt in the world about that. Why are the farmers in North Dakota rising at every point to protest against this deal? It is because they know the moment this deal goes through the premium that they have been receiving in the past will be wiped out, and their price will be put upon an export basis. I say, Mr. Chairman, that the proper policy for the people of Canada is to leave reciprocity alone, remedy the troubles we have at the present time and build Canada up, work out our own salvation and let the people of the United States do the same. I wish to read further the following statement by the Hon. P. C. Knox, and I quote from 'Reciprocity with Canada,' page 6. He says:

> In providing for free wheat we also take into account the facilities which the United States possesses for handling a part of the surplus Canadian crop and thus preventing the demoralization of prices which results through the dumping of large quantities upon the European markets, where the world's price is fixed. The free admission of grain from Canada thus meets the present situation and provides against future contingencies when the Canadian surplus becomes greater by placing the control in the hands of our own grain growers. They have no cause to fear a demoralizing influx under the conditions which will result from the reciprocity agreement.

At page 44, of this book Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture of the United States says:

> The United States produces surplus wheat above domestic requirements. This surplus production is sold in foreign countries. The price of our exported surplus is governed by the world's requirements, being regulated by the law of supply and demand, and the price of wheat in the United States while we are exporting, is governed by the price at which the surplus is sold, as a general proposition. Occasionally wheat corners may interfere with the law of supply and demand, and temporarily affect the price.
>
> Distance from markets has much to do with the prices of grain. So this proposition is modified by proximity to markets and cost of transportation. While Canada is exporting wheat or other grains and the United States is also exporting wheat, there is no particular reason why Canadian wheat should come here, unless it be that a mixture of Canadian and American wheat may be desirable on the part of our milling exporters, and our millers may find it profitable to handle the Canadian surplus. But the price to the Canadian for this surplus wheat will be substantially the same whether sold in Europe or the United States. However, if the handling of Canadian wheat by United States railroads, merchants and mills has a tendency to reduce the price it will be reduced to Canadians; and if it should reduce the price of bread to the American consumer, wise statesmanship may find it necessary to do that to avoid greater evils.

At page 46 he says:

> We can handle the Canadian export grain crop with facility. If it is brought inside our borders and milled, as it would be, our dairy men could use with great profit the byproducts of the mills. This is the feature—bran and shorts—that makes dairy products and robs the soil. If we cannot increase our yield to meet the demands of increasing population, free wheat from the nearest fields would be desirable. The influences at work are enabling the American acre to produce more, but it is a question whether this increase will meet the requirements of our rapidly growing population. Wheat growing for sale from the farm, as the pioneer practises it, can only be temporary. The land refuses to yield profitable crops after a few years, when recuperative farming must be resorted to to build up the soil where the soil robber has reduced it by grain growing. This is the reason the older prairie states, turn to grass, corn and domestic animals as soon as they can bring about the change. The United States could with great profit and benefit to the land take all the grains Canada has to sell and devote its land to less exorbitant crops, as is evidenced by the older prairie state farmers who grow no grain to sell, buy their flour and thereby keep up the fertility of the soil. In the western states where the farmer has turned from grain raising for sale to the production of crops to be fed to domestic animals on the farm, the new departure has become so profitable that lands in those states have risen in value to $100 and $200 per acre, and rents from $4 to $6 per acre.

I want to say, Sir, that I have the honour to represent one of the oldest constituencies in the province of Manitoba, and that is mighty good advice to the farmers of my constituency. We have been growing wheat crop after wheat crop in southern Manitoba, and we have come to a

time now when we must change our methods, and, therefore, it is that I say that the advice given by Mr. Wilson to the farmers of the United States west is mighty good advice to the farmers of my own constituency. Mr. J. J. Hill has had a good deal to say on this wheat question, and no one has studied it more closely than he. Speaking at St. Paul, Mr. Hill said:

Now, then, what will the imperial federation plan mean to the United States and how will it affect the wheat farmer of the northwest, or of any other section of the country? In the first place, there is this established fact: The surplus of any given commodity fixes its price. It is our surplus wheat we export that fixes the price of our wheat, and that price is fixed in the Liverpool market. That is true of everything we export.

As a local illustration, the difference between the price of wheat at Minneapolis and in Winnipeg is about 5 cents in favour of the northwest. So far well and good. Reciprocity would not materially raise or lower that difference.

Suppose, now, that Canada joins the imperial federation of English colonies, as is proposed. A reasonable differential that England might impose on our wheat would be 15 cents a bushel, and that would mean our wheat growers would find their whole product lowered that much per bushel in value. The average crop is 700,000,000 bushels. Figure it out for yourself. And right on top of that we would face also this proposition: Great Britain would take over practically all of the $200,000,000 in round numbers that Canada now pays us for manufactured articles we export across the border, then add the six hundred and more millions we export to Great Britain, and we find that, if we fail to adopt the reciprocity agreement with Canada and drive it to an imperial federation, we are cheapening our wheat crop annually, say, 15 cents per bushel, and at the same time we are losing $800,000,000 of export business to England and Canada. Can we afford to do this? I say, no, and I think every man who gives this matter the study of the situation due it, will agree with me.

He wants us to step into the reciprocity deal and put it through on this side of the line and say good-bye to the mother land entirely. For my part I am not prepared to do it.

President Taft also made a speech at New York on April 27. He said:

MOST CRITICAL TIME.

'I have said that this was a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity,' concluded the president. 'It is critical because unless it is now decided favourably to reciprocity it is exceedingly probable that no such opportunity will ever again come to the United States. The forces which are at work in England and in Canada will derive an impetus from the rejection of this treaty and if we would have reciprocity with all the advantages that I have described and that I earnestly and sincerely believe will follow its adoption, we must take it now or give it up for ever.'

That is the idea of President Taft.

Representative George W. Prince, of Illinois, gave his version of this proposal, and I wish to read a few words from his speech:

I say to our neighbours on the north, be not deceived. When we go into a country and get control of it, we take it. It is our history, and it is right that we should take it if we want it, and you might as well understand it. The Speaker has so said; the party back of him has so said, and it does not deny that that is its desire. Now let us see if the people of Canada believe in reciprocity and annexation.

For my part I am not in favour of that kind of thing; I do not think it is the proper policy for us in this country. I say that we should keep on in the channels in which we have been working during the past 42 years, and build up this country in connection with the British Empire. They talk about opening the market of 90,000,000, who are growing and exporting the same goods that we produce, only in larger quantities. If the government wanted to do anything for our farmers and open up new markets for the people of Canada, why did they not go to some importing countries that would have been of value to us? For instance Switzerland imported in 1908 12,000,000 bushels of wheat, Japan 7,000,000 bushels, Italy 50,000,000 bushels, Germany 77,000,000 bushels, Belgium 69,000,000 bushels, Sweden 7,600,000 bushels, France 13,000,000 bushels. These countries together imported 226,000,000 bushels of wheat in 1908. Here were markets that would have been some good to us, countries consuming just the goods that we have to export. But it is farthest from the minds of the government to open up a market that needs our goods, they want to open the markets of a country that want to take our goods from us and make money in manufacturing them and re-exporting them

I say that, in my opinion, this is not in the best interests of the people of this country. I heard the Finance Minister say some time ago that this deal was made for the masses, and not for the classes, and I wondered at that time whether he remembered the masses when he was paying the classes $17,119,000 of the masses' money in bounties to the steel companies throughout this country. He forgot the masses when he was paying this $17,000,000 out, but now he turns the cry and says he is working for the masses. It is something new if he is.

In 1910, we produced in Canada farm crops amounting to $507,000,000, and dairy

products amounting to $98,000,000, a total of $605,000,000. We exported about $105,000,000 worth and we used at home about $500,000,000 worth of those products of the farm. I think that the home market is by long odds the most important market we have, because every bushel of grain that we consume at home takes that much from the markets of the world, and thereby just to that extent raises the world's price and every bushel that we export into the world's markets lowers the price just that much. In 1910 we exported 52,000,000 worth of wheat. Of this $49,000,000 worth went to the British market and $3,000,000 went to other markets. In the same year we exported $1,107,000 worth of barley, of which $744,000 went to the British market and $363,000 went to other markets. In the same year we exported $21,607,000 worth of cheese. We sent to the British market $21,481,000 worth, and $126,000 worth went to other markets. It looks to me as though we had established markets now, and I think that we should remedy any troubles that we may now have, and keep on in the road that we are travelling. Who will benefit by this Bill if it does go through? I say that it will be the American paper trust, the Chicago beef trust, the United States steel company, the Minneapolis milling trusts and James J. Hill's railways. These are the companies and the trusts that will benefit by this Bill if we allow it to go through, not the grain growers of western Canada. When the grain growers were here on December 16 last, they asked for government ownership and operation of the terminal elevators, government ownership and operation of the Hudson Bay railroad, the establishment of a chilled meat trade, the extension of the British preference to 50 per cent, an amendment of the Banking Act and amendments of the Railway Act in connection with cattle guards, and live stock on railways and in relation to freight rates. They also asked for a Bill for the establishment of co-operative societies, and presented their resolution in connection with the tariff. I have worked for and voted for most of these things that they have asked for—in fact, all of them, except the tariff resolution.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). What does my hon. friend think should be done about the tariff?

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). I think there should be a permanent tariff commission appointed which would have absolute control of the tariff of this country. Look at the tariff question in western Canada. A few years ago we had a duty of 35 per cent on agricultural implements coming into that country. It is lowered to-day to 17½ per cent, but we are paying as much for our implements as we did when the duty was 35 per cent. I say there should be a permanent tariff commission appointed to have absolute control over the tariff of this country.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Subject to parliament.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Of course, always subject to parliament. I wish to say that in my meetings in western Canada I have said that I am not a free trader. No man who has voted for me in either of the elections that I have run has ever heard me say anything in regard to free trade with the United States, because I want to say distinctly now that I do not think free trade is the proper policy for Canada at the present time. Take the history of all the great countries of the world to-day. Take England herself, take Germany, take France, take even the United States, what has built these countries up to what they are at the present time? Protection; there is no doubt about it. After they have had years of protection and have grown to what they are at the present time, ready to face the world, they are willing to have free trade with Canada, because they want to get 'control of' the natural resources of this country. I say the policy of this country is protection—as my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has said, adequate protection—all the way through. But we should have some arrangement whereby we can control the manufacturers of this country, and make them sell at a reasonable price to our people. This deal would allow us—I am speaking of my constituency—to benefit perhaps a little on cattle and barley; but we would lose on butter, eggs, cheese, pork of all kinds, mutton, horses, oats, vegetables, swine and sheep. Just take the egg question for a moment. When I was home, my partner, who is running our store, told me that on the 10th of March he went into the city of Winnipeg and offered some eggs he had for sale; and he found a man in Mr. Codville's wholesale house from the United States who offered to lay down eggs in Winnipeg for 21 cents a dozen. We paid 25 cents and were paying that to the farmers throughout my part of the country at that time; and this American offered to deliver absolutely fresh-laid eggs delivered in Winnipeg at 21 cents a dozen, after paying a duty of three cents a dozen and the freight. It meant that we would lose five cents a dozen on every dozen of eggs; and what happened? We had to sell eggs at 20 cents a dozen in our own town. The moment my partner went back to the town of Manitou, he had to put the price of eggs down to 20 cents, and the farmer was the loser. If the duty had been off eggs,

they would have been selling them at 17 cents instead of 20.

Now, to sum up. The right hon. the First Minister offers us reciprocity with the United States. He will open the markets of 90,000,000 people who do not want our goods at all, who are growing and exporting the very same goods that we are, and they will only export our goods if we send them over there. Why can't we do it ourselves? I say the policy of Canada is to manufacture these and export them ourselves. Now, what does the Conservative party offer in opposition to that? What have I said, in my feeble way, ever since I have been in this House, and what principle does the Conservative party stand for to-day in opposition to this infernal pact called reciprocity? We as a party stand for government ownership and operation of terminal elevators; government ownership and operation of the Hudson Bay railway; the establishment of a chilled meat trade throughout western Canada; a permanent tariff commission; putting Manitoba on an equal footing with the other provinces of the Dominion. We also will work for and stand for preferential trade within the empire. We will hold Canada for the Canadians. We will welcome all who will come to Canada; but we absolutely refuse to send the prosperity of this country out to others. If they want to enjoy the prosperity of this country, they must come to Canada. Why, Mr. Chairman, the government went into this deal without knowing anything about what they were doing. They had no prices of wheat, horses, cattle or anything along these lines in the different provinces of the Dominion or in the different states of the union. That is proven quite conclusively by the returns brought down some time ago. My brother, the member for North Ontario, asked for a statement showing the average prices of butter and eggs in London, England, for the past five years, in comparison with the prices respectively in the eastern provinces, in Montreal, in Toronto, in Minneapolis, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Buffalo, in Boston and in New York. And this is the answer he received:

File No. 12297.

Trade and Commerce Department,
Ottawa, 25th March, 1911.

Order of the House.

Sir,—I beg to return you herewith your Reference No. 172 for statement showing comparative prices of butter and eggs in London, England, and certain points in Canada and the United States. This department has no information upon the subject. Such average prices of butter and eggs, however, are published in trade papers all over the world which can be referred to by any one desiring the information.

Enclosure.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. C. T. O'HARA,
Deputy Minister.

Thomas Mulvey, Esq.,
Under-Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

This proves conclusively that they knew nothing about prices, and in every case where we have put them into a corner it has been shown that they knew absolutely nothing of the facts relating to these matters. The Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) proved that conclusively some time ago when he was talking about the lobster question. He told the House what a great thing free lobsters would be for the people engaged in that industry in the maritime provinces until I understand the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) informed the hon. gentleman that lobsters had been on the free list in the United States for a good many years.

I have tried in my feeble way to show to you, Mr. Chairman, and to this House, my ideas of this deal, and the reasons why I cannot see my way clear to support it. And I believe that the people of my constituency will back me up and give me a better majority than before. For the reasons I have given I cannot see my way clear to support this proposition.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds) moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

Mr. FISHER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to give notice that, when the House is next moved into Committee of Ways and Means or Committee of Supply, to-morrow, I will move an amendment:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:—

This House regrets that in permitting the Farmers' Bank of Canada to commence and to continue business, the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board failed to exercise such proper care and to take such reasonable precautions as were necessary to prevent evasion of the law and to protect the public interest.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FISHER. I thought we were going on with Ways and Means. If the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) moved that motion —Well, would he have any objection to leaving it over for another day?

Mr. LENNOX. I do not understand why. I propose to move it on motion for Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FISHER. Probably to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.21 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, May 2, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

DOMINION LANDS ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. OLIVER moved for leave to introduce a Bill (No. 194) to amend the Dominion Lands Act. He said: A Bill has been on the Order Paper for some time to amend the Dominion Lands Act, a minor amendment. After this Bill had been on the Order Paper, we found that it was desirable to make other minor amendments, merely arising out of the fuller operation and further interpretation of the law. The other day, when the original Bill was called, I asked that it be withdrawn so that I might introduce the present Bill.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 186) respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

Bill (No. 187) respecting a patent of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 189) to amend the Juvenile Delinquents' Act, 1908.—Sir Allen Aylesworth.

Bill (No. 190) for the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 191) for the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 192) to provide for increasing the capital stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.—Mr. Bickerdike.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—HON. FRANK OLIVER.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called I desire to read an Ottawa dispatch which appeared in the Toronto 'World' of Friday morning last. The dispatch is as follows:

Ottawa, April 27 (Special).—The sensational charges made by a Toronto newspaper against one of the ministers of the federal government at Ottawa was no surprise here. The facts of the case have been pretty well known for some time and it is expected that the matter will come up in parliament at an early date.

It is understood that Hon. Frank Oliver is the minister against whom the charge is made. The story at Ottawa is that Mr. Oliver had an order in council passed on May 8, 1907, giving the Canadian Northern railway the power to select in Saskatchewan the whole of the land granted by the government to the Manitoba and Southeastern, which is the Canadian Northern in Manitoba, in 1890, in all 600,000 acres. In 1907, there were no lands left in Manitoba, it was alleged, and the company was given the right to select its lands in Saskatchewan.

In the same year, $50,000 was deposited from the Manhattan Bank of New York to the Imperial Bank at Edmonton in the name of Mr. Oliver. The exact date was October 3, 1907. About one year later, just before the general election of 1908, the sum of $19,000 was deposited from the Manhattan Bank in the name of Mr. Oliver at the Imperial Bank at Edmonton. It is known that he chequed out this money for campaign purposes.

It will be observed that without making a direct statement the dispatch gives currency to two separate rumours or reports, one relating to a transaction affecting the land grant of the Manitoba Southeastern Railway Company, and the other relating to an account kept in my name in the Imperial Bank of Edmonton. No connection between the land transaction and the bank account is alleged or inferred in words, but there can be no doubt that the two paragraphs have been placed together for the purpose of creating an impression in the public mind that there is some connection —and an improper connection—between them.

So that there may be no misunderstanding of my position I desire to state without qualification that there is no foundation for such an insinuation. In regard to the land transaction mentioned, I desire to say that the action taken by the government was on my recommendation, and that I made the recommendation in pursuance of what I believed to be sound public policy and with due regard to the public interest, and that I received no money, or other consideration for having made that recommendation, or in any way in connection with it. Although no specific charge has been made, I desire that the fullest opportunity shall be given to lay such a charge. I would, therefore, respectfully ask that a special committee may be appointed to hear and inquire into any charge that may be made in connection with the transaction mentioned.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Before going on with the orders of the day, I would like to ask the First Minister the name of the man who made the charge to him that has been

referred to by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) just now.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. McGillicuddy.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Another question I would like to ask is if the minister will lay on the table of the House all the correspondence with regard to this charge made by Mr. McGillicuddy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am just about to move for a committee desired by my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), and the correspondence will be at the disposal of that committee.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Another question I would like to ask—I presume I am in order. How many interviews had the First Minister with Mr. McGillicuddy, and what took place at those interviews?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is very inquisitive. I must tell him frankly that I do not remember how many interviews took place. In the article in the 'World' the other day five or six interviews were mentioned, and the time of each interview was given—nineteen minutes, thirteen minutes, and so on. I have no recollection of them. My recollection is, just as I stated, that a certain charge had been made against one of my colleagues, and I said that it could be pressed against him.

Mr. CAMPBELL. What was the nature of the charges preferred by Mr. McGillicuddy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated that the other day.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If that is so, I would like to ask the First Minister, has he made any inquiries as to the source from which those two amounts came, namely, $50,000 and $19,350?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated the other day what had taken place, and my hon. friend will find it in 'Hansard.'

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have read 'Hansard' very carefully.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not going to make a speech. I would like to ask the First Minister if he has any idea for what purposes those sums were expended, and was such expenditure for political or personal purposes?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I stated the other day, and I repeat to my hon. friend, that I had stated to Mr. McGillicuddy that I believed that friend and colleague was an honest man. and that I would presume he was an honest man until he was proved guilty.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have asked a very simple question of the First Minister, and his reply to me is not a reply at all. I will prefer the question again so that he will understand it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I must remind the hon. member that there is a way of asking questions prescribed in the rules. It is only a matter of courtesy that a minister can be asked to answer a question at this stage.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, you surely are not ruling me out of order for asking a legitimate question of the First Minister on a matter of very great public importance. I again ask the First Minister for what purposes were those sums expended, and was such expenditure for political or personal purposes. I think that is a legitimate question, and I would like an answer.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under the rules of the House the hon. member must give two days' notice of such a question before a minister can be asked to answer.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the right hon. the First Minister—

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. The point cannot be discussed now.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I am not going to discuss the point.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to ask another question.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Am I in order, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. minister cannot be required to answer if notice is not given of the question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. The question I wish to ask is a perfectly fair question, and I am absolutely within my rights or I would not be standing here. The question is, was the account spoken of, a trust account, and was it so designated? If so, what was the nature of the trust, and on whose behalf?

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member will have to give notice of his question.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I accept your ruling, Mr. Speaker, but I have a question which I would like to ask. Acting on the precedent of the Hodgins charges, does the First Minister propose any investigation in this matter?

Mr. SPEAKER. Order. Government orders.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege upon the question raised by my hon. friend Mr. Oliver. I move:

That a special committee of five members be appointed to investigate the matter referred to this day by Mr. Oliver, a member of this House, and that the said committee be entrusted with full power to send for persons and papers, and report from time to time.

With regard to the form of motion, I would ask the Clerk to complete it with regard to examining witnesses under oath, and so on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The motion is in rather indefinite terms. What does the Prime Minister understand to be the scope of the proposed investigation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand the scope of the investigation to be just what has been mentioned by the Minister of the Interior, that he is charged with having recommended an order in council whereby a certain quantity of lands supposed to be swamp lands were traded for other lands, and that in connection with the matter the sum of $50,000 was paid to Mr. Oliver.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With regard to the form of the motion, perhaps it might stand over until to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no objection.

Motion allowed to stand.

CANADIAN CURRENCY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). Mr. Speaker, before you proceed to the orders of the day, I would ask leave to read a letter which takes the form of an answer to a question brought up a few days ago in regard to the circulation of Canadian currency in the United States. An hon. member, I think the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), stated that the Pullman Car Company was refusing to accept our currency, and the general consensus of the House was that a company of that nature, doing a large business in Canada, should not so refuse. One can understand the refusal of some small business men to accept Canadian currency in the United States, but that certainly would not apply to a company of the nature of the Pullman Car Company. In that view I had an inquiry sent to the company, and the company in reply has addressed a letter to my deputy, which I would ask leave to read to the House:

Mr. CAMPBELL

The Pullman Company,
Office of the Vice-President,
Chicago, April 21, 1911.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Your letter of April 18, addressed to our president, Mr. Lincoln, has been brought to my attention in his absence, and in reply, I write at once to say to you that it is doing an injustice to this company to say that it 'refuses to accept Canadian currency on the United States side of the boundary line.'

It is, and has been for many years, the practice of this company to receive Canadian currency without discount in payment for accommodations in Pullman cars operated in joint through lines between points in this country and points in the Dominion of Canada, such currency not only being received for accommodations between terminals, but also at intermediate points on such lines. Furthermore, it is a common practice to accept Canadian currency at ticket offices in this country without discount in payment for berths and seats in pullman cars.

In order that there may be no uncertainty in the matter, general instructions will be issued by our operating department directing conductors to accept Canadian currency without discount when tendered in payment for berths and seats in our cars.

If specific instances of disregard of these instructions should hereafter come to your attention, and you will give us the details, the proper corrective measures will be taken.

I have the honour to be,
Very truly yours,
(Sgd.) J. S. RUSSELL,
Vice-President.

I think it is only fair to the company that I should read that as a reply touching the point that we discussed a few days ago.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. BRADBURY. The Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), promised to give an answer to-day in regard to the production of the original documents in connection with St. Peter's Indian reserve.

Mr. OLIVER. I apologize to my hon. friend. I had some other matters on my mind, and I am unable to give an answer to-day, but I promise surely to give it to-morrow.

AYLWIN IRRIGATION GRANT.

Mr. CAMPBELL. One month ago the Minister of the Interior promised to have brought down at the earliest possible moment the papers with regard to the Aylwin Irrigation grant. I have not got them yet.

Mr. OLIVER. It will take a considerable time to transcribe the papers which are voluminous but the work is in progress and the return will be brought down without undue delay.

Mr. CAMPBELL. When?

Mr. OLIVER. I may be able to answer to-morrow.

CENSUS TAKING.

Mr. FISHER. I wish to say to the leader of the oposition, that the return which he asked for a few days ago, about the census taking in other parts of the world was laid on the table some three weeks ago.

INDIAN ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. OLIVER moved the third reading of Bill (No. 177) to amend the Indian Act.

He said: This order was held over yesterday because of the absence of the member for Ste. Anne (Mr. Doherty). The hon. gentleman is not now present and if my hon. friend from North Toronto still wishes it held over I have no objection, but I think it would be perfectly safe to allow it to pass.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps it would not be asking too much to let it remain over for another day as the hon. member (Mr. Doherty), is not present, and as I, too, have had other things on my mind I have not been able to look into it.

Order allowed to stand.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to draw your attention again very briefly to the Farmers' Bank. In view of the previous discussion this session it will not be necessary for me to go very deeply into the matter, and I can confine myself to the records contained in certain returns that have been brought down to the House. The Farmers' Bank was incorporated in 1904. I have nothing at all to say in reference to the incorporation of the bank originally. The Bank Act gives them a year in which to organize and get subscriptions, and as they failed to do that within the year they came back to parliament in 1905 and the Banking and Commerce Committee thought well to renew their charter for another year. They came back again in the spring of 1906 and again asked for an extension for another year and they were granted an extension of six months. I recognize that the Minister of Finance has a duty common to all members of the committee to scrutinize the legislation proposed, and I have no doubt he discharged that duty then. It may be that the Minister of Finance, by reason of his position has a greater obligation on him than an ordinary member of the committee, but I am not disposed to urge that view at present more than to say that, having regard to the failure of these people during two years to put themselves in a financial position to transact business, the minister tells us he was reluctant to grant them an extension of time. That was significant only in that the mind of the Finance Minister being set in that direction at that time, we would apprehend that he would remain seized of that idea and that he would exercise even greater diligence and care in scrutinizing the application of the bank for a certificate to do business. Further than that I have nothing to say at all with reference to the propriety or impropriety of incorporating this company. I am not aware that the Minister of Finance mentioned to the House when the Bill came before it finally the difficulties he felt in regard to the extension of time. I would suppose that probably the minister, feeling that it was doubtful whether this company should be granted an extension of time, might have felt it incumbent on him to mention to the House the doubt in his mind. However, I will let that point go. I come, therefore, to deal with the question of granting the certificate and the first point I have to refer to in that connection is the letter of Mr. Leighton McCarthy, which was mailed to the minister on the 8th of October, 1906, from Toronto. I need not read that letter further than to say that Mr. McCarthy assures the minister that grave conditions have arisen requiring careful consideration by the Treasury Board before granting a certificate, and Mr. McCarthy asks that an opportunity be afforded him of discussing the matter with the minister and he mentions that he could come down to Ottawa at any time if the circumstances are urgent, but he would prefer not to come until the following week. That letter was not answered spontaneously, and it was followed on the 11th of October by a telegram from Mr. McCarthy, and that telegram was answered on the same date by the Finance Department. But the letter of the 11th of October to Mr. McCarthy from the department ignores his suggestion that he should be given a personal interview. It intimates that a personal interview is not desired and simply tells Mr. McCarthy to forward his representations and they will receive due consideration. In other words, so far as I can see, the Minister of Finance, to use the phrase of the Prime Minister, was not actuated by any great feeling of curiosity at that time.

We come then to the letter of the 19th October from Mr. McCarthy, an important letter. It says:

I beg to inclose the special endorsement upon a writ of summons in the High Court of Justice of Ontario, which will be issued by Wm. A Dixon and others. The names of about a dozen persons are given as plaintiffs.

This letter was sent to the hon. Minister of Finance in pursuance of what Mr. McCarthy said he wanted to do, namely, to call the attention of the department to certain irregularities and frauds in connection with the obtaining of stock subscriptions for the Farmers' Bank. In that letter Mr. McCarthy points out that this suit is not merely on behalf of those named, but also of other subscribers to shares who come in and join in it. He also goes on to say that not only the grounds alleged in the special endorsement, but other grounds which may be disclosed upon the examination of the alleged subscribers for shares will be furnished. Mr. McCarthy then proceeds to say:

I have received information that the alleged subscribers for shares paid a large sum of money in cash and have signed notes for other large sums of money, and that the persons professing to act in the name of the bank have transferred notes and received the proceeds, and that a deposit either has been made or will be made of the cash received and the proceeds of these notes, or a sufficient amount to make up $250,000.

Mr. McCarthy concludes by saying:

I would be pleased to go to Ottawa upon any appointment you may make for the further consideration of this matter.

This was the second offer from Mr. McCarthy to go to Ottawa and have a personal interview with the minister and disclose to him all the facts and circumstances which prompted Mr. McCarthy to say that the whole business had been initiated in fraud.

It is necessary that we should refer to some of the statements contained in the special endorsement upon the writ which Mr. McCarthy forwarded to the Minister of Finance. This special endorsement says:

That the subscriptions for shares which were procured from the plaintiffs and others were procured through fraud and misrepresentation.

I would like to call the attention of the minister to the fact that this endorsement is not confined to eight or ten, or a dozen names of parties who allege fraud, but it goes on to say that Dr. Stewart was represented as subscribing for shares to the amount of $10,000, whereas in fact he had not subscribed for any shares. That Major Beattie, represented by the inspectors to have consented to act as a director, had not subscribed for any shares, and refused to be a director, and refused to allow his name to be used in anv way in connection with the bank; and that names of others were represented by the inspectors to have consented to act as directors who had not subscribed for any shares, or given any authority for any such publication. Then it goes on to say:

And the plaintiffs allege that the acts and proceedings of the provisional directors were illegal and irregular; that the agents and sollicitors, professing to act under the name and authority of the provisional directors procured a large number of subscribers for shares, and received the sum of about $175,000 more or less on account thereof, and also procured promissory notes to be signed by persons who were subscribing for shares, and these persons were endeavouring to discount these notes for the purpose of meeting the $250,000 that had to be deposited with the government.

Then it goes on:

That persons professing to act under the authority of the provisional directors did unlawfully deduct large sums for alleged services and commissions and other purposes out of the moneys received by them.

And the plaintiffs further allege:

That the shares and the money and the promissory notes procured from them were procured through fraud, deceit and misrepresentation; and that all money, promissory notes and other obligations received as aforesaid by all persons acting or professing to act in the name of and on behalf of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, or of the provisional directors, or any of them, are impressed with a trust in favour of all the subscribers for shares who may desire to come in and become parties to the action.

I read this special endorsement for the purpose of calling the attention of the Minister of Finance to this point, that whilst there were specific allegations with reference to twelve or thirteen who were beginning the proceedings, there were general allegations of fraud, misconduct, irregularities and disregard of the Bank Act as to the transactions generally of the Farmers' Bank and its representatives in obtaining the right to transact business.

It will be noted that Mr. McCarthy asks for an interview, and that his letter of the 19th October was not answered until the 23rd. And it is a significant fact that all through this correspondence, every letter that affected the Farmers' Bank, or Mr. Travers, was acted upon, and answered with an amazing degree of promptitude, whereas everything that interested the public was delayed or ignored.

Replying to this letter to Mr. McCarthy, of the 23rd October, 1906, the deputy minister said:

I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 19th inst. to Mr. Fielding's ad-

dress respecting the Farmers' Bank of Canada. When application is made by the Farmers' Bank to the Treasury Board for a certificate to enable them to commence business, the representations contained in your letter with its inclosure will be laid before the Board.

That was never done.

Mr. FOSTER. Hear, hear.

Mr. LENNOX. I noticed during the last discussion that it was alleged that probably that was not done. Well, I have here the means of proving absolutely that it was never done. You will note that Mr. McCarthy urged at least twice that he be granted an interview so that he might discuss the whole matter with the minister. As a member of parliament he had a duty to discharge, and he desired to have the minister seized of the whole situation both as regards his clients and the public generally, and the other subscribers to the shares. But for some reason the minister absolutely ignored the petition of one of his own supporters to have this matter investigated in the satisfactory way in which it might have been investigated, if this interview had been consented to. On October 23, Mr. Travers forwards the receipt for that $250,000 deposit, and on October 24, with that promptness which has characterized this branch of the case, the very day upon which it was received, the deputy minister writes acknowledging the receipt of the money and says:

I may say in this connection that opposition has been filed in this department to the granting of a certificate to your bank under section 14 of the Bank Act.

T. C. BOVILLE,
For Deputy Minister of Finance.

On October 29, we have this amazing letter from Mr. Travers:

Toronto, October 29, 1906.

The Hon,
The Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ontario.

Dear Sir,—Yours of the 24th, post-marked October 26, was received here on the 27th.

I was surprised to know that any one had filed an opposition against this bank being granted a certificate.

Would you kindly do me the favour of supplying me with a copy of the said objections, as I do not know up to the present moment wherein we have deviated in the slightest effect from the Bank Act.

W. R. TRAVERS,
General Manager.

At that time, on October 29, when Mr. Travers wrote this letter and on October 30, when it was received in the Department of Finance, the department by perusal of the newspapers to which allusion has been made, possessed full and ample knowledge that that statement was absolutely false, and it is not unimportant that we should keep that point firmly in mind. The Finance Minister knew at that time, as I submit, that the statement of Mr. Travers that he was not aware of any irregularity or any charge that could possibly be made against him was not in accordance with the facts.

On October 30, 1906, a letter was addressed to Mr. Leighton G. McCarthy, as follows:

Ottawa, Oct. 31, 1906.

Leighton G. McCarthy, Esq., K.C., M.P.,
Toronto, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Referring to your letter of the 19th instant, addressed to Mr. Fielding, on the subject of the Farmers' Bank of Canada and the issue of a certificate to that bank to commence business under section 15 of the Bank Act, I notice recently a reference in the newspapers for a judgment given by Judge Anglin in a suit relating to this matter. In view of the decision rendered, I shall be obliged if you will let me know if you still desire the protest contained in your letter to be brought before the Treasury Board upon an application of the Farmers' Bank for a certificate to be considered.

T. C. BOVILLE,
For Deputy Minister of Finance.

That I venture to say is a somewhat remarkable letter. Why did the Deputy Minister write that letter at all? He says he has noticed something in the newspapers, and he, therefore, thinks it is right to ask Mr. McCarthy to withdraw the protest he had entered, and which Mr. McCarthy wanted to supplement by a viva voce interview with the minister. It is worth while to ascertain just what the position was in regard to the newspaper matter. Was the newspaper account one that would allay suspicion, and that would lead the Department of Finance to think that all was right or was it one to add to their suspicion, and give them additional reasons for not granting a certificate? I have taken pains to look into that question, and I find that the case came up in court on Saturday October 27, and the account of it appeared in the Toronto papers, on Monday, October 29. It would reach Ottawa on the evening of Monday, October 29. Again I call attention to the promptness with which the Department of Finance deals with anything that will help Travers to get through this charter. On October 29, items appeared in the Toronto papers. They are sensational items, covering several columns, they are not in the ordinary Osgoode Hall news. The account shows that general fraud was charged, that there was an affidavit by Mr. William Laidlaw, K.C., showing not only specific fraud as affecting his clients, but a general system of fraud in the initiation of the bank. That is what is in the newspapers, and that is what Mr. Boville read. Then it is pointed out in the newspaper accounts that the matter is only tentatively dispos-

ed of, that it will not be actually disposed of until the 1st of November, so that the Department is in a hurry as you see. And then, to make it more easy for the department, to call on Mr. McCarthy, as they do, to withdraw his protest against the issue of the certificate, there are such headlines as: Farmers' Bank avoids threatened windup. Plaintiffs bought out. Oath against oath, and things of this kind. I wondered when I read this letter why the Minister of Finance, having promised to lay this matter before the Treasury Board, was so solicitous to have Mr. McCarthy withdraw this charge. But one is more amazed to find that the very account that is referred to in that letter, and which is the only excuse for writing it, is of a nature to intensify the anxiety of the department to have a thorough and full investigation of this matter. They ask Mr. McCarthy if he still wishes to let the Treasury Board know of the pretty general allegations contained in his letter, and they suggest by their letter that he should not press it, because of what they had read in the newspapers; and what they read in the newspapers must have been of the character published in the newspapers, and not of a character on which to base a letter of this kind. Mr. McCarthy was not satisfied, he knew that the suit was not settled. What happened was this, and it is set out in the newspapers: Mr. Lindsay got busy, he hied off into the county of Halton, got hold of the clients of Messrs. Laidlaw and McCarthy without the knowledge of these solicitors, bought them off, and came into court with affidavits that these people were settled with, and Mr. Kappelle, representing the plaintiffs' interests in court, objected. There was no one present representing the general public interest at this proceeding as in the other proceedings in connection with this transaction. The judge said that in as much as it was stated that the whole matter was settled there was no necessity to proceed further, but he would leave the matter for final decision until November 1. Mr. McCarthy does not altogether agree with the department's view. He writes back:

Home Life Building, Victoria St.,
Toronto, November 1, 1906.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Acting Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—With reference to yours of the 31st ultimo, I will be in Ottawa on Monday or Tuesday of next week when I will do myself the pleasure of calling upon you with reference to the subject matter of your letter.

LEIGHTON McCARTHY.

This is another circumstance, I submit, to call the attention of the department to the fact that Mr. McCarthy does not regard it as so simple a matter that he could write back and say 'Yes.' Then, on November 2, Mr. McCarthy writes in this way. And I call your attention to the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this is not the complete withdrawal that the department has asked Mr. McCarthy for. It is a qualified withdrawal, as much as to say, 'my clients are now safe, and, so far as they are concerned, I have no further protest to make; but you know what I said, about the other; it is up to you to do what you like.'

Mr. FOSTER. Is there anything to show that he saw the minister in the meantime?

Mr. LENNOX. Not a syllable. He never did see the minister, so far as we know from anything that has transpired. You see he has it on his mind that he would like to have an interview with the minister; and even after this call-off-your-dog letter from the department, he again says: I would like to go down. Here is the letter to the minister to which I have referred:

Toronto, November 2, 1906.

Honourable W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Referring to my letters of the 8th and 9th inst.——

That is an error. It should be 8th and 19th ult.

—with reference to the application for a certificate made on behalf of the Farmers' Bank, I am advised by those who are instructing me that the claims made by them in the action brought have been settled by their subscriptions being taken up by some parties interested in the bank and refunding the money paid by the individuals or returning the notes which had been given. The objections which I made on their behalf to the issue of the certificates are therefore withdrawn. Would you mind, therefore, returning to me the papers which I forwarded to you?

Mark you, there is this important item of information, not only conveyed by the newspapers to the department, but conveyed personally to the Minister of Finance by this letter of Mr. McCarthy, that the persons interested in the bank had been compelled to take over the subscriptions to relieve these parties who had brought the suit, to buy them off and give them up their notes. The newspapers show, further, that they had been compelled to guarantee them against the double liability to which they otherwise would have been subject. So the matter stood on the third of November, when this letter would arrive.

Now, I want to pause here for a moment that we may see what the situation was at that time and of what circumstances the minister had undoubted knowledge on that day. I submit that in the letter of Mr. McCarthy's withdrawal and by the ac-

counts contained in the newspapers there is a full, a sufficient and complete acknowledgment by the persons interested in promoting the Farmers' Bank, that all the allegations contained in Mr. McCarthy's particulars of claim, as forwarded to the minister, so far as these parties are concerned, were absolutely true. There are some other outstanding features that I shoud refer to as having been before the minister on the third of November. The first is, that, having regard to the fact that this matter was up in court before Travers wrote his letter of the 29th of October, the minister had specific and clear information on the 3rd of November that Travers' letter of the 29th of October, saying that he knew of nothing wrong, was absolutely a falsehood. That is one item in reference to Travers. The second item is, that the winding up proceedings had been averted by a compromise, and by a surreptitious buying off of the plaintiffs behind the backs of their solicitors effected through Lindsay and Travers, the Travers who afterwards secured the confidence of the minister. Travers was charged in these proceedings, as reported in the Toronto newspapers, to which Mr. Boville refers, with fraud, with gross dishonesty, and with an evasion of the Bank Act, the charge being made by so eminent a K.C. as William Laidlaw, on oath in court. In that statement of fraud others than the plaintiffs—Robert Noble, Dr. Stewart, Major Beattie, and others —were all affected by the frauds; and notwithstanding the settlement of the suit, all the facts as affecting them remained on record on oath at Osgoode Hall, undisposed of, as the minister knew. That a large proportion of the $250,000 was obtained by discount of notes, as the minister, on the 3rd of November, well knew. That moneys actually collected had been wrongfully, and contrary to the Bank Act, unlawfully diverted to the payment of commission and other improper purposes, and charges by the agents and solicitors of the bank, as the minister knew, and that the agents and solicitors of the bank were acting irregularly, dishonestly, and contrary to the Bank Act, as was alleged on oath, as the minister also knew. All these circumstances, as I submit, existed on the 3rd of November, to the knowledge of the minister, and were, as I submit, important circumstances to make him hesitate—yes, to make him hesitate even to the extent of refusing—to grant the charter even if nothing more had been shown.

But it does not stop there. I said a few moments ago that the statements that Mr. McCarthy asked to have laid before the Treasury Board were never laid before the Treasury Board. I have proof in the letter of 7th November, 1906, in which Mr. Boville says, addressing Mr. McCarthy:

> Referring to your letter of the 2nd instant, in the matter of an application of the Farmers' Bank of Canada for a certificate to commence business, I beg to inclose herewith the papers forwarded with your letter of the 19th October.

Returned on the 7th of November, or some weeks before the application of the Farmers' Bank was made. So we have this point absolutely clear,—these papers were not submitted to the Deputy Minister of Justice, and were not submitted to the Treasury Board. Well, what happened? The funniest thing of all happened. The Deputy Minister, having notified this gem-like character Travers of a difficulty—for he says, 'opposition is offered'—on the 24th of October, is dreadfully afraid he might attempt to explain and create greater difficulty. So having got rid of the evidence of Mr. McCarthy laid before the Minister of Finance, and having refused the repeated offers of Mr. McCarthy to go and discuss the whole matter with the Minister of Finance, on the 7th of November, the very day on which the papers were returned to Mr. McCarthy, Mr. Boville says the coast is clear—not in those words, but in a more definite form. He does it promptly; he says:

> W. R. Travers, Esq.,
> General Manager,
> The Farmers' Bank of Canada,
> Toronto, Ont.
>
> Dear Sir,—Referring to my letter to you of the 2nd inst., inclosing copy of a letter addressed to Mr. Fielding by Mr. Leighton McCarthy by way of a protest to the granting of a certificate to your bank to commence business, I beg to state that I am advised by Mr. McCarthy that the objections which he made to the issue of a certificate have been withdrawn.

That is not true. Mr. McCarthy had made a series of objections on behalf of his clients, and so far as his clients were concerned, those charges were withdrawn because these people had been bought off. But what I point out is this: Why in the name of common sense, why in the name of the rights of the people, has the Department of Finance to go out of its way to say: Don't answer that letter, don't take any chances, or complicate matters? We have got rid of the McCarthy letter, don't say anything. It is like Alphonse and Gaston. 'Don't commit yourself, my dear Alphonse,' says the Minister of Finance. 'I certainly will not, my dear Gaston,' replies innocent Mr. Travers. Well, that brings the record down to the application. The application was forwarded on the 27th of November, inclosed in a letter from Mr. Travers. It reached here on the 28th of November. We begin to do something then, there is no delay after that. On the 29th Mr. Travers is

here, and these papers are here before him. There is his application, there is his affidavit and his declaration verifying it. I need only read two clauses of that declaration, the fourth and the fifth, and these are the two clauses upon which the Department of Finance rely when they are trying to satisfy the Bankers' Association later on:

4. On the 23rd day of October, 1906 (says Travers in his declaration), there had been actually bona fide subscribed 5,757 shares of the capital stock of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, and I have had personal knowledge of the applications and subscriptions, and each and all of the said subscriptions is and are on the printed form of application—a copy of which is now produced and marked Exhibit C to this my declaration, and that the said subscriptions appeared on the stock books of the said bank, and that a sum beyond $250,000 thereof in cash has been actually paid in by the subscribers of the same.

5. Now shown to me and marked Exhibit D to this my declaration is a list of the subscribers to the capital stock of the said bank correctely setting forth as to each subscription the name of the subscriber, his address, the number of shares subscribed for by him, the amount of such shares and the amount paid in thereon. Each of the said subscriptions is a bona fide subscription to the capital stock of the said bank.

That is the statement made on oath by Mr. Travers, and filed with the department. It will be admitted surely that if, to the knowledge of the minister, that declaration was in any substantial matter untrue, it stamped Mr. Travers in such a way that his testimony ought not to be received. What will you say, Mr. Speaker, when I tell you that in that very application, attached to it as exhibit D referred to in the clauses I have just read, in that very list of subscribers are the names of the men who were plaintiffs in that suit, and whose names, it was admitted on oath, were every one of them obtained by fraud? Let me read the names:

John McLeod, Milton, Ont., 1 share, $100, $50 paid; John Sproat, Mansewood, Ont., 100 shares, $10,000, $1,000 paid; Geo. Gastle, Milton, Ont., 10 shares, $1,000, $1,000 paid; Finlay McCallum, Milton, Ont., 10 shares, $1,000, $1,000 paid; W. A. Dixon, Milton, Ont., 50 shares, $5,000, $500 paid; James Murray, of subscribers, are the names of the men Mansewood, Ont., 10 shares, $1,000, $300 paid; John Stewart, Milton, Ont., 10 shares $1,000, $100 paid; Geo. Denoon, Milton, Ont., 20 shares, $2,000, $2,000 paid; Robert Hume, Milton, Ont., 10 shares, $1,000, $100 paid; William McLean, Milton, Ont., 5 shares, $500, $50 paid; Wm. Harris, Milton, Ont., 5 shares, $500, $500 paid.

Yet there had been a suit of which the Minister of Finance and his Deputy Minister had complete knowledge, all of record in their own office, and brought to their knowledge by the newspapers, showing that as regards those eleven names, there was enacted an organized system of fraud. There had been a refund, and these parties had been guaranteed and had been bought off, as the 'Globe' and 'Mail' and other Toronto newspapers, alleged. Yet their names are here as bona fide subscribers. They had given promissory notes, and the money had been refunded, and they had been bought up and silenced, and the fraud was compromised, the felony was compounded by those parties who subsequently came to the Minister of Finance to get this certificate. The next step I need not spend any time upon. The minister forwards a file of the papers to the Deputy Minister of Justice, and the Deputy Minister of Justice says:

As regards the statements of Wm. R. Travers, they are sufficient if they are accepted.

And he leaves it in that way. But even if the Deputy Minister of Justice has made a mistake in this matter, he was not much to blame, because he was not furnished with material upon which to found a judgment upon the merits. I am glad that it is not pretended that the minister submitted anything more to the Deputy Minister of Justice than the mere question as to whether the form of the document as a legal document was sufficient for the purpose. Now we began to have things done promptly again after a considerable lack of promptness. Mr. Travers' application came on the 28th of November; Mr. Travers was here on the 29th November. On the 30th of November we have a letter from Mr. Fielding to Mr. Travers. After referring to his inability to see Mr. Travers the day before, the minister says:

There is a phase of the matter which I should like to bring to your notice so that you may consider it at once. It has been represented to us that in some previous instances where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actaully an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital. We have been told that in some cases the subscribers did not actually pay in cash but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise the money. On account of information of this kind, which had reached us in relation to a previous case, we deem it proper to scan very closely every application for a certificate which comes to us. I shall be glad to have an assurance that nothing of the kind has taken place in relation to the subscriptions for the Farmers' Bank, but that the amount set forth in the application as having been paid up have in every case been bona fide cash payments.

Alphonse and Gaston come in again. Why did not the Finance Minister talk to this man in a business way? If a man goes into a bank, and they find that he has been guilty of misrepresentation and fraud, and he applies for a loan, the bank manager meets him and says: 'I want this matter

cleared up before you can do any business with us; if you show that you are an honest man, we will deal with you; if you cannot show that, you will not have any business dealings with us.' The Minister of Finance, however, was very polite and inoffensive to Mr. Travers in referring to what had been done in some other case, imaginary or real, as much as to say: 'You must not imagine for a moment that we think there was anything wrong in your case, but because there was something wrong in another case, we want to be exceedingly careful, and I shall be glad to have an assurance from you that all is right.' What did the Minister of Finance mean by 'an insurance' in that case? Mr. Travers had made a solemn declaration which in law has all the force and effect of an oath rendering him liable to the penalties of perjury. When the minister dictated that letter, did he mean anything or was it a sham? I will not for one moment believe that he meant a sham; no one knows the Minister of Finance would be mean enough to suggest that. He meant what he said—he meant: 'I want some assurance; I want something better than your declaration; I want some proof that this matter is square and bona fide. I have your declaration; I have your letter of the 29th of October; I know that that letter was false; I have your declaration of the 27th of November; I know that it bears on its face the absolute refutation of its truth; and I want some assurance.' And what happens? The minister meant well; no doubt he did. But smooth Mr. Travers came to the minister, and the minister cross-examined him, he says; and what was the result? The result was nothing. After having determined to have an assurance, which meant some other evidence beyond the evidence of a man whom the records had convicted as being unreliable, he had an interview with that man, and, whether by the persuasion of Mr. Travers or by the persuasion of Mr. Calvert, perhaps the guarantee of Mr. Calvert that Mr. Travers was a superior class of man, and, therefore, eminently reliable, notwithstanding the fact that he had sent a false letter, notwithstanding the fact that he had made a false declaration which was on file in the department at that time, in some way which I cannot understand, which I am not bound to explain, the Minister of Finance decided to let this matter go through—a matter which I believe will be one of continued regret to the House, and the country, and, I have no doubt, to do the minister justice, a matter of regret to him also. Therefore, what we find is this, that instead of having any assurance from Mr. Travers, we have merely his verbal statement to the Minister of Finance, followed by this letter merely for the purpose of record:

Ottawa, November 30, 1906.

The Hon. W. S. Fielding,

In reply to your letter of the 30th of November, I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you.

What does that mean? It certainly does not meet the letter which the Minister of Finance wrote; and if the cross-examination was no more successful than was the letter elicited afterwards, the tender conscience of Mr. Travers was not very much hurt. The Minister of Finance, when he wrote the letter of the 30th of November, meant what he said. He realized that with the evidences of dishonesty which were spread out upon the record in his own office, he could not and dare not accept the statement of Mr. Travers, and he writes to him for further assurance; but, by some means, I know not what—some means which are very much to be regretted—honest, so far as the Minister of Finance is concerned, I have no doubt at all, but by some unfortunate circumstance, the matter was allowed to go through, notwithstanding the determination of the minister a few hours before that it could not go through without further evidence. That is the most charitable construction I can put upon it. Now, on the same 30th of November, the order in council was made; on the same 30th of November the certificate of the order in council was issued; on the same 30th of November the certificate was transmitted to Mr. Travers, addressed to Toronto, but handed to him here; on the same 30th of November the balance of the deposit, $245,000, was handed over to Mr. Travers; pretty prompt action, with this fortunate circumstance, that if it had been availed of, the Minister of Finance could have prevented the payment of that cheque if he had thought fit to do so. What have we on the 30th of November? We have the letter of the Minister of Finance to Mr. Travers; we have the interview of Mr. Travers with the Minister of Finance; we have the letter of Mr. Travers to the Minister of Finance; we have the order in council made upon the matter—all being carefully submitted to the Treasury Board; we have the certificate issued by the officials of the department; we have the cheque handed over, and the certificate handed over, and the whole matter closed—seven distinct transactions all in one busy day, the 30th of November, when it is urgent that this matter should be closed. This pretty nearly ends the chapter of incidents. We have also on that day the receipt for the cheque from Mr. Travers. On the 30th of November—dated the same day, and possibly here the same day; it could not have reached the Minister of Finance or else he would not do as he did—we have a letter

of the 30th November written by Mr. E. S. Clouston, president of the Canadian Bankers' Association, an institution acting under the Bank Act, a branch, so to speak, of the administration of public affairs in Canada; we have a letter from him showing that the representations of Mr. Travers were false. I read that letter:

CANADIAN BANKERS' ASSOCIATION,
INCORPORATED 1900.

Montreal, November 30, 1906.

Farmers' Bank of Canada.

T. C. Boville, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—In connection with the application of the Farmers' Bank of Canada for the usual certificate from the Treasury Board, I have reason to believe that the money lodged, or to be lodged, at Ottawa as stock subscriptions, cannot be regarded as paid-up capital, and that a large proportion of the amount necessary to the obtaining of a certificate is a loan made upon the promise of its payment when returned by your department.

Permit me to request that, if only for the protection of the public, the Treasury Board will exercise its right to refuse to issue a certificate if it thinks best so to do, until a thorough investigation has been made into the circumstances stated herein.

E. S. CLOUSTON,
President.

And I may state to you, Mr. Speaker, so as to have it on record, that this statement turns out to be absolutely true—at least $20,000 was borrowed, independently of the amounts that were borrowed on promissory notes, to make up the deposit with the government. Now, Sir, what should the Finance Minister have done? I say in the first place that he should have refused the certificate and that it never should have been issued. The next point I have to make is that even though through improvidence or mistake this certificate was issued in good faith, it was still the duty of the Minister of Finance to see that the result should not be prejudicial to the public. I will not quibble as to the question of cancellation, I will not argue as to the question of a royal commission. Notwithstanding the fact that a royal commission did issue in the insurance case on less grounds than existed here and without consulting parliament, and under the same Act that would have to be invoked in this case, I do not need to argue upon that point. I say that when on the 30th November or the 1st December at latest, the knowledge came to the Finance Minister that he had been deceived, it became the duty of the minister, beyond question, to see that the public should not be defrauded. Can there be any doubt about it? The cheque was not paid; Mr. Travers was a needy man, Mr. Travers was a criminal, the Minister of Finance knew it on the 1st December if he did not know it before, and a criminal is a coward the world over, and the minister had only to telegraph Mr. Travers to come to Ottawa, and he would have come by the first train. And criminal as he was to the knowledge of the minister on the 1st December if not before, the minister had him at his feet, and could have shaken him as a mastiff shakes a terrier, and he could have made him disgorge that cheque in less time than I take to tell you, and he could have made him give up that certificate rather than be landed behind the bars. That was the duty of the minister. I was going to call to your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the peculiar promptness with which everything that facilitated the action of Mr. Travers transpired. I do not want to insinuate for a moment—and I want it to be distinctly understood that in what I say this afternoon I do not make any charge of want of good faith against the minister—but it is a circumstance unfortunate in itself that this fatal rapidity occurred in this particular case when there was every reason for delay, and investigation. There ought to have been such an investigation as would inevitably have prevented the happening of this disaster which will ruin a large number of people in the province of Ontario. Therefore, without imputing to the Minister of Finance any wilful wrong or misconduct or want of good faith, I do think that the Minister of Finance, as a public man in his public capacity, does deserve the censure of this House and of the people of Canada through this House, for the great wrong that has been inflicted upon a large number of deserving people throughout the province of Ontario; many of whom cannot afford the enormous loss entailed upon them. I say so because the minister was warned time and again. The minister is a clever man, we all recognize that—sometimes we think he ought to put it to better account—but he is a clever, astute man, and a warning to such a man ought to have had some effect. He was warned by his own opinion about the matter; he was warned when these men came back a second time for the renewal of their charter, because, as he tells us himself, he realized that having hawked their stock about for two years unsuccessfully, they were not the best class of men to go into the banking business. That should have made him more cautious about investigating before granting the certificate. He was warned by previous cases as to which he writes to Mr. Travers; he was warned by Travers' letter of the 29th October, which from his own knowledge of the circumstances was false; he was warned many times by the hon. member for Halton—and when I say that I do not choose to believe the member for

Halton in preference to the Minister of Finance except upon the broad principle that having faith in both of them as being anxious to tell what is right, I recognize that the member for Halton has fewer charges upon his memory than has the Minister of Finance and also that he is speaking of a fact positive, and the Minister of Finance is only speaking of a matter of recollection. I will say nothing about the warning of Mr. Osler, M.P. for Toronto, because that is in dispute. He was warned by Mr. McCarthy's letters of the 8th and 19th October, and he refused the offers that Mr. McCarthy made to have a personal interview. He was warned by the legal documents explicit, full and direct as to general misconduct, evasion of the Bank Act, and dishonesty, as disclosed in the legal documents forwarded by Mr. McCarthy. He was warned by the newspapers which contained a full account of the fraud by which these Halton farmers had been robbed, and he was warned by the qualified and cautious withdrawal of Mr. McCarthy which was as much as to say: You do as you like, but I want to have it understood that I only withdraw so far as my clients are concerned. And, the Minister of Finance was warned, in a way that I cannot understand his ignoring, by the conclusive falsehoods stamped upon the face of the declaration and application which Mr. Travers filed in his department. This being the case, reluctant as I am to say anything in any degree harsh as regards the Minister of Finance, having great regard for him as a public man, yet realizing as I do that he failed to discharge the duty which he owed parliament in connection with the Farmers' Bank, I beg to move:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:—

This House regrets that in permitting the Farmers' Bank of Canada to commence and to continue business, the Minister of Finance and the Treasury Board failed to exercise such proper care and to take such reasonable precautions as were necessary to prevent evasion of the law and to protect the public interest.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). There is one passage in the speech of the hon. gentleman's in which I can most heartily agree. It is that in which he said it is deeply to be regretted that the Farmers' Bank was allowed to be organized. Most heartily do I concur in that regret. The occasion is one of these, however, in which it is so much easier to be wise in a later stage than at the beginning. Looking at the matter to-day in the light of recent events, in the light of the failure of the bank, in the light of all the facts that are now known, one naturally comes to the conclusion that the whole transaction was most regrettable. It is, however, very difficult to-day to bring a fair judgment to bear upon an event which was not judged in the light of to-day, but which had to be judged in the light of things as they stood some four years ago.

We had a very full discussion of this subject a short time ago, and so far as I can see my hon. friend has not brought forward any point which was not fully gone into in that discussion. At all events I cannot undertake to add anything to the information before the House, and therefore I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House except very briefly. The granting of this certificate to the bank was no doubt a matter of importance, but I do not think it had exactly the importance which my hon. friend seems to attach to it. But for the granting of the certificate, he said, this bank would not have been organized. That is true, but the same thing may be said regarding many other stages in the Bank's affairs. Had the farmers not subscribed for stock, the bank would not have been organized. Had application not been made for a charter, it would not have been organized. Had the charter not been approved by the Committee on Banking and Commerce, it could not have been organized. Nor would it have been organized had the charter not been approved in this House by hon. gentlemen on both sides. Had the shareholders not met and constituted a board of directors, and had the board of directors not taken all the initial steps required by the Bank Act, the organization of the bank could not have been completed. If any one of these steps had not been taken the bank certainly would not have been organized, because it required each and every one of them to give it a legal standing.

There are several stages in the organizing of a bank, the first of which is the granting of a charter. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) has alluded to that as if the government, and the Minister of Finance in particular were specially responsible for the granting of this charter. On reflection, I think he will admit that that is not a fair argument at all. There is a parliamentary sense in which the government have to do with all legislation, but we know that as a matter of fact, in the management of private Bills, the government do not usually interfere. For instance there was a Bill last session in regard to which a number of members of the government happened to unite in its support, and we were told that we were interfering with the privileges of members, and that the government should not interfere in a private Bill. So that the idea that the government had anything in particular to do with the granting of the charter to this bank is an entire-

ly mistaken one. I was a member of the Banking and Commerce Committee. I do not recollect whether my hon. friend was or not.

Mr. LENNOX. I was not. I may say to the hon. minister that I did not address myself at all to the incorporation of the bank, and I agree in all he has said in that connection.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend repeatedly referred to the granting of the charter. He did not dwell on it, I admit, but he said sufficient to imply that in the granting of this charter in the beginning some wrong was done. As a matter of fact that Bill came before the Banking and Commerce Committee like any other private Bill. A charter was granted, then an extension was given, and later on another extension. I was in this position. My hon. friend has represented that for some mysterious reason I was particularly anxious and zealous in having this bank organized, and give Mr. Travers a chance to go into business. Well, those who know anything about the course I took in the Banking and Commerce Committee know that my position was the very reverse. I do not remember the first extension, but I know that I was decidedly unfriendly to the second. I was not unfriendly because I thought there was anything wrong or suspected anything crooked, but simply because I regretted to find a number of farmers undertaking to organize a bank. I was afraid that there were going into a business for which they were not well fitted, and that it might not be a success. I had, however, no reason to suspect anything wrong. When, therefore, the second extension was asked I opposed it. The committee, however, consented to give the six months extension, and that was not the fault of the government or the opposition. I could not say what particular view any member on either side took on that occasion, but I do remember my own, and I know that the committee came to the conclusion that a six months extension should be given. All the members of the committee who gave them that extension are equally responsible with those on this side of the House. When the measure came to the House I do not remember anything particular about it. It travelled the usual course of a private Bill, and all members of the House, irrespective of party who allowed that private Bill to become law, are equally responsible for the granting of the charter.

Now, we come to the question of the certificate. My hon. friend has dwelt upon the letters of Mr. McCarthy. What the record shows is that Mr. McCarthy wrote a letter filing objections to the granting of the certificate, and he was informed that application for the granting of the certificate had not yet been received, but that when the application for the granting of the certificate should come in then his representation would receive consideration and the papers would be submitted to the Treasury Board. The application did come in, but Mr. McCarthy wrote a letter, which is on the record and which my hon. friend read, withdrawing the statements he had made. It is not an unusual thing in the organization of a company to find some shareholders who become discontented and wish to withdraw. Mr. McCarthy, representing some of the shareholders, filed a protest; a little later he withdrew the protest, and asked that the papers be sent back to him. That is the whole story of that matter. My hon. friend said that Mr. McCarthy was very anxious to come to Ottawa and discuss the matter, but we would not let him. The hon. gentleman knows enough of Mr. McCarthy to know that if he wanted to come to Ottawa to see a minister, whether of the present cabinet or any other, Mr. McCarthy would come and see that minister. As a matter of fact, while intimating his willingness to come when necessary, Mr. McCarthy, so far as my recollection goes, did not come to Ottawa. Later on, Mr. McCarthy having withdrawn his objection, proceedings went on towards the granting of the certificate. On a certain date, November 30, the certificate was granted. My hon. friend thinks there was a remarkable and undue haste in the events of that day. Now, once it was decided, whether wisely or unwisely may be a matter of debate, that that certificate should be granted, it would become a mere matter of procedure in the department, and I am certainly far from complaining of my deputy for expediting it. I am of the opinion that once a decision on any point is reached, it is the duty of the officials to carry out that decision as promptly as possible, and if in that instance the deputy minister expedited the transaction I should not see in it anything to suspect; I should, on the contrary, be disposed to commend that official for having carried out as promptly as possible a matter which had been decided by the proper authorities. My hon. friend tried to read into Mr. Boville's letters something mysterious; he implied that Mr. Boville was trying to prevent Mr. McCarthy from coming here. I do not complain of my hon. friend suggesting all sorts of faults on the part of the minister—although he was very kind in his personal references to myself—for after all that is in the game of public affairs; I do think, however, he should not be ungenerous enough to suggest, or imply, that the deputy minister, who is not responsible, I am responsible, in the writing of

these letters, whether as to the dates or to the terms, had any other purpose than to do his duty as a public official.

Mr. LENNOX. In whatever I said with reference to Mr. Boville, I regarded him as identical with the minister.

Mr. FIELDING. I am responsible.

Mr. LENNOX—and therefore the minister becomes responsible.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend knows that while a minister is responsible, matters of this sort have very largely to be carried out by his officials. That does not relieve him of responsibility, I am responsible all through; but my hon. friend will see that if there was a conspiracy in this matter not only must I have been a conspirator, but Mr. Boville must have been one also. I shall not quarrel with him if he puts me in that light, but I want him to spare Mr. Boville who is a good official and merely wanted to do his duty.

It has been said that certain allegations were made against the organization of the bank and that they were withdrawn. Then, we have filed an affidavit of Travers and the next day, after we had agreed to grant the certificate, we received a letter from Sir Edward Clouston, President of the Bankers' Association. It has been clearly shown that that letter reached us after the decision had been reached, after the certificate had been delivered to Travers, or at all events had been issued, and I presume it was delivered to Travers. All that that letter contained was a statement of Sir Edward that he had reason to believe that notes were given. Against that we have the affidavit, the sworn statement of Mr. Travers, and Mr. Travers at that time was a reputable man. I want the House to take note of that carefully; it is of the utmost importance. Even if it had been an open question, which it was not, as the certificate had been given and the question was closed, we had then on the one side, the statement of Sir Edward that he had reason to believe that notes were given, and on the other side the sworn affidavit of Travers that the matter was in proper shape, that the money had been paid in cash, and that the conditions of the Bank Act had been complied with. It is easy to-day to treat Travers as a criminal and to say his testimony was worth nothing, but when Travers made that affidavit he was a man of good standing and good repute in the eyes of the world and we had no right to regard him as otherwise. My hon. friend has stated that Travers was at that time a criminal, that he was known to be a criminal, that it had been shown by the public papers in the city of Toronto that Travers was at that time a criminal. We all know in the light of later events that Travers has been convicted and sent to the penitentiary, but it is not correct to say that at that time he was a criminal; he was a man in good standing. We were bound to treat him as such, bound to pay respect to his affidavit, just as we would to the affidavit of any man of repute.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Were there not eleven names on the affidavit that had been withdrawn?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot from memory deal with that particular aspect of the question. But there remained the fact that he had given his sworn affidavit that the money was up in cash. That was the essential feature of the whole thing, and his affidavit at that time was just as good as the statement or affidavit of any one else, better than the mere statement of any other gentleman, no matter how eminent, who merely said he had reason to believe. I think it is of the utmost importance in judging of this matter to bear in mind the fact that Travers was at that time a man of good repute. It is the essence of the whole question. As I said, it is difficult now, when Travers is a convicted criminal, to see the transaction in the proper light. My hon. friend says that Travers is not only a criminal now, but was a criminal then, and was known to be so from the published statements in the Toronto papers.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister said in his former speech that he had no knowledge at all of Travers. Had the minister taken any steps to ascertain, from persons who could give him information, Mr. Travers' standing, financial and otherwise?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I made no such special inquiry. I want to show that my view of Travers' good standing must have been the view which prevailed among a good many other men, possibly better qualified than I to judge of it. Travers organized his bank in the city of Toronto. Travers obtained the co-operation of well known, reputable citizens. Mr. Travers was associated with these gentlemen who joined him in the responsibility of the bank. Is it conceivable that, if he was a criminal, these gentlemen of repute in the province of Ontario would have associated themselves with him and made him manager of the bank? Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) think that conceivable? I will give him a further point. Mr. Travers, down to the day of the failure of the bank, was regarded by the government of Ontario as a reputable man, for they entrusted him with a considerable sum of the public

funds of the province of Ontario. If the government of Ontario, down to a few months ago, at the very time when the bank failed, regarded him as a man of repute, surely, I could not be regarded as mistaken when he came to me if, in the absence of anything to the contrary, I treated him as a man of repute.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted a question? How did the government of Ontario entrust Mr. Travers with their money?

Mr. FIELDING. I see it stated in a public return of liabilities that the province of Ontario had $25,000 in the Farmers' Bank. That is all I know about it.

Mr. BLAIN. Deposited in one of the branches?

Mr. FIELDING. That makes no difference; it was entrusted to the bank of which Mr. Travers was manager, and if he were known as a criminal—not only now, but at that time—is it conceivable that the government of Ontario would have deposited $25,000 in the bank of which he was manager? I am not finding fault with the government of Ontario. I am supposing that what they did, was done, as they believed it, in the public interest. I have no purpose in referring to it except to show that in all these transactions we must regard Mr. Travers as, at that time, a man of repute.

Now, the irregularity of the proceedings was in regard to the taking of notes. I do not wish to minimize that. I quite say that if we had known at that time what we learned later we would have refused the certificate. But there is a misunderstanding abroad as to the results of that. It should be understood that, as I am informed—speaking of what is recorded in the press—nearly all these notes were paid. If there was irregularity at the time the certificate was obtained the notes were paid; the bank had the capital; no man in the province of Ontario has suffered a loss, so far as I know, of a single dollar by reason of the fact that notes were signed instead of putting up cash. The notes were converted, as I understand it, into cash. If that is not the case, I shall be glad to be corrected.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the minister to say that he was not aware that they were paying their subscribed stock by notes. But did not Mr. McCarthy draw attention to that fact when he stated, in speaking of his clients, that they had been handed back their notes?

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. McCarthy had filed objections, but those objections were withdrawn.

Mr. SPROULE. But he made the statement of which I speak.

Mr. FIELDING. He objected to the issue of the certificate. Later he said: I desire to withdraw my objection; send me back the papers. And the papers were sent back. I merely want to put the case as it stood——

Mr. SPROULE. But there was a clear statement in Mr. McCarthy's letter that notes had been signed.

Mr. FIELDING. But, against that, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) will see that that apparently was settled. The form in which the matter stood at all events, was that Mr. McCarthy withdrew his objections. And later we have the statement of Mr. Travers on oath that he had his money put up in cash. That was the evidence on which we issued the certificate. Say, if you like, that it was insufficient. In looking back on it now I may say that had I known more I would have looked into the matter more carefully. We can all be wise in the later years. But at that time we had every reason to believe that Mr. Travers was acting in good faith and——

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the minister know that the statement on which he says he relied was disputed ? It was stated by Travers that Mr. McCarthy had alleged the opposite. True, Mr. McCarthy withdrew his formal objections, but that, surely, did not remove from the minister's mind the knowledge of the fact.

Mr. FIELDING. I understood that Mr. McCarthy's withdrawing put that matter out of the question. Whether it was wise or unwise that is the way it struck me. Reference has been made once or twice to a former member of this House, Mr. Calvert. I wish to say that any hon. gentleman who associates the name of Mr. Calvert with the issue of that certificate does Mr. Calvert an injustice. So little effect did it have on my mind that until I was reminded of it, I did not remember that Mr. Calvert had introduced Mr. Travers to me. But Mr. Calvert, in his conversation, never exchanged a word with respect to the issue of the certificate. He confined himself to the introduction of Mr. Travers—and even the introduction was not necessary, because, of course, no man needs an introduction to a minister when he comes to Ottawa on public business. But I think it only fair to say that I am not conscious that Mr. Calvert ever spoke a word to me concerning the issue of the certificate. So, whatever else is said it is not fair to blame that gentleman, who is not now in parliament, but holds an important public position. My hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) wishes to convey the impression—I do not say unfairly, because the spirit of his remarks was very fair—that

throughout this transaction there was a desire on the part of the Finance Department to expedite the matter of issuing the certificate. That was the very opposite to my own mind in the matter. If I erred in this matter, I erred from the fact that I feared that I was perhaps going to do injustice to the farmers who wanted the certificate. I did regret at an early stage that they were going into the business. I should have rejoiced could I have found satisfactory reasons to refuse this certificate. But I found that we had precisely the same evidence before us as had been before us in other cases. And I asked myself: What right have I to say that the farmers shall be refused a certificate when they come to us with the same information and the same evidence as had been furnished in other cases? Cases could be shown, one at all events, in which a certificate was granted without an affidavit at all; I do not say wrongly granted, I am sure it was done in good faith. We have to be governed largely by precedent in these things. If we had refused that certificate and if, in consequence, the bank had been wound up, involving a very serious loss to shareholders who had put their money into it and had incurred the expense of organization, I know what would have followed. These good farmers would have turned round and said: Mr. Fielding was ready enough to grant certificates to other banks, but this was a farmers' bank, we were small men, poor people; we wanted a charter, and we complied with the law and did everything that others had been required to do, yet we were refused. I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, would not that have been the position? I do not pretend to say, looking over this matter, that there is nothing to regret. I do deeply regret it. All I ask is that the gentlemen who consider this subject will endeavour to look at it, not in the light of to-day, but in the light of events as they existed at that time, four and a-half years ago. I ask them to remember the standing of Mr. Travers, to remember that he placed before me all the evidence which any other applicant for a bank certificate usually gave. If the matter is looked at in that light, I think it will be seen that there is no real cause to complain of what was done.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). I do not intend to say more than a few words on the subject, as the matter was so thoroughly discussed on a former occasion and has been so well covered to-day by my hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox). I think the matter comes down to a question of whether the facts known at the time justified the issue of a certificate. Nor do I wish to find fault with the minister on account of his intentions; I think his intentions were good.

We have the question whether or not the Minister of Finance, acting as the trustee of the people of Canada, exercised the ordinary and usual precaution that a trustee under similar circumstances would exercise, and if he did that, I am prepared to say he has discharged his duties in that regard. In forming a conclusion as to whether he did exercise proper care, we have to find out what was in his mind at the time, because a man is only guilty of an offence according to the knowledge he has in his mind at the time. The Finance Minister admits that he opposed the incorporation of the bank, and he did that because he thought that to incorporate a Farmers' Bank, a bank of that name might lead unsuspecting farmers to banking transactions with which they were unfamiliar. He was opposed to that idea, and when the charter came to be renewed the second time, he would not grant an extension further than six months. I want to point out that the Act granting the extension for six months was passed on the 26th of June, in the year in which the certificate was granted. So that would be prominently in the mind of the Minister of Finance five months afterwards when he granted the certificate. The first point I want to touch upon as giving the minister some evidence of the transactions which were going on in connection with the organization of this bank, is the statement made by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson). I am of course arguing on a question of memory between the Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Halton. The Minister of Finance says that he has a distinct recollection that nothing was said to him by the member for Halton as to this bank having received some notes in part payment of subscriptions, and that these notes were being discounted for the purpose of raising money to be deposited with the Receiver General. In the first place, I would think that as the Minister of Finance is a very busy man, and as this was a matter which particularly interested the member for Halton, a matter particularly within his own knowledge and affecting his constituents, the presumption is in favour of the memory of the hon. member for Halton as being correct. The member for Halton says himself that he had seen the notes in question which had been given in part payment for subscriptions, he had seen these in the hands of the solicitor, when he says he spoke to the Minister of Finance about it. The Minister of Finance on the other hand says that the member for Halton never spoke to him with reference to it. He admits there were certain conversations between the member for Halton and himself, and that these

conversations were confined exclusively to the question of the charter or the organization of the bank. They were, therefore, according to the memory of the minister, confined to that aspect of the case and to what took place in the Banking and Commerce Committee, I presume, where the matter was discussed. Now, if that is the case, how could we consider that to be a private matter? The minister complains of the member for Halton for divulging a private matter.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I did not complain. I said I had no fault to find with the member for Halton.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am merely speaking as to the minister's recollection.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not complain of the member for Halton for divulging a private matter, I made no complaint against him on that point.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Nevertheless the Finance Minister says that the conversations were of such a character as would justify him in characterizing them as private conversations. Is that not right?

Mr. FIELDING. Except as that would imply any reflection on the member for Halton in repeating them.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. My point is that as a matter of recollection, if the conversation between the member for Halton and the Minister of Finance were confined exclusively to what took place in the Banking and Commerce Committee regarding the organization of this bank, that would not be private conversation; therefore when he says that what took place he regarded as private conversation corroborates the belief that what was in the mind of the Minister of Finance was something else, and was not the question of organization of this bank when it was discussed in the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. FIELDING. I said that arose out of my opposition in the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think that very fact alone shows that what the member for Halton told the Minister of Finance was something that did not take place in the Banking and Commerce Committee, but was something which the minister might think was of a private nature. The member for Halton says that it was a fact that he had seen the notes given in part payment for subscription of stock in this bank, and that he went to the Minister of Finance and told him this, that he was troubled about the matter, and wished the minister to take some action with regard to it That is the way the matter stands between the Minister of Finance and the member for Halton.

Well, that is the second item of which the Minister of Finance should have taken note. Now I come to the third. A member of this House in whom no doubt the Minister of Finance has absolute confidence, that is, Mr. McCarthy, writes to the Minister of Finance on the 8th of October, and he says to the minister: I am acting for a number of people who are alleged to have subscribed for stock in the Farmers' Bank, and I say their stock has been obtained from them by fraud, I say that notes have been taken from these clients of mine by fraud in payment of their stock, and I want you to do nothing until this matter is thoroughly investigated. Then Mr. McCarthy follows that up by another letter, and this makes the strong point in the whole case against the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Finance has admitted to me in answer to a question I put to him in the House when he was making his statement:

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In view of the letter written by Mr. McCarthy on the 19th of October, in which he stated that he had brought action on behalf of certain persons, and of the persons who were subscribers to the funds of the bank, does not the minister consider that that was sufficient warrant, notwithstanding the fact that Mr. McCarthy on their behalf subsequently withdrew his objection, for believing that there was irregularity?

Mr. FIELDING. If we had had no later information, I think my hon. friend's criticism would be just, but after that we did receive the solemn declaration of Travers.

Now let us see what the further letter from Mr. McCarthy says, bearing in mind what the Finance Minister has admitted, that he thought the first letter would have justified him in refusing the certificate. The first letter says there has been fraud of the various kinds mentioned in the letter, and of the various kinds mentioned in the writ, that men had been put on there as directors who were not directors, that they had taken notes instead of cash, and they were discounting those notes and putting the proceeds of those notes into the Department of the Receiver General Now the minister says that if that were true he would be justified in withholding the certificate. Mr. McCarthy writes back and says:

I am advised by those who are instructing me that the claims made by them in the action brought have been settled by their subscriptions being taken up by some parties interested in the bank, and refunding the money paid by the individuals, or returning the notes which had been given.

So in what the minister characterizes as a withdrawal by Mr. McCarthy, there is

the positive assertion by him that notes were given in payment of stock, and that is illegal according to law. Now, I would like to ask the Finance Minister by what process of reasoning can he characterize that as a withdrawal which places on record the fact that there was an infringement of the Act? I would characterize that as nothing more or less than a confirmation of what had been alleged in the former letter; and I say further, that when Mr. McCarthy made this accusation that certain things had been done, and when the government was told of the return of these securities and notes, it was the most complete proof that the parties had been guilty of the charges Mr. McCarthy had laid against them. Under these circumstances, I do not see how the Minister of Finance could possibly have granted this certificate. Upon that evidence alone the Minister of Finance or his department or his officials did not exercise that ordinary reasonable care and diligence which we expect from ordinary men; but, when they are acting in a judiciary or public character we have a right to expect from them a much greater degree of care and diligence. The courts of this country, upon the question being put to them on that evidence alone, whether the Minister of Finance had exercised that ordinary care and prudence which should be exercised by a trustee would say that he had not, and he would be liable as a trustee or executor for the consequences of that act. But we have more than that. We have the evidence that the Deputy Minister knew, according to a report in a Toronto newspaper, of what had taken place in the court at Toronto; we have the evidence of Mr. Laidlaw, an eminent K. C. of Toronto, who swears in an affidavit that the endorsements sent by Mr. McCarthy were true. That affidavit has been ignored for the affidavit of Mr. Travers; the statements of Mr. McCarthy have been ignored for the statements of Mr. Travers; the judgment of the court in Toronto has been ignored for the statements of Mr. Travers; and the recollection of my hon. friend from Halton has been ignored for the statements of Mr. Travers. All these matters which had come to the Minister of Finance have been ignored in favour of Mr Travers. I would like to ask the minister this question: Was he putting a hypothetical case to Mr. Travers when he said to him: 'It has come to our knowledge that in some cases notes have been given instead of cash for payments of subscriptions'; or was he putting an actual case?

Mr. FIELDING. I will answer my hon. friend. I had heard gossip in banking circles regarding the organization of a previous bank. I had no information beyond the whispers that went around among banking men as to the manner in which a certain bank had been organized.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not know that I would be justified in asking the minister the name of the bank?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not care to give that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It seems to me that it makes it all the harder for the Finance Minister to get away from blame in the present case if he had another instance within his own knowledge.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not say I had any knowledge of it. I had heard gossip of that kind in banking circles

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister had heard gossip that another bank had either attempted to do or had done what this bank did. If it had attempted to do the same thing, he must have headed it off, and made it comply with the law. If it had done it, he had the greater reason for looking more deeply into this case before granting a certificate. I would like to point this out to the Minister of Finance. In answer to a question of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), he said this:

> There was some gossip in banking circles concerning the Farmers' Bank of which we became aware. I do not see how we can take cognizance of that. There was gossip abroad concerning the Farmers' Bank, I was well aware of it.

Mr. FIELDING. Not as respecting the notes. I had not heard that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What was the gossip about?

Mr. FIELDING. The banking fraternity generally, looked on the organization of the Farmers' Bank with suspicion, and there was constant talk about it before they got their charter.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I adduce that as one more reason why the minister should have hesitated about granting the certificate. The gossip of the banking fraternity, I suppose means the Bankers' Association?

Mr. FIELDING. Not the Bankers' Association, but bankers whom I met. The bankers looked on the organization of the Farmers' Bank as doubtful, as I did myself.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I can only say that the more information the minister gives me about the rumours concerning the Farmers' Bank, it seems to me all the more reasonable why he should have been more careful in granting the certificate. The Act says in effect that the only two parties to be satisfied are the Finance Minister and the Treasury Board. That is not a ques-

tion of law. It is only a question of the satisfaction of the Finance Minister and the Treasury Board that all the details of the Act have been complied with that would justify him in granting a certificate. He applied to the Minister of Justice for his opinion. As to what did he want his opinion? As to whether or not the evidence was sufficient to justify him in granting the certificate? If he wanted to get his own opinion corroborated by the Minister of Justice, the only way in which he could get an honest corroboration was to submit to the Minister of Justice all the facts that he himself was possessed of. Now, I ask the Minister of Finance if he said to the Minister of Justice: I have a complaint from Mr. McCarthy to the effect that these subscriptions were obtained by fraud, that some men subscribed for $1,000 stock, and when they came to investigate they found that they were down for $10,000; I have information from Mr. McCarthy that a great many of those who are down for subscriptions did not sign the stock book at all, and that a certain member of parliament whose name was put down as a director had never consented; we have the judgment of the court at Toronto, which practically confirms all these allegations, because these men got judgment against the Farmers' Bank, and got back their money and their notes; I have the evidence of Mr. William Laidlaw, K.C., in an affidavit in which he swears that all these things are true. If the Minister of Finance had submitted all these facts to the Minister of Justice, together with the single affidavit of Mr. Travers, does he think that the Minister of Justice would have written back saying: You are quite justified on the evidence you have submitted in granting the certificate. I venture to say that he would not. All that the Minister of Justice did say was: If you are satisfied with the evidence, you are justified in granting the certificate. So that the matter came back to the judgment of the Minister of Finance himself whether or not he would be justified in granting the certificate. And all this evidence is not what has been discovered since, but is from information which the Finance Minister indisputably had in his possession at the time he granted the certificate, which is not only a certificate that the bank has been properly organized, but is practically a certificate of character to Mr. Travers, because it is a refutation of all the charges made against him, and an intimation to the innocent people of this country that he is all right, that he has complied with the laws of the Dominion of Canada, and that they are perfectly justified in placing their money in the Farmers' Bank of Canada. That is what it amounts to. The Minister of Finance says that because the government of Ontario happened to have a small deposit of $25,000 in the Farmers' Bank, they were satisfied with Mr. Travers. But the answer to that is this. The Ontario government knew that before a bank could get a charter it had to comply with the Dominion Act, and, therefore, they assumed that the Minister of Finance had carried out the Act.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not think they had so much faith in me.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. They had until this question of the Farmers' Bank came up. It was because of the action of the Minister of Finance in allowing the bank to be organized, and in giving them a certificate, and in starting them out to work that the Ontario government made that deposit. I venture to say that had the minister placed in possession of the Ontario government all the facts he had before him when he issued that certificate the Ontario government would never have put a dollar in the Farmers' Bank of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member (Mr. Lennox) said it was published in the Toronto newspapers.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the Minister of Finance had told them that Mr. McCarthy had sent this warning that all the allegations contained in the special endorsement had been sworn to by Mr. Laidlaw; if he had told them that the Canadian Bankers' Association had said the certificate was obtained by fraud, does he suppose for a minute that the Ontario government, or anybody else would have entrusted any money to that bank? It was because these irregularities were silenced by the Minister of Finance that the public had confidence in that bank. Apart altogether from the question of intention, the Minister of Finance was not justified in issuing this certificate, and in issuing it under the circumstances he did not exercise ordinary care and prudence which as the holder of a public trust he was called on to exercise, and I think, therefore, the minister is open to the censure of this House.

Mr. DAVID HENDERSON (Halton). I would not have spoken on this occasion were it not for the manner in which my name has become associated with opposition to the granting of this certificate, and I shall crave the indulgence of the House while I endeavour to make my connection with this matter plain. I desire to read two letters, one from the Minister of Finance to Mr. Travers, dated 30th November, and the other the reply from Mr. Travers to that letter, of the same date, and I shall explain why I wish to put these letters on 'Hansard'. The first letter reads:

Minister of Finance, Canada,
Ottawa, November 30, 1906.

W. R. Travers, Esq.,
General Manager of the Farmers' Bank,
of Canada,
Russell House, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—I regret that owing to pressing engagements yesterday, arising out of the budget, I was unable to meet you to consider your application for the issue of a certificate to authorize the Farmers' Bank of Canada to commence business. I shall be glad to see you to-day, at my office, at any time before one o'clock if you can call. Or I might be able to see you later, between four and five, at the House of Commons, if that will be more convenient.

There is a phase of the matter which I should like to bring to your notice so that you may consider it at once. It has been represented to us that in some previous instances where an application was in all respects apparently regular, there was actually an evasion of the intention of the Bank Act in relation to the paid-up capital. We have been told that in some cases the subscribers did not actually pay in cash but gave notes to the provisional directors which were used to raise the money. On account of information of this kind, which has reached us in relation to a previous case, we deem it proper to scan very closely every application for a certificate which comes to us. I shall be glad to have an assurance that nothing of the kind has taken place in relation to the subscriptions for the Farmers' Bank, but that the amounts set forth in the application as having been paid up have in every case been bona fide cash payments.

W. S. FIELDING,
Minister of Finance.

The reply to that is as follows:

Ottawa, November 30, 1906.

The Hon. W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your letter of the 30th of November, I have to say that in the case of the Farmers' Bank of Canada, the provisional directors did not raise the money in the way mentioned by you. You will find the statement put in by me absolutely correct as to the amount of stock subscribed and the amount paid up.

W. R. TRAVERS,
General Manager, Farmers' Bank of Canada.

I now desire to say that I never saw that letter or a copy of it until the return asked for by the hon. member for North Toronto was brought down, but I knew what it contained, and it was known in the county of Halton that such a letter was in existence, and what its purport was. Since our former debate on the Farmers' Bank I have had communications orally and in writing with some of my constituents, and my attention has been called to the fact by different parties, that I had communicated the particulars of my interview to these persons. It is a notorious fact that in the county of Halton to-day there are people who knew the nature of that letter a considerable time ago; one man has known it for a portion of a year, and another man has known it for several years. Now, where did they get that information? They did not get it from the Finance Department, I did not get it from the Finance Department. I got it from the Minister of Finance himself, and I communicated the nature of that letter to people of my county who were interested in the Farmers' Bank, and I got it in the way I have already described in this House. When the Minister of Finance and myself met, the minister communicated to me the fact that he had asked Mr. Travers to write him a letter along the line that is indicated here I assumed, when he told me that, that it was to see whether my previous statement was verified or not with reference to the notes I had seen in the hands of the solicitor. I mention this circumstance, not that it is absolute evidence, but the peculiarity of it is that it was known to men who read what the Minister of Finance said, and that I said that this letter existed, and the very nature of its contents was known. I do not know how much stronger evidence I could get to verify the statement I made at that time. I want to say here with reference to the three interviews I had with the Minister of Finance that in no case did one of these interviews last more than two or three minutes. I do not believe the second interview extended over a minute or a minute and a half, and only the few words that I have mentioned were spoken. The first interview, when I told the minister of these notes, did not extend beyond three minutes, and the later interview very possibly was about the same length of time. But I want to say this now because I had not the opportunity of putting it before the House in the former debate. I want to say now—and I say it with the utmost certainty of its being correct—that not a thing was mentioned at any of those interviews relating to the incorporation of the bank, so that the Minister of Finance must have referred to one set of interviews, and I to another. I am positive that nothing was said regarding the incorporating of the bank at any one of these three interviews. I went to the minister for one purpose only. The bank had been incorporated months before. I think the charter had been passed through this House six or seven months before. Consequently it was not a matter of interest to me at that time how the charter was granted, or who supported it, or who opposed it.

That was a question which did not require to be raised at all and which certainly was not in my mind. The only question in my mind was whether proper proceedings had been taken with regard to

the organization of the bank and the granting of the certificate. I went to the Finance Minister with that matter alone in my mind and gave him the information I had. I did not say to him: I warn you. The hon. minister is too intelligent a man for me to say anything of the kind to him. All I did was state the facts which should have been sufficient. The minister knew his duty and it was not for me to point out that duty to him or to say I had come to warn him. In none of these three interviews did we discuss anything in connection with the granting of this charter, so that the only conclusion I can come to—and I have thought over the matter very carefully—is that the minister has in his mind one set of interviews and I have in my mind another set. As I have said already, I am more than justified by the letter written by Mr. Travers to the Minister of Finance, and which the Minister of Finance knew about four and a half years ago. I had never seen the files of the minister nor did I know that such a letter was on them. The only source of information I had was the minister himself who told me the letter had been written.

I have nothing more to say on this question. The facts have been laid before the House by the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), and the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), and it would be unwise for me to undertake to discuss what may be called a legal question. I am glad to have had the opportunity of making the statement I have made, and I make it with every confidence that it may lead to a solution of what apparently is a difference of recollection in the mind of the Finance Minister and myself.

Mr. H. H. MILLER (South Grey). In referring to the action of the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), used these words: 'He would not grant more than six months extension,' implying that the Minister of Finance went to the meeting of the Banking and Commerce Committee, when the extension of the life of the charter for a year was granted and granted a renewal, not for the year which had been asked for, but for not more than six months. That does not place the Minister of Finance in the true light. The hon. minister was very emphatically opposed to granting any extension whatever. The committee, however, contrary to his wish and advice, insisted upon giving a renewal or extension. When the Minister of Finance could not prevail on the committee to grant no extension at all, he succeeded in getting the extension limited to six months.

Mr. HENDERSON

Mr. BLAIN. Was there a vote in the committee?

Mr. MILLER. No, but it was very apparent that the majority were favourable to granting an extension. Let me say that this is not by any means the only instance in which members of the committee have voted against the advice of the Finance Minister.

Mr. BLAIN. I asked if there was a vote taken in the committee, because the hon. gentleman said that the committee voted the extension.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think I used the word 'voted.' What I said was that the committee insisted on giving an extension. My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), will admit that this was not an exceptional case, but that in many other instances the committee has gone against the advice of the Minister of Finance. The responsibility, therefore, for that extension is wholly upon the committee which acted against the advice of the Minister of Finance.

My hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), says that he has had conversations with the Finance Minister, and there is a dispute between them regarding what took place. No one will doubt the good faith or the word of either the Minister of Finance or the hon. member for Halton, but the hon. member for Halton says to-day: 'I admit that I did not warn the Minister of Finance, nothing that I said could be construed as a warning.'

Mr. HENDERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller), should not put words into my mouth which I did not utter. I did not say in so many words to the minister: 'I warn you.' I did not do this because I consider the Minister of Finance too intelligent a man to be talked to in that fashion.

Mr. MILLER. Then when my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson), says that he did not warn the Minister of Finance, he means that he did not use the word 'warn' but did warn him all the same. Well, I would refer my hon. friend to what he said on the 15th of March last. He was then asked why he had not put his remarks in writing so that there could not be any dispute. He said: 'I did not, because once before I got into trouble. I put my remarks in writing and they were made public by a member of the government and were made public with the intention to do me injury.' The Minister of Finance asked him, how could I injure you in this connection? Even if I did wish to injure you, how could I have done it? And the hon. member for Halton said:

It might have been insinuated that I had made an attempt to wreck the bank.

If the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) who was, as the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) has said, personally interested, as he had constituents concerning whose interests he was 'troubled,' had evidence that indicated to him that there was danger to those gentlemen of his acquaintance, and had been willing as a member of parliament and a man to take some risk, even the risk of ' being accused by some one of a willingness to wreck the bank,' had gone further, had made known all the information he had possessed, had argued the case, he would perhaps have accomplished more than could be accomplished in the half-hearted manner in which he spoke. He desired evidently that the Minister of Finance should take a great deal more responsibility in this case than he was willing to take.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why should he not?

Mr. MILLER. There is no reason why he should. Of course the Minister of Finance has a certain amount of responsibility resting on him because he is Minister of Finance.

Mr. LANCASTER. The whole responsibility.

Mr. MILLER. Not the whole responsibility. The hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) had a responsibility as the member for that constituency, having constituents interested, equal to the responsibility of the Minister of Finance. It has been said that Mr. McCarthy wrote a letter to the minister in which he said that notes had been given for certain stock subscriptions and further that certain subscriptions had been raised from the amounts for which they were really given to larger amounts. What, after all, did that amount to, and how would any other hon. gentleman have been influenced by that statement? Notes had been given for certain stock subscriptions, undoubtedly. There was nothing morally wrong in that, although there may have been, and there was something technically wrong; but if the farmers who had subscribed for stock had taken the same notes to any other bank and discounted them and taken the money to pay for stock, there would have been nothing either morally or technically wrong. The payment by notes is something that might have been done through perfect ignorance and I have no doubt it was done through ignorance on the part of the men who gave the notes and of the men who took them. Nots have been given in payment of insurance premiums, given in good faith, and accepted in good faith by the agents, but payment of the policies has been refused in such cases because the premiums were improperly paid. It has been said that subscriptions were raised. That, of course, was a fraud. If a man subscribed $2,000 worth of stock, and his subscription was increased to $10,000, that would be a fraud, but a fraud on the part of what person? Of Travers necessarily? These subscriptions were taken by agents soliciting subscriptions and getting a certain commission for obtaining them. If they obtained subscriptions for $1,000 and raised them to $10,000 the fraud was theirs, not Travers', and it was not an indication to the Minister of Finance that there was anything wrong in connection with those responsible for the control of the bank or for the obtaining of a license to do business. It was well known that Mr. McCarthy was acting as solicitor for dissatisfied stockholders. He had, I suppose, advised these stockholders that, having given their notes, which was technically illegal, they could get out of their subscriptions, and they used that means of getting out of subscriptions which they were then beginning to fear would not be a profitable investment. The member for Halton pointed out to them that they were incurring not only a liability for their present subscriptions, but also a double liability; with this knowledge they used that technical means of evading their subscriptions or getting back their money. It was well known that Mr. McCarthy was acting for dissatisfied subscribers. I suppose all of those who were dissatisfied at that time became Mr. McCarthy's clients and were made parties to the action.

Mr. LENNOX. He said otherwise in his information.

Mr. MILLER. I am not sure Mr. McCarthy said there were others.

Mr. LENNOX. In his protest to the minister he alleged that he had then certain clients and that many others had been defrauded on the same lines.

Mr. MILLER. I think the writ issued was issued on behalf of those named and of others and of those who might choose to come in and be made parties to the action.

Mr. LENNOX. And mentioned some others.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. McCarthy sends evidence to the Minister of Finance that whether the fraud had been committed by the agents who were soliciting stock subscriptions or by any one else, the dissatisfied subscribers had been satisfied, and that their money or notes had been handed back. The point made by the hon. member

for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) that Travers' affidavit, when he filed it with a list of shareholders, was a false affidavit, because the names of some of Mr. McCarthy's clients appeared as stockholders, although a few days before Mr. McCarthy had stated that they had parted with and sold their stock, is not well taken. There is no evidence of untruth in that affidavit. Only a few days elapsed between the time of Mr. McCarthy's letter and of Travers' affidavit. Travers could only make that affidavit by taking his list of shareholders from the stock list as recorded in the books of the bank, and a dozen others might have been shareholders whose names would not appear because they had recently purchased stock from other parties for consideration, and the transfers had not been completed in the books of the company. Even although Mr. Travers had known of such transfers he could not say in his affidavit that these people were shareholders; the shareholders for the time were the men whose names were properly entered as shareholders in the bank's stock lists, who had not yet completed the assignment or transfer of their stock on the books. One hon. member to-day said that the granting of a license was equal to a guarantee by the government, and was evidence that the Farmers' Bank was a proper and safe place in which to deposit money. It would be just as logical to say that if the Minister of Agriculture issued a patent on a certain device which was claimed to be able to do certain things, that would be a guarantee by the minister to the people that they might invest their money in the purchase of that device, and that he guaranteed by giving the patent that it would do the work claimed for it. I think this is altogether an unfair attack that does no credit to the gentlemen who make it.

Mr. LANCASTER. You are not the judge.

Mr. MILLER. Hon. gentlemen will judge for themselves, but let me tell hon. gentlemen how other people judge of the attack made on the Minister of Finance. Some little time ago I received a letter from the constituency of an hon.member opposite who had made such an attack. This letter was from a very respectable gentleman who had occupied a very high municipal position, and he said:

> I have never voted other than a Conservative vote in my life, but after reading the attack made by our member on Mr. Fielding, for whom I have the greatest possible respect and for whom the country has the greatest possible respect, I will never again vote for the gentlemen who made that attack.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name, name.

Mr. MILLER. No; I do not want to make hon. gentlemen on the other side feel too bad, and one of them would feel very bad if I were to publish the name. But, while it is unfair to the Minister of Finance for hon. gentlemen to make these attacks, yet they are doing neither themselves nor their party any good when they make them.

Mr. BLAIN. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Miller) should furnish the name of the gentleman to whom he has referred.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lennox).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Ames,	Lennox,
Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Arthurs,	McCall,
Barker,	McCarthy,
Barnard,	Magrath,
Blain,	Meighen,
Borden (Halifax),	Middlebro,
Broder,	Nantel,
Burrell,	Northrup,
Campbell,	Paquet,
Chisholm (Huron),	Perley,
Cowan,	Reid (Grenville),
Crosby,	Roche,
Crocket,	Schaffner,
Crothers,	Sexsmith,
Currie (Simcoe),	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Daniel,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Donnelly,	Smyth,
Edwards,	Sproule,
Elson,	Stanfield,
Foster,	Staples,
Fraser,	Taylor (Leeds),
Gilbert,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Goodeve,	Thoburn,
Haggart (Lanark),	Thornton,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Wallace,
Henderson,	White (Renfrew),
Herron,	Wilcox,
Jameson,	Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Kidd,	Wright.—63.
Lake,	
Lalor,	
Lancaster,	

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Allard,	McIntyre,
Allen,	McKenzie,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	McMillan,
Béland,	Marcile (Bagot),
Brodeur,	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Bureau,	Martin (Regina),
Carvell,	Martin (Wellington),
Champagne,	Meigs,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Michaud,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Miller,
Clark (Red Deer),	Molloy,
Clarke (Essex),	Murphy,
Congdon,	Nesbitt,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Neely,
Demers,	Oliver,
Devlin,	Papineau,
Douglas,	Pardee,

Dubeau,	Parent,
Ecrément,	Paterson,
Fisher,	Pickup,
Fortier,	Proulx,
Fowke,	Prowse,
Gauvreau,	Pugsley,
German,	Rankin,
Gervais,	Reid (Restigouche),
Girard,	Richards,
Gladu,	Rivet,
Graham,	Robb,
Guthrie,	Ross (Middlesex),
Hodgins,	Ross (Rimouski),
Hunt,	Roy (Montmagny),
King,	Rutan,
Knowles,	Savoie,
Kyte,	Sealey,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Seguin,
	Sinclair,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Smith (Middlesex),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Smith (Nanaimo),
Law,	Sperry,
LeBlanc,	Templeman,
Loggie,	Tobin,
Lovell,	Todd,
Low,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Macdonald,	Turgeon,
MacNutt,	Turriff,
McAllister,	Verville,
McCoig,	Warburton and
McColl,	White (Victoria,
McCraney,	Alta.)—97.
McGiverin,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Borden (Sir F.),	Porter,
Lemieux,	Doherty,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,	Beattie,
Talbot,	Owen,
Brown,	Lortie,
Bickerdike,	Hughes,
Geoffrion,	Monk,
Harty,	Osler,
Cash,	Boyce,
Chew,	Clare,
Conmee,	Worthington,
Gordon (Kent),	Bristol,
Black,	Marshall,
Emmerson,	Forget,
McLean (Huron),	Lewis,
Tolmie,	Maddin,
Schell,	Price,
Smith (Stormont),	Stewart,
Wilson (Laval),	Blondin,
Beauparlant,	Best,
McLean (Sunbury),	Rhodes,
Lafortune,	Bradbury,
Turcotte (Quebec).	Russell.

Amendment negatived.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have an amendment to that Bill, of which notice has been given. The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) is in charge of the Bill, and he is not present. It might not be fair to go on in his absence.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know much about the Bill myself, but we postponed it two nights in succession on account of the absence of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster).

Mr. LANCASTER. I want to be fair with the hon. member for Nipissing.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, let it stand.

Progress reported.

TORONTO HARBOUR COMMISSION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 175) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the harbour of Toronto.

On section 16,

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not like that section. It gives the corporation power to regulate and control all land and property on the water-front. Is it intended to give the Board of Harbour Commissioners the right to say how any man's property on the water-front of Toronto shall be developed? There is another objection; it is that the Crown is the owner of a considerable area of property on the harbour front, and I do not think this Bill should give the Harbour Commissioners the right to say how that property should be developed. I cannot think that it is the intentioin to make the provision as broad as that. This would compel a man who wanted to improve his wharf property that he owns himself, to go to the Harbour Commissioners and get their consent as to how he shall develop that property. It would also prevent the Crown from developing some fifty acres of land that has been reclaimed in the harbour of Toronto in connection with the recent operations for the construction of the western entrance; property which, if developed would be very valuable, and if it could not be developed, would be of very little value. When the draft Bill was submitted to me, and when I objected to certain provisions which were in the Bill for the transference, by virtue of this proposed Act, to the Harbour Commissioners of Crown property, I did not understand that by agreeing to strike out that provision the Harbour Commissioners should still retain control over the Crown property and be able to say in what manner the Crown should develop it. Of course, my remarks apply as well to private property as to Crown property, but I speak in particular for Crown property. The Crown owns 50 acres of land fronting on Toronto harbour.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). The point which the hon. the Minister of Public Works has just mentioned was fully discussed and considered by the committee, when the Bill was before the committee, and also by the hon. the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) both prior to the Bill coming before the committee, and after it was before the committee. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries was present at the meeting during the entire session when this Bill was being considered, and the point was then taken that is now taken by the Minister of Public Works. If the Minister of Public Works will refer to subsection 2 of section 21 he will see that the subsection says that:

No by-law shall have force or effect until confirmed by the Governor in Council and published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

The words which the chairman has just read, and which amend section 16 now, were added for the express purpose of making it emphatic and plain that all the by-laws which are referred to in section 16 have to be confirmed by the Governor in Council under subsection 2 of section 21. When we come to that it will be seen that that subsection requires that these by-laws shall be confirmed by the Governor in Council and published in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is all very well to say that the by-laws shall be confirmed, but suppose the commission did not choose to make any by-laws in reference to the development of this Crown property; the Crown could not develop its property at all without getting the consent of the Harbour Commissioners. I do not suggest for a moment that that section was framed with the view of preventing development, but I happen to know that the commissioners would like to get hold of the Crown property, and, although I do not suggest that they would desire to do so, if they could prevent the Crown from developing this property either by leasing it, or making other disposition of it, as we might think in the public interest, it certainly would deteriorate very much the value of the property. My hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries is not here, and certainly I would think that before this clause should pass he should have an opportunity of expressing his views upon it. This land I speak of was developed, not by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, but by the department over which I preside, and I would hesitate very much indeed, before I would give to the commissioners the power to control our development of that property. Perhaps this clause might stand and we can go on with the others.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Quite so; let it stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Clause 16 stands for further consideration.

Progress reported.

GRAIN GROWERS' GRAIN COMPANY, LIMITED.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Rutan.

On section 13—authorized objects for purposes of the company,

Mr. GERVAIS. Before the committee proceeds with the examination of this clause there are a few remarks that I wish to make. I think the title of the Bill is rather misleading.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What is the title of the Bill?

Mr. GERVAIS. The Bill is entitled: 'An Act to incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.' If the committee looks at sections 14 and 15 of the Bill it will find that grain growing is the least of the occupations that is being sought to be pursued by this incorporation. I beg leave to be allowed to read a few lines of sections 14 and 15 to show that the promoters of this Bill should have called themselves, not 'The Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited,' but the 'The General Promoters and Schemers' Company, Limited.'

Mr. GRAHAM. Prove that.

Mr. GERVAIS. Well, I will prove it by reading a few lines from section 14.

14. For the objects and purposes set forth in section 13 of this Act, the Company may—

(a) manufacture, buy, sell, deal in and deal with timber, lumber, hardware, bricks, stone, tiles, wood products of all kinds, building material of every description, and all kinds of merchandise and supplies;

(b) manufacture, develop, transmit, distribute and use pneumatic, hydraulic, electric or other power or force for any purpose for which the same may be used, and manufacture, buy, sell and deal in all machinery, implements and material necessary for the manufacture, development, transmission and distribution of pneumatic, hydraulic, electric or other force: Provided, however, that any distribution or transmission of power or force beyond the lands of the company shall be subject to local and municipal regulations in that behalf.

That reminds me of some Bills that have been rejected in former years by the Private Bills Committee.

(c) purchase, acquire, develop, operate, hold, dispose of, or otherwise turn to account timber lands, timber licenses, coal lands, quarries, water-powers, and other lands for the purposes of the company;

(d) subscribe for, purchase or otherwise acquire, and hold, sell or otherwise dispose of

the shares, bonds, debentures or other securities of any bank, or of any printing or publishing company, but in the case of a bank to no greater extent than one-fourth of the capital stock of such bank;

(e) purchase or otherwise acquire, build, operate and charter ships, barges, vessels or other means of transporting passengers and cargo by water;

(f) enter into any arrangement with any authorities, municipal, local or otherwise, that may seem conducive to the company's objects, or any of them, and obtain from any such authority any rights, privileges and concessions which the company may think it desirable to obtain, and carry out, exercise and comply with any such arrangements, rights, privileges and concessions;

I think possibly the company could acquire Indian reserves under this.

(g) acquire or undertake the whole or any part of the business, property and liabilities of any person or company carrying on any business which the company is authorized to carry on or possessed of property suitable for the purposes of the company;

(h) apply for, purchase or otherwise acquire, any patents, licenses, concessions and the like, conferring any exclusive or non-exclusive, or limited rights to use, or any secret or other information as to, any invention which may seem capable of being used for any of the purposes of the company, or the acquisition of which may seem calculated directly or indirectly to benefit the company, and use, exercise, develop or grant licenses in respect of, or otherwise turn to account, the property, rights or information so acquired;

And so it goes on for two pages.

An hon. MEMBER. Is there anything forgotten?

Mr. GERVAIS. Not very much; they are empowered to do lots of other things. Take paragraph (i) for example:

(i) construct, improve, maintain, work, manage, carry out or control any roads, ways, tramways, branches or sidings on lands owned or controlled by the company, bridges, reservoirs, water-courses, wharfs, manufactories, warehouses, elevators, electric works, shops, stores, office buildings, and other works and conveniences, and contribute to, subsidize, or otherwise assist or take part in, the construction, improvement, maintenance, working, management, carrying out or control thereof.

Mr. LANCASTER. They have everything but the parliament buildings.

Mr. GRAHAM. Section (j) is the most useful, they can lend money under it.

Mr. GERVAIS. They can do banking by issuing little notes payable to bearer, by receiving deposits, and by lending and borrowing money either by way of mortgage or upon their own paper. It seems to me I repeat, that the company should not be called 'The Grain Growers' Co., Limited,' but the 'General Promoters and Schemers Co., Limited.'

Mr. LENNOX. Unlimited.

Mr. GERVAIS. Yes.

Mr. TURRIFF. The Bill is all right.

Mr. GERVAIS. It is not all right. It is against the sound parliamentary rule of the British parliament to grant charters right and left of that kind, because such a charter tends to create all kinds of conflicts with individuals and with other companies.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Can they do banking?

Mr. GERVAIS. Oh, yes; they have power to do a banking business.

Mr. SPROULE. Has this Bill been before the Banking and Commerce Committee?

Mr. GERVAIS. It was referred to the Miscellaneous Private Bills Committee.

Mr. LENNOX. That was because it covers everything?

Mr. GERVAIS. Under the circumstances the consideration of this Bill should be postponed to enable hon. gentlemen to study it and to come to an opinion about the propriety of giving all these extraordinary powers which are sought for by would-be or so-called farmers.

Mr. TURRIFF. There is nothing in this Bill that the company could not get by letters patent any day of the week; there is nothing in the Bill that other companies have not got. The powers asked for are simply for the purpose of the undertaking, and in farming nowadays you have not only the growing of the grain and of farm products, but you have to deal with the disposal of these products. I see no reason on earth why my hon. friend (Mr. Gervais) should want to prevent this Bill going through. He got his Bill through a year ago to incorporate the Retailers' Association, and that same association has been dead against anything that sounds like co-operation in any shape or form. Why should not the farmers, if they desire it, have a company for the disposal to the best advantage of the products they themselves raise? The Bill is fair and reasonable, the name of the Bill is all right, and there is no reason why the committee should not pass it. It was submitted to the Private Bills Committee, and there was an amendment distinctly debarring the company from going into the business of banking in any shape or form.

Mr. SPROULE. I move that the committee rise and report progress, and then the House can send the Bill to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. RUTAN. There is no reason for that. The Bill has already been before a special committee of the Senate, and also before the Private Bills Committee of this House.

Mr. SPROULE. We have more than once sent Bills to more than two committees.

Mr. RUTAN. The section that refers to banking only allows them to hold a small amount of stock in a bank, and they have no desire to do a banking business. The association cannot hold more than the minority stock in any bank.

Mr. PUGSLEY. While it is true that possibly all the powers contained in this Bill are granted under the Companies Act in letters patent, in this case the difficulty to my mind arises by reason of the name of the company which is called the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited. You will observe that the intention is that the shareholders shall be farmers, or their wives and children, or the lessees of farms, and one might naturally assume that the business of the company was limited to dealing in grain. It seems to me objectionable that a company whose name indicates it was formed for a specific purpose, should be given such general powers as are contained in section 14 of this Bill. If the title were of a general nature so that any one taking stock in the company would suppose it were dealing in various kinds of business, that might be different. As my hon. friend from St. James division (Mr. Gervais) says, this section is very broad. True, the company is limited to dealing in these lines of business for the purpose of carrying out the objects mentioned in section 13, but, as a matter of fact, that section does not limit its operations. One can hardly see any line of business in which this company cannot engage, and one can hardly see how the developing of electricity, purchasing timber lands, acquiring water-powers, dealing in lumber, hardware, bricks, stone, tiles and all kinds of merchandise and supplies can be necessary to carry on the business of farming. Section 14 has to do with a line of business entirely different in character from that provided in section 13. I would think that this is a Bill—following out what we did in the case of the Bill incorporating Revillon Freres—which should be sent to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Clause D authorizes the company to purchase, or otherwise acquire and sell, bonds, debentures, or other securities of any bank or any printing or publishing company. The company may also acquire ships and electric powers and sell electricity without coming under the Railway Act. It may acquire and develop water-powers, and do all these things I have mentioned without being bound by any of the safeguards we usually attach to corporations seeking charters from us. It seems to me plain that this Bill should go to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is there any business transaction which this company has not power to do under this Bill?

Mr. TURRIFF. I cannot see any object in sending this Bill back to the Banking and Commerce Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. It was never there.

Mr. TURRIFF. I can not see any object in sending it to that committee, because in the Private Bills Committee, an amendment was inserted distinctly prohibiting this company from doing a banking business.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Where is that amendment?

Mr. TURRIFF. It was passed by the Private Bills Committee, and must be in the hands of the Chairman. All the powers asked for are only asked in connection with the business of the company. This Grain Growers' Company is at present dealing in grain and other products of the farm which the members of the company raise on their farms; and if the farmers who established this company wish to go into different lines of goods that they need in conducting their farming operations, why should they not be allowed to do so? Why is this Grain Growers' Company not as much entitled to these powers as any other company which asks for a charter? If it has a great many powers, the chances are it will not use one out of ten, but what harm can there be in giving it these powers? It is not right that this company, representing some 30,000 farmers, should not have power to take over business as it sees fit.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do they want to become a monopoly?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, although they have handled more grain in the past year or two than any other grain company doing business in Winnipeg, and they have handled it to the advantage of the farmers.

Mr. BRODER. They can do business without this Bill.

Mr. TURRIFF. They think they require this Bill, and why not give them what they want? Have they not as good a right as any other combination of men?

Mr. LANCASTER. What combination has ever asked for a Bill like that?

Mr. TURRIFF. There have been lots of Bills passed this and other sessions giving just as large powers.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not one.

Mr. TURRIFF. There have been lots ments in the press within the last four weeks of a company getting a charter by letters patent which confers greater powers than this company asks for. Is there any reason why this company should not get the powers it asks for? To send the Bill back to the Banking and Commerce Committee would be practically to kill it, because it is altogether unlikely that we would be able to get a quorum at that committee again this session. In any event there is a clause which prohibits the company from doing a banking business.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I understood the Minister of Public Works to say that this Bill conferred no greater powers than would, under the Companies Act. If that is the under the operation of the law, be granted case, I do not think that this is the proper time or the proper committee to discuss whether or not these powers should be limited. The Companies Act should be amended, if any change is to take place, because this company is entitled to as much rights as any other. Why did these people not apply in the ordinary course under the Companies Act and secure a charter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend will find a great many charters granted by this parliament which might have been obtained under the Companies Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If a Bill containing these powers can be secured under the Companies Act and the government has no discretionary powers to limit charters, it seems to me that the Companies Act is merely a farce, and we might just as well empower this company to do everything, and put all companies on the same footing. The hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff), says he has seen wider powers granted. I am at loss to understand how any wider powers could be granted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A friend of mine once read a charter granted under the English Companies Act; it specified a great many powers and then it said: And generally to acquire gain by all lawful means.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That would be a very brief translation of this Bill. My point is that if the House stands under the assurance of the government that these powers would, in the ordinary course, pass without any exercise of discretion on the part of the Secretary of State and his department, then we certainly would have no ground to oppose this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not say it would under a name like this which seems to have the appearance of limiting the objects.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is to say the Secretary of State and his department, by whom these charters are granted, under the Companies' Act, never refuse the powers at all, no matter how wide they are, they pass automatically.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then it will need to be explained what wider powers can be granted than are granted in this Bill. I know that in our province if one applies for powers as wide as this, that application passes under review through the proper department at Winnipeg, and those powers are curtailed. There is a discretionary power in that department and it is exercised very frequently. I understand the Minister of Public Works to take the position that no greater powers are granted here than would in ordinary course be granted under the Companies' Act, but that the only restriction is that the title may be deemed a misnomer. With the latter part of his remarks I quite agree, and I cannot see any justification for granting this charter under the name of the Grain Growers' Company. There would be ten names just as appropriate, perhaps 50, and it will undoubtedly lead to the sale of shares under a misapprehension. I cannot see much restriction even in the clause referring to the sale of shares. Any one is allowed to purchase a share who owns a farm. That means any one who owns land whether it is farmed or not, or anybody who has land leased, or the wife or child of any such person. Who can be said to be beyond that pale? Very few of our population, and if any one is beyond the pale and the company need the money, all they have to do is to pass an amendment by a two-thirds majority. The restriction, to my mind, will serve rather an ill than a good purpose. It would seem to me to be better to make it general. While these powers are granted the public should be protected and a more appropriate name should be given. Undoubtedly shares will be purchased under a misapprehension, particularly in view of the fact that we already have a company under the same name under the provincial incorporation with much more restricted powers; and the general apprehension will be that the new company are restricted in the same way, and if the same name is continued shares will be bought under a misconception of the real state of affairs. I would object to the name even under the assur-

ance of the government, and if the assurance is to stand I would say it is time the Companies' Act was reviewed.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I would again ask if this Bill will enable the company to deal in options?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly not.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If it does, I would object because the Grain Growers' Grain Company solicit subscriptions all over the country, from farmers and men who do not pretend to be business men or to look very closely into these transactions, and these men may be led into great difficulties and possible loss if this company is permitted to deal in options; were it not for the company soliciting these subscriptions I would not care whether they dealt in options or not. If the Minister of Public Works says this will not permit them to deal in options, I have nothing further to say, but if it does permit them I would like to see an amendment made.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know much about options in grain, but I have read about dealing in options on stock, and I understand that is usually known as stock gambling.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Exactly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not buying property, and this is limited to buying property.

Mr. LANCASTER. Under section 14, subsection (a) the Bill goes further. It covers any kind of dealing.

For the objects and purposes set forth in section 13 of this Act, the Company may—

(a) manufacture, buy, sell, deal in and deal with timber, lumber, hardware, bricks, stone, tiles, wood products of all kinds, building material of every description, and all kinds of merchandise and supplies.

What is to prevent them buying any sort of option?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I understand when a man buys an option he does not buy the material of any kind.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). My hon. friend could go to any broker to-morrow and buy 100,000 bushels of wheat to be delivered on June 1st, and pay 3 cents a bushel down on it. Then if the price goes down he has to make his 3 cents good.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is 'buy or deal' in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He does not buy the wheat.

Mr. LANCASTER. He deals in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he makes a bet, he gambles on the prospect of it going up or down. That is prohibited by the statute, and this company cannot do it any more than any individual could legally do it, and if this company attempted to do it, it would be acting outside of its charter, and could be restrained by any stockholder from using its money for betting purposes, for that is all it is. A man bets with a broker that grain will rise or fall, and it is distinctly understood by the broker that he is not to deliver the grain, there is no actual bona fide purchase. If the price goes down he pays a forfeit to the broker, and if it goes up the broker pays a forfeit to him.

Mr. LANCASTER. It may be betting according to what the hon. gentleman says, but if a man buys real estate and pays only a small proportion of the money because he is speculating, my hon. friend could equally well say he is betting. He is betting to a certain extent as to whether the value of the property will go up or down, but the words in this statute are not 'buy, sell or deal in.' If he deals in this in any way, it is not restricted to one sort of buying, selling or dealing. Section 13 shows clearly that these men are not to be limited to dealing in grain, they are going to manufacture everything the farmer uses. And so I suppose they may be asking for a duty on agricultural implements under one part of the section and that the duty be taken off under another. There is the inconsistency of the position that this gentleman gets into when he says that it only has reference to the products of the farm. These men are authorized by section 13 to make any blessed thing under Heaven that a farmer uses. They can manufacture anything in the world. The farmer uses nearly everything that is made that he does not produce himself, and under this section he is enabled to do everything besides farm. I agree with my hon. friend behind me that this Bill is not properly drawn, and ought to be amended in some way.

Progress reported.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE AGREEMENT WITH THE UNITED STATES.

House again went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. GEORGE TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Chairman, on the 26th of January the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) brought down a reciprocity agreement made by himself and the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) with the approval of the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). There was a commission of two sent down to Washington to deal with the Americans. I fancy the Prime Minis-

ter was the principal, and that the Minister of Finance agreed with him. It made little difference whether the Minister of Customs did or not. But, I think that while we are discussing this matter, we, on this side of the House, have a right to have these three hon. gentlemen sitting in their places and I ask the minister in charge, whoever he may be—I do not know whether it is the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), or the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman)——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Both.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Or the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), but I think it is his duty to inform these gentlemen that we want them present. I propose to ask them some questions, and it is their duty to be here. I ask now the minister in charge of the House to send for these hon. gentlemen.

Mr. KING. I have already sent word to the Prime Minister to let him know that the hon. gentleman is speaking.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is the Minister of Labour in charge of the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will proceed they will come in no doubt very shortly.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I think it is due when a gentleman is discussing this question, that these ministers who made this bargain should be present. So far as I am concerned I insist upon it. It is the right of gentlemen speaking to have these gentlemen present.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Does the minister tell me that it is not my right or duty to ask these gentlemen to be present?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be very sorry to say that to my hon. friend. I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will not be able to be present this evening, but I will send and find out. Perhaps my hon. friend will proceed, and I will send for him in the meantime.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am dealing more particularly with the Minister of Customs, and I do not like to say behind his back what I want to say to his face. I have some very pointed questions to put to the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, but, if the Minister of Finance is not to be present I shall not insist upon it so far as he is concerned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure that my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will not mind if my hon. friend does speak behind his back. It will be reported to him.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want him here to answer some questions.

Mr. CARVELL. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The hon. member (Mr. Carvell) is not running this institution. The opposition have some rights here although the Minister of Finance said that we had not. But, we are going to insist upon our rights, and we are going to see that these rights are granted to us. These ministers are a little slow in coming, but I will say this that on the 26th of January, when the hon. the Minister of Finance laid his proposition on the table my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) and other hon. members on this side of the House asked for information, and they have been continuing to ask for it ever since. That information has never been given to us. We have not received anything worthy of the name of information from any of these hon. gentlemen and particularly from the delegates who went to Washington. On the 6th of April my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) made a speech and he furnished the House with valuable statistics that are now on record and are available not only to the members of the opposition, but to members of the government who never had the information before and who did not have it when they went to Washington. After the hon. member for Grenville had made an able speech and had placed these statistics on 'Hansard' the hon. the Minister of Customs rose in his place and here is what he said:

I think perhaps it would be just as well to put a little appendix to the statement that will appear at length.

The minister added his appendix to the speech of my hon. friend from Grenville. The late, lamented Sir John A. Macdonald told me and a number of others at one time that no matter how busy he was with the affairs of state he always spent a part of every day talking with his little invalid daughter. Every person knows that Sir John had an invalid daughter and no matter how busy he was he always put in a portion of his time every day in conversation with her. He said that one day he was talking with her and she asked: Papa, why do they call you a minister; you do not preach and you do not pray very much? Sir John said: My dear, there are two kinds of ministers; there are ministers of the Gospel and ministers of State. She said: What is the difference between a minister of State and a minister of the Gospel? He said: My dear, it is the duty of a minister of the Gospel to preach and pray and to tell people how to live so that when they die they will go to Heaven. His daughter said: Then, I suppose it is the duty of the

minister of State to teach them how to go to the other place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did Sir John say to that?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I think that the ministers that are occupying these positions to-day are doing it to a very large extent. The Minister of Customs would fill both bills. He pretends to be a minister of State and I understand that he preaches and prays on the Sabbath and directs people to the good place. That reminds me of another story. I live opposite the Thousand Islands, and, some twenty-five or thirty years ago, the different religious denominations established parks there. The Methodists selected a place on Wesley Island and they called it Wesley Park. The Presbyterians selected another place farther down and called it Westminster Park and the Baptists selected another place and called it Round Island Park. The ministers of these different denominations used to meet at these resorts during the summer time. At Round Island Park two Baptist ministers with an oarsman went out one day to have a fish. After being out a short while they got a fish and began disputing about the species to which it belonged. One of them asserted that it was an overgrown sun-fish and the other said that it was a moon fish. Being unable to agree they referred it to the oarsman, and the oarsman who had a nazal twang, like most of the Americans, said: 'Waal, now, down here we call it a Baptist fish. One of the ministers said: Why do you call that a Baptist fish? Well, he says, it is one of those kind that turns bad so quick after coming out of water. I think my hon. friend the Minister of Customs represents that kind of a fish very much, because, although he may preach and pray on Sunday, judging from the speech I am going to read out of the 'Hansard,' I think any one reading or hearing that speech must come to the conclusion that he was not very careful as to the statements he made. I propose now performing a surgical operation upon the minister's appendix, and after I get through dissecting it, I think he will be sorry that he ever added an appendix to the speech of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid). Any one who listened to that speech or read it must come to the conclusion that the hon. gentlemen was suffering from appendicitis or a malady of some sort. Let me read a little:

Mr. PATERSON. I think, perhaps, it would be just as well to put a little appendix to the statement that will appear at length. I have no objection to it, in fact, I am rather pleased it has gone in. I was going to ask the hon. member what his object is in putting this in.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds)

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman is pleased that they have gone in we need not waste time in discussing it.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman attaches importance to it. What I want to point out is that he has placed on 'Hansard' these tables that have taken a very long time to read. His object, I believe, is that this committee may come to an understanding as to the wisdom of this arrangement that has been made. Therefore, it is valuable for that reason. He stated very positively that my colleague and myself went it blind in Washington, we had no figures, and did not know where we were. He said that time and again, and the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) said it last night. You have been listening for an hour or two to figures that he says are absolutely necessary to get at a proper understanding of this matter. My colleague (Mr. Fielding), and myself, had this in our possession all the time, all the information for all the years, and yet we are told we have gone it blind. We had it, we had it all. More than that, let me remind these gentlemen who complain that we did not have it, that on the day this session opened, I believe before the address was presented to His Excellency, every one of these hon. gentlemen opposite had these figures in his possession.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Where?

Mr. PATERSON. In your desk.

Mr. REID (Grenville). No.

Mr. PATERSON. But here they are, they were taken out of this blue-book which I hold in my hand, taken out of this exactly.

Now there is a statement made by one of these gentlemen that the Prime Minister sent down to Washington to make a bargain with these sharp Yankees. Is that statement correct? I challenge the Minister of Customs or the Prime Minister, I will contribute $100 to any charitable institution in Brantford if that statement is correct. But I will prove that it is not correct. Now here are the statistics the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) put on record, and if the Minister of Customs or the Prime Minister can produce a blue-book with these figures in it I will send $100 to any charitable institution in the city of Brantford. Here are the satistics: The first statement the member for Grenville put on 'Hansard' was a statement showing 'The quantity and value of the under-mentioned articles entered for consumption in Canada, by countries, during the fiscal years from 1905 to 1910, inclusive.' Then he goes on and reads them: Butter from Great Britain, Australia, Newfoundland, New Zealand, Norway, France, Italy, Turkey and the United States. Can the Prime Minister or the Minister of Customs produce a blue-book that was presented to every member of this House at the opening of the session, containing these statistics? I defy them to do so. There is my proposition. Let him produce the blue-book, and I will make a present to any charitable institution he

names. That is the first statement. Then he goes on giving other countries, for all kinds of produce, potatoes, cheese, eggs, bacon, and gives the details for each one from 1905 to 1910. When we get through with that, there is another table 'Exports of Danish produce from Denmark, year ended December 31, 1909.' I have another $100 to give to any charitable institution the Minister of Customs will name if he will produce a blue-book that he presented to the members of the House with that information in. Those statistics were compiled by my hon. friend, and the Minister of Customs had the audacity to get up and say that every member of the House was furnished with them. No wonder I compared him to the gentleman that is teaching the people the road to go to the bad place when he dies. Then the hon. gentleman goes further and says:

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is only one year.

Mr. PATERSON. One year, yes, but we had a knowledge of all the years when we were in Washington. That was the very information these gentlemen have asked for, that they have been cavilling for, they had it on their desks all the time.

He repeats it again. That is that beautiful appendix he was sending out to the people of this country. I will read further:

Mr. BARKER. No.

Mr. PATERSON. The reason I want to put in this appendix is that this goes to the hon. gentleman's constituents with his remarks.

Knowing that the 'Hansard' will go into his constituency, he wanted to have the appendix added to it to show the people what a statesman he was; and no one expects a statesman, or any other minister, of this country, would get up in his place and make statements that are not in accordance with the facts. Every statement he made from beginning to end of his speech is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then why did it take several days to prepare it?

Mr. PATERSON. That is what I am coming to. When this goes to the hon. gentleman's constituents with his remarks, and they read my remarks, they will understand that five years ago he had the returns for 1905 which were printed at great expense, and of which three copies were given to him. In 1906, as soon as parliament opened, he had three copies given to him. So in 1907, so in 1908, so in 1909, so in 1910. What I want to bring to the attention of those who read his remarks, especially his own constituents, is the fact that he had these figures in his possession.

He did not have them, never had them, neither did any other hon. gentleman have them until the hon. member for Grenville produced them and read them here in the House. Yet the Minister of Customs will get up and make this kind of a statement.

Mr. PARDEE. Don't get excited.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I intend to give my hon. friend enough to make him ashamed of it; if he has any conscience at all he would be ashamed to support a minister that would get up and make such statements in the House.

They will say: You have had these figures for five years to study for yourself; when we sent you to parliament, we did not send you there to sit down and do nothing but play around. Why did you not look these things up? They have been printed for you and given to you. I want to say that in the hearing of the constituents of all the hon. gentlemen who are opposite.

Mr. HUGHES. That voice will nearly reach them.

Mr. PATERSON. That voice has been played on just the same as the biscuits have.

That is nice talk for a minister of the Crown.

I wish it was loud enough to reach the ears of all, that they might understand the utter absurdity of the position these hon. gentlemen take, and that their constituents who send them here—and these hon. gentlemen are paid just as much as the minister of the Crown is paid as a member of parliament, and just as much bound to do the work of parliament as is a minister of the Crown—might see that these hon. gentlemen have absolutely neglected their duty and have confessed ignorance with reference to figures that have been given them year by year.

There he repeats it again. Those figures I have quoted have never been given year by year, no one has given the exports of the foreign countries. I have a table of every foreign country that is admitted as a favoured nation. My hon. friend from Grenville gave them all, and placed them all on 'Hansard.'

As to the information you have been clamouring for, you have had it here; you had it all the time. And we had it when we were in Washington making this bargain. Suppose that you had been there, what would you have done?

Mr. HUGHES. I rise to a point of order.

Mr. PATERSON. I have a right to speak——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Hughes) has a right to state his point of order.

Mr. HUGHES. The hon. minister (Mr. Paterson) has been making reflections upon you, Sir, accusing you of ignorance——

Mr. TALBOT. Is that the point of order?

Mr. HUGHES. If the hon. minister is not referring to you, Sir, but to the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), he should speak of him as the hon. member for Grenville and not address him directly as 'you.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point of order is well taken, and I think it is well

that it should be taken. The habit has grown up of addressing members directly in the second person, which is wrong. A member of parliament should be referred to in the third person, and the Speaker or Chairman addressed.

Mr. PATERSON. I was not aware that I had, perhaps, in the warmth of debate, overlooked that point.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) will understand that, in speaking as I did, I had reference to a habit that has grown up rather than to his individual infraction of the rule.

Mr. PATERSON. It is one of the wisest rules that a deliberate assembly can adopt, for it tends to avoid anything like personal feeling. I was not aware that I had made the mistake, but having made it, I am sorry.

This is the gentleman we sent down to Washington to deal with these shrewd, sharp Yankees to make a bargain, and who did not know when he made a blunder here in the House, and the Speaker had to correct him.

I was pointing out that hon. gentlemen opposite, as well as hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, are sent to understand and discuss public questions. Under the rules of the House they are provided with information of which it is supposed they will make use. But when we find hon. gentlemen with that information in their possession, some of it in their possession for years, and yet saying that they cannot discuss a public question intelligently because they have not the information, what are we to think? I was going to say that those hon. gentlemen might remember another rule of the House—also a good one. I would remind them that a minister of the Crown is also a member of parliament. He is no better and professes to be no better, or of any higher standing, than any other member. But he is of equal standing with those in this House who oppose him. It is the duty of a minister, when asked a question, to give a courteous answer; that is becoming in a deliberative assembly of gentlemen. But it must not be lost sight of that it is equally incumbent upon every member of the House, in propounding questions to a minister, to propound them as to one who has equal rights with themselves and is equally entitled to courtesy.

What answer did the Minister of Customs give to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House? The member for Algoma rose and said: 'May I ask the Minister of Customs a question?' and he answered: 'No.' And the member for Quebec (Mr. Price) very politely asked if he might ask the minister a question, and the minister said: 'No, sit down,' in that loud voice he has got. I ask him to compare his conduct with the lecture he is addressing to members on this side of the House. I have so many things to say that I will not be able to read all I intended to read, and I do not want to occupy more than two or three hours of the time of the House, but I want to refer to another statement made by the Minister of Customs

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is referring to a previous debate. The particular speech he is now referring to was ruled out of order by me because the Minister of Customs was at the wrong time referring to the resolution now before the Chair. When we are now discussing this resolution, necessarily a quotation from that speech would not be in order. That particular debate which the hon. member is quoting was ruled out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Why, my dear friend——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Chairman, the speech here was delivered by the Minister of Customs on this question, and no other question has been before the House since, and I certainly have the right to discuss what the Minister of Customs referred to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will hear the hon. gentleman's argument on the point of order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). My point of order is that I am not referring to a previous debate. The closing paragraph of the Minister of Custom's speech was ruled out of order, but not his whole speech. I am about to refer to the statement made by the Minister of Customs as to what happened at Washington showing why this pact should be put through. I want to obey the rules of the House, and it certainly is my right to quote from 'Hansard' what the Minister of Customs' said:

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. To be in order in quoting a previous debate it must be a previous debate on the same question that is before the Chair. The question before the Chair at the present time is that this resolution be adopted; the question when the Minister of Customs was addressing the House on that occasion was that the House do go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the Minister of Customs in discussing his resolution on that motion was ruled out of order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). With the Speaker in the Chair?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. With the Chairman in the Chair as Speaker, and I am now applying the same rule with the reverse conditions. If the hon. gentleman can show me that the previous debate was in committee on the question, he will have the right to quote.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Customs on that occasion was ruled out of order because he was dealing with the very reciprocity resolution that we have now before us, and do you not think, Mr. Chairman, that when we are on the resolution my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is quite in order in referring to what the Minister of Customs said. The minister was ruled out of order because he was speaking on the subject now before us, and not on the subject then under consideration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. When the Minister of Customs was ruled out of order the Speaker was in the Chair, and it so happened at the moment that I was the Speaker. The motion was to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and I ruled the speech of the hon. Minister of Customs out of order because his speech was discussing a resolution that lay before the committee. Having ruled that speech of the Minister of Customs out of order for that reason, now that we are in committee I cannot consider that this is a continuation of that debate.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the Minister of Finance referred to these subjects in his Budget speech on a motion to go into supply, would it not be quite in order for an hon. member to quote what reference the Minister of Finance might make to this reciprocity arrangement? The Minister of Customs was ruled out of order because he was anticipating a subject that was on the Order Paper, and now that we have reached that subject on the Order Paper, surely the hon. member (Mr. Taylor) can refer to what the Minister of Customs said.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And the remarks of the Minister of Customs which were ruled out of order were with reference to this very subject which we are now discussing. The amendment was moved, as I understand it, simply for more information, about this very same question. So, to my mind, it is practically the same debate. Do I understand, Mr. Chairman, that you take the ground that, simply because the House divided on the main motion at that time, this is not part of the same debate? With all respect to your judgment, it seems to me it is the same debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Reid, Grenville), realize that when a motion is made to go into committee on a certain resolution, the resolution being already before the committee, it is not in order to discuss that resolution to go into committee? That I believe to be the rule of the House, and that is the rule I apply to this case. Having done so, I do not see how I can do otherwise than consider that a previous debate. Having refused the Minister of Customs the right to continue his remarks on the matter before the committee I think I am carrying out the same rule, dealing with reversed conditions.

Mr. SPROULE. But on what ground did you rule the Minister of Customs out of order? It was because he was attempting to deal with a motion that was already on the Order Paper; his remarks applied to a motion which we had not reached, but which was on the paper. We were not then in Committee of Ways and Means, but we are now in Committee of Ways and Means. That is, the Minister of Customs was ruled out because he was attempting to anticipate a motion, and it seems to me that for that very reason, remarks made on this motion now would be proper, because we have reached the motion.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Minister of Customs spoke so long that his remarks covered ten columns of 'Hansard'—and all dealing with the questions now before the House, the question of reciprocity—before he was called to order. And you were in the chair at the time, Mr. Chairman. It seems to me that it was all part of this debate, and I shall certainly have to appeal from your ruling. I was reading part of your speech this part of the speech from page 7032 of 'Hansard'——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor, Leeds), will please not endeavour to proceed with the speech.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am only going to refer to these items:

Mr. BOYCE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question?

Mr. PATERSON. Oh, no. What did we do with the malt business, if you want a common sample of it?? They had a duty on malt and they said that they wanted their interest guarded. What was done? We left our malt duty on just as it was in the tariff. The American duty was about two and a half times as high as ours and we had the American government reduce their duty to our duty. So, it was with respect to other questions when they came up. We knew this, yet these hon. gentlemen say that we went it blind. They have the information now; let us see all that would happen if these eggs and cheese and butter should be allowed in. Of eggs 750,456 dozen came into this country. This is going to ruin the farmers! If you multiply the dozens by twelve that gives you 9,000,000 of eggs.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I just read this quotation with reference to eggs and butter, and I will ask you if it is not part of this reciprocity question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it will not be necessary for the hon. gentle-

man (Mr. Taylor, Leeds), to do that. I have no desire to do injustice to the hon. member or to unduly curtail his remarks. But I am equally bound to see that no injustice is done to the Minister of Customs. This particular point of order is one that is a little unusual and my course not as clear as I have found it sometimes. Still, having ruled the Minister of Customs out of order as referring to a matter which he had no right to discuss at that time, I must, in duty to the rules of the House, and my own position, state that the hon. gentleman is not at liberty to discuss that question which was ruled out of order on that occasion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I suppose that it could be done with the consent of the House. The Minister of Customs is here. Does he object to having his speech discussed?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The consent of the House may be obtained by the appeal from my decision, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor, Leeds) spoke of——

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I wish to obey the rules of the House. I appeal to the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). The Minister of Customs made a speech in answer to my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid), on a motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means. The Minister of Customs wanted to add an appendix to my hon. friend's speech, and did add some 9 or 10 columns. Some person then called, 'order,' and the Speaker ruled that we had not got into committee—but the Minister of Customs had spoken about 10 columns, as I have said. I want to make a few references to that appendix that he added to the speech of the hon. member for Grenville. And now, you, Mr. Chairman—perhaps properly, but I do not think so, for I do not think that this is a past debate, but simply a continuation of the debate—rule me out of order. I have only a little more to say in reference to the Minister of Customs' appendix.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is the title he gave it. And I appeal to the Prime Minister if I should not be allowed to continue my speech.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, Leeds), has shown the most earnest intentions, when, as he tells us, he wants to perform a surgical operation on my colleague, the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), but I think he will not find it unfair if we follow the rules of the House. They were applied against the Minister of Customs, and I think it not unfair that they should be applied to the hon. member for Leeds. I think that under the circumstances he would be performing what is the duty of every member of the House if he sustains the Chair, except when he thinks the Chair is absolutely wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the particular reason why the speech cannot be referred to?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The decision has been given by the Chairman.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have no objection to repeat. The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor), was quoting and discussing a speech made by the Minister of Customs on a previous occasion. This speech of the Minister of Customs was made on a motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means after an amendment by the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), had been disposed of. After the minister had proceeded some distance—a considerable distance—and had discussed the figures quoted by the hon. member for Grenville, and was proceeding to discuss the matter that is now before this committee, I being in the Chair, called him to order and ruled him out of order, on the ground that he was then, on a motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means, discussing a matter that was already in possession of and before that committee. That ruling was not objected to. Now, while in committee on this resolution the hon. member for Leeds is quoting that speech. My judgment is that I must apply the same rule to him that I applied to the Minister of Customs, and rule that the speech of the Minister of Customs is not a portion of this debate. it having been ruled out of order as not having connection with the debate. For that reason, I think the hon. member for Leeds is not in order in quoting or referring to that speech.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There seems to be a little confusion, if I may be pardoned for saying so, between the two reasons assigned. It might be objected that the reference is to a past debate and, therefore, was out of order, but I have never known the rule as to a past debate to be carried to that extent in my experience. The debate was upon the very question which we are now discussing in committee, and it is perfectly well known and understood that the various discussions upon different stages of a Bill are all one debate. An analogy might be drawn between such a case and this case in which, after the House has

resolved itself into Committee of Ways and Means, reference is sought to be made to the debate on the motion to go into Ways and Means. That is one point. The other point is absolutely distinct. It is involved in the circumstance that the minister himself was ruled out of order. I do not think that that is a good reason for not allowing a reference to the portion of the speech which was delivered before the minister was declared out of order. If the Minister of Customs was permitted to go on to the extent of twelve columns of 'Hansard' in making an argument in favour of these proposals, it would seem remarkable if that portion of his speech, which he did utter before any point of order was raised, and which could have been referred to had it been made in committee, cannot now be referred to because the hon. minister in the end was stopped. It would be a great advantage to an hon. member to go on to the extent of twelve columns of 'Hansard' before being ruled out of order, and then have no one allowed to answer his argument. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) is simply making reference to the argument which the Minister of Customs used to the extent of twelve pages of 'Hansard' before any question of order was raised. Surely it would be outside the ordinary bounds of fairness that twelve columns of 'Hansard' should be employed by an hon. member of this House and no answer to that argument permitted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In answer to my hon. friend, I think I can appeal to his sense of fairness that the ruling is perfectly fair. The question of course is a technical one, and very often technical rules are not easily intelligible, but they are the best that could be devised for the conduct of an assembly such as this. My hon. friend says, and his point has some force, that the Minister of Customs was allowed to proceed some twelve columns in 'Hansard' before he was called to order, and that, if the ruling of the Chairman be held good, the opposition would then have no opportunity to answer. But the opposition might have taken the point of order immediately; and if they did not, the blame is not on the government or any body else, but only on themselves. Very often a speech which is out of order is allowed to proceed for some considerable length before it is challenged. That was the case here.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No, it was not challenged.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was challenged by Mr. Speaker himself. The opposition made no objection, but they might have objected at the very start. The attention of hon. gentlemen opposite was not called to it, but the Speaker noted the point and stopped the minister from going further. The result is the House cannot take that speech into consideration because it was out of order, and the minister was not allowed to complete it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He was through practically when called to order, and had begun to flounder.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the opinion of my hon. friend, and perhaps my hon. colleague might have the same opinion of his remarks.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I ask for a ruling on the point. I have been here twenty-nine years, and never knew of a case of this kind before. There have been many cases in which speeches were made on the motion to go into Supply or Ways and Means, anr references to these speeches have never been challenged. I ask the Chairman to show me the rule.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is a well known rule that a previous debate may not be referred to.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). This was not a previous debate.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have decided that it was and the hon. gentleman is at liberty to appeal from my ruling. In many cases the chairman will not interfere, but takes the spirit and feeling of the House. In the present instance I might possibly have accepted the feeling of the House, but for the fact that the remarks referred were declared out of order. The speech of the Minister of Customs having been stopped by the application of the rule, I feel I would be open to a charge of injustice if I did not apply the same rule in this case.

Mr. PORTER. Is it not a fact that the remarks of the Minister of Customs remain in 'Hansard' as part of the record, and part of the debate upon reciprocity? There is no rule I am aware of by which the remarks of hon. members upon any question may be expunged from the record. It stands there to-day as part of the record. Any body reading the record of the debate upon the question of reciprocity would be obliged to read that in connection with the other in order to have the whole debate. That being so, and there being no process by which it can be expunged from the record, does it not appeal to one as being only fair that so long as it remains there any hon. gentleman discussing that question at a subsequent date might be allowed to refer to what has taken place upon the question. Either the remarks of the Minister of Customs should be expunged or any hon. member should be

permitted to deal with those remarks when speaking upon the same question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The application of the rules of the House will undoubtedly at times work unfairly to some members. The Minister of Customs might, I presume, object to some remarks I have already allowed and if I have been unjust with him any unjustness or unfairness will be a matter of regret to myself as well as to him. But I have felt called upon, as I have told the House, to apply this rule to the hon. member for Leeds, partly because it was the rule of the House and partly because I have ruled against the Minister of Customs on that very subject in the manner I have stated.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) was trying to explain that the Minister of Customs made a statement that is of record on 'Hansard' to the effect that I had those figures or statements in my possession when the House opened, and my hon. friend was proving that I had not those statements, nor had any hon. member of the House but that I had had them compiled in the Trade and Commerce Department. That being the case, there is no way of having that record on 'Hansard' made right, and so it seems to me that in all fairness we should be allowed to discuss the question in order to put it right. I appeal to the Minister of Customs and to the prime minister that the member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) ought to have an opportunity of explaining the matter fairly.

Mr. SPROULE. I understand the chairman's ruling to be that the hon. member cannot refer to a previous debate because that debate took place on another motion. Suppose the Minister of Finance delivered his budget speech on a motion to go into Supply. In doing so he might go over the same items that are included in this resolution. He would perhaps refer to the duty on natural products, wheat, rye, oats, etc., and on the conclusion of his speech these duties would become law. Then when we came to discuss the reciprocity pact, although the same subject would be under discussion, any hon. member quoting from the minister's remarks on the budget speech would be out of order according to the ruling of the Chair. In my judgment he would not be out of order because he would be dealing with the same subject.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to be understood as, with all respect, absolutely dissenting from the ruling which has been made. The ruling of His Honour the deputy Speaker would prevent any reference whatever to the speech with which the Minister of Finance introduced this proposal in parliament on the 26th of January. I think it only necessary to mention that to see, if I may use the words, to what absurd conclusions such a decision would bring the committee. The Minister of Finance introduced this whole question to parliament in a speech on going into committee of ways and means. If this ruling is a correct ruling, that a speech made by the Minister of Customs upon a subsequent motion for the same purpose cannot be referred to in committee, then in this committee we cannot refer to a single argument made by the Minister of Finance when he presented the subject to the House. If the rules of the House mean that, and I do not think they do, then the sooner we get some other interpretation put on them the better. I have never understood that the rule as to a previous debate went to anything like that length. I do not think, with all respect, that it does go to that length. Unless it does go to that length then the remarks of the Minister of Customs on that occasion when he was discussing the very subject we are discussing now in this committee, may be properly referred to by my hon. friend from Leeds. These debates have gone on without any check from the Chairman over and over again, during the past two and a half months, upon motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means. I do not know how often they have been referred to in Committee of Ways and Means, but I would not be surprised to find that they have been referred to very often in committee, although they were made on the motion to go into committee. I can understand the logic of regarding all these debates as one debate because they are, after all, one debate; but I cannot understand the logic or principle of saying, for example, that the speech of the Minister of Finance, made upon the introduction of these proposals, cannot be referred to after you once get into committee nor a single argument in that speech answered after you get into that committee. That is the position into which we are likely to be driven if the ruling of His Honour the deputy Speaker is a correct ruling in this respect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend knows as well as I do that in these matters when a decision is given by a chairman, or by a judge, it is very difficult to have unanimity of opinion among all those concerned. I am sure that my hon. friend, in the course of his career, has very often heard decisions rendered with the soundness of which he was not satisfied. He says that this has been going on for two and a-half months unchecked. But on one

occasion it was checked. I was present when the Minister of Customs was called to order and I heard the ruling given by the Chair. I thought at the time that the ruling was, perhaps, questionable—I say that frankly in your presence, Mr. Chairman. But I bowed to the chairman's judgment, recognizing the very able manner in which he discharges his duties. I thought he ought not to have given that decision; but he gave it and I bowed to it, as did everybody on both sides of the House. My hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) knows that he has a thousand and one ways in which to challenge the figures of the Minister of Customs if he wishes to do so, but it so happens that the ruling of the Chair is against his referring to the matter on this occasion. And I should hope that, under such circumstances, the ruling of the Chair would be obeyed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the Prime Minister think that we are at liberty to refer to the speech of the Minister of Finance which was given before going into Committee of Ways and Means?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Customs was cut off and ruled out of order, and I think the same rule should apply to my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, Leeds) who has the floor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But I was asking the Prime Minister if we were precluded from referring to the speech with which the Minister of Finance introduced these proposals, that the speech not having been made in committee but on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The point taken by the chairman was that the matter had been referred to the Committee of Ways and Means, and it was not open to discussion in the House on motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I will try to take another opportunity to deal with the speech of the Minister of Customs, as the Prime Minister suggests. You, Mr. Speaker, having ruled, I will obey your ruling. I appealed to the Prime Minister to allow me to speak, but he has refused because he knew I was scoring his Minister of Customs pretty severely, and he took this opportunity to knock me out. However, I am Irish, and an Irishman may be knocked down, but he never stays down. We tried to get some information from the Minister of Customs, in fact I myself put questions on the Order Paper and moved for returns. But the Minister of Customs would not give us information. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) moved for a return and this House granted the order—a return showing the quantity and value of butter, eggs, poultry, chilled or frozen meat, bacon, lard, apples, vegetables, wheat, barley, cattle, horses and potatoes imported into Canada during the six months ending March 1, 1911, the countries from which the same were imported and the duty collected thereon. The minister brings that down as a return, but it does not show that there was a pound of butter imported during the time covered by the order of the House. Yet the return that I asked for gives the import of butter for one month. the month of February, at figures 206,000 pounds. And this return of the Minister of Customs says at the bottom, 'chilled or frozen meats not separately provided for in the customs classification of imports.' That is the conduct of the Minister of Customs. I asked for information as to the cheese, butter and eggs imported into Canada during February. This return shows that 119,729 pounds of cheese were imported into Canada in February last. Eggs were imported to the extent of 719,000 dozen. I heard the Minister of Customs say not long ago, that the imports from all these countries would not affect the trade of Canada nor the farmers of Canada. I heard him say that there were 750,000 dozen of eggs imported, and if this were reduced to single eggs and these divided equally among the population it would mean 1⅛ eggs for every man, woman and child in Canada. These are the Minister of Custom's statements. But what are the facts? The figures I have before me show that 725,000 dozen of eggs were imported into Canada in February and three cents a dozen duty paid on them. This was the importation for one month. Multiply that by the twelve months of the year and reduce it to single eggs, and you have 13½ eggs on the average for every person in Canada, instead of 1⅛ eggs, as stated by the Minister of Customs. The same applies to butter. According to the statement I heard him make, the importation was ¾ oz. for each man, woman and child in Canada. But the return he has given me shows an importation of 206,000 pounds in February alone. Multiply this by the twelve months of the year and reduce it to ounces, and you find that it gives an average of 9 ounces to every man, woman and child. Yet the minister says that the appendix which he had added to the statement of the hon. member——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Ch, oh.

Mr TAYLOR (Leeds). If I could have my whole speech added as an appendix to his I would send a copy to each of his constituents, for I would like to show the kind of statements he makes before parlia-

ment. Because I am surprised that they should send a gentleman here—and he is retained in the cabinet, too—who makes statements that he knows are not in accordance with the facts—

Mr. PATERSON. May I ask a question?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER——'makes a statement which he knows is not in accordance with the facts,' is stronger than is allowed under the rules of the House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman does not say that he knew at the time, but that he now knows, the statement to be incorrect.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the gentleman draws that distinction it will be in order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I think it is in order, because I make a statement that is true, and I heard the minister make a contrary statement and which I know to be not in accordance with the facts. The same applies to butter.

Mr. PATERSON. I want to make one point, if the hon. gentleman will allow me.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No, sir, I claim my rights. The minister was asked a question from this side of the House by the hon. member from Quebec West (Mr. Price), and asked politely, and he replied, 'No, sit down.' Now the government have an agent over in New Zealand, and on page 394 of the weekly report of the Trade and Commerce Department, of March 27, here is what their agent reports from New Zealand:

In any event prices are not expected to go much lower, for should they do so the butter could be shipped to other markets such as Vancouver and San Francisco. At the present time there is a keen demand for New Zealand butter at Vancouver, and good prices are offering.

The government had that information before them, and yet they say there is nothing coming into this country from New Zealand. If there is any man in whose statements I have confidence it is the man who is talking about his own business. Now the government have given their case up entirely in so far as this reciprocity pact is concerned, by an hon. member who is supporting them, the hon. member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb). Here is a comment by a newspaper on a speech of that hon. gentleman, a man who knows his own business, and he tells us how it will affect the farmers. I am surprised that any member from Ontario, after hearing this statement, and knowing how this bargain is going to injure the farmers of Ontario, will still persist in supporting it.

FARMERS WILL NOT GET SAME PRICES UNDER AGREEMENT.

Hon. J. A. Robb, Liberal, Huntingdon, Admits that Best Figure is Secured Now.
Government Afraid to Leave Issue Alone.

Ottawa, Ont., April 19.—(Special.)—Hon. J. A. Robb, the Liberal member from Huntingdon, Que., completely spoiled the case of the government to-day as regards the reciprocity agreement. He is a miller. He admitted that the Ontario farmers got better prices for their wheat than they will get under the agreement. He said the farmers to-day refused to sell their grain at the world's market prices.

'Now,' said Mr. Robb, 'under the reciprocity agreement the millers would be able to go to Chicago and buy grain cheaper,' in other words the Canadian farmers could stew in their own juice.

That is the comment of the newspapers on the statements of one of the government supporters. Now I will read the hon. gentleman's own words in the 'Hansard' :

Under the proposed tariff changes, the United States miller will have the advantage in that he can import a certain percentage of our number one and two hard wheat, blend it with the softer United States varieties, mill it in the United States and market a 30 per cent or 40 per cent best patent at home, export the bakers, on clears, and the price received for his best flour at home will enable the United States miller to sell the lower grades for export at reduced prices. The Canadian miller, having a smaller home market, will be that much handicapped on the export trade.

Again he says:

My hon. friend comes from Ontario. He knows that the millers of Ontario have been at a considerable disadvantage in recent years because the farmers of Ontario refused to deliver their wheat at the market price; that is the market value of the world. The Ontario miller will be able to go into Michigan, Kansas, Missouri, Ohio, anywhere they grow wheat, and buy it at the market price.

There is an hon. gentleman who says that it will ruin the farmers of Ontario, yet the Minister of Customs wants to impose this pact upon them.

Mr. ROBB. Did I say it would ruin the farmers of Ontario?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You said they could go to the United States and buy wheat cheaper at the world's prices than they could get it at home. I have been quoting from the hon. gentleman's speech in 'Hansard,' pages 7486 and 7487, the Unrevised Hansard.' My hon. friend no doubt has corrected it in the Revised 'Hansard,' because he was ashamed to let such a statement go out. I have not got through with the surgical operation on the

Minister of Customs. He is my senior by a few months, and it is not very well for a boy to thrash an old man. But I felt it my duty in the present case to tell the facts that I knew. Now I want to take up the reciprocity question from another point of view. In my opinion we have arrived at the most critical time in the history of Canada since 1891. Then the right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald appealed to the country and fought his last political battle, and his battle cry was 'Canada for the Canadians. A British subject I was born, and a British subject I will die.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Yes, and there are a good many people who are not British subjects just now. The opposition was then led by Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, and what was his battle cry? It was not Canada for the Canadians,' it was unrestricted reciprocity or commercial union. The hon. Edward Blake, one of the loyal men of Canada, who had been leader of the Liberal party, gave way to Mr. Laurier, who led the party in the fight of 1891. But the hon. Edward Blake would not go into the fight with him, and he wrote a letter to his constituents declining to go into the fight, because he said the policy of the Liberal party would lead to annexation. In 1896 there was another battle fought. Sir John had passed away, and Sir Charles Tupper was leading the government. What was the battle cry in 1896? It was not commercial union, the battle cry of the Liberal party was 'Hands off Manitoba.' That was the only question fought out in 1896, and Mr. Laurier, the present Prime Minister, came into power on that question. How did he act after getting into power? Did he carry out the policy of 'Hands off?' Did he keep his hands off Saskatchewan and Alberta? No, he forced separate schools on Saskatchewan and Alberta, after opposing them being forced on Manitoba. What has been his policy ever since? I quote from the speech of the right hon. gentleman in which he told us what his ambition was:

I hold out to my fellow-countrymen the idea of independence, but whenever the day comes it must come by the consent of both countries, and we shall continue to keep the good feeling and good will of the mother land. If we are true to our record we will exhibit to the world the unique and unprecedented example of a nation achieving its independence by slow degrees, and as naturally as the severing of the ripe fruit from the parent tree. Is there a Canadian anywhere who would not hail with joy the day when we would be deprived of the services of British diplomacy.

There is the gentleman who is to-day prime minister of this country and that is the policy which he laid down then and he has never retracted. What has he ever done to strengthen the bonds that bind us to the British Empire? How did he act in the Boer war? Did he send men?—no, but he allowed England to send them, paid their expenses, and passed an order in council declaring that it would not be a precedent, that it must never happen again. What did he do to help England at the colonial conference of 1902? Did he assist England then? He made an arrangement shortly afterwards for England to hand over the fortifications at Halifax and Esquimalt and to take her soldiers home. Was that strengthening the tie that binds us to the mother country? A number of years ago I took a trip to Victoria and while there I went out to Esquimalt. In a little cove I saw lying three or four of England's bulldogs—ships and armed men kept there simply to say to Russia, Japan and China: You may pass by on these waters but keep your hands off Canada. He drove those boats away, sent those soldiers back home and said: We will take care of ourselves, we are a nation now. The other day an English general reported that the docks at Halifax and Esquimalt were old junk shops. Next he started a Canadian navy without consulting the people. He must establish a Canadian navy and he will not allow Canada to assist England in time of trouble unless the parliament of Canada says so, and he is the parliament of Canada. Let me allude to what is said by one of his own newspapers, 'Le Progrès de Valleyfield':

WHAT SIR WILFRID HAS DONE.

'Le Progres de Valleyfield' (Liberal) thus outlines the triumphs of Sir Wilfrid Laurier:

He paralyzes the efforts of Chamberlain.

He has rendered abortive the intercolonial conference of 1902, designed to submit Canada to heavy military contributions to the empire.

He has not only taken the head of a powerful English general, but has furthermore chased him from the country.

He refers to Lord Dundonald.

He claims for Canada all the privileges of independent action, even to the point of menacing the colonial tie.

He has placed our militia under the command of a Canadian.

He removes him from the will of the English parliament.

He leaves to the decision of Canada's parliament the question of our soldiers fighting outside their country.

He claims for Canada the right of concluding her own treaties.

'Le Progres de Valleyfield' joins with the Toronto 'Globe' in condemning the advice that we 'Keep both hands on the Union Jack.'

This is what his own papers are saying he has done. We are not saying it, but it

is the statement of one of his own strong supporters and organs. He was the principal in making this bargain with the United States assisted by the Minister of Finance. I said before that I did not think the Minister of Customs counted because two are a majority and with the premier and the Minister of Finance what could we expect? What could we expect from a man who was responsible for this?

At the Quebec interprovincial conference, the following minute was inserted in the official record of the proceedings, at the instance of Messrs. Fielding and Longley, the Premier and Attorney General of Nova Scotia:

In view of recent movements in the province of Nova Scotia, the representatives of that province desire to place it on record that they participate in the determinations of this conference on the understanding that while they join the representatives of the sister provinces in seeking reforms in matters which are of common interest, they do so without prejudice to the right of the government legislation or people of Nova Scotia to take any course that may in future be by them deemed desirable with a view to the separation of the province from the Dominion.

This is one of the gentlemen who went to Washington to make a bargain and bind Canada without allowing the people an opportunity to speak upon it. Then, the hon. Minister of Finance, speaking at Annapolis, said this:

I believe that the people of Nova Scotia are now even more in favour of separation from the Dominion than on the 15th June last.

The position with regard to a choice between Blake and McDonald was that out of ten issues he would favour Blake, but on the tenth issue he believed he was equally opposed to both. That tenth issue, that of repeal, transcends all others. In closing, he declared his belief that the people of Nova Scotia in every county would assist in throwing off the yoke of Toryism, and that there would be a grand victory in Nova Scotia for Liberalism and repeal.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). What date was that?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It was shortly after the Quebec conference. These are the gentlemen who have gone down there and to add respectability they took the Minister of Customs along knowing that they would over-rule the other and that he would have to agree to their conclusions, which he did. What does this bargain mean for Canada? It lets Canada, with its eight million of people, trade with 92,000,000 people in the United States, but it lets 92,000,000 people come in with the same products and trade with Canada. It also lets in thirteen other countries, besides the British colonies, with many millions of trade and places them in competition with eight millions of people. Does it let Canada trade with any other country except the United States and England? Every one of these countries has a high tariff against Canada and we cannot send any of our products into those countries. They have a right to dump their stuff on the Canadian market but Canada cannot send over anything to them. The United States with its ninety-two millions would sell in Canada with its eight millions, twelve American farmers against one Canadian farmer, twelve American invaders against one Canadian defender. The following is a statement of the area and population of the twelve favoured nations:

12 FAVOURED NATIONS.

	Area in Square Miles.	Population.
The Argentine (1908)..	1,117,059	6,484,023
Austria-Hungary	241,197	49,280,000
Columbia..	504,773	4,142,000
Denmark (1909)..	15,052	2,692,000
Japan (1908)..	147,476	52,340,220
Norway..	124,090	2,253,000
Russia (1909)..	8,379,044	157,044,700
Spain (1909)..	194,744	20,068,381
Sweden (1909)..	172,875	5,476,441
Switzerland..	15,417	3,555,000
Venezuela..	599,358	2,647,000
Bolivia..	650,000	say 2,000,000
	12,161,085	307,982,765

Making 307,982,765 people that we are allowing to come in here with their produce and sell it to the Canadian people.

Mr. SPROULE. On the same terms with the Americans?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). On the same terms with the Americans, duty free, no duty on their grain or produce. It means a territory three times as large as Canada let in for nothing, a foreign population forty times the population of Canada furnished with free trade passes and every one of these living behind high protective walls. Take wheat alone. The following is a statement showing the production of wheat by nine favoured nations in 1908:

PRODUCTION OF WHEAT.

	Bushels.
Switzerland..	3,500,000
Denmark..	4,400,000
Norway..	5,000,000
Sweden..	7,000,000
Japan..	22,500,000
Spain..	120,000,000
Argentine..	193,000,000
Austria-Hungary..	230,000,000
Russia..	570,000,000
	1,155,400,000

We could not get that information from the Minister of Customs or any member of the

government, but we are able to learn from our trade and navigation returns what were the exports of the products of the farm from Canada for the year ending 31st March, 1910, and they were as follows:

PRODUCTS OF CANADA EXPORTED FOR THE YEAR ENDING MARCH 31, 1910.

Animals and their products	$ 54,696,630
Fruits	5,598,927
Grain	68,404,421
Flour and meal	16,044,228
Cereal foods	1,690,296
Hay	1,808,470
Hemp	28,303
Hops	28,035
Malt	11,328
Maple sugar	129,046
Syrup	4,572
Nuts	5,765
Clover	844,327
Flax	3,642,476
Grass	78,729
All other	38,851
Straw	25,933
Tobacco leaf	171,481
Trees, shrubs and plants	32,926
Vegetables	1,550,094
Vines	4,939
Other articles	230,458
Total agricultural products exported from Canada, 1910	$102,347,694

Now, the United States exported for the year 1909, $490,000,000 worth of the products of the farm, as follows:

PRODUCE OF THE FARM EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED STATES IN 1909.

Animals	$ 47,000,000
Breadstuffs	216,000,000
Provisions, including meat products	180,000,000
Fruits and nuts	18,000,000
Hides, about	1,000,000
Hops	4,000,000
Vegetables, about	3,000,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	31,000,000
	$490,000,000

Here we have the United States exporting $490,000,000 worth of farm products or four times the value of farm products of the same kind exported from Canada, and yet we are told it is a boon to get into the United States market. Now, the following tables give the exports of farm products from the Argentine, Austria-Hungary, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, all of which come into competition with us:

EXPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS FROM COUNTRIES MENTIONED IN 1908.

Argentine exported in 1908—	
Animals (living) to value of	$ 4,120,000
Butter to value of	1,380,000
Bran, about	4,500,000
Wheat and wheat flour to value	165,000,000
Frozen and salted meats to value	24,000,000
	$189,000,000

In 1910 the Argentine exported not less than $200,000,000 or double Canadian farm exports, ($102,000,000).

Austria-Hungary exported in 1908—	
Eggs and cheese, more than	$10,000,000
Denmark exported—	
Butter (usually $10,000,000)	$ 7,000,000
Sweden exported—	
Butter, about	$10,000,000
Russia exported—	
Animals to the value of	$ 12,000,000
Butter to the value of	24,000,000
Wheat, wheat flour and barley	200,000,000
Total	$236,000,000

Or 2⅓ times the total exports of the Canadian farms.

AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND EXPORTED IN 1908.

Australia—	
Butter, cheese, eggs and lard, about	$12,000,000
Meat, principally frozen, about	12,000,000
New Zealand—	
Meats, about	$16,000,000
Butter and cheese	10,000,000
	$50,000,000

These two countries on four or five items alone, exported farm products equal one half total export of Canadian farms.

These are all countries that will compete with us. And yet, hon. gentlemen opposite, from the Prime Minister down, say, that these countries cannot export anything into Canada. Speaking on this question, the Prime Minister said:

> Perhaps it is just as well now, since I am reviewing all the objections to this agreement, that I should take up another point which has been made against it and which has drawn many a tear from the eyes of some gentlemen sitting on the other side.

He has not a tear to shed for the poor farmers of this country when he is allowing all these countries into the home market to compete with their products.

> I refer to the consequences of the agreement on what are known as the Most Favoured Nation Treaties. There are in existence certain old treaties between England and other countries in which it is provided that if England or any of her colonies should give a preference to any country in the world the same treatment shall be given to certain nations with which England has these old treaties. These treaties were in the past of so little consequence that we never troubled about them, but when in 1896 we found in our way the treaty with Germany and the treaty with Belgium we asked for the renunciation of these treaties. Similar treaties with other countries were not in our way, and, therefore, we did not trouble about them.

That is what the Prime Minister says. When the pact was entered into by the Minister of Customs and the Minister of

Finance with the United States they thought they were dealing with the United States alone, and they never thought that all these other countries would be allowed into our markets on the same terms. They lost their heads, they did not dream of it. The Prime Minister goes on to say:

However, all of a sudden these treaties have assumed enormous magnitude in the eyes of some, and a few days ago heard a gentleman on the other side of the House say that we were practically opening our doors to the whole world. Well, the whole world is a big phrase, but let us examine in detail what it is composed of in this sense. The whole world in detail, so far as these treaties are concerned comprises Venezuela, Switzerland, Sweden, Spain, Russia, Japan, Denmark, Colombia, Bolivia (and who ever heard of any trade with Bolivia), Austria-Hungary and the Argentine Republic. Let us see what our trade is with these nations. All told last year we exported to Venezuela $14,000 worth and we actually imported from Venezuela $53,000 worth, a trade which would probably supply the next corner grocery.

Well, it would be a pretty big corner grocery that would dispose of all these things. Is not 101,000 pounds of cheese from Italy more than enough to supply a corner grocery? And all these other countries send in here cheese, butter, mutton, eggs, all of which the Canadian farmers raise. Here is the conclusion of the Prime Minister's speech:

The Argentine, however, is a wheat-growing country, and it exports wheat; but if ever the Argentine Republic sends wheat to Canada, there is no reason why Canada should not send wheat to the Argentine, so that objection is wholly exploded and may be dismissed without further reference.

Just think of the Prime Minister making a statement like that. Does he not know that while under this arrangement the wheat of the Argentine is admitted into Canada free, Canadian wheat has to pay a duty of 25 per cent before we can get it into the Argentine market. What nonsense it is for the Prime Minister to talk about our sending wheat into the Argentine and paying a duty of 25 per cent on it. Now, there did come in a great deal of farm products from these countries, to the Canadian market, and they paid a duty to get into our market, and after paying that duty they competed with our farm products, and what will it be when these foreign products have to pay no duties under this trade agreement? On the 29th of March, I put a question to the Minister of Customs which was answered, and it shows what we may expect with increased imports of the same kind of goods from these countries if this treaty comes into force and they are admitted duty free. I quote from 'Hansard' my question and the reply of the Minister of Customs:

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).

IMPORTS OF BEEF, PORK, &c.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. How many barrels, boxes or packages of pork, beef, mutton, lamb and cheese have been imported into Canada during the months of October, November and December, 1910, and for the months of January and February, 1911?

2. What was the weight and value thereof and the countries from which the same were imported?

3. What was the number of pounds of butter and number of dozens of eggs, and the value thereof, and the countries imported from, for the month of February, 1911?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The department has no record of the number of barrels, boxes or packages of pork, beef, &c., imported, the quantity in pounds, simply being shown.

2. The quantity and value of pork, beef, mutton, lamb and cheese imported into Canada, by countries, during the months of October, November, December, January and February, was as follows:

BACON AND HAMS, SHOULDERS AND SIDES.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
Great Britain	24	$ 5
United States	812,893	139,483
China	271	15
Hong Kong	100	8
November, 1910—		
Great Britain	420	90
United States	299,258	54,312
Belgium	35	12
Hong Kong	455	23
December, 1910—		
Great Britain	74	18
United States	234,408	39,716
New Zealand	20,304	2,894
Hong Kong	741	50
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	56	13
United States	223,392	34,240
Hong Kong	515	28
Japan	62	4
February, 1911—		
United States	195,975	32,583
Australia	8,959	1,569
Hong Kong	23	2

BEEF, SALTED, IN BARRELS.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
United States	247,361	$17,511
November, 1910—		
United States	271,468	18,933
December, 1910—		
United States	134,092	8,636
Newfoundland	1,255	151
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	7,902	702
United States	92,944	6,255
February, 1911—		
United States	198,425	12,384

MUTTON AND LAMB, FRESH.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
United States	76,027	$ 7,046
Australia	217,266	15,766
November, 1910—		
United States	33,760	3,251
Australia	163,909	12,341

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
December, 1910—		
United States	71,720	$ 6,063
Australia	179,470	11,880
January, 1911—		
United States	54,665	5,027
Australia	157,927	10,371
February, 1011—		
United States	99,359	8,903
Australia	142,751	9,192

PORK, BARRELLED, IN BRINE.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
Great Britain	2,568	$ 304
United States	1,121,100	114,523
China	66	4
November, 1910—		
United States	824,265	85,189
Hong Kong	1,858	131
December, 1910—		
United States	467,820	45,582
Newfoundland	2,916	322
China	291	25
Hong Kong	3,499	246
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	45,000	5,919
United States	852,135	83,072
Hong Kong	302	19
February, 1911—		
United States	540,324	51,024
Hong Kong	398	30

OTHER MEATS, FRESH.

October, 1910—		
United States	59,596	$7,774
Australia	6,480	146
November, 1910—		
United States	27,019	4,028
December, 1910—		
United States	42,350	5,303
Australia	800	97
January, 1911—		
United States	29,397	4,526
Australia	11,902	595
February, 1911—		
United States	37,080	5,008
Australia	506	60

OTHER MEATS, SALTED.

October, 1910—		
United States	58,941	$8,191
Hong Kong	4,831	323
China	866	57
November, 1910—		
United States	22,701	3,587
Italy	631	179
France	220	81
China	1,481	105
Hong Kong	950	66
December, 1910—		
Great Britain	544	144
United States	25,590	3,645
Hong Kong	3,071	240
Newfoundland	900	93
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	36,800	2,228
United States	22,538	3,037
Hong Kong	200	10
China	200	12
February, 1911—		
United States	20,343	3,039
Hong Kong	840	72

CHEESE.

Countries.	Lbs.	Value.
October, 1910—		
Great Britain	8,967	$1,774
United States	21,716	4,234
France	15,879	3,158
October, 1910—*Con.*		
Italy	72,702	$ 16,378
Belgium	1,489	210
Switzerland	30,197	5,254
Holland	2,400	397
Germany	1,960	391
November, 1910—		
Great Britain	10,161	2,276
United States	19,539	3,708
France	22,482	4,754
Italy	23,224	4,320
Switzerland	36,317	6,755
Germany	18,449	3,141
Belgium	963	123
December, 1910—		
Great Britain	5,184	1,300
United States	20,274	3,961
France	44,559	12,173
Italy	66,775	8,878
Austria-Hungary	3,439	427
Turkey in Asia	850	40
Switzerland	31,873	5,817
Holland	3,543	443
New Zealand	260	32
January, 1911—		
Great Britain	979	254
United States	18,261	3,418
France	1,810	517
Italy	18,280	3,453
Turkey in Asia	538	42
Switzerland	33,519	6,238
February, 1911—		
Great Britain	3,362	862
United States	11,543	2,203
France	900	249
Italy	101,053	22,278
Germany	113	36
Holland	2,759	160

We had all this cheese coming into this country subject to a duty of 3 cents per pound. These countries will be allowed in the future to send their cheese into our market free of duty to compete with our cheese makers, and yet these gentlemen say that this agreement will not affect this market.

Mr. PATERSON. How much does that amount to apiece?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The hon. gentleman can add it up himself.

Mr. PATERSON. I did.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then you need not ask me. Let me give now the quantity and value of butter imported into Canada:

——	Countries.	Pounds.	Value.
			$
October, 1910	Great Britain	201	31
	United States	5,496	1,707
November, 1910	Itaiy	213	71
	United States	3,917	1,161
December, 1910	Australia	72,800	17,219
	New Zealand	19,600	4,815
	United States	5,563	1,453
January, 1911	Great Britain	19,333	4,776
	Australia	101,920	23,957
	New Zealand	115,800	30,175
	Asia, Turkey in	142	33
	United States	2,132	640

Then take the quantity and value of eggs imported into Canada during the same period:

—	Countries.	Dozens.	Value.
			$
October, 1910....	Hong Kong.....	2,855	121
	China	1,075	53
	United States...	14,056	4,994
November, 1910.	Hong Kong.....	4,290	273
	China	1,930	114
	Germany.....	24,000	3,942
	United States...	26,440	8,159
December, 1910..	Great Britain...	12,000	2,117
	Hong Kong.....	10,966	977
	China	10,450	2,118
	Germany.....	12,000	1,971
	United States...	41,930	11,922
January, 1911...	Great Britain...	40	11
	Hong Kong.....	14,704	219
	China	10,485	2,364
	Germany.....	2,000	1,971
	United States...	165,026	36,622

	Lbs.	Value.
Butter—		
Great Britain..	2,800	$ 689
Australia..	15,008	3,000
New Zealand...	181,826	41,813
United States..	6,838	1,707
Totals	206,472	$47,209
Eggs—		
Hong Kong..	4,250	$ 193
Chinese Empire	11,138	1,673
United States..	719,315	131,341
Total..	734,703	$133,207

These paid a duty of 3 cents per dozen and yet competed with the product of our Canadian farms in the Canadian market. Now, we are asked to allow these in free of duty. Eggs can be produced down south in summer and winter, whereas our farmer can only raise them six months in the year. What chance then has our farmer against this American competition? He will have to go out of the business. I know that the Minister of Customs must have voted against this but was overruled by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Customs would never have consented to that bargain in the interests of the farmers but he was overruled.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you believe that?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I certainly do, because I have more confidence in the Minister of Customs, than to think he would be a party to it. But he was overruled by his colleagues and his voice did not prevail, even loud as it is. I would like to refer the right hon. the Prime Minister to the Argentine tariff. If we sent any wheat over there, that wheat would be charged a duty of 25 per cent. I refer the right hon. gntleman to the year-book of 1910, in which he will find my statement corroborated. In 1910 Canada exported:

Animals and their products....	$ 54,696,130
Agricultural products..	102,347,694
Total..	$157,044,224

Canada, with all its production, consumes 80 per cent of that production within its own borders. In 1908 the United States exported:

Animals and their products.. ..	$191,016,582
Agricultural products....	216,494,100
Total	$407,510,682

Or $250,000,000 more than Canada exported. The Argentine Republic exported wheat and flour to the value of $129,286,786. Denmark exported butter, eggs, and dressed meats to the extent of $87,100,000. New Zealand exported meats, butter and cheese to the value of $25,029,889. Australia exported bread stuffs and animal products, $43,895,226. France exported animals, butter, cheese, eggs and potatoes, $35,779,246. All of these will in the future, under this pact, be admitted free into our country, but if we ship any to these countries, our shipments will be charged a duty. Denmark charges a duty on butter of $4.86 per 100 pounds; on cheese, $2.43 per 100 pounds; and so on. Austria-Hungary charges a duty on butter of $2.21 per 100 pounds; on cheese, $5.52 per 100 pounds. New Zealand charges a duty of 20 per cent on butter, cheese and eggs.

This is a gold brick surely, to the farmers of Canada to allow these articles to come in free and compete with ours. What provision did the Minister of Customs make for oleomargarine. A friend of mine was in the states the other day, and there a merchant told him that this time last year he sold 50 tubs of butter to the 12 he sells now and is selling 100 tubs of oleomargarine and only 12 of butter. I believe that oleomargarine is coming in to-day as butter into our market.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). How does the hon. minister know? I am satisfied that we are eating oleomargarine for butter on this side of the line. I am satisfied that only the other day I ate oleomargarine for butter in this city. The minister shakes his head and says, no, but that is like his other statements, he does not know, he cannot know. I know that butter is being imported, and can be imported, after paying the duty, at a profit as compared with our own butter, and it may be oleomargarine for all the Customs Department knows. The government, and their supporters, are

trying to make believe that this is a boon for the farmers of this country, and they are running down the manufacturers. The manufacturers and farmers of this country must go hand in hand. What are our manufacturers doing? What are the populations of Toronto, Montreal, Hamilton, Winnipeg? Over one-eighth the entire population of the country, and who is feeding them but the farmers? Are they not to be taken into account? I have a number of extracts which I intended putting on 'Hansard' but shall refrain from doing so. However, there appeared a letter in the press yesterday that to my mind is unanswerable. It is from a gentleman whom the people of Canada respect and love. I refer to a letter written by Sir Charles Tupper, from Bexley Heath, near London, where he is now residing. Sir Charles Tupper sends the following letter to the hon. the Minister of Finance in reply to attacks made upon the writer by the minister:

To the Hon. Mr. Fielding:

Sir,—Now nearly ninety years of age, I had hoped that I was done with political controversy,——

So he ought to have been, he ought to have been let alone by any member of this government or this House; the people of this country will resent an attack upon a gentleman who has attained the ripe old age of 90 years.

—but as you found it easier to misrepresent and disparage a man three thousand miles away than to reply to the unanswerable speech of Mr. Sifton—your former colleague —I am compelled to notice some of your remarks at Montreal on March 27.

I cannot accuse you of want of courage in challenging the statement that you had 'advanced or advocated annexation to the United States, and that that statement was without the shadow or the ghost of a shadow of foundation in truth.

When I was fighting the battle for confederation you were in the employ of Mr. William Annand on the Halifax 'Morning Chronicle,' denouncing Canada and holding it up to public execration.

In 1868, when Joseph Howe, after exhausting in vain every means to defeat confederation, decided to abandon hostility and make the best of it, Mr. Annand proposed to apply to the United States. Mr. Howe rejected his proposal with scorn, but you remained with Mr. Annand and supported those who hounded Howe to his death, and drove him into an untimely grave.

You say that you represent Nova Scotia, but you forget that in the election of 1872 the opponents of confederation were unable to elect a single member to oppose the government, of which Mr. Howe and I were members, and that when in 1886 you carried the province in a desperate attempt to break up the union, I went out to Canada the following year and cured you of your folly by obtaining the support of 16 out of 21 members for the government of Sir John A. Macdonald. So much for your loyalty.

You say: 'Sir Charles Tupper in 1888 went to Washington to seek reciprocity. I find at that time so anxious was Sir Charles Tupper for reciprocity that he offered to give the Americans, in addition to their ordinary exchanges of trade, free access to the fishing privileges of Canada. We give an arrangement which gives everything that Sir Charles Tupper wanted, but we have not given the fisheries of the Dominion of Canada. We have maintained the rights of the people of Canada as owners of the fishing grounds, and the Americans must have a license when they come in, and not have free rights to fish in the waters of Canada.'

These are the depreciatory terms in which you refer to the great services rendered to Canada by Mr. Chamberlain and myself as plenipotentiaries of Her Majesty in 1887-8.

At that time it is well known that the press of the United States, both Republican and Democratic, were denouncing Canada for the alleged brutal treatment of American fishermen in Canadian waters, and, as they said, in violation of the treaty of 1818.

We obtained a treaty which was sent to the Senate by President Cleveland with the declaration that it was a fair and just settlement, and he urged its adoption.

That treaty provided that when American fishermen were allowed to purchase fishing supplies and enjoy transhipment of catch and shipment of crews in Canadian ports, Canadians should be allowed to sell their cargoes of fish in the United States free of any duty.

It also settled the contention as to bays on the terms contended for by Canada. It was accompanied by a modus vivendi providing for a license to American vessels pending the adoption of the treaty, to enjoy these commercial privileges upon payment of $1.50 per ton, and neither under the treaty or the modus vivendi could a fish be caught in Canadian waters by Americans, as Mr. Chamberlain and I refused the urgent appeal for that privilege by the American plenipotentiaries.

The treaty was carried in the Canadian parliament by a unanimous vote, and the modus vivendi has been continuously re-enacted down to the present day.

Why did not the government repeal it if it is a bad thing, why not amend it or repeal it?

President Cleveland was not re-elected, but Mr. Harrison, who defeated him, said in his inaugural address that under the modus vivendi given by Canada all irritation had been removed between the two countries.

If you wish to learn the value of the treaty of 1888, read the handsome reference to it by your colleague, Sir Allen Aylesworth, in the House of Commons, where he stated that our settlement of the bays question had been adopted and made permanent by The Hague arbitration.

The Minister of Finance denounces it, and the Minister of Justice commends it.

You say that Sir John A. Macdonald was in favour of reciprocity in 1891, but you do not explain that he was fighting a desperate battle to prevent Laurier and Cartwright, who were co-operating with Wiman and Far-

rer—avowed annexationists—from carrying unrestricted reciprocity with the United States, which involved Canada taking the tariff made at Washington with its discrimination against Great Britain.

Have you forgotten that the Hon. Edward Blake left his party on the ground that that policy would end in annexation to the United States.

It appears they have.

Which at that important crisis you supported? The policy for which Laurier and Cartwright and Wiman and Farrer were struggling.

It is true that in that struggle, which cost Sir John A. Macdonald his life, in maintaining British institutions for Canada, we succeeded. But before that election Mr. Laurier made the following solemn declaration:

I have read the history of unrestricted reciprocity in this way—that every reform has cost to the reformer years of labour, and those years of labour I, for one, am ready to give, though the Democrats may be defeated in the States, and though Canadians may grow faint-hearted in Canada, the Liberal party as long as I have anything to do with it, will remain true to the cause until that cause is successful.

He thinks he has gained the point now because he sends the Finance Minister who is like himself, and the Minister of Customs who does not carry weight, to consummate the bargain which he said he would live to carry into effect. The people of this country will let him know, on the contrary, that he has not gained it.

I will not expect to win in a day, but I am prepared to remain in the cool shade of opposition until the cause has triumphed, and you shall never hear a complaint from me. I tell you the Liberal party will never cease for the agitation until they triumph and obtain continental free trade. We are asked, sometimes, gentlemen, what is the programme of the Liberal party. This is the programme of the Liberal party: To obtain a continental freedom of trade. Success will certainly crown our efforts at no distant day. Fixing our eye steadily on the goal we shall go on steadily until we reach it—unrestricted continental reciprocity.

This declaration was made at the Young Men's Liberal Club, Toronto, September, 1889.

He has not changed his policy since he made that declaration, he is standing by it in any way he can get there, but he intends to get there.

I regret that I must now charge you with a wilful misstatement.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Do I understand that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor, Leeds) is quoting from a letter written by Sir Charles Tupper? No letter written by a person outside this House referring to or reflecting on the action of a member or on a speech made in this House may be read in the House The hon. gentleman will not be at liberty to read a letter written by some one outside the House reflecting on proceedings in the House or on any member of the House.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). This is a letter written by Sir Charles Tupper a few days ago.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will hear what the hon. gentleman has to say.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). ——written by Sir Charles Tupper, a copy of which the Finance Minister has in his possession, and I am quoting that speech verbatim, and I think I have a perfect right to read, because it is repeating history.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman says he is quoting the speech. Does he not mean that he is quoting the letter?

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, quoting the letter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will read the rule on the subject:

Nor is it in order to read articles in newspapers, letters or other communications, whether printed or written, emanating from persons outside the House, and referring to, or commenting on, or denying anything said by a member, or expressing any opinion reflecting on proceedings within the House.

The expressions used in the letter appear to come within this rule.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). In what way?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The expressions, as I heard them, charged a wilful misstatement against a member of the House. That would be out of order not only under this rule but if applied by one hon. member to another.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). This was not a speech made by a member of this House, but a speech made by a person in Toronto.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The letter emanates from a person outside the House. If it reflects upon a member of this House or upon proceedings in this House, it may not be read.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It does not reflect upon proceedings that have taken place in this House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not been following the letter closely, but it appeared to me that it did so. If I find—well, I think I should ask the hon. gentleman in accordance with the precedents set, to allow me to see the letter before he proceeds to read it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Certainly.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The passage I heard a moment ago appears to be a por-

tion of a letter written by Sir Charles Tupper and addressed to the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding). He says:

I regret—

No, I think that in justice to all concerned I should not read it for the very reason for which I am stopping the hon. member (Mr Taylor, Leeds). I find in it a reference and a charge that would not be allowed in this House by one member to another, and it cannot be in order when quoted from some one outside the House.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I bow to your ruling. We will have it printed as an addendum to my speech, so that the whole letter will go to the constituents of the hon. minister. I have a number of other letters; but I have already occupied about two hours, including interruptions, and my hon. friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner) has to deliver himself to-night, and I will make way for him.

Mr. F. L. SCHAFFNER (Souris). Mr. Speaker, I am sure I hesitate at this late stage of the debate and this late day of the session, to occupy the time of the House. But I feel that it is due to myself and due to the constituency I have the honour to represent that I should not give a silent vote on this important question, fraught with so much that will and must conduce either to the progress and expansion and building up of a greater Canada or to the retrogression, contraction and tearing down of the magnificent structure on which the skilful architects of our country have expended so much industry, energy, labour and capital. I thoroughly agree with the Toronto 'Globe' which said, the other day, that this was the most important and far-reaching issue that had occupied the minds of the people of Canada since confederation. I think that the word 'far-reaching' is exceedingly appropriate to this issue. And when President Taft used the words 'the parting of the ways,' although he used them in a different sense from that in which I wish to apply them, I realize that the events which may occur in connection with this great question may be the parting of the ways for the Dominion of Canada. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the other day, told us, that history was useful for what it taught us to initiate as well as for what it taught us to avoid. In the history of Canada as in the history of any other great nation, there are certain events which are of great importance and which stand out prominently in its record. While I do not pretend to enumerate these outstanding chapters in the history of our country there are a few to which I shall briefly refer. The first great step in connection with our country, perhaps, was confederation. Then came the National Policy of Sir John Macdonald, the building of the first great transcontinental road, the event of 1891, and now comes adding to the history the event of 1911. Sir, it seems strange to me, and it will seem strange, I think, to the people of this country when it is called to their mind, that hon. gentlemen opposite have all most invariably—not all of them, but a majority—placed themselves in opposition to these great events and great chapters in the history of Canada. Take confederation. Not all hon. gentlemen opposite opposed it. But the very hon. gentleman who introduces into this House now this important change in our national history is the very man who opposed confederation and opposed it for many years. And I propose to place on record the hon. gentleman's history in connection with this great event. For it is singular, as I have suggested, that the same hon. gentleman not only opposed but fought confederation after it became the law of this country, also did his utmost to smash confederation and to take out of it my native province of Nova Scotia together with New Brunswick. Sir, when he was premier of Nova Scotia he refused to adopt legislation for flying the Union Jack on Dominion Day, or for making Dominion Day a school holiday. The hon. gentleman has a record in regard to confederation. He issued a manifesto to the people of Nova Scotia in 1886 in which he said:

If you do this the battle will be fought and won, the enemy dethroned and Nova Scotia set free to enter upon that career of usefulness which nature ever intended should be hers, and hers alone.

People of Nova Scotia, if you have any of that latent fire and enthusiasm which once throbbed in your hearts, and in the hearts of your fathers, let it be awakened and aroused; let the principles of justice and liberty, the love of freedom and of home once more animate and inspire you; let your dearest rights, privileges and institutions be nobly espoused and gallantly upheld; let the vials of your righteous indignation be poured forth against those who would further bind you by that monstrosity of legislation——

What was the monstrosity of legislation? It was the British North America Act, that was a monstrosity of legislation in the eyes of the hon. the Minister of Finance:

——the British North America Act, and let it be said to-day that you have championed the cause of political freedom, that you have thrown off the Canadian monster and emancipated yourselves and your beloved province from the thraldom, the servitude and the bondage of the Canadian union.

Mr. Fielding also headed a secesssionist movement, and in 1886 championed a resolution which had for its object the disruption of confederation. In speaking of that resolution he declared that the maritime provinces had everything to gain by separation from the

remainder of Canada that his honest conviction was that confederation had not been satisfactory and that it was the duty of the eastern provinces to place themselves on record and then let the people decide and stand or fall on that issue, i.e., disunion.

Now, Sir, is it strange that I am unable to support an agreement introduced by that hon. gentleman? I may be wrong. Hon. gentlemen on the other side possibly may be right, or they may be wrong, and I may be wrong. But I believe that since confederation no proposition has been introduced into this parliament that will do more to disrupt confederation than the very pact we are called upon to support to-day. I represent a constituency of which I am proud, which extends some 110 miles along the American border, and if there is any constituency in Canada that might benefit to some extent from this agreement, perhaps it is mine. I want to say right here that this government has been derelict in its duty in neglecting to give the people proper information. Had our government taken the pains to obtain proper statistics, had they devoted the energy and the capital that the people of the United States have in procuring information, there would not have been so many long speeches as we have found it necessary to make. On visiting my home the other day I found the people exceedingly eager for information upon this question. They asked what I could refer them to, and I told them that the only information I could give them was obtained from American sources, that our government had absolutely no information that would enable the people of Canada to come to an intelligent conclusion on this question.

I wish now to refer briefly to the great National Policy introduced by Sir John A. Macdonald in 1879. I do not care to take up your time in stating what was said on that great question by hon. gentlemen opposite, by the present Prime Minister of this country, by the Minister of Finance, and many others. You know very well, Mr. Chairman, that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and all his followers at that time did their utmost to discredit the great policy of that great man. They were not successful. Sir John A. Macdonald carried the country, and introduced this great National Policy, a policy that has gone on to this day. Though the present hon. gentlemen when they were in opposition condemned the policy of protection, and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking in Winnipeg, condemned it as a policy of robbery; nevertheless, after these gentlemen came into power in 1896, they adopted that policy of robbery. The question has been asked many times how it was, if they were so opposed to the policy of protection, and so enamoured of the policy of free trade when in opposition, that they still retained the friendship and support of the manufacturing interests. Well, it has been said, and I think very few people will deny it, that the present Prime Minister had a secret compact with the manufacturers of this country. We find him sending a telegram to Toronto saying: 'Who ever else may be hurt, the manufacturers of this country will not be.' We found our friends opposite everywhere opposing this great National Policy.

Now, we come to the building of the first great transcontinental railway. Where did we find our friends opposite on that great question? Did we find them trying to assist in carrying forward that great undertaking? Why, Sir, people talk about the Grand Trunk Pacific being a great undertaking, and so it is, but it does not compare in importance with the Canadian Pacific railway. When that great railway was undertaken there were only 12,000 people west of Winnipeg, and our friends opposite said, Why spend so much money, why tax this country to such an extent to build a railway to British Columbia with only 12,000 people? It is not worth the money. What was the road built for? It was built to cement together the widely extended portions of this great Dominion, it was the child of the Conservative party principally, helped I am glad to say by some of the better Liberals in this country.

I omitted to explain to the House how the disruption of this confederation was prevented. When Mr. Fielding had carried Nova Scotia in the local election, what occurred then? Sir Charles Tupper, a bigger man than Mr. Fielding, and a more patriotic man, carried the Dominion elections in the province of Nova Scotia he gained 16 members out of 21, and that is what preserved this confederation from disruption. I believe that this present reciprocity arrangement with the United States will also tend to the disruption of the Dominion. The building of the first great transcontinental railway, and the events of 1891, when our friends opposite expended all their energy to switch the Canadian people from the great ideal of building up a country of our own, independent of our goods friends to the south of us. Sir, great as these people to the south may be, they are not of our household. They are a foreign nation, and Sir, it is as true of nations as of men that they grow strong, vigorous, and influential by dependence upon themselves, rather than by reliance upon others. I ask you what would have been the result, if in 1891, the policy of commercial union had been sustained by this country. I do not need to refer you, Sir, and the members of this House, to what Canada was in 1891, or to what progress has been made since 1891, but I will ask you if we would have been as great a country to-day

if we had linked ourselves up with that great nation rather than depend upon ourselves to build ourselves up through our industries and energies. I certainly believe we would not have been. Because information has not been given to this House it becomes necessary for me to spend some time placing statistics before the House, and before my constituents. I cannot understand two intelligent men, ministers of the Crown, not young men, but men of experience going over to Washington with the meagre amount of information that they seemed to have had. True, when they got there, a hurried message was sent for the Commissioner of Customs, but these hon. gentlemen had devoted no time or expense to collecting facts in order to place themselves in the same position as the foreign nation with which they were negotiating as to information. No hon. gentleman can deny that the information we have to-day in order that we may discuss this important subject comes from Washington and not from our own government. I say it is humiliating; I go further, and I say it is a shame, and a disgrace that our government should have pursued such a course, and Sir, I say, however bold faced the ministers may be, down in their hearts they feel humiliated. Time and again have been asked for information, and they have had, by their acts at least, to confess that they have no information. But, I would remind you we have been able to secure data which condemns from first to last the pact made by these gentlemen so far at least as this country is concerned. I want the people whom I have the honour to represent to know that their government, not having any information, endeavoured to oppose and obstruct the putting of that information upon the records by members on this side of the House unless they went through the formal process of reading statements to the House and reading them for hours after eleven o'clock at night.

Mr. KNOWLES. I understand the hon. gentleman is making his speech for the benefit of his constituents. I wish to ask: Does he want the House to understand that he is representing his constituents as being opposed, generally speaking, to this reciprocity agreement?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I look after my constituency, and I will be back here, as the member for the constituency, to oppose this compact, and everything in connection with it. The government has given no comparative information, and whatever information has gone out to the people has gone out as a result of the energy of the hon. members on this side of the House. Then, I ask you: Is it not a logical conclusion that, the government having no information, and having supplied no information to the people, it becomes necessary, in the shortest form possible, to read the comparative prices that have been given by other members in the House that our constituents may have at least some opportunity of acquainting themselves with what they are to gain or lose by this agreement. We do not find other countries attempting these great revisions of their tariffs with so little preparation. I have already stated what the Americans have done. We find that Germany, in the last revision of the tariff, employed 20,000 experts to obtain all the information that it was possible to get. We find that the Americans have the comparative prices as regards products, and the increase of values, and that they have almost every minute detail in connection with this question not only on their own side of the line, but on this side of the line from Nova Scotia to Victoria.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. gentleman say that it will be necessary to employ experts on agricultural implements from 17½ per cent to 15 per cent?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I will answer the hon. gentleman's question in this way. Does he consider one item of reduction in our tariff which we should control ourselves in our own country is of as much importance as going to a foreign country dealing with that foreign country, and allowing that foreign country to make and unmake our tariff?

Mr. SINCLAIR. I understand this is a reduction of our own tariff and not of the tariff of a foreign country.

Mr. LENNOX. As long as you understand, it is all right.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. But, Sir, in face of all this we find these two gentlemen going to Washington without an exact knowledge, and that they were wined and dined until they sat down to make the bargain with men primed with all the necessary facts. Had our representatives the comparative information that they should have had if they had done their duty, because, Sir, this whole question relates to markets and prices, they would have hesitated before entering into such a pact as they did. I referred a moment ago to the events of 1891 when we went through an election in connection with commercial union. Fortunately, commercial union did not survive any more than free trade as they have it in England, or unrestricted reciprocity. These have all been illegitimate children of our hon. friends opposite, but every one was strangled in its infancy, just as this will be. They will all meet the same fate, thank Providence, and this country will go on and be just as prosperous in the future as it has been in the past. I think

that we on this side of the House are just as pleased as hon. members on the other side to know that we live in a country that is prosperous. The fact that commercial union failed to be placed on the statute-books of Canada in 1891 I claim as one of the reasons why Canada has been so prosperous, and why Canada to-day occupies a position in the minds of all the nations of the world of which we are so proud. I believe it is largely because we refused to accept commercial union, depended upon ourselves, and therefore became strong and vigorous.

The Prime Minister tried to make light of the expression: Let well enough alone, and he had his joke about China, but after all if we are getting along well it is not a very bad idea to be content with our lot rather than take dangerous chances, and on the whole it is often not unwise to let well enough alone. Sir, I do not say, in the sense in which it was intended, 'Let well enough alone,' but I do say, in our advancement, in our progressiveness, let us be Conservative enough to cling to Canadian methods and British institutions. Let us, Sir, keep ourselves free from all entanglements with our friends to the south, so far as the making of tariffs is concerned. Do not let us ever have again to say to a delegation like the fruit growers 'You are too late.'

Now, Mr. Chairman, we had three very interesting delegations here during the present session, and first of all came the farmers from the three prairie provinces. That delegation asked for many things which I am proud to say that since I have been a member of this House I have advocated to the best of my ability. Amongst these things which they asked for and which I have advocated, were terminal elevators, the reduction of the tariff on agricultural implements, the chilled meat industry, and government ownership and operation of the Hudson Bay Railway. Let me say that when I was home last I attended quite a large meeting of farmers and others and I was surprised to find that while there were three grain growers associations represented at tnat meeting, not one of these associations had ever said a word about reciprocity with the United States to the delegates they sent down to Ottawa. I understand, that after these gentlemen arrived in Ottawa one of the leading members connected with the 'Grain Grower Guide' had a consultation with the Prime Minister and it was then that it was decided to add reciprocity to their demands. I assure you Mr. Chairman, that reciprocity has never been talked in that western country.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). We don't want it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We don't want it and we are not going to have it. I say, Mr. Chairman, that when the third of these delegations came here, fifteen hundred fruit growers pleading on the floor of this House for justice, it was humiliating to hear the Prime Minister say that because of this reciprocity agreement he was powerless to help them. They represented that it was unfair that protection should be taken off what they produced while everything they utilized in the culture of fruit had to pay a high duty and yet the Prime Minister had to tell them they were too late. I say, Sir, that if we have grievances, and we have grievances, if our transportation rates are too high, if one class of the community is overburdened because of special privileges to another class let us not shrink the responsibility of applying a remedy, and finding a solution, within ourselves without looking to a foreign nation for help. I say, Sir, that the time for this reciprocity pact was very inopportune, and what in brief is the story that leads up to it? Everybody knows that a few years ago when the presidential election was on in the United States, promises were made that if Mr. Taft were elected there would be a revision of the tariff downwards. President Taft was elected, but there was no revision of the tariff downwards. Then, in the United States elections of last year a majority of Democrats were returned to Congress, and President Taft seeing trouble ahead, he began to shape his course towards satisfying those who clamoured for a reduced tariff. The Prime Minister of Canada took a trip west last year accompanied by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) and, following the usual custom it was expected that when the Prime Minister visited portions of the community, addresses would be presented, and flattering tributes paid to the head of the government, and everything pass off lovely, but on this occasion things were not quite so smooth. In fact, there had been so much disturbance that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) had to chastise some of the audience because of the manner in which they were criticising the record of the Prime Minister. They found there was something doing in the west. He had been for fifteen years prime minister, he had promised the western farmers time and again that the tariff would be reduced and he had broken every promise that he had made in this respect, probably because of the secret contract that had been made with the manufacturers in 1896. He looked around to find some way in which to satisfy the farmers of the west, and he was quick to accept the invitation of President Taft, and they consulted together and brought forth this reciprocity agreement.

I want to say a word or two, because the question is very much debated now, as to whether reciprocity has been the policy of the two parties for many years past, as the Liberals allege. The right hon. the Prime Minister claims that it has always been the policy of his party but it is very well known that some time ago he declared we had bid good-bye to reciprocity. It is also well known that in the general elections of 1900, 1904 and 1908 we heard nothing whatever about reciprocity, unless it were from my hon. friend (Mr. Turriff) who last night told us that he had discussed the question during his campaign. I think my hon. friend must have been very lonely for I do not know of any one else who had anything to say about reciprocity.

I would like to refer to this question as it applies to my own constituency, which is perhaps a fair sample of the agricultural constituencies of the west. We do not grow in that country many of the natural products produced in Ontario or British Columbia, but rely principally upon wheat, barley, horses, hogs and cattle. Let me for a few moments take up the question of wheat, which is perhaps what we depend on in my constituency more largely than any other of the natural products. If my people were to be largely benefited by this proposed pact, I think it would be my duty to support it, although I take this stand, that while a member of this House represents but one constituency in particular, he also represents the whole of Canada, and should endeavour to educate his constituency to the point of being willing to do that which is in the best interests of the whole country. That is the aim I set up for myself, but whether I am able to reach that standard, it is not for me to judge. As wheat is concerned, the United States grows a great deal more today than they can eat. They can only consume a certain quantity, and if they grow 127,000,000 bushels more than that, they must export it. Therefore, I do not see what advantage it is going to be to our farmers to be given free entry for their wheat to the United States. The price of wheat all admit is fixed by the Liverpool market. In fact that has been admitted by two Liberal members, the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy), and the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie). The hon. member for South Wellington said:

I do say this, however, that so far as I have been able to examine the matter—and I have looked into it with some care—I cannot see any reason why we should expect any very great increase in the price of wheat for exportation to the United States. There may be a reason, and there may be an increased price, but I am not able exactly to find out how it will come about.

My hon. friend from Provencher (Mr. Molloy), said:

I do not pretend it will increase the price of wheat to the Canadian producer but I say it will maintain the present price.

Therefore, it seems to be generally admitted in this House that we are only to maintain the present price, and I do not see any great reason why I should be found supporting this pact, because of any benefit it will give us in the marketing of our wheat. If it is only to maintain the present price. But I want something better than maintaining the price. I want, as the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe), said last night, a better price, and a better price we will never obtain if we tie ourselves to our friends in the south and allow them to handle our wheat instead of handling it ourselves along British channels and through our own channels in this country. Take the delegation which was here last December, one half and more of its time was spent in presenting to the government the needs and desires of the west, regarding terminal elevators. Why do the people out west want terminal elevators? They want them in order to maintain the identity of their wheat and have it reach the market of Liverpool in the same condition as that in which it leaves the farmers. We grow the best wheat in the world. I think the Minister of Agriculture took a little exception to that last night, and thought that perhaps Quebec did, but he had not seen enough of our wheat in the west. Well, we want to protect the identity of that wheat. The miller in Liverpool will pay for his grain what it is worth to him for milling purposes, and if our wheat does not reach the European market in the same condition as that in which it leaves the farmers here, that will have a bad effect upon the price, and our farmers will receive less profit. But how are you going to maintain the identity of our wheat if it goes south? It will then be absolutely impossible for us to do so. I would like to read some of the things that were said in that connection, at the meeting of that delegation:

The value of our wheat depends on its milling qualities, but it depends on its qualities not as it is inspected at Winnipeg, but on its qualities as it is placed on the British, or the ultimate market wherever they may be. And, if, as has been proved, each grade of our wheat is brought down to the lowest point by the mixing of wheat from lower grades, (and we believe it is often brought below it, that is, it is allowed to pass out of the terminal elevators with the minimum point of each grade lower than it would be allowed to pass the inspector at Winnipeg), if this is so, it will be readily understood that the value and the reputation of our wheat on the Brit-

ish market is regraded also, and as the British miller can only afford to pay for wheat according to its milling value, the price is reduced, and being reported back to us, becomes the basis of our market here, and we have to accept a price based on the lowest point of each grade, instead of on the average as it should be, which means a difference of about two cents per bushel.

It has been said that the United States will soon furnish a market for our wheat. Mr. J. J. Hill has been leading us to believe for several years that the wheat production of the United States was growing less and its population increasing, and that consequently we would have in that country a market for our wheat. But this set of statistics, which I am about to read, does not corroborate that. Their production for the last ten years was as follows:

UNITED STATES WHEAT PRODUCTION.

Year.	Bushels.
1901	522,229,505
1902	749,460,218
1903	670,063,008
1904	637,821,835
1905	552,399,517
1906	692,979,489
1907	735,260,970
1908	634,087,000
1909	664,602,000
1910	737,199,000

They are producing more wheat every year. They export about 127,000,000 bushels of wheat. But what could they do? I find that only about 50 per cent of the tillable land of the United States is cultivated and under wheat. I find further that the United States is only producing about 13 bushels of wheat to the acre, while Great Britain is producing 33 bushels. If you work that out you will find that the United States with a proper system of farming by tilling their land, by intensive farming will be able to export not 127,000,000 bushels but over 700,000,000 bushels. That does not look very much as if the United States would soon have to be an importer of wheat for their own consumption. The increase in production in the United States in the 10 years has been 214,000,000 bushels of wheat.

The supporters of this pact make use of the cry that they are opening up a market of 90,000,000 people to our producers. What is the use of a market of 90,000,000 if that 90,000,000 produce everything you produce in very much larger quantities? If these 90,000,000 did not produce sufficient quantities of wheat, butter, hogs, oats, cheese, for their own consumption then certainly you would be opening a market, but when, as is absolutely undeniable, the 90,000,000 have a surplus for export of every one of these products, it is at once seen that the market is of comparatively little value. Many people have been led away by this

cry of the opening of that market of 90,000,000, but when the matter is explained to them they say: Well, is that what our government are giving to us? There is nothing to it.

We have much discussion as to whether the tariff on wheat going into the United States really affects the price of wheat. We find that the price of wheat in the various provinces of the Dominion and in various states of the union varies far more than the price between North Dakota and Manitoba. Some of these prices are as follow:

The average price for wheat per bushel, in 1909, in the North Atlantic states, was $1.12; in the South Atlantic states it was $1.17½; What made the difference between the two? Was it the tariff? But there is no tariff whatever, so you have to seek for some other cause to account for the difference. The average value per bushel on the farm, in 1910, for Iowa, was 72 cents; for Missouri, 78 cents; for Tennessee, 90 cents, for Alabama, $1.02; for Oklahoma, 73 cents; for Arkansas, 85 cents, for Oregon, 72 cents; for California, 84 cents; for North Carolina, $1.01; for South Carolina, $1.14.

These differences in price between different states and different provinces, cannot be due to tariff because there is no tariff between the various states or provinces.

I also wish to give some figures of the prices of wheat in the United States for the last ten years. I find they are as follow:

Year.	Average price.
1900	61.09
1901	62.04
1902	63.00
1903	69.05
1904	92.04
1905	74.08
1906	66.07
1907	87.04
1908	92.08
Average price for nine years	74½

We find the average for these years has been 74½ cents.

Even at the risk of delaying the House, I wish to refer to the production of wheat of the favoured nations which will benefit by this agreement. That production has been:

	Bushels.
Switzerland	3,500,000
Denmark	4,400,000
Norway	5,000,000
Sweden	7,000,000
Japan	22,500,000
Spain	120,000,000
Argentine	193,000,000
Austria-Hungary	230,000,000
Russia	570,000,000

Wheat from the Argentine can be laid down at Montreal cheaper than we can send it from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, because it

all comes by water from the Argentine and it has been a surprise to me how cheaply freight can be carried by water. It costs about 5½ cents to bring a bushel of wheat from the Argentine to Montreal. I may be asked why wheat is to be brought to Montreal from the Argentine. That question came up in my own experience in dealing with terminal elevators. I found that 100,000,000 bushels of wheat went through the elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, and only about 55,000,000 bushels were exported.

It is very well known that Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces produce very little wheat, but eat the wheat of the west. We hope and believe that these provinces are going to increase a very great deal in population. I must say that, however much I appreciate the west, since I began to study this question, I have been struck with the great progress and importance of the two old provinces of Ontario and Quebec. However much we have been doing in the west, when we find that the province of Ontario produced last year $250,000,000 worth of farm products we realize the progress that is being made in this country. These provinces are going to use wheat. But if wheat can be landed in Montreal from the Argentine at 5½ cents a bushel, and it costs us 10 cents a bushel from Winnipeg to Port Arthur, and the additional cost of bringing it to Winnipeg, and then bringing it from Port Arthur to whatever point in the maritime provinces in which it is to be used, the competition is seen to be a very serious matter. I have looked forward to a large market in these old provinces for our Canadian wheat. Hence, I think it most unfair that this government should enter into a compact such as this. When these gentlemen went to Washington, they seemed to have so little information, and to give the matter so little attention, and to regard it of so little importance, I believe there is great doubt whether they ever thought of these favoured nations until after they returned home. It is a most important and most vital question in connection with this whole compact. When the Argentine can send wheat into Montreal for 5½ cents a bushel, is it not something to be alarmed at in connection with the wheat growing industry of this country.

But I cannot dwell any longer on the wheat question. I have here some figures on which I shall enlarge later, bearing on the possibility of trade between Canada and the Australian dominions:

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO AUSTRALIA.

Articles and tariff rates of duty.
Cattle, $2.43 per head.
Swine, $1.22 per head.
Sheep, 48·6 cents per head.
Wheat, 36·6 cents per 100 pounds.
Barley, 48·6 cents per 100 pounds.
Beans, 36·5 cents per 100 pounds.
Potatoes, 21·7 cents per 100 pounds.
Butter, 6 cents per pound.
Cheese, 6 cents per pound.
Eggs, 12 cents per dozen.
Hay, $4.34 per ton.

RATES OF DUTY ON CANADIAN PRODUCTS ON IMPORTATION INTO NEW ZEALAND.

Cattle, $2.43 each.
Swine and sheep, free.
Barley, 48·6 cents per 100 pounds.
Beans, 18·2 cents per 100 pounds.
Wheat, 18·2 cents per 100 pounds.
Potatoes, 21.7 cents per 100 pounds.
Butter, 20 per cent.
Cheese, 20 per cent.
Eggs, 20 per cent.
Hay, 20 per cent.

Let me now refer very briefly to our hog production—certainly a very important industry. I find that in the United States they have 49,000,000 hogs and in Canada 3,000,000. That is they have sixteen hogs to our one in the slaughter houses of the United States. Hogs in Canada and the United States average about 200 pounds or a little more. The average price in the United States is $6.85 per hundred, or $13.70 for the average hog. The price in Canada is $8.10 per hundred or $16.20 per hog. So, you would have a loss to the Canadian farmer under this agreement of $1.18 per hundred, or the loss of $2.36 per hog. This is on the basis of five years' average for the two places. No man will pretend that the one hog is going to govern the prices for the sixteen hogs; the price will be regulated rather by the sixteen hogs. Let me give you the prices in Chicago and in Ingersoll for the last ten years:

AVERAGE PRICES OF HOGS IN CHICAGO AND IN INGERSOLL—

Year.	Price at Chicago.	Price at Ingersoll.
1901	$5 71	$6 70
1902	6 70½	6 68
1903	5 88	6 07
1904	5 04	5 32
1905	5 18	6 41
1906	6 23	7 17
1907	6 09½	6 85
1908	5 36⅓	6 87
1909	7 53½	8 04
1910	8 59¾	9 11

And now, a few figures showing prices in Chicago and Montreal, respectively:

AVERAGE PRICE OF HOGS IN CHICAGO AND MONTREAL FOR THE FIVE YEARS ENDING DECEMBER 31, 1910:

	Chicago.	Montreal.
1906	$6 20	$7 77
1907	6 10	7 43
1908	5 70	7 10
1909	7 35	8 64
1910	8 90	9 60

I also have some figures in connection with the large amount of hogs which we are delivering from year to year to the packing houses, but these I will not read. These figures were somewhat a surprise to me. I will not give each month, though one thing that struck me as important, was the great regularity for the different months. The total for the year was 1,133,000. Now, if we take cattle, we find that practically the same conditions exist. Let us compare the prices in Chicago and Toronto. Here are the figures:

Comparative prices of cattle in Toronto and Chicago. Table of prices from 1901 to 1910, in the month of May each year:

	Toronto.	Chicago.
1901	$4 25	$3 95
1902	5 25	5 00
1903	4 90	4 06
1904	5 20	4 90
1905	5 70	5 50
1906	5 10	4 00
1907	5 12½	4 00
1908	5 50	5 00
1909	5 75	5 10
1910	7 00	6 25

So we find that cattle in Canada also bring a better price than on the other side, I see no reason to believe that we should gain in that connection by the reciprocity pact. When it comes to horses, we stand to lose a very great deal, not only in Ontario, but in the western provinces. The average price of horses in the United States to-day is about $108, while the average price in Canada is about $130. Not only that, but take my own country, where we used to buy a great many horses, but where to-day, we are exporters of horses. We sell many of them and sell them at good prices. What occurred two years ago? The very same thing that will occur when this pact is signed. We have coming into that country a lot of these western horses, cheap horses, whose coming was exceedingly detrimental to that country. We could not keep them out except through our customs. It was provided that horses of the value of $50 or less had to pay $12.50 in coming in. That absolutely stopped that class of horses coming in.

Of course you would not bring in horses costing $25 and $30 and pay $12.50 duty on them. Hence we have got rid of all that class of horses, and at present I think I may say without boasting that we have in Manitoba as fine a class of working horses as are to be found in any other province in the Dominion. Perhaps when you come to driving horses, we cannot boast much. But it is draught horses that are of commercial value, and there is scarcely a town of 500 or 1,000 people in that country that did not export last year four or five carloads of horses. Now we do not want that trade interfered with, we do not want this pact signed, we do not want this reciprocity in horses after we have spent so long a time in bringing up the splendid class of horses we have to-day, and we don't want these cheap horses coming in, as they will if this pact is signed.

Mr. McCOLL (Northumberland). Where were those horses exported to?

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Perhaps I made a mistake in saying they were exported; I meant to say that they were sent out of Manitoba, sent to British Columbia, Alberta, Rainy River, and other places. Manitoba is doing a large interprovincial trade in horses, and we found them a great benefit last year when the crop was not good There is no question that this pact would destroy absolutely our interprovincial trade in horses. On the question of interprovincial trade, I may remark that last year there was an interprovincial trade of about $14,000,000 between the prairie provinces and British Columbia. Now does any hon. gentleman in this House suppose for one moment that that interprovincial trade will continue, or that it will prosper if this pact is signed? For my part I do not.

I have here a comparison from a United States government report showing that land values rose more rapidly in the Dominion than in the republic:

Between 1900 and 1910:

	Per Cent.
Maine	67
Nova Scotia	181
New Hampshire	37
New Brunswick	120
Vermont	33
Prince Edward Island	70
Quebec	80
Michigan	39
Ontario	43
Minnesota	77
Manitoba	123
Saskatchewan	201
Alberta	185

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to dwell a little while on the question of these favoured nations. We have favoured nation treaties with the Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela. Now we are asked many times: Do we need to fear these favoured nations? They do not send anything into Canada. But I find they do. I find they send a great many million dollars' worth of their products into Canada, even while they have been paying a duty, and it stands to reason that when the duty is taken off their imports will be greatly increased. Take the case of eggs and butter, there is now a duty of 4 cents

a pound on butter and 3 cents a dozen on eggs. Take off that duty, and it gives so much more profit to the exporter of those articles into Canada. We have had $30,000,000 worth of the products of those countries coming into Canada, and we may reasonably expect that the trade will greatly increase when the duties are taken off. And we must keep in mind the fact if we wish to send our natural products to any of the countries named we are met with a light tariff, while this pact permits their natural products to come into Canada free. I have a table showing the imports into Canada for home consumption from the most favoured nation countries during the period of six years:

IMPORTS INTO CANADA FOR HOME CONSUMPTION FROM MOST FAVOURED NATION COUNTRIES DURING SIX YEARS.

Article.	Quantity.	Value.
Butter.. .. ..lbs.	2,894,416	$ 685,306
Cheese,. .. .. "	2,901,815	566,786
Eggs.. .. ..doz.	4,600,534	944,704
Poultry..	.....	276,648
Potatoes.. .. ..bush.	1,422,829	926,693
Beef (salted).. .. .. ..lbs.	10,610,533	502,831
Bacon and hams.. .. "	35,140,613	4,312,359
Mutton.. .. .. "	6,317,785	440,317
Pork (in brine) .. .. "	51,826,804	4,250,673
Other meat products.. "	13,028,060	1,567,251
Cattle.. .. ..head	45,086	640,514
Horses.. .. .. "	57,565	2,920,117
Sheep.. .. .. "	359,447	1,151,022
Swine.. .. ..lbs.	184,779	12,696
Barley.. .. ..bush.	280,314	174,504
Beans.. .. .. "	307,211	490,343
Buckwheat... .. .. "	6,311	6,177
Oats.. .. .. "	1,168,266	603,264
Pease.. .. .. "	51,241	120,840
Rye.. .. .. "	145,920	112,950
Wheat.. .. .. "	373,979	317,748
Hay.... .. ..tons	49,974	853,059
Flaxseed.. .. .. ..bush.	4,702,090	5,747,612
Apples.. .. ..brls.	239,647	975,870
Vegetables (except potatoes)	....	4,755,980
		$33,356,102

Now we can easily imagine that when the door is thrown open and their goods can enter Canada free of duty, these 307,000,000 people inhabiting the favoured nations will very greatly increase their exports into Canada. The question of eggs is an exceedingly interesting one. The hen seems to be a very valuable bird. I was surprised to learn that the United States, whose greatest natural product is corn, has its second greatest product, eggs. I find that in the month of February alone we imported from the United States over 700,000 dozen of eggs, paying the duty. Australia last year exported $6,000,000, and the Argentine $5,000,000 worth of frozen mutton and other frozen meats. New Zealand exported $17,500,000 of cattle; the Argentine, $4,000,000. These cattle can come directly into Canada, paying no duty. The Argentine exported in 1903 over $4,000,000 worth of cattle, and over $1,500,000 of butter. Austria-Hungary exported of eggs and cheese more than $10,000,000. Denmark, to my great surprise, a little country with a population of 2,500,000, made 169,000,000 pounds of butter, and exported $10,000,000 worth. Russia exported animals valued at $12,000,000, and butter valued at $24,000,000; wheat flour and barley, $200,000,000. Australia and New Zealand, although not favoured nations, will come in under this pact. Australia exported butter, cheese and eggs to the value of $12,000,000. New Zealand sent out $16,000,000 worth of meat, and $12,000,000 worth of butter and cheese. Speaking of wheat, the question has been put up to me that we have been exporting wheat already through the United States. That is quite true, but it has been going through in bond, and that is a very different thing. When wheat goes through bond the by-product could not be utilized in the United States, and had to be sent through bond also. After this pact is signed our wheat will go to the United States to be ground by their millers and the by-product will be sold in the United States for feeding their hogs. If we wish to get any of that by-product returned to Canada, as my hon. friend from Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) said last night, we will have to pay a duty of 12½ cents per 100 pounds. I would like to place on record a statement of some of the natural resources of Canada as estimated:

Standing timber, 500 billion feet.
Wheat lands, 117 million acres.
Coast fisheries, 12,500 miles.
Fresh water fisheries, 440,000 miles.

Our coal is estimated at 172,000,000,000 tons; we have produced $260,000,000 of gold; silver mines rank third in the world; nickel, we have three-fifths of the world. In 1904, we produced 509,000,000 tons of iron ore and in 1910, $507,000,000; dairy products, $98,000,000; timber cut, $63,000,000; fisheries, $30,000,000.

The United States having been extravagant, according to the confession of President Taft, their resources are becoming scarce, and it is only natural that, although they have ignored us for 40 years, they are now exceedingly anxious to get our raw material. That was well explained by my hon. friend from Dundas (Mr. Broder), the other night. What do they want it for? They want us, with our unskilled labour, to gather up this raw material, send it over to the United States in order that they may employ their skilled labour and machinery in manufacturing it and that they may then send it back to Canada in the form of manufactured articles for which we are expected to pay an increased price. A good illustration of

that is afforded by the item of pulpwood. By the employment of unskilled labour it costs $6 to produce a cord of pulpwood. They send that to the United States where, with their skilled labour, they manufacture it and then send it back here and charge us $45 for it. I for one cannot consent to give my vote for a pact which does that for Canada. I would rather that we should continue to build up our country in the way we are now doing. We are not only doing that but we are causing a good deal of worry to men on the other side of the line, like Governor Foss, of Massachusetts, and others. They are not pleased with the fact that Americans are sending their money over here to establish mills and industries. Something like $223,000,000 of American money has been utilized in that way in this country and that fact is worrying these gentlemen very much.

Now, I desire to refer to the question of barley. There has been a great deal said about barley and my hon. friend from Lisgar made some statements that I would not like to make. Before 1893, the duty on barley was 30 cents a bushel. Between 1893 and 1897 the duty was reduced to 15 cents a bushel and the price of barley went down 11 cents. We find that when the duty was raised to 30 cents again the price again increased, and we find that during the three years preceding the lowering of the duty the average price in the United States was 44 cents a bushel and that during the three years since the restoration of the duty the price went up.

There is another important feature in connection with barley that does not perhaps so much appeal to us in the west at this moment, but I think there is no hon. gentleman in this House but will agree with me that we will have to do a little different system of farming in the west. The best thing that ever happened in Ontario was the raising of the duty on barley going into the United States. The Ontario farmers went into hog raising and the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph informs us that three and a half pounds of barley makes a pound of pork. It is stated that the adoption of this process makes barley worth 97 cents a bushel. It has been flashed all over this country that barley is worth 90 cents in the United States. While we get a much lower figure in Winnipeg, it is very easily explained. In the west, and I believe also in Ontario, they are not growing very much malting barley. I believe that 90 per cent of the barley that is grown is feed barley and there is not a tremendous difference in the price of barley. The barley that is bringing 90 per cent a bushel is malting barley grown in South Dakota.

I would like to say a word in regard to

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

the preference. I believe that British mutual preference would be of very much more benefit to us than any thing in connection with this pact, and I believe that they are rapidly coming to it in the old country. Hon. gentlemen in this House may not agree with me, but the fact is that about 48 per cent of the people of the old country in the last election voted for mutual preference. I would like to read to the House the words of Mr. Balfour:

> There could not be a prelude to controversy more clear and more decisive than that of coming to a friendly arrangement between the mother country and the Dominions, though the Dominions ask for it, and though a vast section of our own population ask for it also. I really cannot imagine on what this is founded. . . They will not treat the colonies better than they treat foreign nations, and that is the broad difference between us. We think that it would be for the benefit of the empire as a whole, for the benefit of the empire as an economic whole, if we did treat our self-governing colonies better than we treat the foreigners. That is the difference between the government and ourselves, and upon that difference I am perfectly certain that in the long run the good sense of the people to which the right hon. gentleman appeals, certainly the verdict of history will be on our side.

That is what Mr. Balfour says in connection with the mutual preference. I call the attention of the House to what Mr. J. J. Hill thinks about it; he says:

> The pending reciprocity treaty before Congress is the most important this country has had before it since the civil war. If, after having Canada waiting for years, they turn her down again, our country will suffer, and one of the hardest hit of our industries will be that of wheat raising. England is waiting and watching for just that thing to happen. Within the fortnight Austen Chamberlain had called up for decision in the British parliament the measures providing an imperial federation for England and her colonies. Suppose that Canada joins the imperial federation of English colonies, as is proposed. A reasonable differential that England might impose upon our wheat would be 15 cents a bushel, and that would mean our wheat growers would find their whole product lowered that much per bushel in value. Great Britain would take over practically all of the $200,000,000 in round numbers that Canada now pays us for manufactured articles, then add the six hundred and more millions we export to Great Britain, and we find that, if we fail to adopt a reciprocity agreement with Canada and drive it to an imperial federation, we are cheapening our wheat crop annually, say, 15 cents per bushel, and at the same time we are losing $800,000,000 of export business to England and Canada.

Now, may I refer to the question of timber. What the Americans would do to Canadian forests may be judged by what they have done to their own. Any one who fifty years ago could have seen the vast extent of virgin timber in the United States,

an area of forest which in quality, quantity, variety and value had not its equal in the world, would surely have exclaimed: 'Here is a forest which can supply all the needs of man for all time to come.' Within one short half-century the American people have, before their arable lands were all brought under cultivation, before their population reached 100 millions, so reduced that forest by wasteful exploitation, by fire and by lack of skilful management that they are now seeking access to a foreign supply. Within fifty years the American people, though fewer in number than they are now, though dealing with their own property, have consumed a forest wealth at least thirty times as great as that of Canada at the present day.

The rapid wasteful exploitation of forest areas in the United States has left that country in an unenviable position. With a population twelve times as great as that of Canada the United States has forest resources only four times as great. The timber in the United States will last the people twenty-five to thirty years. The timber of Canada would last them seven years. Combined, the timber of both countries would supply the citizens of both countries under present conditions of use perhaps thirty-five years. There is the secret of the great American desire to secure free Canadian timber, the 'far-sighted policy,' of which President Taft speaks. In the United States the securing of free Canadian timber will have a great effect in giving United States forests a rest.

On the other hand the free entry of Canadian lumber into the United States will have quite different results in Canada. The chief effect will be the hastening of the destruction of Canadian forests. In short the wholesale selling of our timber to the Americans at the present time can only have one result, the denudation of our forests without adequate provision for their renewal, and the subsequent development of a timber famine in Canada.

If I remember correctly the Minister of Customs gave an expression to sentiments that I would rather not hear coming from a minister of the Crown. He told us he was quite willing that the Americans should have our raw material including our timber, but I do not think that such a policy would be in the interests of Canada; on the contrary I believe that such a policy would be most detrimental to our future prosperity.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I shall briefly refer to the transportation question. One of the greatest difficulties of making farming profitable in the west is the high rates for transportation in this country. We have spent a great deal for the construction of Canadian railways, as the following figures will show:

EXPENDITURE ON RAILWAYS UP TO 1910.

Federal government..	$127,000,000
Provincial governments	36,000,000
Municipalities..	18,000,000

The total cash expenditure for railways by the people of Canada since 1878 amounts to nearly $500,000,000. In addition to that the federal and provincial governments guaranteed bonds for railway construction in Canada to the extent of $27,000,000, and in addition to that the various governments federal and provincial have granted in aid of railway construction no less than 55,000,000 acres of the public domain. I have said that one of the great difficulties in making farming profitable in the west is the high cost of transportation, and I say that our way out of that difficulty is not through the south. That is not going to help us. It is just as far from the town in which I live to the seaboard of the States as it is to the seaboard of Canada, and the only way you are going to help us in the matter of transportation is by carrying out the policy advocated by the Conservative party for years, and building the Hudson Bay railway over which there will only be 500 or 600 miles of land haul for our wheat. That, no doubt, will settle the question of transportation and consequently make our wheat more valuable to the farmers. Notwithstanding that the hour is late, I must put on 'Hansard' the remarks made by Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he introduced the measure for the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and what he said was true then, and is true to-day. But, why has he changed his mind so frequently, and why did he change his mind so frequently on the tariff before and after he came into power? They say that if you ask an Oriental a question his great desire is to find out what answer you want him to give, and it does seem to me that the right hon. the Prime Minister has an Oriental tinge to his character because he appears to be so anxious to please with his answer that he finds himself in a maze of contradictions. The argument advanced by the First Minister for the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific is absolutely opposed to this reciprocity agreement with the United States. He said in July 10, 1903, 'Hansard' page 7670:

> Now, Sir, we lay it down as a principle, upon which we are to be judged by friend and foe, that we are to have a transcontinental railway, that its terminus must be in Canadian waters, and that the whole line, every inch of it, must be in Canadian territory. We say further that such a line is of necessity to our commercial independence. Sir, I am surprised at the levity displayed by some hon. gentlemen on so grave a question.

The right hon. gentleman was surprised again. He told us at the beginning of the

session that there would be an investigation before a change was made in the tariff. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) told us that he had the word of the Prime Minister that before any tariff changes were made, there would be an investigation. The right hon. gentleman also said the same thing to the farmers of the west, and in making that declaration, spoke in a constitutional business-like manner. He went on to say:

What have you to say to-day to this? What are your minds running to when you have facts staring you in the face which show you that at this moment Canada is not commercially independent of the United States?

What do you think of that?

The American government granted us the bonding privilege. They granted us the privilege of using their harbours for our imports and exports without paying them tolls and customs dues. But my hon. friends opposite are aware that this privilege has always been held over our heads by the American authorities as a sword of Damocles. My hon. friends on the other side are aware that the abrogation of this privilege has been used again and again as a threat to obtain from us concessions.

Again, he said on July 30:

We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people to provide immediate measure whereby the products of those new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost, and whereby, likewise, a market may be found in this new region for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces. Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. It is not of to-morrow, but of to-day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; Heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels——

When I first began my speech, I referred to the Canadian Pacific railway, which was built when there were very few people in the west, and built under great difficulties, and that road was completed in a shorter time than the contract called for. But here is our great Transcontinental which the government have been building since 1903, and which it not yet built, although all the conditions were most favourable. My right hon. friend then was very much exercised lest the trade of this country might be diverted into other channels:

—and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land.

What splendid sentiments those are. They are the kind I like to read:

Upon this question we feel that our position is absolutely safe and secure; we feel that it corresponds to the beating of every Canadian heart.

Mr. SCHAFFNER.

On July 30, page 7671 of 'Hansard,' the right hon. gentleman said:

Let me observe that if we have used American ports it is not because for five months in the year our own ports are ice-bound. Everybody knows that our ports in winter are just as open as the American harbours. Everybody knows, except Mr. Andrew Carnegie and the bulk of American public opinion, that if we have used American ports and the bonding privilege it was not because our harbours were ice-bound in winter, but simply because we had no railways to reach them. In the face of this, are the Canadian parliament and people going to stand on their manhood and place us in such a position that all times of the year, not only by one railway, but by two or more, we shall have access from January to December to our own harbour, and be able to say to our American neighbours: Take off your bonding privilege whenever it suits you, we are comparatively independent.

Again, he said:

Sir, our relations to-day with our American neighbours are friendly; they were never more so, and I hope they will so continue. For my part, I never made any secret of it, I have the greatest possible admiration for the American people. I have always admired their many strong qualities. But I have found in the short experience during which it has been my privilege and my fortune to be placed at the head of affairs, by the will of the Canadian people, that the best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them.

Does anybody want any better sentiment than that? We could not have anything better.

How is it our neighbours to the south want us so badly just now? They want our natural resources, our raw materials. They have a large population and large industries, and they want to make use of us to feed those industries.

There is another subject to which I would like to refer. I have not waived the flag since I started, I have not referred to the annexation subject, but I should like to quote a few of the statements made in that connection. I propose to read a few of the remarks made on the other side of the line giving the reason why they want this pact. This winter it has been my experience to come in contact with shrewd business men who were spending the winter in the south; and there is not one I met who did not tell me that whenever this pact is spoken of on the other side it is taken to mean annexation. Here is a dispatch in a leading American journal:

Minneapolis, Feb. 12.—In an editorial leader which bears every evidence of Washington inspiration, the Minneapolis 'Journal,' the leading newspaper of the Twin Cities, makes a frantic appeal to congress for the ratification of the reciprocity agreement. The 'Journal' urges that this is for the United

States the golden hour of opportunity which, if it passes, may never return. It shares with Hon. Joseph Chamberlain the view that the reciprocity arrangement spells the doom of empire federation and colonial preference, and asserts that the United States has the greatest opportunity 'to unite the continent, to avert future jars and wars, and to change history that has arisen in this generation's time.'

We all have heard of our friend Champ Clark. It was he who let the cat out of the bag, and our opponents have been trying ever since to explain away what he said. He said:

Reciprocity in raw materials, in natural products, and in some of the simpler and more generally used articles of manufacture, as provided for in the pending agreement, is the obvious road to a relation profitable to both countries.

The time, probably the last time, when this can be realized has arrived.

The future union of all parts of the British Empire in a commercial federation is almost certain.

When that shall have been concluded, under a system of preferential advantages securing the English market to the colonial producer of raw materials and food products, and the colonial market to the English manufacturer, it will strike the United States a double blow.

Our best customer, Great Britain, and our third best, Canada, will trade less and less with us and more and more with each other.

And it will then be permanently impossible to repair our error.

Political and economic weather signals indicate that should the present measure fall no other can succeed for many years, if ever.

Then he goes on to speak of the price of wheat.

Representative G. W. Prince, of Illinois, gave his version of the proposal.

I say to our neighbours on the north, be not deceived. When we go into a country and get control of it, we take it. It is our history, and it is right that we should take it if we want it, and you might as well understand it. The Speaker has so said; the party back of him has so said, and it does not deny that that is its desire. Now let us see if the people of Canada believe in reciprocity and annexation.

Only in to-day's paper Mr. Madden, of Illinois says:

My hope is that if we can have closer commercial relations with the people of Canada, he said, some day this relationship may blend the two peoples into the harmonious whole; and that the territory lying north of us may become a part of the United States, as it should be. I have always believed we should be one people, under one flag, and under one form of government; and it will be better for us when such a thing happens, if it ever does.

I might keep on reading such extracts all night.

Just a word as to what we offer, and what we believe to be far better than reciprocity. We stand for an improvement in transportation rates by the building and government operation of the Hudson Bay railway. We stand for the complete identification of our wheat, for maintaining the quality and price by government operation of terminal elevators. To my mind it does not make so much difference who owns a railroad or a terminal elevator, the important point is, who operates it. The whole Conservative party have voted this session for the government operation of terminal elevators. We will soon have a Bill before this House. I am not a prophet, and perhaps I should not prophesy to-night but, so far as I have seen that Bill, it does not meet the exigencies of the case, they stand about where they were before, but I am afraid that every man from the west supporting the government will be found supporting that Bill, for they have voted against the government operation of terminal elevators so far.

We stand to improve our stock, cattle and hog trade through the establishment of a chilled meat industry, which has been moved in this House, and supported by every member of the Conservative party. I consider this, as the 'Globe' has said, the most important crisis in our history since confederation. Once this pact is signed, once it goes into effect I believe it is going to be detrimental to the interests and the nationhood of this great country of ours. One of our friends opposite asked me what my constituents thought. I have not had an opportunity of meeting all my constituents, and I dare say quite a number of them have been in favour of this pact, but if they are in favour of it the only thing they have heard about it is reciprocity, it has not been explained to them, they have not had a proper knowledge of what it means. I know from my own experience, and from that of those who have talked to these men in the west, that every man, when he thoroughly understands this pact, is opposed to it. The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) who held four meetings told me that only one man of the Conservative party who voted for him before stated that he still wanted this pact. That is a splendid record for the west. That is where the government have expected us to fall down, they have been looking for the western members on this side of the House to support this pact. I wish to say honestly that when this thing was first presented to the House on January 26, I thought there was something in it. I thought it would be my duty to support it, but every day since then, to the best of my ability, and with the time at my disposal, I have endeavoured to become familiar with the different facts, and it would take one all night to discuss the whole question. But I believe that if our freight rates are too

high, if our wheat is not properly handled, if we have any other grievance, we should, in the name of all that is good and great, settle these difficulties ourselves. We have met as great difficulties in the past. We to-day have a Railway Commission, and I am prepared to give this government great credit for the creation of this commission. They have had two splendid chairmen. Where was there a better man in Canada that Mr. Justice Killam. We thought when he was lost to the commission that no man could be found to fill his place, but it seems to be the impression that Judge Mabee has filled the position, and is doing excellent work. Let them look after the freight rates. I say that the freight rates of this country are too high, but we are not going to get them lowered by turning to the south and asking the United States to help us. Let our commission solve that problem. If the commission have not sufficient power this parliament has power to give them further powers to handle these railway rates as they should. Let us settle all our grievances in the same manner. That to me is a very strong objection and a reason why I cannot possibly support this pact; it does seem to me that by it we are tying ourselves up to our friends to the south.

I would support the hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) in his statement that the Conservative party is in favour of a permanent tariff commission that will handle this question in the interests of this country. I do not believe in privileged classes as I have said before, and if the manufacturers of this country are getting too high prices, a commission of the proper kind could easily remedy that, such a commission could go into the offices, and into the books of the different manufacturing interests in this country, and find out just what prices would be fair. There may be ignorance in connection with this matter. Our farmers complain that they are paying too much for binders. I think that they are, but it would satisfy the farmers if through a commission we were able to ascertain what was the actual cost of that binder, and what would be a fair profit on it.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion let me say the attempt of a few men to force the resolution upon the country is contrary to democratic government.

Canada is shaping her own destiny. The request comes from the United States, who had squandered her natural resources to such an extent, that they are face to face with their exhaustion and were, therefore, anxious to get at Canada's raw material in order to relieve the strain on their own.

Sir, we are building up a strong Canadian nationhood. Let us take heed lest we take a false step now that we are so near the goal of our ambitions. Let us take this false step and we may shatter with one stroke all the work of confederation.

When the old treaty was repealed, we were poor in skilled labour, banking capital, in agricultural and in manufactures. To-day we are rich in them all.

The repeal of that treaty threw us upon ourselves and we were roused to action. When the United States, in 1866, flung our poverty in our faces and told us our only choice was annexation or starvation, we refused to accept either, and have proven to the world that we can captain our own ship of state. Let us be friends with our friends to the south, but let us run our own affairs.

Mr. STANFIELD moved that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion of Mr. Stanfield, committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fisher, House adjourned at 1.02 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

WEDNESDAY, May 3, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 188) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Trussed Concrete Steel Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 193) respecting La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 195) to incorporate the Western Canal Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

PAYMENTS TO MR. TREAU DE COELI.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What was the total amount paid by the government of Canada during the year ended 31st March last to Mr. Treau de Coeli, immigration agent at Belgium?

2. What was the total number of Belgian immigrants that arrived in Canada during the same period?

3. What men were returned to the government by Mr. Treau de Coeli as employed by him for government work during the months of December and February last, how much was paid to said men so employed and what work did they do?

4. What official residence in Belgium did Mr. Treau de Coeli attribute to said men so employed in his report?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. $5,125.87, made up as follows:

Salary of Mr. de Coeli.. ..	$1,558 31
Salaries of staff	716 76
Expenses..	2,850 80
Total	$5,125 87

2. 1,608.

3. One only, Mr. George Mercier, of Dumas, Saskatchewan, employed as a farmer delegate in Belgium for three months, January, February and March, 1911. $394.69 was paid.

4. See answer to 3.

NEWSPAPER STATEMENTS AFFECTING HON. MR. OLIVER.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Pursuant to the notice I gave the House yesterday, I beg to move:

The statement having been made in certain newspapers that on the recommendation of the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, an order in council was passed on 8th May, 1907, giving the Canadian Northern Railway Company power to select in the province of Saskatchewan 600,000 acres of land in place of lands granted to the Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Company, and that on 3rd October in the same year $50,000 was paid into the Imperial Bank at Edmonton to the credit of Mr. Oliver, and that about one year later the further sum of $19,000 was similarly paid into the same bank to the credit of Mr. Oliver.

And Mr. Oliver having on the second day of May instant stated from his place in this House that no foundation whatever existed for the insinuation or suspicion that the said payments of money or either of them were made on account of the passing of the said order in council or by reason of the making of the said land grant, or in any way in connection therewith or on account thereof.

Resolved, that it be referred to a special committee of five members to investigate and inquire into the truth of the statement, and matters above set forth and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine persons on oath or affirmation, and to report from time to time.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister is now proposing a motion, which, in its effect, is practically the same as the one which he proposed yesterday, although it is not in the same form. The effective words of the motion are, in this case, preceded by a recital which has been read to the House by my right hon. friend. That recital is in these words:

The statement having been made in certain newspapers that on the recommendation of the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, an order in council was passed on 8th May, 1907, giving the Canadian Northern Railway Company power to select in the province of Saskatchewan 600,000 acres of land in place of lands granted to the Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Company, and that on 3rd October in the same year $50,000 was paid into the Imperial Bank at Edmonton to the credit of Mr. Oliver, and that about one year after the further sum of $19,000 was similarly paid into the same bank to the like credit of Mr. Oliver.

And Mr. Oliver having on the second day of May instant stated from his place in this House that no foundation whatever existed for the insinuation or suspicion that the said payments of money or either of them were made on account of the passing of the said order in council or by reason of the making of the said land grant, or in any way in connection therewith or on account thereof.

Resolved, that it be referred to a special committee of five members to investigate and inquire into the truth of the statement, and matters above set forth and that the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records and to examine persons on oath or affirmation, and to report from time to time.

Before saying a few words about the character of the motion which the Prime Minister proposes, I would like to remark that this is very much of a family quarrel between the supporters of the right hon. gentleman, The Prime Minister introduced the subject into the House last Friday, the 28th of April. He then alluded to a gentleman who had had several interviews with him, and who had made charges against one of his colleagues. He did not at that time name the gentleman who had made the charges, nor did he name the colleague. He did, however, refer to an article which had appeared in the Toronto 'Telegram' of the previous day, the 27th of April, and the Prime Minister in bringing the matter to the attention of the House said this:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I deem it my duty to call attention to an article which appeared yesterday in the Toronto 'Telegram,' in which direct reference was made to me. The article is a long one, and I need not read it all.

As a matter of fact, the right hon. gentleman read very little of it, and he did not read some of the most important parts. His speech continues as follows:

It will be sufficient to read the matter which has reference to my name. The article proceeds to say that on the 2nd of March this letter was addressed to me.

Then the right hon. gentleman quotes the letter, and one part of that letter quoted is as follows:

Recently evidence has come to me that one of your colleagues is a grafter and a boodler. I shall be in Ottawa for a few days, and am willing to submit the evidence to you as Tarte was willing to submit his evidence of the Langevin-McGreevy boodling to Sir John Macdonald. Should you see fit to take immediate action it would go no further. The alternative would be to place the document,

letters and photographs of cheques, &c., in the hands of the opposition.

After quoting that letter, the right hon. gentleman alludes to a letter which was written by his secretary at his direction under date 3rd March, 1911, in which the gentleman who had written this letter to him was informed that the Prime Minister would be in his office at ten o'clock on the following day, Saturday, March 4, and would be ready to see the gentleman who was preferring these charges. Then the right hon. gentleman refers to the interview, and he uses this language:

> The gentleman in question waited on me, as stated in the rest of the letter, several times. Without committing my memory as to the number of times, I know it was more than once, but the tenor of each conversation between us on these occasions was of the same nature. The gentleman in question, with whom I had in former years friendly relations, but with whom I have not been in communication for many years, called on me and gave me the name of one of my colleagues and said that he had lost the confidence of the party, particularly in his own province, that he was a boodler and a grafter, and for these reasons should go out of the government.

Then the right hon. gentleman goes on to state that he had no doubt as to the honesty of his colleague, who was not only a colleague but a personal friend, and that the person who had the interview with him would have to take such steps as he might think fit. To quote the exact language of the right hon. gentleman:

> My informant was free to take such steps as he pleased, to place the papers and documents in the hands of the opposition, and do anything he pleased with them. If my colleague were then proved to be dishonest, he would have to take the consequences, but if not, it was my duty to stand loyally by him. This is the gist of any conversation that took place between us.

The newspaper article to which the right hon. gentleman here alluded comprised nearly a full page of the Toronto 'Evening Telegram,' and purported to set forth the bank account of the Minister of the Interior and to show there that there had been deposited to his credit two sums of money, one on the 3rd of October, 1907, amounting to $50,000; the other on the 11th September, 1909, amounting to $19,350. The newspaper article to which the Prime Minister alluded, so far as I have been able to examine it, did not indicate any source from which these sums were supposed to have been derived, but this article did urge in a very insistent way that the source of these sums should be disclosed, and that an investigation should be held for that purpose. It now appears from a statement made by the Minister of the Interior in this House yesterday that he was the person to whom allusion had been made in the Toronto 'Telegram', and he based his remarks to some extent upon an article which had later appeared in the Toronto 'World', and the right hon. the Prime Minister, in reply to an inquiry from an hon. member on this side of the House, stated that the gentleman who had the interview with him which was alluded to by the Prime Minister on 28th April last, was Mr. McGillicuddy. The hon. the Minister of the Interior in his statement in reference to this matter yesterday did not allude to the article which was brought to the attention of the House by the right hon. gentleman but did allude to a despatch which appeared in the Toronto 'World' of the 28th ult., and which the Minister of the Interior set out in his remarks. There was no reference yesterday by either the Prime Minister or the Minister of the Interior to the article in the 'Evening Telegram' to which the right hon. gentleman had called attention on the previous Friday, nor was there any allusion to the charges or allegations set forth in the various interviews between the Prime Minister and Mr. McGillicuddy. Now, the Prime Minister has thought this newspaper article in the Toronto 'Telegram' worthy of being brought to the attention of the House, and the Minister of the Interior, referring not to that article but to another article which appeared in the Toronto 'World", has challenged a certain suggestion, or suspicion, as it has been called, which appeared in that newspaper; and the Prime Minister basing his action upon the statement in the House of the Minister of the Interior has asked for an inquiry which is absolutely restricted in its terms to the question as to whether the surmise or suspicion contained in the Toronto 'World' is a true or an untrue statement of the source of these moneys. Well, I think it must be apparent to the right hon. gentleman that if this matter is worthy of investigation, that is not the way to investigate it.

There is only one question properly before this House and this country in connection with the matter, and that is: Whether or not the source from which these moneys came was a clean and untainted source. You cannot possibly arrive at a conclusion with regard to that by the inquiry which the right hon. gentleman proposes. Let us assume that there are one hundred sources; and one can easily imagine one hundred sources from which that money may have been derived, and in respect of which the acceptance of that money would be regarded as improper or prejudicial to the public interest. What is the position which the right hon. gentleman takes? Instead of inquiring and investigating as to what the source of the money was, he takes one sur-

mise or suspicion in one newspaper, which probably knows no more about it than any other newspaper in the country, and he declares to this House: We can disprove that, and, therefore, we will investigate that charge. Well, Mr. Speaker, it does not seem to me that that is worthy either of the occasion or of the government or of the Minister of the Interior himself or of this parliament. If there is to be any investigation upon this question, let it be an investigation which will satisfy parliament, and the country that the Minister of the Interior is absolutely free from any charge or suspicion of unworthy motives or unworthy conduct in this matter. That can only be done by disclosing the source from which these sums of money came. It can be settled in five minutes before a committee of this House. If it came from the private resources of the Minister of the Interior, all he has to do is to go before that committee and show that. That will settle the matter for all time. But to go before a committee of this House and say, here is one source as to which an unworthy suspicion is cast, and it did not come from that source, while you leave open to conjecture fifty or a hundred other sources from which the money might have come, surely would not satisfy the conscience of this House, the conscience of the Minister of the Interior or the reasonable desire of the people of this country to have this mystery cleared up in so far as mystery is attached to it. In that connection I would like to say just one word as to some past investigations. I do not know whether the Prime Minister would regard it as a serious thing, an unjustifiable thing, that a conclusive inquiry of the kind I have suggested should be made. I may be told that it is not a right or proper thing to have the deposits of large sums of money to the credit of a minister of the Crown investigated. But I did not hear any very great complaint or any great murmuring from the right hon. gentleman or from any of his colleagues when the bank accounts of my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and other hon. gentlemen then members of this House were investigated by a Royal Commission which he himself appointed, the books of their bankers brought into court and exposed to the investigation of counsel, and the men themselves called before that commission to be cross-examined not only as to the source from which the moneys had come, but as to the disposition which they had made of those moneys, and that simply for the reason that a cross-examining counsel had some hint given to him that it might be a desirable thing to investigate those bank accounts; and as a matter of fact the investigation was made in more than one instance for reasons altogether out of the legitimate scope of the inquiry. What is the position the Prime Minister takes now? He proposes to select one possible source which he believes can be disproved, and to prevent any further inquiry or investigation into the source or origin of these moneys. Does my right hon. friend seriously think that he will be clearing up this matter or solving this mystery by taking any such course as that? I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, and I say this with all respect, that such an inquiry as the Prime Minister proposes would be a pure farce, and I would not advise any hon. gentleman on this side of the House to have any part in it. It is merely a piece of stage play, made not for the purpose of a real investigation, but for the purpose of disproving a suspicion or conjecture which the right hon. gentleman believes can be easily disproved, and without giving any opportunity whatever to investigate the real source and origin of these sums. Under these circumstances I think I am entirely justified in moving:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be omitted, and the following substituted therefor: A special committee of five members be appointed to inquire into and investigate the charges and allegations set forth and referred to in the statement of the Prime Minister made in this House on Friday, the 28th day of April last, and the charges and allegations set forth and deferred to in the statements of the Hon. Mr. Oliver, Minister of the Interior, and of the Prime Minister, made in this House on Tuesday, the 2nd day of May instant, and that the said committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, and examine witnesses on oath and affirmation and report from time to time.

I propose this motion in this way because I understand in view of the statement of the Prime Minister and the article which he brought to the attention of the House, that it will open up this whole matter for investigation by that committee. That was the intent and desire of the Prime Minister when he made his remarks in this House on the 28th of April last, if he had any real desire or intention of having this matter investigated. A motion of this nature, which is confined to statements made in this House, set forth in speeches of ministers of the Crown in this House, in respect of a matter as to which charges have been made against a minister of the Crown, surely cannot be objected to by any hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. It is quite true, it may bring in allegations and statements set forth in the Toronto 'Evening Telegram,' but that is due to the fact that the Prime Minister himself, having observed these statements, has seen fit to bring them to the attention of the House; and having been brought by him to the attention of the House, they are surely to be taken account of in any inves-

tigation which the right hon. gentleman proposes to make in respect of a matter which he himself was the first to introduce. Under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I feel it my duty to press this amendment in order that the scope of the proposed inquiry may not be restricted, but may be just as wide as the Prime Minister himself made it when he first spoke in this House on this matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I submit to the fairness of members of this House, that the amendment submitted by my hon. friend would not in any way meet the justice of the case and be fair to my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior. It is true that on Friday last I spoke on the matter, but in what respect? I quoted from an article published in the Toronto 'Evening Telegram' of the day before to the effect that a gentleman, with whom I had been formerly acquainted, had stated to me that he could bring charges against one of my colleagues, and the article seemed to take me to task because I had taken no steps to investigate that statement. Well, I drew the attention of the House to the matter simply to inform it that I had told the gentleman who called on me, that if he had any charges to make against my colleague, he should make them. I also called attention to the alternative given in the letter which had been addressed to me, namely, that Mr. Oliver—the gentleman in question—should go out of the cabinet and that would set the matter at rest, or otherwise it would be made public. I replied that I did not consider it my duty to take any notice of charges made in that way and that the gentleman who made them should go on and make them public. So far there was nothing but a general statement. In addressing the House I simply gave it the correspondence which had been placed in my hands. In that correspondence as published no charges were made against anybody by name, no charge was made against anybody in particular, no facts were given. But the following day another newspaper, the Toronto 'World,' made, not a charge, but an insinuation, against my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of the Interior, Mr. Oliver. That insinuation was to the effect that in the month of May, 1907, he had made a recommendation to council to substitute, for certain lands situated in Manitoba, which had been given as subsidies to a certain railway, certain other lands in the province of Saskatchewan, inferring, though not asserting, that the latter were of greater value than those originally given. This was a specific fact, it was something tangible, but there was no direct charge. Nobody took the responsibility of coming forward and making a charge. There was however, an insinuation based on certain facts set forth in that newspaper. My hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Oliver), might very well have waited. He might very well have said: 'Certain insinuations have been made against me and I am ready to meet an accusation if any be made.' He, however, did not wait for a charge but he said: There is an insinuation made in that newspaper against me and I challenge investigation.

Now, my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), says that the investigation asked for by my hon. friend and colleague, is restricted. But how much more could it be extended? What is there to investigate except this insinuation—not a direct charge at all—that certain lands were improperly substituted for others for the benefit of a certain railway company. It will not do for this House, or the other House, to investigate rumours floating in the air, things which are not tangible, which cannot be taken account of. The moment a specific fact was brought up, and an insinuation based upon it, my hon. friend and colleague said: I deny the insinuation and am prepared to show it is not true. What more could he do? If there is anybody in this House, or out of it, who will bring against my hon. friend and colleague, any specific accusation of any kind whatever, it will be the duty of my hon. friend and colleague to meet that, but here we have nothing of the kind. The article in the 'Telegram' is made up of vague insinuations. In the article of the Toronto 'World,' however, which was published the following day and which referred to this first article in the 'Telegram,' there was the specific fact I have just stated. My hon. friend then comes forward and says he is prepared to show there is no foundation for it.

But my hon. friend, the leader of the oposition (Mr. Borden), says there is something suspicious, there is the possibility that there was $50,000 given for other purposes. But when we have the statement that the $50,000 was given as a consideration for a certain order in council, is it not right and proper that this allegation should be investigated, and that this is the very thing which should be looked into? I submit to the fairness of my hon. friend and everybody else, that my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Oliver), has taken the only course he could. He did not wait for a charge, but the moment there was an insinuation which could be reached, he asked for the opportunity to show that it had no foundation.

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden), has said that we had no consideration for the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster).

I did not want to bring the name of that hon. gentleman into this matter. A commission was appointed in his case, that commission did its duty according to its lights, and that has nothing to do with this matter. If any one has any charges to make against my colleague, outside of this House or in it, of course it will be the duty of my hon. friend and colleague to meet them.

My hon. friend (Mr. Borden), said a moment ago that the money might have come from a thousand different sources. Certainly it might. But are you going to fish to find out those sources? Is that what my hon. friends would call justice?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If any one has any charge to make regarding the source from which this money has been paid, it is for him to come forward and make a charge. But my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), wants my hon. friend and colleague (Mr. Oliver), to prove a negative, to show that he did not get the money from this source or another.

Mr. BORDEN. I did not say that.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Of course not, but that is what my hon. friend's motion means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am sure my right hon. friend has no desire to misquote me. What I said was that the whole question could be cleared up by proving the source from which the money did come.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is a specific charge that this money came from a certain source.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What is the use of saying 'no'? You have the statement in the Toronto 'World.' If the money came from any other source, it would be for the parties claiming that it did, to come forward and make a charge. But my hon. friend's motion asks us to do a thing which is unheard of in parliamentary justice or in any court of law, namely, to force a man to prove his own innocence. My hon. friend wants the Minister of the Interior to go into the box and prove that he is innocent. Well, the rule of law is that the guilt of a man must be proved and not his innocence. That is the basic principle of British justice, and that is the principle on which I rely when I ask that this amendment be not accepted.

Hon. GEO. E. FOSTER (North Toronto). Mr. Speaker, it strikes me that the Prime Minister in his desire to play up quickly and efficiently to the Minister of the Interior has not sufficiently looked at the article in the 'World' or if he has, I think his statement to-day has gone a little beyond what that article would carry it. If I understood the right hon. gentleman correctly, he has made an argument upon what he says was a direct allegation made in the 'World' that the moneys in question came from a certain source. That article reads:

> Ottawa, April 27 (Special).—The sensational charges made by a Toronto newspaper against one of the ministers of the federal government at Ottawa was no surprise here. The facts of the case have been pretty well known for some time, and it is expected that the matter will come up in parliament at an early date.
>
> It is understood that Hon. Frank Oliver is the minister against whom the charge is made. The story at Ottawa is that Mr. Oliver had an order in council passed on May 8, 1907, giving the Canadian Northern railway the power to select in Saskatchewan the whole of the land granted by the government to the Manitoba and Southeastern, which is the Canadian Northern in Manitoba, in 1890, in all 600,000 acres. In 1907, there were no lands left in Manitoba, it was alleged, and the company was given the right to select its lands in Saskatchewan.

That statement stands by itself, and is complete as far as that transaction is concerned. Then follows another statement:

> In the same year, $50,000 was deposited from the Manhattan Bank of New York to the Imperial Bank at Edmonton in the name of Mr. Oliver. The exact date was October 3, 1907. About one year later, just before the general election of 1908, the sum of $19,000 was deposited from the Manhattan Bank in the name of Mr. Oliver at the Imperial Bank at Edmonton. It is known that he chequed out this money for campaign purposes.

That is the other statement. Where does the Prime Minister get his authority for stating that the Toronto 'World' specifically stated that the money which went into the bank at Edmonton to the credit of the minister was paid to him or into that bank for him by the Canadian Northern railway?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER Hear, hear.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the Prime Minister say whether or not such a statement is made there? He knows it is not. My right hon. friend smiles over this because he is thinking in the back of his head: Well, there are two items placed together so that if anybody wishes to he can infer that what the Toronto 'World' meant was that there probably, if you dug into it, you might find the source from which the money came. But that is not a direct allegation. Two statements are made and persons reading the statements may take a certain inference from their being

so placed. But there is a difference between an inference and a direct allegation. My right hon. friend would perhaps have been perfectly right in stating that the two statements were so deftly placed, side by side, that it might lead any one to infer that the money came from the Canadian Northern to the credit of the minister. I would not have found any fault with that statement of the case, but when he tries to make this House or the country believe that the Toronto 'World' made a specific statement, made an allegation that Mr. Oliver received his money from the Canadian Northern railway out of that transaction, he is undertaking a task which he cannot perform in this House, or in the country. No such allegation was made by the 'World.' The minister had to do that in order to find a basis for demanding a committee of inquiry.

With reference to this whole matter the Prime Minister has to-day not gone very lengthily, or very fully into the case but he has made certain statements. He says that the amendment which is moved by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition would not be fair to the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). What does the amendment call for? It calls for an investigation into the basic facts which were brought out by the Prime Minister himself, and made a public question by the Prime Minister on April 28. This question would not have been before the House as a public matter as it is to-day if it had not been for the action of the Prime Minister himself. The Prime Minister bases his action, so he told this House, on an article which appeared in the 'Telegram' the day preceding, if I remember aright, on April 27. The Prime Minister told this House that having seen and read that article and found what was stated in it, he deemed it of so much importance that he considered it was no longer in the category of a private, or personal matter and he brought it to the attention of this House in order to make his own position fair and clear before the House. How did he make his own position clear? He endeavoured to do so by referring to another gentleman who had nothing to do with the 'Telegram,' and to other information which did not come through the 'Telegram' to him at all, but had come through conversations which took place between Mr. Gillicuddy and himself, conferences more than one, from letters which passed between Mr. McGillicuddy and himself, and from absolute specific charges which were made by McGillicuddy to the Prime Minister himself with reference to the Minister of the Interior. Is not that where the right hon gentleman got his information? Is that not the information on which he based his statement in the House on Friday last? Then why does he need to look to the Toronto 'World' which commented upon certain matters of which the Prime Minister had absolute knowledge from six or seven conferences that he himself had with the man who made the charges? I say then that the basic charge, the only charge in which this House is interested, the only charge in which the country is interested, is the charge made by Mr. Daniel McGillicuddy to the Prime Minister himself, and that charge was that the Prime Minister had a minister in his cabinet who was a grafter and a boodler, and that he had the evidence with him to prove that he was a grafter and a boodler, and he offered that evidence to the Prime Minister as a friend, and a Liberal, and a beneficiary of old times.

Will the Prime Minister deny that? What are the facts, then, that Mr. McGillicuddy laid before the Prime Minister? The facts were admitted by the Prime Minister himself, and the Prime Minister's answer to the specific charges was given before the House. What was the evidence that Mr. McGillicuddy laid before my right hon. friend? Did my right hon. friend, as the keeper of the conscience of his government and the honour of the public men surrounding him, men in whom this country is interested as well, did the Prime Minister look into, investigate and weigh that evidence? Will he say that he did? Or did he refuse to look at that evidence, and spend his time in an endeavour to switch off Mr. McGillicuddy from pursuing a course that he, as a friend of the party, thought it was his duty to pursue in order to cleanse the cabinet of which he was a supporter. Will the right hon. gentleman tell this House now whether he refused or not to look into the evidence which was given by Mr. McGillicuddy, which he had in his hand? Will he say so? I take it from what he said that he refused to look into that evidence. His statement to this House bears me out in coming to that conclusion. He stood on his dignity. His statement to the House is: I told Mr. McGillicuddy that I would not look into the matter, that I would not investigate the matter, that I would not give him a decision on the matter. Why? Because Mr. McGillicuddy said to me: Sir Wilfrid, here are my charges; Sir Wilfrid, here are my proofs. I want you to take these charges and see whether these proofs substantiate them. If they do, I want you to purge your cabinet of the minister against whom I make the charges, and if you do that it will remain a family matter. You and I are both Liberals. I have supported you for many a long year, I have written for you. You have supported me in a way, I was a beneficiary of yours

for a time and enjoyed your confidence as a friend of the party, and as such I put this up to you. I say to you now: Investigate this and do your duty, as I consider you ought to do it in this matter. If my proofs are correct and sufficient, then I want you to do your duty by the party. If you do not, I must take them elsewhere, for I am not going to stop with your refusal. That is where my right hon. friend parted company with Mr. McGillicuddy, that is where he showed his keen sense of his duty to the public and the country. Got a little huff on him, stood on his dignity, and shook his fist in the face of Mr. McGillicuddy, and said: Aha, you threaten me, do you, that if I do not take this matter up and look into it you will go to the leader of the opposition? That separates you from me. I will not allow my dignity to be infringed upon in that way. You should have crouched to me, Mr. McGillicuddy; you should have said to me: I your most humble and obedient servant, beg you to look into those things, give your judgment upon them, and then, whatever you tell me to do, I your obedient servant will do. Be sure that it will never go out from the room in which we two are talking about it now. That would have pleased my right hon. friend. Mr. McGillicuddy is a man with a conscience, I suppose, with a history, with a purpose. His own record is one as a Liberal through and through. Having got hold of what he thought was a case of malfeasance in office, having the proofs by which he believed he could substantiate that, he came to his own Prime Minister and asked his Prime Minister to look into it. My belief is that the Prime Minister refused to look into the evidence altogether, and his statement to the House goes to prove it. He told the House the reason why he and Mr. McGillicuddy parted company: I could not stand his putting it up to me in this way; you look into it and it will go no further, but if you do not, I shall have to take it further. I ask my right hon. friend if he will put himself in the place of Mr. McGillicuddy. Suppose we argue it out in this way, that the Prime Minister was in Mr. McGillicuddy's place, that he was in possession of this information, that he had these proofs, that he was an honest man, as we will suppose that the Prime Minister is; and the Prime Minister standing in that position, with these facts and the proof behind him, goes to the man in power and says: In the interest of public life and the purity of public life, I put these things before you as a friend, and I ask you to act upon them. See if the proofs are sufficient to substantiate my charges, and if they are, do your duty. If you refuse I must go further. Will my right hon. friend imagine himself in that position, and then if the man to whom he applies says to him: Well, Sir, I will not treat with you on that ground at all. You tell me that if I do not look into these things you will take them to some one else. If that is your position I refuse to do anything. Would he not, if honest, be bound to say: But I am a man with a public duty, and I refuse to be balked because you decline to look into these things, and investigate them and do what I think is your duty. Would not my right hon. friend be doing his duty if he did that? The simple question I ask my hon. friend is this: Does he believe that Mr. McGillicuddy, not being able to get the Prime Minister to make the investigation, should not persist in going on and getting somebody else to bring force enough to have the investigation made? I do not think my right hon. friend can hold otherwise. The basic fact then is the charge that was made by Mr. McGillicuddy.

Now, what happens? It is extremely farcical, it seems to me. The Minister of the Interior sits tight. I do not blame my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior in sitting tight if he thinks that is the best way to do. The Minister of the Interior, as he sits there, is not a man proved guilty of anything, he sits there perfectly innocent, so far as any proof that is before this House or this country is concerned. He has a perfect right to maintain his innocence and to maintain his position by all the means in his power. But the Minister of the Interior must recollect that he is not a private person. The investigation which was brought by the Prime Minister himself is not an investigation into the private business of the Minister of the Interior. We are simply pressing for a fuller investigation, which will not be abortive but effective, in a matter which the Prime Minister himself brought up because he considered it to be of public importance.

Now, the Minister of the Interior, besides being a man, is a public officer of this country, and the gist of the charges is that the Minister of the Interior had a bank account in which large sums appeared to his credit in two separate amounts, and that these moneys, according to the man who makes the charge, were not properly obtained, and were not properly paid out. That is the charge. There is no other before this House. The Minister of the Interior can dispose of this matter in five minutes if he chooses. We have to take facts as they appear and circumstances as we know them. Few cabinet ministers are rich men; at least, they are not when they start in as cabinet ministers. There have been some exceptions, which, I hope proves the rule, where cabinet ministers have started in most mighty poor, and have come out most mighty rich. Well, as

a rule, then, we will say that a cabinet minister generally starts in poor and if he remains honest he generally comes out about as poor, or a good deal poorer, than he started in. The Minister of the Interior is a man like the rest of us, and I do not think lays claim to any great wealth. I do not think he did when he came in as a minister, and I do not believe that he would now. When a bank account is portrayed to the members of this House, and to the people of this country in which a poor cabinet minister gets a deposit of $70,000 in two sums, it makes people think; that is all. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will not object to people thinking if the matter is made public. He himself would think if it occurred in the case of another, and he would say: Where under heaven did that man—that poor cabinet minister get a $70,000 deposit to his credit? That would be the natural question which would come to men's minds. He is engaged in politics, he is fighting battles, battles are fought by various weapons; was this one of the weapons with which political battles were fought? Was that a contribution for political purposes put at the minister's credit, where did the money come from, and did he check it out for political purposes? If he did he is amenable to public opinion as a minister in the cabinet taking in large sums of money, putting them to his credit, and using them to fight political battles which is to debauch the electorate. So that, if there was no personal dishonesty at all, if it comes out, or is the fact, that the minister's bank account show these large sums improperly obtained as political contributions, and that he then checks them out in the way of political payments, he is amenable to the Prime Minister, he is amenable to this House, and he is amenable to the country as well.

I said that the minister could settle this in five minutes. He could inform this House in what business he was engaged which brought him in, on these two dates, payments of $50,000, and of $20,000. If he did so it would clarify the position. If that $70,000 was business profits would not the Minister of the Interior settle this whole question and allay all suspicion by immediately rising in the House, and giving the details of the business which brought in these large deposits? Then he can go on and give the details of the checking out in the course of his business. That would settle the matter very largely; that would clarify it. The Minister of the Interior is his own judge as to whether he will take that course, or not. He does not choose to take that course. What course did he take? I am free to say that he took a course which I do not think helps his position before the House, or the country. He really does this, when you bring it down to plain English; he forages around, finds a paper which comments upon the basic charges made by Mr. McGillicuddy to the Prime Minister, and partly brought out in the 'Telegram' article, he finds in one of the newspapers a comment which seems to him to be heaven-sent, two statements side by side without an insinuation, the minister manufactures an insinuation, treats that as a charge, and then asks this House to appoint a committee to investigate his own charge based upon an insinuation. That is all he does. If the minister had said: I received that $70,000 in the way of honest transactions, I deny that there was anything dishonest in it, I am a public man, and this is now a public matter, I invite this House to appoint a committee which shall investigate that, and I will put my bank books, and my cheque books before the committee, it would settle this question in short order. He does not do that. It is as if there is a charge made against a man, and the man against whom the charge is made, not wishing to face it, looks around and says: No, this charge does not suit me at all, and that other charge does not suit me, but here is one that I make myself, and that I would like you to investigate. If every man who had charges against him in the courts or otherwise had latitude allowed him to do that same thing almost anybody could make a very plausible, and good defence.

The Prime Minister leaped to the occasion, and he had his resolution ready to empower a committee to investigate—what?—to investigate a charge that the minister himself made in reference to himself, on two parallel passages, stating what were the facts, but making no insinuations as to what the facts led to, and making no allegations of any kind at all. I think that what ought to be done, if anything is done, and the least that can be done, is to investigate the charges which were made by Mr. McGillicuddy. If the minister will not clear the matter up himself, as he could do in very short order, then let a committee be struck, and let it have the scope to determine whether or not the facts which Mr. McGillicuddy alleges in his charge, and which the Prime Minister thoroughly knows, are well founded, to investigate that to the extent at least of the payments, and deposits in the bank account which evidently form the basis of Mr. McGillicuddy's charges, and which is of the essence of the 'Telegram's' article, and charges so far as they are preferred by the 'Telegram' in that respect.

For, let it be thoroughly understood that the 'Telegram' made no statement with reference to the order in council granting the choice of selecting these lands to the

Canadian Northern Railway Company. What the 'Telegram' said is this:

There are theories as to the origin and significance of the deposits of $69,340 on the credit side of the bank account. These theories cannot be tried out in these columns, or in the proceedings that might follow the disclosure of names and identities.

This journal has tried to stick to the facts and leave theories to the parliamentary tribunals that can test such theories. The truth or falsity of the charges which warring Liberals urge against a cabinet minister of their own political faith was tried by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and decided in favour of the cabinet minister. The facts and issue of that trial are matters of public interest. Every minister of the Crown should be prepared to have the origin of his bank deposits shouted from the housetops.

Publicity is the great cure for the ills of public life in Canada, and facts that were forced upon the attention of this journal could not be suppressed without making the 'Telegram' a party to the conspiracy of silence that clothes in the robes of secrecy proceedings that should be fought out and controversies that should be decided in a blaze of publicity.

So that Mr. Speaker, the Toronto 'Telegram' itself was absolutely silent as to the source from which the money came. It exposed the photograph; its letter-press work brought out certain other incidents, and made reference to certain other facts, but the 'Telegram' absolutely said nothing with reference to the order in council, or any other possible source of the money which was deposited to the credit of the minister in the bank account. I, therefore, think that the Prime Minister has not been well advised when he attempts to limit the scope of the investigation to something outside of the 'Telegram' article, and outside of Mr. McGillicuddy's charges, and bases it upon a chance guess; not even a chance guess, but bases it upon two statements of fact made by the Toronto 'World' without any allegation direct or specific that there was a connection between the facts, allowing it to the minister to infer that there is such an insinuation, and such a connection. It seemed to me that the Minister of the Interior has been badly advised in endeavouring to cut out and shut away the real charges and to base his effort at exoneration upon something which was not included in Mr. McGillicuddy's charges so far as we know, and was not included in the Toronto 'Telegram' article. One single word at the end—I am not here as a member of parliament to say that the Minister of the Interior is guilty of any wrong-doing in this matter. I am not here to say so. I would not say so. I am here to state another thing; that I will be glad if the Minister of the Interior shows himself to be absolutely clear in this matter. I have been long enough in public life, and I have had enough iron driven into my soul to know that it is not pleasant for a man's reputation to be put in stake and wrongfully be tried out, and I hope that every man in public life who has any charge brought against him will be able to substantiate the falsity of that charge. I have never had a charge brought against me as to my public life; never once. I believe that I can stand any charge that any man whose face is above clay can make against me in that respect. I have had charges made against my private life, and my private business, and in my opinion very unwarranted ones, and ones which were very unwarrantedly prosecuted; and, there are men in this House that went beyond what any decent Christian should. But, trying to be a decent Christian myself, I have no hard feelings against any man in this House, not one. My character will stand for what it is worth, and what God knows it to be, and for no more and no less. Therefore, I say that I will be glad if the Minister of the Interior shows that this whole thing is a tissue of falsehoods, and has no foundation in fact. But as a friend I would advise him to take hold of this matter frankly, and to lay before this House and the country, or a committee if he chooses, every transaction in that bank account of his. If the business is honest he can afford to do it; if he does not do it, I fear that many men will have a suspicion that he does not do it because he is not able to do it, and that I should be sorry to believe.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I wish to offer a very few remarks to this House in regard to this matter so unpleasant to me. My view of the important features of the matter differs materially from the view expressed by my hon. friend (Mr. Foster). It appears to me, Mr. Speaker, that the question which is of interest to the House and of interest to the country is the question as to how those who are charged with the responsibility of administration in this government discharge that responsibility; whether honestly or dishonestly, fairly or unfairly, in the interest of the public or not in the interest of the public. As to what private transactions any person may have it is quite true that when an improper connection is established between these private transactions and public responsibility then the public have an interest and a serious interest, but as long as private transactions are private transactions, as long as they are not connected with public responsibilities, I submit Mr. Speaker, that however, public curiosity may be aroused, however, public interest may be inflamed from other causes or in other ways,

these matters are not in any degree in the same class or entitled to the same consideration as the discharge of public responsibilities. In regard to my action, I do not wish the House or the country to understand that I am in any way trying to shirk investigation into any administrative act of mine. The article read by the Prime Minister from the Toronto 'Telegram' did not allude to me specifically, that is to say my name was not mentioned, and there is no evidence in that article that I could put before the House or before the country that there was an allusion to me. Therefore, it was not for me to act. There was an allusion in the article to the Prime Minister, and it was for the Prime Minister to take his own course in regard to that. But when the Toronto 'World' came out specifically mentioning my name and specifically connecting me with an act of administration, which although it did not specifically charge that that act of administration was connected with certain private transactions, still, as my hon. friend will admit, conveyed an insinuation. Now, it is true that I might have been satisfied with denying the insinuation or with saying nothing about it. But I do not know that that would be fair to the House or to the country or to my friends. There was an insinuation, and a serious insinuation, which related to an important administrative act for which I was primarily responsible, and I think it is only right that the country should know and have the earliest opportunity of knowing, what foundation there was for that insinuation. In regard to that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition has suggested—he has been unkind enough to suggest—that the money which was deposited to my credit might have come from a thousand different sources. He was perfectly correct in that. I want to say to the House, what is within the knowledge of the members on both sides, that the transactions of the Interior Department during the six years that I have been at its head have been necessarily of such a character as to make possible the securing of contributions from day to day of large or small amounts. Everybody knows that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to interrupt the minister for a moment. In the first place, I did not say a thousand. In the second place, I used the word 'hundred' without the slightest idea of making any insinuation or suggestion, but merely by way of argument. I do not want the minister to be under any misapprehension as to that. I was merely saying that if you select one particular source, you do not clear the whole matter up. I did not wish to make any insinuation or suggestion whatever as to matters of fact. It was using that argument only in the way of an illustration.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to press the point. I was only using it as an argument, too.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I was making no insinuation.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to make any suggestion of that kind, but such a view might be drawn from the hon. gentleman's remarks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I did not intend it.

Mr. OLIVER. I very much appreciate the consideration of the hon. leader of the opposition in making that statement. But what I want to say is this. I have been at the head of the Interior Department for the last six years, and in that time there have been from day to day administrative acts involving values of large and small amounts which might be laid under contribution for political purposes or for any other purpose either private or political. Now, I want to say, so far as I am concerned, that, although the motion before the House has reference to a specific case, the only case with which my name has been specifically connected, I court inquiry, and the fullest inquiry, by parliamentary committee or otherwise, into any administrative act of mine of all the thousands that have taken place, and of all the millions of dollars of value that they have involved. I say I court the fullest inquiry into any of all those thousands of acts, in the House or in the committee or anywhere else; and I want the House distinctly to understand that as far as I am concerned, there is no restriction to the particular charge mentioned, because it was the only specific case in which my name was mentioned.

Now, my hon. friend said that I might clear the whole matter up as to my bank account by a simple statement as to the source from which this money came, and the direction to which it was diverted. I have no doubt that is a fact, that I could take that action, and could clear this whole matter up. But I conceive my duty to be this: I do not think it is in the interest of Canada, I do not think it is in the interest of the public life of Canada, that upon an insinuation based upon theft, and put forward as blackmail, a man in public or private life in Canada should be compelled to expose his private business. I do not think that it would add to the dignity of parliament or to the standing of public life in Canada to say that parliament should be the assistant of thugs and blackmailers by requiring the exposure of a bank account on such a

statement as has been put before the public. The committee which has been asked for will have every opportunity to establish any connection that can be established between my bank account and that transaction or any other transaction that may be brought forward in a similar way. But I say I do not think that it would be right or wise or that it would tend to the dignity of parliament, to the standing of public life or to the good of the country, that, because a thug or a blackmailer should make a statement in regard to a man's private bank account, thereupon the authority of parliament should be invoked to expose that bank account to the public, no matter what the consequence might be to the man involved or no matter who might be affected by it. My hon. friend says that I am in public life and I cannot dissociate my personality from my position. That is true; but at the same time I have a responsibility to the public in regard to my public position that I have not in regard to my private transactions. So far as that is concerned, I am absolutely in the hands of parliament, and I ask for an investigation of any public account for which I am responsible to parliament and the country, which affects the welfare and the rights of the country; and I do not make the exposure which my hon. friend suggests for the purpose of clearing up my bank account, for the reason I have stated, that I do not think the public interest, the public welfare or the standing of the public men of Canada would be benefited by my doing so.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). Mr. Speaker, I would not have said anything on this matter but for the fact that I do not think the original motion exactly covers the ground in the information that was given to the House in the first place by the Prime Minister. What was the Prime Minister's statement to the House in regard to this case? He did not give names, but he said:

I deem it my duty to call attention to an article which appeared yesterday in the Toronto 'Telegram,' in which direct reference was made to me. The article is a long one, and I need not read it all. It will be sufficient to read the matter which has reference to my name. The article proceeds to say that on the 2nd of March this letter was addressed to me:

My Dear Sir Wilfrid,—I see that you are having troubles of your own by the defection of the 'young Napoleon' on the trade question and in other ways.

The other ways are the more serious. Only in one instance in the history of Canada has the trade question played a part in making or unmaking governments, and that was in 1878. Neither your government nor any other government will fall except from weakness on the inside. That was what happened to the Tories in 1896. Ministers of the cabinet had become corrupt, and the McGreevy-Langevin scandal, aided by the Manitoba School Bill and cabinet crookedness did the rest.

Then the writer gives information that is of interest to the House to-day:

Recently evidence has come to me that one of your colleagues is a grafter and a boodler. I shall be in Ottawa for a few days, and am willing to submit the evidence to you.

That was the allegation, namely, that one of the Prime Minister's colleagues was a grafter and a boodler. No doubt the writer of that letter told the right hon. gentleman who that colleague was. He also said that he would be in Ottawa in a few days and was prepared to submit the evidence. The writer proceeded to say that should the Prime Minister take immediate action, he would go no further, but in the event of the right hon. gentleman failing to do so, he would place the documents, letters, photographs of cheques, &c., in the hands of the opposition. He thus declared that he had the evidence in his possession. But what did the right hon. the Prime Minister say in his winding up? He said:

This is the position I take, and I leave that position in the hands of parliament and the country.

He thus handed the matter over to parliament and the country and did nothing himself. But on account of another article following that one, which appeared in the Toronto 'World,' the right hon. gentleman took this matter up again, and in pursuance of the article and a statement made by the Minister of the Interior, he proposed that a commission should be appointed to inquire into the allegation contained in the Toronto 'World'—not into the allegations made by this friend of his in that letter which the right hon. gentleman read to this House. The only allegations he deemed it necessary to have the commission inquire into were those published in the Toronto 'World.' But what were the allegations in the letter sent to the Prime Minister and which he read to the House? One of them was that the right hon. gentleman had a colleague who was a grafter and a boodler, and had improperly become possessed of certain moneys which were placed to his credit in the bank, and that certain portions of these moneys were disbursed for improper purposes, and the party who made these allegations said he had the documents to prove them. It seems to me, therefore, that if we appoint a commission of inquiry, that inquiry should be extended to cover these allegations. The right hon. gentleman knows the party who gave him

the information, but he did not disclose his name to the House when he said he handed over the whole matter to parliament to deal with. In my opinion the commission of inquiry which we are asked to appoint should be instructed to ascertain whether these allegations are based on fact or otherwise, and should call on the individual who made them to submit those documents, letters, photographs, &c., and other evidence, and let parliament satisfy itself as to the truth of these charges. But if the right hon. the Prime Minister confines the scope of that inquiry to what is contained in another paper which was not before the House at that time at all, he will not satisfy the country that he has done his full duty.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). The question before the House narrows itself into limits that are certainly not of any great breadth. The question is simply as between the motion and the amendment and as to the form in which this matter ought to go to a committee of inquiry. It is to be borne in mind that this committee of inquiry has been asked for by the member of this House who is, so far as personal considerations go, particularly concerned. He has been for the last few days the object of continuous attention on the part of some of the newspapers of this country, and the course he ought to take has necessarily been a question with him to decide. I would ask any one to consider what course he himself would have taken if he had been placed as a public man, in the position in which my hon. friend and colleague, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), found himself, when the article was published in the Toronto 'Telegram.' I read that article with some care, and without taking up time to go into detail, I may say that the general impression which it leaves on the mind of the reader—at any rate of a reader without any previous knowledge of the circumstances—is that the writer is purporting to give an account of some investigation or proceedings which have recently, according to his statement, taken place before the Prime Minister in respect to one of the members of his cabinet. In the article no name is mentioned. It could not be said who was hinted at or whose bank account it purported to give. Apart altogether from the fact that no one was in any way specifically attacked, there is, from first to last, no specific charge in it. There is just the general reference to which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), has referred, namely, that the Prime Minister was waited upon by a political friend—name not given—and told that one of the members of his cabinet was a grafter and a boodler.

I ask hon. gentlemen to pause and think, in a spirit of fairness to the man who is now marked out as the one aimed at in that article, how could any one meet such a charge. Would any one suggest that it should be referred to a committee of this House or any tribunal to investigate in order to determine whether or not any individual person was a grafter or a boodler?

If a man writes of another that that other is a thief, then that other person has redress by an action of libel, because there is something specific. But if a man in conversation, or even in writing, limits himself to some vague, unspecified term, which has no recognized meaning in legal terminology, although it may have a perfectly well understood meaning in every day parlance, the position of the man assailed is very different indeed. It may be that it would be libellous, and that it would be the foundation of a civil action for damages, if any newspaper specifically charged a person with being a boodler or a grafter. I do not doubt that under certain circumstances, and if there were facts surrounding the general charge which tended to make it a little more specific, the language would be actionable, but the question was upon the appearance of that article in the 'Telegram' whether or not the Minister of the Interior could, assuming he was the person intended to be referred to, maintain an action for libel against the proprietors of that newspaper with the slightest hope of success. I cannot undertake to say whether or not the publishers of that paper took the precaution to have the manuscript of that article revised by counsel before it appeared, but I cannot help saying, speaking with some experience as a lawyer, that that impression was left on my mind after reading it, for nothing more carefully guarded, more evidently designed to convey an impression without stating it, more plainly intended to be used not merely for political effect, but for the purpose of stabbing an opponent in the dark, and behind the back, without the writer, or the publisher incurring any responsibility for what he did, I can scarcely imagine. It was not many days, not many hours, before the allusions of the article were pointed by the appearance in a contemporary newspaper of something a little more specific. Possibly that was not necessary; it may be that there were rumours and hints in the air, passing from mouth to mouth, and from lip to lip, to enable the average reader of the 'Telegram' article or at least the readers of it who live or are temporarily in this city, to understand who was meant by what was said. But whether or not that is the case it was a very short time before another article appeared which was a little more specific, and which mentioned the

name of the person who was meant by the previous article. When that article appeared, I ask gentlemen to pause, and think again, what course the Minister of the Interior could take in regard to it. Was it actionable? Could he, with any hope of maintaining it, bring an action of libel against the publishers of the Toronto 'World'? The article of the 'World' is upon the pages of 'Hansard'; it may be looked at by any one interested, and if it is examined it will be seen that again while there is innuendo and insinuation by the way in which sentences are put together, there is no specific allegation of any wrong-doing; there are simply statements of fact which probably are perfectly true, and it is only by the collocation of them in the manner in which the writer has placed them that any injurious meaning is conveyed by the article in question. The Minister of the Interior, so far as he has redress by legal proceeding in any court, was left as perfectly helpless, notwithstanding the statements in the Toronto 'World' in which his name was used, as he was when the original article appeared in the 'Telegram.'

The only remedy to be thought of for a public man in such a position, was to demand his right that there should be an inquiry into this matter at the hands of a committee of this House. That course the hon. gentleman has promptly taken. The only point of difference at this stage of the matter that I am able to understand is as to the terms of the reference to the committee. Every member, I presume, is agreed in thinking that, after what has happened, a committee ought to be appointed with power to take evidence under oath and to investigate this thing. The question is what should be referred to that committee. I fully concede the handsome spirit in which this matter has been treated to-day by hon. gentlemen opposite so far as I have been able to follow their observations. I am well assured in my own mind that no one in this House, no matter how strong his political feeling may be, desires to pry into a man's private affairs unnecessarily. It is not a matter of individual curiosity, it is not a matter of one of ourselves satisfying his own mind on this subject, but it is a matter of exposing private business affairs to the public knowledge. The 'Telegram' newspaper has purported to publish as its evidence of these transactions what is called a photograph of something, a photograph of the evidence. It has been stated in other newspapers since that photograph appeared that it is not a photograph of the bank account of the Minister of the Interior at the Bank at Edmonton. I have seen the statement that the head officer of the Imperial Bank has so declared, and I think there is certain evidence of that kind upon this photograph of the document. It will be noticed at any rate if any one examines the photograph of the document that the date of that $19,000 transaction is said to be 1909, and notwithstanding the statement, or the appearance on the photograph of the figures 1909 as being the date of that transaction, the whole point of the matter in the various newspapers, so far as that transaction is concerned, has been that it was money used in the general elections of 1908. I think that circumstance demonstrates that the photograph is probably, while a true photograph, not the photograph of an authentic document, and I think that the probabilities will corroborate the statement attributed to the cashier of the bank that this is not a photograph of a bank account. It does not look on the face of it like the work which would appear on a ledger page of a bank, and my theory is in that regard that certainly the bank or any official of the bank would never make public unnecessarily the business of one of its customers. My supposition is that some one has surreptitiously stolen a copy of the account, in other words has sought to make a copy of some ledger account appearing in the books of the bank at Edmonton, and has not copied correctly.

The photograph, of course, does not lie, but the document which has been photographed I feel no doubt is not any page of any ledger of a bank. That, however, is a matter of detail into which I did not intend to digress. I want to say merely this: This account, while it is a private account of the Minister of the Interior, is not his private account in the ordinary sense of the word. It is an account in trust, he is trustee for other persons unnamed and unknown. Is it a matter of mystery that, in connection with some trust estate, a large payment may be made, or large disbursements paid out? It is not at any rate an unusual thing in the handling of many trust accounts. This circumstance, perhaps, increases the difficulty of the position in which the Minister of the Interior finds himself. He is obliged, in a sense, to formulate the charge. He comes before the House and he says to the House: The only specific thing which is here is the collocation of these circumstances in the articles which appeared in the Toronto 'World' by which the ground appears to be laid for an inference or a supposition that the two things are connected, and that I got this money for something connected with the administration of my department; that because 600,000 acres of land was given in Saskatchewan instead of Manitoba to the Canadian Northern railway, and because that was done upon my recommendation as Minister of the Interior, then this

$50,000 which came to my account four months afterwards was connected with it and was the result of it. It is perfectly true that he puts those two things together. That is only doing what the mind, perhaps, of every reader would have done the moment his eye ran over the article. It is perfectly true that no man in this House has made any such suggestion. But I ask hon. gentlemen to consider what was the Minister of the Interior to do. Has he not, in putting those two things together in the statement which he made to this House yesterday, stated as fairly as words can state it, the gist of what is insinuated or suggested by the article in the 'World' newspaper? If he has not, if any one has any suggestion of omission or variation in that regard, I am perfectly sure, from what I know of my hon. friend, that it is one he would be very willing to receive. That is the only thing in the nature of a specific charge which has appeared in any way before this House, or anywhere, from first to last, in connection with this matter, and accordingly that is incorporated in the terms of the resolution proposed by the First Minister.

Now, it is the first right of any person who is accused that he should know something specifically of what it is he has to answer. More than that, it is the first right surely of the committee of investigation that it should have, with some reasonable accuracy defined before it that which it has to inquire into. In this case the question for consideration now is properly, as it has been put by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, whether a specific thing, which is the only thing specific that can be framed or deduced from the newspaper articles which have appeared, should be the subject of investigation, or whether the matter should go at large pitchforked before a committee of this House, for that committee to inquire whether or not the hon. gentleman is a grafter or a boodler. I think that position only has to be stated to show its unfairness. No one in this House is making any charge, or is desirous of so doing, so far as I understand; no one outside the House is doing so. In those circumstances, can there be any doubt as to the course which this House ought to take in referring this matter to the committee?

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the Minister of Justice regard the charge in the letter read to the House by the First Minister, as a specific charge in connection with which Mr. McGillicuddy said he had the documents and letters and photographs to prove it?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I may say that the charge is not in any way a specific

charge made before this House, upon the responsibility of Mr. McGillicuddy, even, leaving out of consideration altogether the fact that he is an entire outsider so far as this House is concerned. No member of this House would take the responsibility of repeating that charge. It is in fact nothing more than the general charge which I have referred to, that this man is a grafter and a boodler, and unworthy of a position in the cabinet.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). If the House is to take the Minister of the Interior at his word, and we are bound to do so, I cannot understand why so much concern should be exercised by other hon. members of the government to prevent the inquiry which the hon. the Minister of the Interior says he is perfectly willing should take place. There is an inconsistency there which it seems to me calls for some specific answer on the part of the Minister of the Interior. If I understand the Minister of the Interior correctly, he said that he courted the fullest inquiry into any public act of his during the six years that he had occupied the position of Minister of the Interior. This charge that has been made, as I understand it, is a charge against the Minister of the Interior in his public capacity, and not a charge against him as a private individual at all. Now the Minister of Justice, in his remarks he made upon this question, stated that the Minister of the Interior was obliged to formulate a charge against himself; that the newspaper article appearing in the Toronto' World' was the only charge before the House, and that the Minister of the Interior had a right to know what he was charged with. With those statements I beg to take most direct issue. The article, as I understand it, appearing in the 'World' newspaper was nothing more than a repetition—in fact it did not amount quite to that—a reference to the direct charge that had been made to the right hon. the First Minister himself by Mr. McGillicuddy during the interviews he had with that gentleman. It is idle to say that the Minister of the Interior is obliged to formulate a charge upon an insinuation. There is not an insinuation contained in the article in the 'World' newspaper. They do not insinuate that the Minister of the Interior has been guilty of any particular offence, but they make reference to the facts that had been declared before the Prime Minister himself.

If theMinister of the Interior is as anxious as he says that there should be a full investigation of the charge, if there is any charge against him, then it seems to me that he needs to go no further than the interviews which took place between Mr. McGillicuddy and the Prime Minister. There is no uncertainty about the charge.

The charge is there made clearly and distinctly. The minister is charged with being a boodler and grafter, not a boodler and grafter in private life, but a boodler and grafter in public life in connection with these two sums appearing in his bank account, the $50,000 and the $19,300. There is a direct and specific charge and, as has already been pointed out, the Prime Minister himself considered that that was a specific and definite charge against his minister. In the interest of the country the right hon. gentleman thought it his duty to bring it before this parliament. He did not undertake that responsibility or duty without having some evidence before him, and the gentleman who had preferred the charge to the First Minister offered to submit the proof by which he could establish the charge of grafting and boodling against his minister. When evidence is laid before any member of this House, without making any special reference to the right hon. gentleman himself, that is considered sufficient to prove a charge of boodling and grafting against another hon. member of this House, I conceive it to be the duty of any member before whom that evidence is laid, to take the responsibility, just as the right hon. gentleman did, of bringing the matter to the attention of the House. When the right hon. gentleman had a thorough opportunity of viewing that evidence, when the charge was made direct and when he saw fit, in the discharge of his duty, to bring the matter before the House, I think the scope of this inquiry should be wide enough to cover the charge that was made and the evidence that was offered to be submitted.

We have in this case a very remarkable situation. We have, on the one hand, a gentleman who interviewed the Prime Minister saying that he has evidence in his possession which he is ready and willing to submit, and which will be sufficient to prove the Minister of the Interior guilty of the charges to which I have referred. There is no answer to make to that charge. There is no offer in this motion to investigate that charge. The only answer that is made at all is the retort by the Minister of the Interior himself, when he is called a boodler and a grafter, that the man who says that is a thug and a blackmailer. There are the two questions—a boodler and grafter on the one hand, and a thug and blackmailer on the other. It is proposed to settle this question by a reference to a special committee appointed by this government to say whether the Minister of the Interior, in a certain transaction in connection with the Canadian Northern railway, received a certain sum of money or not. The Minister of Justice was quite right when he used the expression that it was just a question here as to how far the motion should be limited. The government have gone to the full extreme, in the motion offered by the Prime Minister himself, when they limit the inquiry in the way in which they do. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax), has proposed that this motion be amended to such an extent as to permit of the investigation, not of any insinuation, but of the direct charge of which proof has been offered. He has appealed to the right hon. gentleman himself to open it wide enough to admit that evidence, and if it is true, and if it establishes the guilt of the Minister of the Interior, then the consequences must follow. But, if, on the other hand the evidence is not sufficient to establish that charge then the minister goes free and there will be no one in this House happier than myself, because of my personal relations with him, if the minister is acquitted of the charge which has been made against him. But, so long as the position taken by the minister himself is allowed to prevail, I cannot but think that this country, as well as this parliament, will believe that there is something in the situation that it is the desire of the government to hide and to prevent the country from fully knowing.

Mr. W. S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey). This is a trouble which has arisen within the domestic ranks of the Liberal party, and up to the present time the opposition have in no way interfered with it. But the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) thought that there had been sufficient allegations against one of his ministers to justify him in bringing the matter to the attention of the House. The hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) argued for a considerable length of time this afternoon for the purpose of proving that neither the 'World' newspaper nor the 'Telegram,' published in the city of Toronto, contained any direct charge or allegation against the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), that neither of these two papers contained any assertion which could by any manner of means be construed as a libel. If such were the case, why is it that the Prime Minister of his own action is proposing, in a resolution in this House, a committee for the purpose of investigating something against the Minister of the Interior? It appears to me at any rate that the reason he does that is because a certain gentleman of his own Liberal persuasion came to him and made certain allegations to him in private which were sufficient to justify him, apart from the newspaper allegations altogether, to bring the matter to the attention of the House. The Prime Minister having done that for the first time now asks us to consent to something. He asks us to consent to the nomination of a tribunal for the

purpose of trying the charges which were made to him by Mr. McGillicuddy. I would like to ask the Prime Minister here if he would give us the assurance now that the powers of the committee are wide and broad enough to enable it to call upon Mr. McGillicuddy to give the same evidence which he gave, or tendered, to the Prime Minister. If the Prime Minister does not do that it is proof conclusive that he does not expect, and does not intend that this House shall have the same opportunity for investigating the charges which were made to him by Mr. McGillicuddy against the Minister of the Interior that he himself had. There seems to be no answer to that, as the Prime Minister does not reply. Perhaps the Prime Minister will tell us? If he will give us the assurance that the committee which he is appointing now will have full power to investigate and receive the evidence of Mr. McGillicuddy as it was presented to him, or as it was tendered to him. As the Prime Minister does not answer, I see that the Prime Minister does not intend to give us any such opportunity, that he does not intend us to look at the original bank account of which we have seen a photograph, which is the most positive proof we have, although, as the Minister of the Interior himself said, he could, if he chose, allow us to go into his bank books and clear himself, but that he did not intend to do so. If he does not intend to do that he knows that the scope of this resolution is not broad enough to allow Mr. McGillicuddy, or to allow the committee, to produce the evidence which might clear up the matter. I have not had very much experience in parliamentary life, but I would think that if I had a bank book showing $20,000 and $50,000 deposits, I would certainly know where the money came from, and if a charge were made against me in a public newspaper, published in Ontario, accompanied by facsimiles of the bank book, or what are supposed to be facsimiles of the original, showing these deposits, it would be a very simple matter to show where the money came from.

The Minister of Justice says that the fact that the account is marked as a trust account makes it more difficult for the Minister of the Interior to tell where the money came from. There may be more truth in that assertion than we think, and perhaps if we knew the names of the beneficiaries of the trust it would place the matter in a different light than it now presents itself in. Looking at it from the standpoint of the Minister of the Interior, I think I am safe in saying that if this resolution passes, judging by the stand taken by the Minister of the Interior and the Prime Minister, we will not have power to investigate the bank book and therefore, we will not have power to investigate the gravamen of the charge, that two sums of money were received and disbursed by the Minister of the Interior for purposes which were not in accord with the honest discharge of the duties of a minister of the Crown. It would be a very simple matter to allow the committee to investigate whether or not the charges which were read by the Prime Minister are true, and which charges were thought to be of sufficient importance by the Prime Minister himself, to, on his own initiative, bring them to the attention of the House, especially in view of the fact that his own Minister of Justice has said that nothing which was contained in the newspaper statement constituted a libel or a reflection on the Minister of the Interior. Therefore, in bringing the matter into the House the Prime Minister must have had in mind what had been told him by Mr. McGillicuddy, when making the charge.

Mr. E. A. LANCASTER (Lincoln and Niagara). I rise principally to protest against the doctrine, if you call it a doctrine, laid down by the Minister of Justice. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice thinks he was expounding a principle of responsible government which people hold dear in this country, but I did notice that as soon as he delivered his oration or special plea he left the chamber apparently not caring what any one else thought about it. The Minister of Justice has practically undertaken to say that the Minister of the Interior does not know what he is talking about, and he is not satisfied with the statement made by the Minister of the Interior. I was satisfied with it to a certain extent, but I was sorry that the Minister of the Interior did not give the country the hope, by accepting the amendment of the leader of the opposition, that everything was all right with him. I think he should have persuaded his leader, that, in his own interest, the amendment of the leader of the opposition should be accepted. I am assuming at present that the Minister of the Interior is able to clear himself, but unless the inquiry has the scope which the leader of the opposition calls for, it will be impossible for the Minister of the Interior to clear himself either in the House or in the country. If the Minister of the Interior so acts that the people must infer that he is afraid of something, coming out he can only blame himself if people draw the inference that he is guilty. The Minister of Justice thinks that the position taken by the Minister of the Interior is not the safest one for him to take. I do not know whether the Minister of Justice, acting as personal counsel for the

Minister of the Interior, advised him to take the position he took to-day, but evidently he is not quite satisfied with that position. The Minister of the Interior told us that his only reason for declining the amendment of the leader of the opposition was that he did not propose that his private bank account should be inquired into for the satisfaction of a thug or a blackmailer. He gives the House to understand that in his humble judgment the bank account in question was a private matter that nobody but himself was concerned in. The Minister of Justice, however, pays him the poor compliment of thinking that is not true, and he points out that on the face of it it is a trust account, and, notwithstanding that it is being advertised in the public press as evidence to show that the Minister of the Interior is a grafter and a boodler, the Minister of Justice undertakes to say that the fact that it is a trust account, and not a private account, is a reason for refusing investigation. The Minister of Justice is the legal adviser of the government, but judging by the breaks he has recently made I have not much hope that the Minister of Justice will ever increase the moral tone or the high standing of cabinet ministers in this country. I regret that the Minister of the Interior has fallen into the unfortunate position of listening to the advice of the Minister of Justice. If the Minister of the Interior can clear himself, as he says he can, then it would have been better for him to act on his own judgment, and to have accepted the amendment of the leader of the opposition. If the Minister of the Interior insists on selecting the issue on which he should be tried, he must expect the people of Canada to think that he is more guilty than I hope he is, and, than at the present moment I believe he is. Knowing the Minister of the Interior as I do, I think he is making a great mistake. I do not want to lose faith in his honour or ability to conduct the affairs of this country as well as any one belonging to his political party can be expected to. I had hoped that he would place himself in a position which would lead us to believe he was innocent, but by adopting the argument of the Minister of Justice, he forces us to think, to use the words of the Minister of Justice, that he should be treated as if he were on trial for a criminal offence. The Minister of Justice contends that he should have certain particulars given to him of what he is charged with, just as if the Minister of the Interior did not know all about it, before any of us on this side knew. Surely the Prime Minister told him what Mr. McGillicuddy said about him, and is not that a complete answer to the suggestion of the Minister of Justice, that nobody knew who was the cabinet minister alleged to be guilty. The Prime Minister knew and it was because the Prime Minister knew, that the matter came before the House at all. The Minister of Justice was disputing the statement of the Minister of the Interior and of the Prime Minister when he led us to infer that he himself does not know from the newspaper articles what minister is accused.

Nobody believes that any one is accused other than the minister whom the Prime Minister mentioned when he brought this matter up in the House. The Minister of Justice does not seriously think that any other member of the cabinet to which he belongs is accused, and it is idle for him to contend that any want of particulars exists, or that the minister accused and everybody else in this House does not know exactly what the charge is and what the investigation is required about. When the Minister of Justice undertakes to say that the Minister of the Interior should be treated as a criminal in any court is, and is entitled to particulars, if he wants to put the matter on that basis, I would point out to him that after the minister has pleaded and said he is not guilty it is altogether too late to ask for particulars. He knows all about what he is charged with, and says he could clear it up by going into the box and giving evidence. But he prefers to stand mute and not tell, and the Minister of Justice says he is not obliged to tell because it has not been put down in black and white exactly what he is charged with. I repeat that the Minister of Justice knows, and the Prime Minister knows; and the Minister of Justice is really finding fault with the Prime Minister for bringing this matter into the House without apparently knowing what the charge was. The Minister of Justice has simply tried to find some technical excuse for preventing an inquiry in regard to the money which the Minister of the Interior is alleged to have handled. If the Minister of Justice wants to have the laws administered properly and investigations carried on in the interest of the people, he ought to have taken a position the very opposite of what he did. I cannot help comparing his stand with the stand taken by ministers of justice like Sir John Thompson in matters of this kind. The Minister of Justice is evidently bound to prevent any investigation that will prevent a recurrence of offences on the part of ministers of the Crown, preferring to leave them in a position where they will be liable to temptation to do what they should not do, because those whom the Minister of the Interior characterizes as thugs and blackmailers can say, 'we can go on and try to do all the

evil we can because we have a Minister of Justice who says there will not be any investigation and, therefore, we will not have to go to jail.' That is the position. People who wish to approach ministers of the Crown with a view to corrupting them will be encouraged to do so by the doctrine of the Minister of Justice, because they know that no matter whether they succeed or fail, the Minister of Justice is going at all hazards to attempt to throttle all investigation and prevent the truth coming out. That is the position of the Minister of Justice in supporting the feeble attempt of the Prime Minister to find a reason for rejecting the amendment of the hon. leader of the opposition. The Minister of Justice knows that the Minister of the Interior is charged with having received in round figures $70,000 from some improper source for some improper purposes, and the only way to have that matter cleared up is for the Minister of the Interior to tell the whole truth about it. It does not do for the Minister of the Interior to say that because he does not want to give to the thug or the blackmailer the satisfaction of knowing where he got that money, he is not going to give the evidence, but is going to trust the majority in the House of Commons, led by the Prime Minister, with the Minister of Justice supporting him, to vote down the motion for having all the facts laid before the people, so that the people could see whether he was justified in doing what he has done or not. I regret exceedingly, as a friend of the Minister of the Interior, that he does not accept the proposition of the hon. leader of the opposition. It will be the worst thing he will ever have done as a public man if he allows this matter to go as suggested by the Minister of Justice.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, before the House is asked to pronounce upon the resolution before it, for an investigation limited to the article which appeared in the Toronto 'World,' I would like to call attention to several manifest inaccuracies in that article, which show it to be so slipshod in its composition that to go through the form of solemnly investigating it would be simply farcical. I refer more particularly to the concluding paragraph as printed in the official record of yesterday, where it says:

> The exact date was October 3, 1907. About one year later, just before the general election of 1908, the sum of $19,000 was deposited from the Manhattan Bank in the name of Mr. Oliver at the Imperial Bank at Edmonton. It is known that he chequed out this money for campaign purposes.

Now, the article upon which this 'World' despatch is based shows that in these seven lines there are three glaring errors of fact. In the first place, it was not one year later, just before the general election of 1908, that the sum of $19,000 was paid; but it was two years later, and nine months after the general election of 1908. In the next place, it was not deposited from the Manhattan Bank in the name of Mr. Oliver; but, as the photograph shows, it was sent from Ottawa to the bank. In the third place, it is not known that he checked out that money for campaign purposes, because the photograph of the account shows that that money was checked out month by month during nine months of the year 1910 when there was no campaign in progress. Now, it seems to me extraordinary that in view of these inaccuracies, that that one despatch, of all the matter published in this connection, should be picked out as the matter to be investigated. It is extraordinary that this should be suggested, in view of the statement by the minister himself that he is perfectly willing to have all his official transactions placed in the limelight. We are asked to put on the limitation that the person particularly concerned, according to his statement here today, has no desire to have placed on the investigation.

I am, Mr. Speaker, particularly concerned in this connection because of a rumour which I heard in the corridors of this House yesterday. This rumour is to the effect that Mr. Dan McGillicuddy, the informant in this connection, has stated in Ottawa that this $19,000 was paid in connection with a transaction in my own riding. I presume that if he made that statement to other persons in this city, he must have made it to the right hon. the Prime Minister in some one of his several interviews with him. That transaction was not connected in any way with the Canadian Northern railway or swamp lands of Manitoba or lands in Saskatchewan. It has no connection whatever with anything that has been mentioned in this House. I wish that the right hon. the Prime Minister were in his seat now so that he could say whether or not this information was given him by Mr. McGillicuddy, whether or not the fact has slipped his mind, and whether, upon its being recalled to him, it makes any difference to him in the limitation which he seeks to put on this inquiry.

Mr. OLIVER. Might I interrupt the hon. gentleman? I do not know to what transaction he refers, but that does not make any difference. If he will be good enough later on to inform the right hon. the Prime Minister as to what particular transaction it is, I shall ask my right hon. leader to include that subject in the inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That statement is very satisfactory to me, and I may say that it is what I would have expected from the hon. the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver). I am very loathe indeed to have any part in this matter, and I would not have taken any part in it were it not that to be silent, after the information volunteered to me yesterday, would be apt to be misunderstood by the electors whom I represent. I would like to add, however, in consequence of the limitation which the minister has suggested to place upon the scope of the inquiry, that I would not be satisfied to judge this question on the point as to whether or not the transaction I have indicated was one which could be justified in the public interest. The protest against it is that it was of a very harsh character, confiscating the rights of a community on behalf of a private corporation. That matter is before the courts now, and I do not wish to go into it at any length, but would simply say that I understand the defence to be that the transaction was in the end in the public interest. Now it is not sufficient for me to be told that it is in the public interest if it can be established that at the same time as this transaction occurred—and the dates are almost identical—a very large sum was paid into any fund of which the minister was made the trustee by the beneficiaries of that transaction. I think that the scope of the inquiry should be enlarged to show not only whether or not that transaction was in the public interest, but whether the beneficiaries did make a payment of this kind. I would suggest further that a minister of the Crown, in a matter of this kind, occupies another position than that of a colleague of the Prime Minister. I would suggest that he is also an adviser of the Governor General, and that His Excellency is entitled to other information than can be conveyed to him by a resolution of this House refusing this or any inquiry, and that, in my humble judgment, it is the prerogative of a member or members of this House to directly address His Excellency in a matter affecting the honour of one of his advisers.

Mr. OLIVER. I have suggested to my hon. friend that he should specify to the Prime Minister the matter which he wishes to have investigated so that it might be included, in this motion.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it necessary, under the circumstances, that the Prime Minister should be here before we vote. The Finance Minister can send out for him.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Now that the right hon. the Prime Minister has returned to his seat, I might be permitted to mention the matter which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) has asked to be included in the scope of the investigation. It is this. I stated that information was given me in the corridors of this House yesterday that Mr. Daniel McGillicuddy had said that the second deposit, photographed in the reproduction of the bank account, related to a matter in my own riding. I said that this deposit was coincident with the date of a confiscation of certain property there, and the award of that property to other parties, which matter is before the courts. I said that I did not wish to go into it further than to say that I understood the defence in court by the minister to be that the transaction was in its outcome in the public interest. I said also that this was outside the limitation which the Prime Minister wants to put upon the inquiry, whereupon my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior said he was willing that all his official acts should be brought into the lime light and judged on their merits, and is willing that this particular transaction should be included in the inquiry. I ask the right hon. gentleman whether he would also widen the scope so that this transaction should be included and be judged, not only on the point whether or not it was in the public interest, but whether it be proper that a minister of the Crown should accept under trust—if he did, as rumour says, and I do not vouch for it—concurrently with a transaction of that kind, even though the transaction be shown to be in the public interest ; accept under trust a large sum of money from the beneficiaries by it. It was suggested to me that the Prime Minister might permit that subject to be included in the scope of the inquiry.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a very long statement, and rather involved; I do not know that I understood it accurately, and I would understand it better if I saw it in writing. My hon. friend can make it the subject of a substantive motion of his own.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would remind the First Minister that I premised my statement to the House with the suggestion that the First Minister had already obtained this information from Mr. Daniel McGillicuddy, because I do not think Mr. McGillicuddy would state in one office in town what he would not state in seven interviews in the Prime Minister's office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That matter?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Never heard of it until this day.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). And as to the statement in writing, of course

when we come back at eight o'clock there will be available to the First Minister the 'Hansard' report of what I said to the House.

House divided on amendment of Mr. Borden (Halifax).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Ames,
Armstrong,
Arthurs,
Barker,
Barnard,
Blain,
Blondin,
Borden (Halifax),
Bradbury,
Bristol,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Cowan,
Crosby,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Daniel,
Donnelly,
Edwards,
Elson,
Foster,
Fraser,
Gilbert,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Lanark),
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lalor,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Lortie,
Macdonell,
McCall,
McCarthy,
Magrath,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Monk,
Northrup,
Perley,
Porter,
Roche,
Russell,
Schaffner,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thoburn,
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Wright.—69.

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Allard,
Allen,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),
Beauparlant,
Béland,
Borden (Sir Frederick),
Boyer,
Brodeur,
Brown,
Bureau,
Carvell,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Delisle,
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Emmerson,
McCoig,
McColl,
McCraney,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Sunbury),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Regina),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Neely,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Roy Dorchester),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Sperry,
Templeman,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warburton and
White (Victoria, Alta.)—102.
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
German,
Gervais,
Girard,
Gladu,
Gordon (Kent),
Graham,
Guthrie,
Hodgins,
Hunt,
King,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville,
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
Law,
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Lovell,
MacNutt,
McAllister,

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Lemieux,	Doherty,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,	Beattie,
Talbot,	Owen,
Low,	Broder,
Schell,	Hughes,
Harty,	Osler,
McGiverin,	Reid (Grenville),
McLean (Huron),	Boyce,
Conmee,	Worthington,
Tobin,	Paquet,
Tolmie,	Marshall,
Clark (Red Deer),	Forget,
Bickerdike,	Price,
Black,	Madin,
Ecrément,	Nantel,
Macdonald,	Rhodes,
Cash.	Best.

Amendment negatived.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). Before you proceed further with the motion before the Chair, I wish to call attention to the matter very briefly, and I propose to end with an amendment to the motion moved by the First Minister. I listened attentively to the whole argument, and particularly to the argument advanced by the Prime Minister. Notwithstanding his great skill, I failed to find that the propositions he advanced were convincing, and it seemed to me that the Prime Minister, whether intentionally or

otherwise, was grasping at a shadow and avoiding the substance of the difficulty presented to the House. He pointed out that the article that appeared in the 'World' did not at most amount to more than an insinuation. I daresay that is true. The item in the 'World' is merely a comment upon a very distinct and specific charge made in the 'Telegram'; and whilst it may be true, as the Prime Minister says, that what appears in the 'World' is shadowy and indefinite, there is no difficulty about the main article upon which that comment rests. What I would ask the government to do is, not to investigate a comment, not to investigate a mere guess by a newspaper, perhaps one of many guesses made by newspapers throughout Canada, but to investigate the specific charge made against a minister of the Crown. This charge is made definitely in two ways. In the first place, Mr. McGillicuddy went to the Prime Minister and made a definite and clear charge against the Minister of the Interior, made a specific and grave charge against him and demanded an investigation. That matter is before the House, first, by reason of the subsequent publication of it in the 'Telegram,' and secondly, by the statement of the First Minister to the House the other day. As regards the statement of the First Minister, I submit that the whole item appearing in the 'Telegram' was placed before the House by the First Minister, if not by actually reading the whole of it, by reference to it, and, therefore, incorporating it in what he said to the House. So we have this fact upon the statement of the Prime Minister, that a gentleman made a charge against one of his ministers of a very grave offence, and asked for an investigation. The minister in referring to that, therefore, incorporates it, and puts the House in possession of that circumstance. What the Prime Minister says that no name was disclosed in the 'Telegram,' is irrelevant. When Mr. McGillicuddy went to the Prime Minister there was nothing indefinite about who was spoken of. He charged this matter against the Minister of the Interior, mentioning him by name. The First Minister admitted he knew who was being attacked, and he said to Mr. McGillicuddy, I have confidence in my colleague, I will believe in his innocence, and will continue to believe in his innocence until he is proven guilty. That is the position of the matter to-day. So we have a clear and definite charge against the Minister of the Interior by a responsible newspaper in the city of Toronto, made in temperate and guarded language, clearly identified by the subsequent events as to the hon. gentleman to whom it refers, and setting forth in the article the photograph of the bank account, showing that a large sum of money had been actually handled in a way that is not yet accounted for, and we ask that if there is an investigation, it shall not be merely an investigation into a guess by a newspaper, to wit, the 'World,' but that it shall be a bona fide, honest and complete investigation into the source of this money, to ascertain whether the source is an honest one or not.

Now we are not without experience in this House of similar farcical investigations. In the case of the Hodgins investigation, we urged the government to give us a wider scope than they were willing to give us, we urged them to do that in the interest of the public. The First Minister refused, and we had a perfectly farcical investigation as a result, and in the end we were told that everything in regard to the Transcontinental railway was proved to be all right. We had another investigation along somewhat similar lines in the Lumsden charges, narrowed down in the House, narrowed down more completely in the committee, resulting in another statement by a committee of this House that everything was all right. We have the fact that, notwithstanding these two certificates by a committee of this House, upwards of half a milion dollars of over classification, and for over-break and matters of that kind has been disclosed by the gentlemen subsequently appointed, in part at all events, by the government. So we will go on in the same way if the First Minister pursues the same tactics, we will have this farcical investigation, and no practical result will follow. This is a little worse than anything we have had yet in this respect. We start out with an absolutely clear proposition that the government proposes to investigate something that can lead to no result whatever, investigate a mere comment by a newspaper, while we refuse to investigate what it is important to find out, namely, the source from which this money came, what were the purposes to which it was applied, to ascertain whether it was or was not applied to any proper purpose. We have no desire to pry into the private concerns of a minister of the Crown, but in the public interest it is necessary that this matter should be thoroughly investigated. I, therefore, move that all the words after 'that' be left out and the following be substituted therefor:

A Royal Commission do issue for the purpose of inquiring and reporting whether the two sums of $50,000 and $19,350, or thereabouts, alleged to have been deposited to the credit of the Hon. Mr. Oliver, the Minister of the Interior, in a bank at Edmonton, in or about the month of October, 1907, and in the month of December, 1909, were received or obtained by the said the Hon. Mr. Oliver in such manner, under such circumstances or from such sources as would render the

said minister's acceptance thereof prejudicial to the public interest.

Mr. A. MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). Mr. Speaker, before the question is put, I wish to state the position assumed by myself with regard to the amendment and the previous amendment offered by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). In the first place, I am utterly unable to understand what is the general attitude of the government towards charges of this kind appearing in newspapers or otherwise. The hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) has stated that when the 'World's' statement appeared as it did, setting side by side two facts, and leaving the inference that they afforded an explanation of the source of the money that appeared to have been placed to the credit of the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), the only course open to the Minister of the Interior was to demand an investigation. I have sat long enough in the House to recall a similar state of affairs where the complaints were much more marked not more than two sessions ago. I recall that at that time an hon. member of the cabinet was not only charged in a public document but was found guilty by a judicial tribunal of an offence certainly as great as any contemplated on the present occasion, but I cannot recall that on that occasion upon which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) was charged with malfeasance in connection with his public duty, that the Minister of Justice promulgated any such doctrine as he now holds to be good. He does not appear to have made the suggestion to his colleague on that occasion that he has now made before the Minister of the Interior. It may quite well be that the mere fact that large sums appear to the credit of the bank account of a member of the cabinet is not of itself sufficient foundation for demanding an investigation as to where these moneys came from. Suppose we assume that that is the case, then what is the explanation of the action taken by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) some three days ago? The Prime Minister took the position that such evidence as had been adduced was sufficient for him to make it a public question in this House. That being the case, the whole question was laid open. We are in this position: A newspaper since that time has offered the suggestion that possibly these moneys came from a certain source. The Minister of the Interior says that that requires an investigation. How far is he going to go? Supposing to-morrow another newspaper says that possibly they can trace the origin of that money back to the old days of the timber steals; will the minister have another investigation and inquire as to the correctness of that charge? Then, perhaps another newspaper out in our country will offer a still further suggestion, and I have no doubt he will be able to excite curiosity sufficiently to inquire whether or not these moneys had still another relation to something else in the history of the administration of this government. The minister will be bound, on the very doctrine he has himself laid down, to conduct successive investigations to inquire into every successive guess of every newspaper published in Canada. If we are going to investigate at all, let us have an investigation that has some chance of finality. Let us have one that means something and that will end the question once and for all. If there is nothing to investigate then do not investigate at all. If we are going to offend the dignity of parliament by a logical, sensible, final investigation, surely we will offend it infinitely more by a purely farcical attempt to probe into this case. The Prime Minister has utterly taken the ground from under the position that otherwise would have disclosed some merit taken by the Minister of the Interior. If we are going to do anything let us do something that means something and that will give satisfaction to the country and will, if the Minister of the Interior is right, result in clearing his skirts. I am quite sure there is no special venom on this side of the House towards the minister. I may say there is rather a disposition to believe that if these moneys can be traced to an unclean source it will speak loudly against the character of the government in general perhaps rather than against his own. It seems to me that no greater guilt will be traced to his door than to the door of his colleagues. Therefore, I say, for the good of all concerned, let us have an investigation, not only covering the record of his own department, not only inquiring whether or not the moneys were connected with any certain act of administration of the Department of the Interior, but get at the source, whatever it was, and see whether or not these moneys had anything to do with the general record of the government in the handling of election campaigns and other such business. That is the position I take. If I might presume, let me say this: There is considerable in what the minister says that the mere fact that a bank account shows rather startling credits may not be sufficient to found a parliamentary investigation upon. That may all be, but the Prime Minister has said in this House that these credits have been brought before him in such a way and with the support of evidence that he deems the matter worthy of the attention of parliament. That being the case, the attention of parliament can only properly be called to it and parliament

can efficiently exercise its function only by a full investigation. The attention of parliament produces no good result by the kind of investigation that is now proposed. So that, whatever force there would be in the Minister's position is lost; he is robbed of it by the action of the First Minister. Having been so robbed of it he placed himself in the utterly false position of saying that a mere suggestion by a newspaper as to the probable source of the moneys so placed in his credit is sufficient to found an investigation upon to find whether or not that is a lucky guess. That position, to my mind, is utterly untenable, because it would force the minister and parliament to pursue the same course on each subsequent occasion and follow an interminable series of investigations into the mere vagrant guesses of one irresponsible party or another. Therefore, it appears to me that it is the duty of the House to support this amendment as it was the duty of the House to support the other.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Lennox).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Ames,	Lortie,
Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Arthurs,	McCall,
Barker,	McCarthy,
Barnard,	Magrath,
Best,	Meighen,
Blain,	Middlebro,
Blondin,	Monk,
Borden (Halifax),	Northrup,
Bradbury,	Paquet,
Bristol,	Perley,
Burrell,	Porter,
Chisholm (Huron),	Roche,
Clare,	Russell,
Crosby,	Schaffner,
Crocket,	Sexsmith,
Crothers,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Daniel,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Donnelly,	Smyth,
Edwards,	Sproule,
Elson,	Staples,
Foster,	Stewart,
Fraser,	Taylor (Leeds),
Gilbert,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Goodeve,	Thoburn,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Thornton,
Henderson,	Wallace,
Herron,	White (Renfrew),
Jameson,	Wilcox,
Kidd,	Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Lake,	Wright.—65.
Lalor,	
Lancaster,	
Lennox,	

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Allen,	McCoig,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	McColl,
Beauparlant,	McCraney,
Béland,	McIntyre,
Black,	McKenzie,
Borden (Sir Frederick),	McMillan,
Boyer,	Major,
Brown,	Marcil (Bagot),
Bureau,	Martin (Regina),
Carvell,	Martin (Wellington),
Champagne,	Mayrand,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Meigs,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Miller,
Clarke (Essex),	Molloy,
Congdon,	Murphy,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Nesbitt,
Delisle,	Neely,
Demers,	Papineau,
Devlin,	Parent,
Douglas,	Paterson,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Emmerson,	Proulx,
Ethier,	Prowse,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Rankin,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fowke,	Richards,
Gauvreau,	Rivet,
Geoffrion,	Robb,
German,	Ross (Middlesex),
Gervais,	Roy (Dorchester),
Gladu,	Rutan,
Gordon (Kent),	Savoie,
Graham,	Sealey,
Guthrie,	Seguin,
Hodgins,	Sinclair,
Hunt,	Smith (Middlesex),
King,	Smith (Nanaimo),
Kyte,	Smith (Stormont),
Lachance,	Sperry,
Lafortune,	Templeman,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Tobin,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Todd,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Law,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Loggie,	Turgeon,
Lovell,	Turriff,
MacNutt,	Verville,
McAllister,	Warburton and White (Victoria, Alta.)—99.

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Lemieux,	Doherty,
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,	Beattie,
Talbot,	Owen,
Low,	Broder,
Schell,	Hughes,
Harty,	Osler,
McGiverin,	Reid (Grenville),
McLean (Huron),	Boyce,
Conmee,	Worthington,
Tolmie,	Marshall,
Clark (Red Deer),	Forget,
Bickerdike,	Price,
Esrément,	Natel,
Macdonald,	Rhodes,
Cash,	Campbell,
McLean (Sunbury),	Cowan,
Chew,	Currie (Simcoe),
Allard,	Lewis,
Knowles,	Maddin,
Pardee.	Stanfield.

Amendment (Mr. Lennox), negatived.

Main motion agreed to.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1911, which on motion, were referred to Committee of Supply.

BANKING AND COMMERCE COMMITTEE.

Mr. MILLER moved that the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce be granted leave to sit while the House is in session.

Mr. HENDERSON. Does the quorum still remain at twenty-one, or has it been reduced?

Mr. MILLER. The House has been asked to reduce the quorum, but has not consented, and the quorum remains at twenty-one. Several meetings have been called, and we have not been able to proceed with business, because of the lack of a quorum.

Motion agreed to.

NAVAL CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. F. D. MONK. Tenders for the construction of cruisers were to have been in yesterday and opened to-day at noon. I wish to ask: who has tendered; do the tenders cover cruisers, or cruisers and destroyers as well; what are the amounts of the tenders; what action, if any, has the government taken upon these tenders?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that tenders have been received and opened; they will be laid on the table of the House in due time.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND SUPREME COURT.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I wish to ask the Prime Minister if an appointment has been made to the Supreme Court bench of Prince Edward Island, and if so who has been appointed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Action has been taken, but I am not in a position to say who has been appointed. The information will be in next Saturday's 'Gazette.'

ST. PETER'S CANAL.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I call the attention of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), to a question put on the first of May by the hon. member for Colchester, and the answer given by the minister (Page 8266 unrevised 'Hansard.')

Mr. STANFIELD:

1. Is it the intention of the government to construct a new canal at St. Peter's, Cape Breton? If so, when is the work to be commenced?

2. Is the old canal to be abandoned? If so, for what reason?

3. What is the estimated cost of the proposed new canal?

Mr. GRAHAM.—$150,000 has been voted by parliament for this work. The details have not yet been decided on. It is estimated that the entire cost of the work will be in the vicinity of $300,000.

There appears to have been no answer given to the second part of the question as to whether the old canal is to be abandoned, and if so, for what reason? Will the minister be good enough to supplement his answer?

Mr. GRAHAM. Whether the old canal can be enlarged or whether it would be wiser to construct a new canal is now under consideration by the department, and no decision has been arrived at as to the better method.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the difficulty about using the present canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have been informed that if we repair the old canal it would be necessary to close it for a year, and that would be a serious matter.

PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT—TRAVELLING EXPENSES.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). When will the Minister of Public Works bring down the return with reference to the travelling expenses in his department?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The return asked for the expenses of the outside service as well as the inside service, and as there are many hundreds of employees in the department in all sections of the country, the accountant began with the outside service, and reported that it would take several months to complete it. As the returns from the other departments only included the inside service, I thought he had better prepare the return for that service, and that will be completed in the course of a few days.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to offer an apology to my hon. friend from Selkirk. In view of the somewhat strenuous circumstances of to-day, I hope he will excuse my inability to answer his question, as I promised to yesterday. I will give him an answer to-morrow.

INTERNATIONAL JOINT CONTROL OF RATES.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When will the treaty or agreement be laid on the table of the House, which has been arrived at between

the United States and Canada respecting joint control of railway, express, telegraph and telephone rates? I understand such a treaty has been concluded.

Mr. GRAHAM. No such treaty has been concluded.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Some time ago the minister informed the House that an agreement had been practically arrived at between the Chairman of the Canadian Railway Commission and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and would be laid before the House. Has anything further been done?

Mr. GRAHAM. The member for South Simcoe asked the same question a short time ago, and what I said was that the Chairman of the Canadian Railway Board and the Chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission had met and discussed details which had been reported to the two governments. Further than that, nothing has been done.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. It is alleged outside of the House that nothing further is being done until after the reciprocity agreement has been concluded.

Mr. GRAHAM. That might be alleged.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is there any good reason why the treaty should not be consummated now, before the reciprocity agreement?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I suppose I might answer that in the opinion of my hon. friend it might lead to annexation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Might I suggest that one reason why it is not brought down is that it will lead the people of this country to believe that it will tend towards annexation.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe). On this same topic, I suppose the minister will have no objection to lay that report on the table, now that he has announced to the House that such a report has been made?

Mr. GRAHAM. Most assuredly we have an objection to laying the report on the table. It is a report made by the representatives of the two governments, and until the government takes action upon it, it would not be proper to lay it on the table.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I read the details of this treaty in an American magazine six weeks ago. They seem to have in the United States all the details of this treaty, as they usually do of all treaties, while we are kept in the dark.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House again go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I want to refer to the fact that last evening I purposed saying a few words in reference to the treaty that has been entered into between this government, and the United States government. Neither of the gentlemen who negotiated the treaty was present in the House, nor was the Prime Minister, who I presume was the chief mover in the whole arrangement.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was here.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). These three gentlemen were absent. I objected. I thought it was the duty of all of them to be present to defend the agreement which they had made, and to give information to hon. gentlemen on this side of the House at all times while this debate was going on. I inquired of the ministers in charge of the House. There appeared to be three of them—the hon. the Minister of Public Works, the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, and the hon. Minister of Labour; and I said I did not purpose going on until some one of the trio was present. I said this:

> I think it is due when a gentleman is discussing this question that these ministers who made this bargain should be present. So far as I am concerned, I insist upon it. It is the right of gentlemen speaking to have these gentlemen present.
>
> Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be very sorry to say that to my hon. friend. I understand that my hon. friend the Minister of Finance will not be able to be present this evening, but I will send and find out. Perhaps my hon. friend will proceed, and I will send for him in the meantime.

From what the Minister of Public Works said about the Minister of Finance I understood that he was not well, and I immediately said that I would not expect him under the circumstances, but that I did expect the Minister of Customs and the Prime Minister. This morning I read in the morning 'Citizen' that the Minister of Finance was occupying a box at the Horse Show last night. That showed the interest that he took in attending to this pact. I went on with the discussion in the absence of the Minister of Customs; but after half an hour or so he came into the House feeling very sore about having been called out of his bed to come up here. He had gone home and gone quietly to bed, and had left this agreement to be taken care of without him, or the Minister of Finance, or the Prime Minister.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I was here the whole time.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then I went on and referred to the fact that on the 6th of April the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) had made a speech with the Speaker in the Chair, and that after having made his speech, he placed on 'Hansard' some valuable statistics containing information that we could not get either from the Prime Minister, or from his diplomats who had gone to the United States to make this bargain. After the hon. member for Grenville had made his speech, the Minister of Customs said: 'I think it would be just as well to put a little appendix to the statement that will appear at length'. I stated then that it was my intention to perform a surgical operation upon that appendix, and to dissect it, and when I got through I thought the hon. Minister of Customs would regret having made the speech he did. Then I went on discussing his speech, and after a time the Chairman of the committee ruled me out of order. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to know whether I am in order, with the Speaker in the Chair, to discuss a speech made by the Minister of Customs when the Speaker was in the Chair. I was ruled out of order last night because the Chairman said I was referring to a previous debate. If that ruling was correct, I certainly have a right to discuss the speech of the Minister of Customs now, and I purpose doing so.

Mr. SPROULE. It is difficult to perform a surgical operation with the patient absent.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I had it about half performed when I was called to order. This is what I read from 'Hansard' of the 6th of April:

Mr. PATERSON. I think, perhaps, it would be just as well to put a little appendix to the statement that will appear at length. I have no objection to it, in fact, I am rather pleased it has gone in. I was going to ask the hon. member what his object is in putting this in.

Mr. BARKER. If the hon. gentleman is pleased that they have gone in we need not waste time in discussing it.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman attaches importance to it. What I meant to point out is that he has placed on 'Hansard' these tables that have taken a very long time to read. His object, I believe, is that this committee may come to an understanding as to the wisdom of this arrangement that has been made.

I quoted this last night, so I will not refer to it further.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have no objection to the hon. gentleman proceeding, but I would like some understanding to be reached. He is an old member of the House, and I would like him to remember these two rules, that he cannot refer to a previous debate, and that he cannot discuss the subject of reciprocity, which is now before the Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That was the statement made with the Speaker in the Chair. It cannot be out of order in both places—with the Speaker in the Chair and in Committee of the Whole. The speech was delivered with the Speaker in the Chair and in Committee of the Whole, and a cabinet minister cannot escape being criticised in either the one case or the other.

Mr. BELAND. Wait until next fall.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You do not purpose talking reciprocity until next fall, do you?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR. I want to quote this statement taken from page 7032 of 'Hansard'. The minister said:

Oh, no. What did we do with the malt business, if you want a common sample of it? They had a duty on malt and they said that they wanted their interest guarded. What was done? We left our malt duty on just as it was in the tariff. The American duty was about two and a half times as high as ours, and we had the American government reduce their duty to our duty. So, it was with respect to other questions when they came up. We knew this, yet, these hon. gentlemen say that we do not know anything about it, that we went it blind. They have the information now; let us see all that would happen if these eggs and cheese and butter should be allowed in. Of eggs, 750,456 dozen came into this country. This is going to ruin the farmers! If you multiply the dozens by twelve that gives you 9,000,000 of eggs. Thus, every man, woman and child in this country will get an egg and an eighth a year. You asked for information! I am giving it to you and you will not believe it. We have heard about butter; 389,462 pounds of butter came into this Dominion not only from these twelve countries, but from all countries. I reduce it into ounces and I find that 6,231,392 ounces of butter came into this country—three-quarters of an ounce of butter for every man, woman and child in this country in a year! Now that you have that information, do you think it will help you to make up your mind whether you are in favour of this agreement or not? But there is another thing. The cheese industry is going to be ruined! 662,568 pounds of cheese coming into this country! This man Fielding went down there and had President Taft gold brick him!

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. PATERSON. Reduced to ounces it represents a little over 10,000,000. That is worse than the butter, because it is an ounce and a quarter for every man, woman and child in this country in a year.

Now I asked the minister for a return of what came into Canada in the month of February and he gave me the quantity,

119,728 pounds of cheese came in. Great Britain sent us 3,000 pounds; the United States, 11,000; Italy, 101,000 pounds; Germany, 113,000 pounds; Holland, 2,759 pounds, making a total of 119,729 pounds. This came in at a duty of 3 cents per pound. What will that importation amount to when cheese is allowed in free as it will be if this agreement should be ratified? In one month 119,729 pounds came in. Multiply that by twelve and then multiply the total by sixteen, at the rate of sixteen ounces to the pound, and in place of one ounce and a quarter you will have three ounces of imported cheese for each man, woman and child in Canada. That is the statement made by the Minister of Customs.

I made the minister a proposition last night. I said that if he would back up the statement he made in this appendix which he added to the speech of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), I would make him a present of $100 for any charitable institution he would name in Brantford.

Mr. PATERSON. I will take it now, if my hon. friend——

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am not going to be interrupted. When the hon. minister was speaking, a couple of my friends on this side very respectfully asked leave to put him some very respectable questions. My hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Boyce) wanted to put him a question, but the minister said 'No.' My hon. friend from Quebec West (Mr. Price) asked if he might put a question and the minister said, 'No, sit down.' That was the treatment we received from him, and he is not going to interfere with me when I am performing the surgical operation on his appendix which I told him last night I would perform. The hon. minister said that he had brought down to this House a blue-book at the opening of the session giving all the information which the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) had given. I say that he cannot produce any blue-book giving the statistics and information which my hon. friend from Grenville gave. If he did produce one, I would make him a present of $100 for any charitable institution in Brantford he might name.

Mr. PATERSON. Here is the blue-book.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If the hon. gentleman will turn up any page in that blue-book—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hand over the $100.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If the hon. minister will turn up any page in that blue-book and read from it the exports from British India of animals, fruit, corn, hay, meat or vegetables for the year ending March 31, then I will cheerfully give him the $100, and say that he told the truth. But if he will not, then he told an absolute falsehood to this House.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. That expression is not parliamentary.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then I will cheerfully withdraw it, but I will back it up with the proposition I made. If that information is in that book, the hon. minister will have $100 to give to any charitable institution he pleases.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend must not bet. It is against the law.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am not betting. I am simply challenging the minister to make his statement good.

Mr. TURRIFF. You will not let him interrupt.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Perhaps I had better read the words which the minister used on that occasion. He gave these figures. In the month of February there was imported into Canada butter as follows: From Great Britain, 2,800 pounds; Australia, 15,000 pounds; New Zealand, 181,000 pounds; the United States, 6,000 pounds. Total, 206,472 pounds of butter imported into Canada in February, according to the figures he took from some old blue-book which he had at Washington, and he said that it amounted to three-quarters of an ounce to each man, woman and child. Then he asked how that would affect the butter market. On that butter, however, there is a duty of 3 cents per pound and now the government propose to let it in free. Multiply 206,000 pounds, the amount imported in one month, by twelve, and then multiply the result by sixteen ounces and you get nine ounces for each man, woman and child in Canada, yet the minister said that only three-quarters of an ounce came in for every man, woman and child. That statement is not correct.

Then take eggs. He worked out eggs and said it would give an egg and an eighth to each man, woman and child in Canada. Why in February alone there came into Canada from the United States 719,000 dozens of eggs which paid a duty of 3 cents a dozen. From all countries in that month there came 735,000 dozen eggs and if you multiply that by 12 to get the figure for the year and by 12 to give the number of eggs to the dozen, you get 13½ eggs to each man, woman and child, yet the minister says we only imported 1-⅛. How does that accord with the minister's statement? Here are his words:—

Mr. PATERSON. Reduced to ounces it represents a little over 10,000,000. That is

worse than the butter, because it is an ounce and a quarter for every man, woman and child in this country in a year.

Mr. PRICE. How many pounds are coming in when the reciprocity agreement goes through?

Mr. PATERSON. That is what you will have to make up now with the information you are getting. We got this out of the same blue-books that the hon. gentleman had all the time.

Is that correct? Let me ask the Minister of Customs. He had not the information in the blue-books. Then the debate continued:

Mr. REID (Grenville). Give us biscuits too.

Mr. PATERSON. I agree with what the hon. gentleman (Mr. Price), said, when he candidly admitted that as a lumberman this arrangement was in his favour but he was not sent here to represent his own interests. He took the right view of it. No gentleman ever hears me discussing my own business. I do not think it is very good taste to do so.

Mr. HUGHES. Do they not taste well?

Mr. PATERSON. Sometimes some hon. gentlemen want to give the impression that, somehow or other, from my being in the ministry and having something to do with framing the tariff, the duty on that article was by that means raised higher than it was under the previous government. Well now, I am not saying anything about it and I do not want to say anything about it, but if hon. gentlemen entertain that idea they are entertaining an absolutely fallacious one, an untrue one, because the fact is that the duty on that article has been reduced.

It is pretty high yet, it is not on the free list under this agreement.

Mr. PATERSON. It is not as high as on carriages.

Mr. TAYLOR. (Leeds). I will come to carriages. (reading).

It was reduced when we inaugurated our own policy and it is further reduced and largely reduced under this agreement. But, I do not want to talk of my own business. I do not know that it is right. I heard my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell). and while I sympathize with him if he thinks he is hurt I think it would be better taste for a man to leave the advocacy of business in his own interest to some one who is not connected with it. Therefore you never hear me talk about my own business at all. I find myself maligned. I find statements made in a public manner that give that idea to the people; in fact, it has been absolutely stated in the public prints and I have not taken the trouble to deny it. If it is any fun to hon. gentlemen opposite, if it is a mark of superior wit and wisdom that was manifested by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) —I do not think it elevated his position in the House to undertake to picture me sitting on a biscuit box or something—but if it amuses hon. gentlemen opposite, I am sure that I do not begrudge them the merriment it gives them. I do not think I have said as much as this in my life. Of course, I am not connected and I have not been connected in any active way with any business since I took office under my leader,

Mr. HUGHES. Just a sleeping partner.

Mr. PATERSON. I have a little money invested. It has to be invested in something, but as to drawing salary or getting any remuneration, I have never done that. If that company is fortunate enough to have any dividends I hope to share in them the same as you gentlemen do. I do not suppose that you wish me to take what little money I have and wrap it up in a handkerchief.

The hon. gentleman says he has no interest in these biscuits. It is a limited liability Company, he has stock in it. He is not a salaried officer but he may be a director; he has money invested there and it depends on how much that business makes, what the dividend will amount to and if the duty is not kept up he will not draw much dividend. He is a stockholder in a limited liability company as he has a perfect right to be but I ask if the passages I have quoted from his speech would indicate that he is a man qualified to go over to the United States to negotiate a reciprocity agreement with the cleverest men in the United States. I am quoting this because he said he was adding it as an appendix to the address of the hon. member for Grenville, so that his constitutents and the constituents of all hon. gentlemen opposite might read the speech of a statesman, appended to the speech of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid). Therefore I quote from it because I purpose having it published and sent to each of my hon. friend's constituents because I know he would not send it, he would be ashamed of the speech he made that night, ashamed to send it to his constituents as the speech of a statesman.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Paterson) continued:

I make this statement in the presence of gentlemen. I shall find out whether they are gentlemen or not, I shall find out which of them makes a suggestion of this kind which carries with it the inference that Paterson is in there in his own interest. I agree with the hon. member for Quebec (Mr. Price), that no man should come here to forward his own interests. He is sent here to exercise his best judgment in the interest of the country. I have told you simply how we conducted these proceedings in Washington and how we arrived at our conclusion. When we were at Washington we knew that last year there were 662,568 pounds of cheese imported into Canada, but we knew we exported 180,000,000 pounds,——

Where to? Not to the United States but to the English market.

—and we took it for granted that in view of this we could hold our own in cheese with the United States. As to potatoes, it is true

that while 513,735 bushels were imported last year from all sources, we exported 1,923,595 bushels.

Not to the United States. The hon. gentleman would lead the House to believe that we had exported them to the United States.

We exported 780,000 bushels to the United States, which is 150,000 bushels more than we imported. The Finance Minister told you that he did not think it necessary to have statistics on all these things, but we knew about the exports and imports of lumber just as hon. gentlemen opposite could know if they took the trouble to open the blue-books. The hon. gentleman who interrupted me so often knows something about the business, and we knew it too. We knew there was a duty of $1.25 on lumber going into the United States, and we believed from the information we had that it would be a good thing for the lumber interests of this country if without putting a duty on lumber here we could get the Americans to take their duty off lumber, and so far as I am concerned I made up my mind that if we got the Americans to do that, I would agree to it, statistics or no statistics.

Mr. PRICE. Did the hon. gentleman ever consider that the new Congress might possibly make lumber free?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What difference does that make?

Mr. PRICE. It makes all the difference in the world to the lumberman.

Mr. PATERSON. If the Democrats should make lumber free, and this agreement goes through——

The deputy Speaker then ruled the Minister of Customs out of order, but although he was ruled out of order he went on a little further dealing with the same question. I shall not go further because with what I put on 'Hansard' last night and this addition to-day, I feel that I have said sufficient.

Hon. Wm. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). I thought last night that perhaps the complaint was that I was out of order when I was making these remarks. The question arises whether as the hon. gentleman has spoken to-night and brought this matter up I am entitled to reply.

I did not want to be out of order, but I would like to make one or two remarks.

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand, the minister has a perfect right to speak on this point.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman has thought fit to make some remarks that were offensive. There is no evidence of talent in any one making offensive remarks, therefore, I will not notice them. I want to set him right on one point, so that, if he is going to spread his speech broadcast, it will not look quite so silly when people read it. He quoted some calculations that I had made. I may be wrong on those calculations, if I am, let any one show that I am wrong, and I will admit it at once. He says I brought down a report which shows that in one month a certain amount of cheese was brought into Canada, and he says if you multiply that amount of cheese by 12 months in the year, you will have a much larger quantity than the minister stated. Well, it would occur to the merest child to ask whether the same amount of cheese came in in each of the other 11 months. I was quoting from the blue-books, I was quoting from the trade and navigation returns, from the documents we have, giving the returns by the year, and not by the month. In those yearly returns the figures the hon. gentleman mentioned are included.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No, the returns I gave are for February, 1911, and the year he gave was the year ending March 31, 1910.

Mr. PATTERSON. I stand corrected in that, then. But what I was quoting from was the full year's returns, ending 31st March, 1910. Therefore, I was taking a year's returns. The hon. gentleman has not given us the year's imports, he has taken only one month, and then he multiplies it by 12. But supposing none came in, or scarcely any, during the other 11 months, that shows nothing. He must challenge my figures, which every one will admit are the proper basis to take for an argument, and show how much of these goods came into the country during the whole year. I took the last completed year, and if any one will make the calculation and show that I made a mistake, I will stand corrected. I took the returns from the books we had with us in Washington, I made my calculations on these, and I stand by those calculations until some one can prove they are wrong. Every hon. gentleman has the trade and navigation returns for the complete year in his desk, and, therefore, he has the figures. I think you will find that my calculations of the total importations during the whole year would amount to an ounce and a quarter for every man, woman and child in the country. I do not want to follow the hon. gentleman in anything approaching insolence or effrontery. I think it is quite out of taste for him to call in a minister to listen to personal abuse. I have to say here again what I said once before, that I endeavour always to treat every member with the utmost courtesy. But I do not want it to be forgotten that, though I am a minister, I am also a member of parliament, and I have the same right to courtesy that every other member has and no more. But the simple fact that I occupy a seat in the ministry is no justification for any hon. gentleman in this House to think he is at liberty to address to me language that he

would not apply to others. Last night I was sent for, and came into the House to listen to him. It is not evidence of very good taste to summon a person from his needed rest to come in here and listen to personal abuse, to be told that he has made statements that are false in their nature, to hear allusions to his business. It is true that I am engaged in a small business, and if any hon. gentleman can point out anything disreputable in connection with it, he is at liberty to do so. But I want to remind the hon. gentleman that in making a remark of that kind, while I may happen to have some money invested in a certain business, it is a very small amount in comparison with what is invested in that business by other men scattered through the Dominion. Therefore, when he endeavours to make out that there is something wrong and disreputable in that business, he is doing an injury, not to me personally, but to men who hold millions of capital invested in this industry.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I hope the minister is not trying to misrepresent me in insinuating that I said anything implying disrepute in his business. I was simply answering an argument that he himself placed on the 'Hansard' in reference to that business, and he will not find a word in the 'Hansard' that I uttered against his business.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman, though, was bold enough to insinuate that I had done something to further my own interest.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). In what way?

Mr. PATERSON. That I had taken care to keep the duty up to a good high figure.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is nothing against the business.

Mr. MACDONALD. Are you in favour of protection to the business?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Of course I am.

Mr. BEST. May I ask the minister a question? Why is it that you expect the farmers to produce wheat without duty, and as soon as it is turned over to the man that makes flour and biscuits out of it you give him a high protection?

Mr. PATERSON. My answer is, because I am trying to give effect to the wishes of the farmers. But I rose simply to show the hon. gentleman the position he is in. He disputes my calculations based on a year's returns which were given as a year's returns, and he presents a return for only one month, and says if you multiply that by 12 the result is so and so. My figures are there, on which I made a comparison. The hon. gentleman has not attempted to meet that. He has attempted to contradict that by taking the imports for one month, neglecting all the other months, and he says he will send that broadcast and that he will send it to my own constituency. For his own sake I would ask him not to do that, because they will look at the returns for themselves and see exactly what I am pointing out to the House. They will see that the hon. gentleman talks about one month in that speech, but takes no note of what came in during the other months. I have no objection, whatever, to any one disputing my figures. If they can show that I am wrong, I am very glad to be corrected, because we do not want to have figures placed before the House that will not bear investigation. But that can be no reason for personal abuse, for attempting to use language that would not be attempted to be used between one gentleman and another, and, as I say, I do not feel particularly pleased that the hon. gentleman should think that he occupies a position in this House which would lead him to send for the Prime Minister and to disturb me from my needed rest in order to come up here to listen to him, not disputing any arguments that I have made, but engaging in a tirade of abuse. That I do object to, and I think it is going beyond the limit. These hon. gentlemen, when they try to injure the business I am in, may do harm but I would tell them that there are millions of capital invested where I have very little, and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor, Leeds), seeks to create a prejudice against that business he is not hurting me very much, but he will be hurting men all over the Dominion. I see in a paper—true he did not say it—an article in which it was stated that the article of talc had been overlooked, that it was an article that was used in an hon. gentleman's business in order to reduce the cost and cheapen the quality of confectionery—the line I am engaged in. There are millions of capital invested in Canada and in like manufactured goods, and a statement of this kind must have a deteriorating and damaging effect upon the trade, not upon my trade, but on the trade of the men throughout the country who manufacture these goods. I know of no such article being used in the business of any man who is engaged in the trade, but to scatter that statement broadcast over the country, I am sure, must tend to lessen the quantity of the goods that must be sold for people are sensitive, and properly so, with regard to the question of pure foods. Yet, that statement is made to the detriment of millions of capital and of the interest of men who are engaged in this business, strong Conservatives as well as Liberals, without, in so far as I

am aware, the slightest shadow of foundation that any such thing takes place.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the hon. gentleman if that statement was made in this House?

Mr. PATERSON. No, I say it was made in a newspaper and it was copied into another, I have been told. I am glad that it appeared originally only in one newspaper. But, I am only pointing out the venomous attacks of this kind that are made upon me, and that it is an unfortunate thing for the line of business that I am connected with, because it is doing injury to others engaged in that business. I would ask my hon. friend from London (Mr. Beattie), if he believes there is any such custom as that, and if he believes that such a statement as that made in a newspaper can for one moment be believed? Yet, people may believe it. I, therefore, have made these remarks, not in my own interest so much, because my interest in business is only very slight in comparison with the millions of capital that are invested, but it is an unfair, it is unjust to the community and unjust to the men engaged in this line of business.

I need not say any more. I just rose to put my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, Leeds), right, and to let the House know that the figures which I gave were based upon calculations that are in the trade and navigation returns, which returns are in the hon. gentleman's possession. I took the number of pounds of butter that were imported during the whole year, I brought them into ounces, I estimated the population at 8,000,000 and I said that if those figures were correct that represented an ounce and a quarter of butter for every man, woman and child in the Dominion, and I pointed out that that amount could not influence the butter market very much. I did the same with cheese and with eggs. The hon. member for Leeds says a certain quantity of butter came into Canada in one month, and then on the supposition, without any foundation for it, that a like quantity had come in during the other eleven months says the figures I gave were incorrect. Hon. gentlemen can check the figures I gave, they have the trade and navigation returns in their possession and, as I said before, if they will check them, and show that I am wrong I will admit that I made a mistake most cheerfully. But, while they stand uncontradicted, for an hon. gentleman to get up and make a calculation without any foundation whatever, to mention that I have uttered a falsehood in the House, an accusation subsequently retracted, and to apply language equally offensive, is to transgress the bounds of that common civility that ought to prevail in this House between one member and another.

Mr. SPROULE. Medical men sometimes find that a patient, after a surgical operation, and especially after an anesthetic has been administered, are rather incoherent in their talk. We have an example of that to-night which is not unusual in the experience of those who belong to the profession to which I happen to belong. The hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), has apparently diverted attention to what he was pleased to call a gross abuse of a minister. I do not think that any minister ought to be abused any more than any other member of the House, but I think he did that more for the purpose of drawing attention away from the gravamen of the charge than for any good purpose. What was the gravamen of the charge? It was that the House was desiring to get correct information instead of information that was neither correct nor reliable. Examples were given last night by my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), and repeated to-night. The Minister of Customs deals with the calculation that my hon. friend from Leeds made. He made a calculation showing what would be most likely to happen if the duty were taken off certain articles of food.

Mr. DEVLIN. I would like to know what the question is before the Chair, and what the hon. gentleman is speaking on.

Mr. SPROULE. The question before the Chair, is for the House to go into Committee on Ways and Means. I understand that perfectly well, and if the hon. gentleman was in the House he ought to understand it also.

Mr. DEVLIN. I assume that the Minister of Customs was allowed to speak simply in answer to the hon. member for Leeds.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor, and the hon. gentleman has no right to interrupt me. What I say is that we are not given the information we ask for. We charge that the House is misled by the incorrect, unreliable information which is given, and therefore arguments based upon such information must naturally be misleading and unsuitable to the House. Let me give an example of that. I have in my hand a return brought down to the order of the House dated the 3rd March, 1911, showing the quantity and value of butter, eggs, poultry, chilled or frozen meat, bacon, lard, apples, vegetables, wheat, barley, cattle, horses and potatoes imported into Canada during the six months ending March 1, 1911. I have read that re-

turn with a great deal of care, and there is no mention in it of the importation of butter. What do the trade and navigation returns show? They show that in the month of October, 1910, there were imported of butter from Great Britain 201, pounds, and from the United States 5,496 pounds, although nothing at all is given in this return. Then, for the month of November, 1910, we find, according to the trade and navigation returns, that we imported from Italy 213 pounds, from the United States 3,917 pounds; for December, from Australia 72,800 pounds, New Zealand 10,000 pounds, United States 5,000 pounds; for January, 1911, Great Britain, 10,000 pounds, Australia 101,920 pounds, New Zealand 115,000 pounds, Asiatic Turkey 142 pounds, United States 2,132 pounds and yet, in that return, there is not a pound mentioned. Is that not misleading the House? Have we not a right to complain of that? I think we have. We do complain that the information we get is not reliable, and that ministers found arguments upon incorrect information. There is another complaint made. The minister said that we have all the information in the trade, and navigation returns, yet the hon. member for Leeds refers to importations from other countries of articles that are not mentioned at all in this return. He gives the exports of other countries that are not in this return, and are not in the trade and navigation returns, and yet the Minister of Customs says that you have all the information in the trade and navigation returns if you will only take the trouble to look it up. That could not be so because they do not make these returns. Then, why make the statement?

Mr. PATERSON. I did not make the statement.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister did make the statement in my presence that every member of this House had every item of this information before him, and yet there is no return before this House that contains that information. That is improper, and the minister is not treating this House with the courtesy to which it is entitled; nor, has he answered the argument advanced on this side of the House by saying something that has no basis in fact. These are the things that we complain of, and these are the things that the country is complaining of.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I was here the other evening when the discussion arose between the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) and the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and I think that pretty nearly the whole question was this: After the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) had placed his statement on record showing the exports of products such as are covered by the reciprocity agreement from all of these thirteen countries, and from the British colonies, the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) got up and, with the trade and navigation returns in his hand, said that all the information which the hon. member for Grenville had just placed on 'Hansard' was contained in the blue-book which he slapped on his desk. As a matter of fact that is not so, and the Minister of Customs knows, or should know, that this blue-book of which he spoke does not contain the information which the hon. member for Grenville put on record because it does not give all the imports and exports of foreign countries of articles covered by this reciprocity agreement such as we should have in order to know whether these countries can send their products in to compete with our Canadian farmers. I think the Minister of Customs does not desire this debate to proceed upon information that cannot be relied upon.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon member for Grenville said that the facts and figures he was quoting were not in the blue-book, and I said, no, but that the imports and exports of articles that concern our country were there. I would not be positive but I think that if you look at 'Hansard' you will find that the hon. member for Grenville said that with reference to certain figures which he quoted, and which are not in the blue-book. I think that you will find that I said they were not there.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister will know what we were contending for; we wanted to know the total exports of these countries to see whether or not they could possibly compete with the farmers in this country. The minister held up the blue-book, and said that all these figures in the report that my hon. friend from Grenville was putting on 'Hansard' were in the blue-book, we said they were not, and that is the reason why we put them on record.

Mr. PATERSON. As I remember I stated that certain articles which he was giving, having reference to what the hon. gentleman is alluding to, now, were not there, but that all that portion of the information which it was necessary for Canada to have with reference to imports and exports was contained in the blue-book.

Mr. SEXSMITH. The minister was very unfair in selecting the year he did. If you look over the imports of butter from the United States for the last ten years you will find that in 1910 there was only one-tenth of the amount imported from that country that was imported in the year 1909. Now, the minister selects that one year, and he hands it out to the farmers of this country so as to make the quantity of but-

ter the United States have been selling in Canada look small. In 1910 we imported a little over $18,000 worth of butter from the United States, but in 1909 we imported $156,143 worth. The Minister of Customs selected that lean year, and the reason such a small quantity was imported to Canada that year was that butter had been cornered in the United States, and the price had been run up. They held it in cold storage, and did not export it to Canada or anywhere else. But at the present time butter is cheaper in the United States than it is in Canada. Last year the butter was cornered and put in cold storage, and the people in the United States bought oleomargarine in its place. I was in New York state ten days ago, and a big butter dealer told me that last year he sold fifty tubs of butter in a week, but this year he was selling twelve tubs of butter and a hundred tubs of oleomargarine. The corner in butter raised the price so that the public had to buy oleomargarine, and when they were forced to put the butter on the market the bottom had fallen out of the demand for it. A friend of mine in Watertown, a Canadian, who conducts a big grocery business, told me that he had farmers' butter, creamery butter, and oleomargarine and that while eighteen months ago he was selling a much larger percentage of butter than of oleomargarine his invoices showed that at the present time he was selling 18 pounds of oleomargarine to one of butter. If the Minister of Customs had quoted the imports of butter in 1909 instead of 1910 he would have found a great difference. It was unfair for the Minister of Customs to hand out that statement to the farmers of the country because it was calculated to deceive them.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not doubt what the hon. gentleman says about the imports in the previous year, and I dare say that year after year the importation of butter will vary. The reason I took the particular year I did was that I just happened to have the figures for it in my desk. I certainly did not select it intentionally. However, take any year you like and you will find there is not sufficient imported to affect this market.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If the duty is removed it would.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). Mr. Chairman, this reciprocity pact recently entered into by two representatives of the Canadian government with representatives of the government of the United States, and now before us for consideration, is in my judgment the most important question that has ever come before this or any other parliament of Canada. Last year I was disposed to regard the navy question as such, but the question now before us I think predominates in importance. True, the navy question was settled, but not in the best interests of our race. If Canada is going to be one-twentieth as great as some gentlemen are pleased to think, then we are on the high road to meet great and grave issues. Last year we plunged into the navy question, and now we find ourselves imbedded in this national issue at the instance of but two gentlemen in this whole Dominion, and, the result of this arrangement if carried into effect will be that the home market, the best market, the market which takes about eighty per cent of our farm products will be thrown open to practically the whole agricultural world. These two representatives of our government entered into this bargain, a bargain which for example gives the Argentine Republic, exporting as much wheat as practically the United States and Canada combined, free entry into the market of Canada. It would interest me very much to know what it costs to produce a bushel of wheat in the Argentine Republic. We have heard it said that labour there is worth about 64 cents per day, and we know it is worth probably three times that in this country. The position we find ourselves in is that, so far as any information which the government is able to submit to us, we are practically in the dark; we are unable to say what the nature of the competition we are throwing our own farmers against in their own home market. We have heard a great deal recently of statistics, and I was much interested some time ago to hear the hon. member for North Wellington state that if there is any one thing which the Canadian government can learn from the United States government it is their system of collecting statistics. Before the President of the United States entered into this pact, he went about it in an intelligent way. He sent representatives of his government throughout the United States and throughout Canada I am told, and obtained data as to the conditions existing in both countries from the view point of the United States, and with that data before him he entered into these negotiations. And, in placing this pact before the representatives of the people of the United States the President submitted to the Congress three or four messages containing from 100 to 150 pages of printed matter, giving detailed information as to the conditions prevailing in both countries, and of course from the point of view of the United States. That was an intelli-

gent and courteous way to treat the representatives of the people. But in our case we have had but two Canadian representatives come before the representatives of the Canadian people, and tell us that we must accept this pact without having any information on the subject at all. If it was proper for the President of the United States to place before the Congress detailed information of the conditions in that country and especially from their viewpoint, it was the duty of the Canadian government not only to present the statistics from our view-point, but to go further and to show what the conditions are in the Argentine Republic, in Austria-Hungary, in Russia and these other countries which are given free access to our market under this arrangement. We should be told what is the cost of producing a bushel of wheat in Russia and what is the cost of landing Russian wheat in Canada at a profit to the Russian producer, but we are kept absolutely in the dark as to information of that character, and we are called upon to blindly pass this pact. It appears to me that we are giving democratic methods in this country a considerable jolt when the government undertakes to say that the people shall not be permitted to pass upon a question of this character and are going to insist upon the representatives of the people swallowing this measure without treating us with that courtesy to which I contend we are entitled. It has been suggested during the course of this debate that we should bring this question to the people. I am ready, Sir, to see that done, and am willing to go with it. It is possible that political parties are not always ready to go to the people; but the people are always ready for political parties when there is any matter of importance to be brought before them. Frequently I have been constrained to ask myself, what are we doing in this parliament? Surely we are not prepared to admit that it is a question of ins and outs. Is the only aim of a political party to get into power and then strive to remain there even to the extent of breeding parish politics into a science? I have the idea that we are sent here to take part in the development of this young country, to see that the varied interests of this country get a square deal.

In December last we had a visit from farmers who claimed that they had not been getting a square deal, who claimed they had been making their representations to the government of this country for some years past, who claimed that their product had been despoiled, and that much of it had been going to enrich middlemen and others. One of these farmers, Mr. Tregillus, vice-president of the United Farmers of Alberta, made a very strong plea for government terminal elevators on the Pacific. He stated that the first demand for such facilities had been made in 1906. I quote his statement from page 19 of the report:

> Since that time events have transpired and evidence has been acquired by your officers which shows that there is no possibility of the grain trade being placed upon a stable foundation unless all terminal facilities are owned and operated by the government as a public utility.

Other speakers dealing with the elevator question pointed to the fact that the farmer had not been getting his own out of his own product, and they asked for protection. In my opinion their demands were both fair and reasonable. I consider it to be the supreme duty of a government to see that the product reaches the consumer at the least possible cost to the producer. Then they dealt with the cattle industry. Mr. Warner, another Alberta farmer, pointed to the heavy expenditures by way of bounties and bonuses for the development of the industries of this country, and very pertinently asked, why not do something for the farmer in this matter? Those of us who come from the west know that the cattle industry of that country is not in a satisfactory condition. The shipment of cattle long distances by rail and water should be a relic of past ages. It is not humane, Sir. Some weeks ago I asked for return of all information in the possession of the government regarding the cattle business. The Minister of Agriculture very courteously told me that it would take probably two or three years to bring down that information. Well, I suppose the government is to be commended for its energy in that respect; but it appears to me that we have got to a period when we should stop collecting, and do business in the interests of the farmers. One of the farmers' delegates spoke of Dr. Rutherford, who had been dealing with the dressed beef question on August 1st, 1909. This remark is to be found on page 27 of the report:

> It is altogether likely that had it been possible to secure the required capital, that trade would have been inaugurated years ago.

The question in my mind is: Why was something not done towards acquiring the necessary capital for the establishment of the industry Dr. Rutherford refers to? In short, Sir, the farmers' requests in that matter appear to me to be fair and reasonable.

The next question that the farmers' delegates dealt with was the Hudson Bay railway, which they requested should be constructed and operated by the government. We are more or less in the dark as to the future of that undertaking; I refer to the

navigation of Hudson Straits. There is only one way to determine that question, and that is to construct the road. If successful, as many of our people appear to think it will be, it will be an immense factor in the development of this young country. In my judgment it will be successful, and even if it should not for the purposes for which it is being constructed, it can at least be used as a trunk line for opening up some of our hinterland. I, therefore, consider that we are justified in building that road. I cannot say that I endorse the public ownership of railways in a young country like Canada, as we have so many other purposes requiring our energies as well as capital; but in this case, as the success of the road from a financial standpoint is somewhat problematical, it appears to me that no corporation would undertake its construction without having the government behind it. Therefore, if the government is to get behind the construction of the Hudson Bay railway, I think the government had better build it and operate it for a few years until we see what the outcome is likely to be. Therefore, I say that the farmers' demands in that regard likewise are fair and reasonable.

The next question that was dealt with was by one of our Alberta farmers, Mr. Bower, who suggested some amendments to the Railway Act. I believe that the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) introduced certain amendments largely along the lines suggested by Mr. Bower. I have confidence in the Railway Board of this country. I believe it stands between the people on one side and the railways on the other, endeavouring to see fair play between both interests. The Railway Board is operating that Act day after day, and is probably more familiar with it and its ills than any other interest in this country. I think it would not be amiss for the government to have these suggested amendments considered by the board and dealt with promptly by the government and by parliament.

The next question that was dealt with by the delegates was certain suggested amendments to the Bank Act. No arguments were brought forward to show why that amendment was necessary, and as the banking institutions of this country must be on a very stable basis, it appears to me that it would be unwise to make any changes without the most careful consideration, and I do not know enough about the question to speak with much positiveness regarding it.

Finally the delegates took up the tariff question, and asked among other things for reciprocity with the United States in farm products as well as agricultural implements. When we attempt to touch the tariff question, there at once arises the question of free trade and protection. We find people convinced that protection is absolutely necessary in a young country like Canada, and we have others who are strongly of the opinion that free trade is the proper policy either in Canada or in any other country. Great Britain is the only world power that indulges in free trade, and we are told that she has never been more prosperous than in recent years. On the other hand we know that every other world power operates under some system of protection and these powers have never had greater prosperity than they are enjoying at present. The great republic to the south of us has made probably greater progress than any other country, and that republic has been operating not only under a protective system but a very high protective system. It is not for me to criticise the character of the protection which that country has had. That is none of my business. It is true that the United States has her trusts and other ills, and that some people lay those ills to the fact that protection exists there. I am not sure about that. I fear that the citizens of the United States have been bending their energies to the acquisition of wealth to the neglect of some other things. If they had been prepared to go into their legislative halls and with the same energy make laws in restraint of trusts, the situation might be different there to-day. In this country I believe we are commencing to suffer from the same thing. Apart from that, free trade Britain has her ills and in plenty too. My attitude on the tariff is not very firm because I regard the tariff not as a question of two or three years' study, and I do not propose to nail my colours to any tariff mast so firmly that I cannot get away from that attitude, if at a later date I conclude through the working of the machinery in my own head, that any other attitude is better in the interests of the people of this country. I know that we have a vast storehouse of virgin wealth in this country. I know that we have raw material in great quantity. I wish to see that raw material converted in this country into the finished product so that we may get the full benefit from what nature has so generously given us. Should we attempt to do that under free trade, I fear we would be contributing to the support of the vast masses of the people in the United States where industrial development has been brought to the highest point of success. Therefore, I believe that a fair measure of protection is necessary to develop the industrial side of this country. It has been said that our industries have been developed. Are we going to say that Canada is to remain

where she is to-day? I want to see great industrial centres grow up in our west. I would like to have those engaged in manufacturing to-day in this country expand their energies and establish industries throughout our west and not confine their efforts to any one portion of this country. Industry in the west means labour, labour means population and population means a home market—the very best market we can have. If we had in our west centres such as Minneapolis, Omaha, Chicago and St. Pail, the prices of our farm products there would be much more stable than they can possibly be under existing conditions.

Turning again to the farmers delegation I find on page 38 of their report that they ask in connection with reciprocity:

> That in the event of a favourable arrangement being reached, it be carried into effect through the independent action of the respective governments rather than by the hard and fast requirements of a treaty.

It would be interesting to know what was in the mind of the gentlemen who penned that paragraph. If reciprocity of the character we now have before us is in the best interests of the people, why should it not be hard and fast? But if there be any question as to its not being in the best interests of all the people we should be prepared to go slowly. What right have we to experiment in trade matters when in this intelligent age, we can by investigation conducted in a scientific manner work out results with fair accuracy. No such method was followed by this government. Reference has already been made to the fact that we have no statistics to guide us. Our government did not follow the example set by President Taft who, when he saw he was going to be engaged in negotiations for reciprocity with this country, got busy and had information collected from both countries. If our government had done the same, this pact would not be before us in its present condition. We would not have had a vast number of our fruit farmers here, shortly after the pact was announced, protesting against the manner in which the fruit and vegetable farming industry were being destroyed to a certain extent in this country. My hon. friend the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is not here, but I do not think he will challenge the statement I am about to make. He was in the constituency of Medicine Hat, a few days ago. He, there addressed an important gathering of citizens in my home city, Lethbridge. He told them, according to the press reports, that there was substantially nothing in the claim of the fruit farmers that their industry was in any way being injured. But practically at the same time as the hon. gentleman was making that address in Lethbridge, we had the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) presenting an amendment to this committee against the pact that is now before us. My hon. friend from Wentworth is a strong supporter of the government and he would not have taken the action he did unless he believed it was absolutely necessary. What I want to point out is that not only he but every page boy in this House knew that that pact has to go through in its present form and that consequently if his amendment carried it would destroy the pact. What then was his object in doing what he did? He has fruit and vegetable farmers in his constituency but all our fruit and vegetable farmers are not hived in that constituency. He knew that that pact was going to injure that industry both in his own constituency and in a number of other constituencies throughout the country.

I believe, however, that the author of the paragraph referred to had something entirely different in his mind. I believe he suggested independent action so that Canada, the small country, would keep herself clear of any entanglements whereby her large and influential neighbour could not at a later date dominate here in trade matters. In my opinion, the present pact is the most dangerous one that this young country could engage in. It is not of a character that will permit Canada to be absolutely independent as suggested by the farmers' delegation. The pact has a flavour of divorce court proceedings, which, at least in this country, are not agreeable. We are told it may be broken at a moment's notice. While it is true we may change our tariff, it does not destroy the pact so long as the United States continue to keep faith in whole or in part. Can we not then see the position it may land us in? It has been truly said that Canada is placing a noose around her neck by entering this pact, and the string to tighten that noose will not be in our hands. It will be in the hands of our neighbours. On the other hand, a firm treaty for a definite period of time, would, at the end of that period, leave us in exactly the same position as when we entered that pact, namely in absolute control of our own tariff to do our own business for our own people in our own way. Let me suggest a difficulty that we might find ourselves in under this pact. While the proposals resulting in this arrangement emanated from the President of the United States, still the correspondence embodying the terms of the pact was negotiated by the two representatives of our government. In that correspondence there was a direct invitation to the United States to drop her tariff wall, to let, for instance, our wheat free into that country. Now we know that cannot be accomplished without transporation lines; we know that Canadian railways are not going to build down to the

boundary and hand over our product to their rivals, the American railways. Then Sir, it means this, if it means anything, that it is a direct invitation to the American railways to come into our country for the product of our farmers. I do not object to that so long as they come in as other foreign capital is coming in at this moment, not under any pact or arrangement between our government, and the government of the country from which that capital comes. I do not wish to put a board fence around this country, but I want to see us keep absolute control of our own affairs. If our western farmers expect to get our grain into the American markets, it appears to me that the American railways must accept the invitation of our country, and build those roads into our country. Nothing can be accomplished by a few trunk lines, because the farmers cannot afford to haul grain more than six or eight miles of railways. Therefore, if it means anything, it means that our western country must be grid-ironed by American railways. I do not, I repeat, object to that; in fact I will be glad to see them come into the country. Then suppose that we break this pact 24 hours after we enter into it, and our neighbours should continue to keep it. Suppose the American railways should grid-iron our country. Suppose that 10 or 15 years hence our government should do something along our boundary that they thought to be in the interests of our people, is it not possible that these American railways would say they had created vested interests in this country? Is it not possible they would say: You invited us to come into your country, we are taking your wheat out, we are taking your timber out, we are taking your fish out, and we have developed a north-bound traffic as well, for we cannot operate with profit without traffic both ways. They would add we developed that north-bound traffic under conditions that prevailed during the time our government had been keeping faith with yours. Then might we not find them saying to us: You have broken faith, you are injuring vested interests. We would say: Nay, they would say: Yea, and probably that yea would be repeated at Washington with the statement that our proposed Act was that of an unfriendly people, which, in diplomatic language, is not agreeable.

While on the subject of railways let me digress to say that I consider railways to be the crying need of our western country. I have constituents who live 50 miles from a railway. I know that they want railways a great deal more than they want any reciprocity of the character before us, and I am prepared to go back to them on that issue. I say that the government has failed to realize the situation in that country. Corporations are building railways through that country, and spending an immense amount of money, but they are going where they please, and how they please; they are jockeying each other for advantage in certain territory. They should, in my opinion, be pulled apart and the government should insist on their spreading their energies over the entire country. If our government had been paying some attention to that feature, the farmers of the west would appreciate that to a much greater extent than this pact now under consideration.

Possibly some one may say that I am playing with shadows when I suggest the foregoing possible entanglement with our neighbours. Can we not learn something from the past? We had a pact in existence in 1854 which was abrogated in 1865, and one of the reasons given by our neighbours for abrogating it was that we had the hardihood to change our tariff in respect to some articles not covered by the treaty. They took the position that because they had entered into a treaty with us, because certain tariff conditions existed at that time, we were not at liberty to change our position in that regard. It seems to me that was travelling a long way to find a reason for abrogating that treaty. I can refer to a case in the past few years. In June, 1902, Congress passed an Act inviting Canada, through Great Britain, to take part in an investigation of international waters. When the Joint International Waterways Commission was completed under that Act by the appointing of three Canadians and three Americans, one of the first questions referred to that commission by our government was a dispute on the St. John river as between interests in Maine and New Brunswick. The dispute had reached an acute stage. What happened? The Canadian section referred it to the American section which in turn consulted its government at Washington, and they were instructed that they were to have nothing to do with the St. John river dispute. The instructions which the American section received from the government at Washington were in the following words:

> The broader interpretation given to the Act by Canadian authorities should be rejected if for no other reason than on account of the smallness of the appropriation for the support of the American section.

In other words our interpretation of ordinary plain English, was to be governed by the amount of money our neighbours saw fit to vote for the use of their section. It appears to me that is an extraordinary position to take. Our government persisted, the matter was placed before the British Ambassador at Washington, who was instructed to take it up with the govern-

ment of that country, but without success, because his office telegraphed to Ottawa the following:

This government regret they cannot agree with your commission in dealing with the St. John river.

That answer was certainly to the point, it was direct, and what happened? Simply this, that our government had to back down. I am not criticising them for that, because there was no other course open to them. That was done by the right hon. gentleman on the 5th of June, 1905, when he addressed the Canadian section in the following language:

With reference to the opposition raised by the American commission to consider other waters than the waters of the lakes and rivers whose natural outlet is by the River St. Lawrence to the Atlantic ocean, it would be no use to persist in our contention, and the government, therefore, are of the opinion that the commission had better even proceed in this limited way.

Well, it appears to me, that the foregoing is a sufficient evidence that our neighbours will dominate us when it suits their purpose. If we believe one tithe of what we say about the great virgin wealth of this country, if we have confidence in ourselves, then we must know that we have a country loaded with raw material, with water routes equal to the best in the world, with an excellent strategical position in the world of commerce. We will, provided we keep ourselves clear of trade entanglements, be the serious rival of even the most successful and the most prosperous countries of the present time. A more fruitful source for trouble between Canada and her immense neighbour could not be found, than in trade arrangements, especially when that trade is to be the source of the only rivalry that can possibly exist between us.

Now, I would like to consider briefly the economic side of this question. The farmers asked for, amongst other things, reciprocity in farm products as well as in agricultural implements. They are only getting reciprocity, of a character, in agricultural products. We are giving our home market to our neighbours, as well as, practically, to the entire agricultural world. The United States is not attempting to do anything of the kind, and the reduction in agricultural implements is of little or no account. Why does the United States want our farm products? Not to give us better prices than we have been getting. They want our farm products to assist in lowering the prices of such products to the consumers in the United States. Canada exports about 60,000,000 bushels of wheat, while our neighours last year, I think, exported about 151,000,000 bushels.

Supposing for the purpose of argument that Canada exported her 60,000,000 bushels to the United States, then our neighbours would have their own 151,000.000 bushels, plus our 60,000,000, or 211,000,000 bushels which they would have for export to Liverpool. The heavier the stock the United States carries for export purposes, the lower it will force the price of the product in their home market. So there must be a sagging in prices in the United States, governed by the amount of wheat they import from us. But every bushel they import from us displaces a bushel in that country, which has to be shipped out of New York, because they produce much more than they consume. Therefore, their railways and their flour mills will get the benefit of what they import from us, and it will do the double duty of helping to steady or lower prices in their market. as well as to create labour for their railways and their flour mills. Here is what President Taft had to say at Springfield, Illinois, on February 11 last:

To let the wheat of the northwest come down to Minneapolis and Chicago will steady the price of wheat. But that it will in the end substantially reduce the price of wheat fixed for the world in Liverpool, no one familar with conditions will assert.

It will give to the United States much greater control of the wheat market than it has ever had before. It will enable its milling plants to turn Canadian wheat into flour and send abroad the finished product and will stimulate the sale of manufactures and other things that we have to sell in Canada.

Now, Sir, I do not know that we are particularly interested in the United States obtaining control of the wheat market; I do not know that we are particularly interested in the creation of labour for Minneapolis in turning Canadian wheat into flour. We have some people in this country, irrespective of politics, who are strongly of the opinion that Canada is to be the greatest wheat producing country in the world. If there is anything in that statement it appears to me that we might be somewhat ambitious to control the wheat market in this country for our farmer, instead of allowing him to become the agent through which the wheat trust in the United States will take advantage of his product in order to obtain greater control over the wheat products of the farmers in his own country. Some people claim that the United States is rapidly reaching the point when she cannot produce enough to feed her own people. There is absolutely nothing in that. We know that the density of population in that country is about 25 to the square mile, and we know that there are countries in Europe with almost ten times that density of population, producing enough to feed

their own people. The United States produce enough to feed her own people and some 17,000,000 over and above her own population; in other words, she can feed her own people and a country twice as populous as Canada.

Now, what is the position in Canada? Not only do we allow American farm products in free, but under the favoured nation treaties practically every other agricultural country in the world. Canada will become absolutely free trade in agricultural products. Free trade, we are told, means the lowest possible prices, so that Canada, like Great Britain—the only two countries in the world—will have open doors for farm products, which means the cheapest farm products. Is it not the height of absurdity to ask the farmer of this country to sell his products in an open market and to buy in a protected market? It certainly does not look good to me.

However, in coming back to my original position, I wish to say that I have the greatest regard for our neighbours to the south of us. Yet if we wish to maintain our own national integrity, if we wish to work cohesion into the four scattered sections now known as Canada, we are positively sure of one safe way to do it—the dignified one, of doing our own business for our own people. Therefore, let us keep clear of business pacts, at least until we have some evidence that there is less selfishness in humanity than exists at the present time.

The pact, Mr. Chairman, that I wish to see consummated is that peace pact between our family and the United States. I wish to pay my tribute to President Taft for his efforts in that direction, because I would like to see that pact so worded that it will allow every civilized people to come in, knowing full well that when we get fifty-one per cent of civilization into such a pact we will have a sure means of reducing the taxes of the people. President Taft addressed a meeting in New York on the 28th instant and made some very significant remarks. I find the following:

I have said that this is a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity. It is critical because unless it is now decided favourably to reciprocity, it is exceedingly probable that no such opportunity will ever again come to the United States. The forces which are at work in England and in Canada to separate her by a Chinese wall from the United States and to make her part of an imperial commercial band reaching from England around the world to England again, by a system of preferential tariffs, will derive an impetus from the rejection of this treaty, and if we would have reciprocity with all the advantages that I have described, and that I earnestly and sincerely believe will follow its adoption, we must take it now or give it up for ever.

I do not know that it would be possible to read a more significant statement than that. If President Taft objects to the idea of the Chinese wall between that country and this, he does not appear to have any objection to having a Chinese wall built with Canada and the United States within it, and a part of our own family outside of it because we find that upon the same occasion he stated that:

We tendered to the Canadian commissioners absolute free trade in all products of either country, manufactured or natural, but the Canadian commissioners did not feel justified in going so far.

We do not see any statement from him as to any suggestion of free trade with the other nations of the world. So, I say that it looks as though he would be quite willing to have a Chinese wall built around the two countries. What does his statement mean, that reciprocity must be taken by the United States now or never? It appears to me that it means that Canada has been proceeding along a certain path and, as Mr. Taft stated on another occasion, that Canada had reached the parting of the ways; it means that if we are allowed to continue along that path there may be a vista opened up to us which would tend to continue to draw us along that path. It looks to me as if that was what President Taft had in his mind, and it is a statement that should be considered very carefully by the people of this country. If President Taft in his wisdom believes that if reciprocity is not accepted by the United States now they will never get it from us, he must also believe that there is something a great deal better for us if we continue as we have been going. I find that President Taft stated elsewhere on the same occasion, speaking of the government of this country:

The government is one entirely controlled by the people, and the bond uniting the Dominion and the mother country is light and almost imperceptible. There are no restrictions upon the trade or economic development of Canada which will interfere in the slightest with her carrying out her independent future.

That is evidently what is uppermost in Mr. Taft's mind. That is not my ambition as a Canadian, and I do not believe that is the ambition of the majority of the people of Canada.

Now, there has been some talk about annexation. I believe a number of people in the United States who have been favouring this pact, had in their minds annexation. I consider it as a mark of intelligence on their part. We Canadians should have enough vanity to think that we would not lower the standard of citizenship of the United States if we joined the union, and

the addition of our vast virgin wealth would do much to replete the overdrawn stores of that country. However, no one in Canada is looking for annexation. Yet if our neighbours did think seriously of the matter, they could only do it through some trade arrangement. The orthodox way of catching a colt is by coaxing with a handful of oats. It might be interesting to quote Archibald Cary Cooledge from his work on 'The United States as a world power.' Mr. Coolidge was in the diplomatic service of the United States. He was with Secretary Taft to the Philippine Islands in 1905 and 1906, and is now a professor at Harvard University, and when a gentleman attains that position in such a seat of learning, he is capable of doing his own thinking. In referring to the Canadian situation and the abrogation of the Trade Treaty of 1854, he says:

In consequence, when the period for which the trade treaty was made came to an end in 1865, the agreement was not renewed. Justifiable as such action may have been from a commercial point of view, it was none the less short-sighted. If the Americans believed that Canada would one day come into the union, they should have prepared the way for the event——

And how?

—by cultivating close trade relations, even if the weaker state did in the meantime get the greater profit from them. Wise foresight would have dictated the same sort of policy in the United States as was shown by Prussia in her formation of the German Zollverein—a willingness to sacrifice small temporary advantages in favour of large aims for the future. But a popular government is seldom guided by such long views if they mean immediate loss.

It appears to me that President Taft has gotten away from the idea of popular government. Speaking of the resources of the country, Mr. Cooledge says:

* * * *

And grain is not her sole reliance; her forests will be called on more and more to supply the lumber which their depleted American rivals will be unable to furnish; her fisheries, both in the east and in the west, are of untold value; she has copper north of Lake Superior, coal in Nova Scotia and elsewhere, mineral wealth of all kinds in her Rocky mountains only waiting to be exploited, and near the Alaska frontier, the gold of the Klondike. These resources, which are just beginning to be developed, hold forth a brilliant promise for the future.

He then undertakes to discuss the question of Canada remaining in the British empire. He says:

* * * *

There is no doubt that the idea of being an equal member in the community of the largest and most populous empire in the world is one to appeal to the imagination, a magnificient dream, capable of rousing the utmost enthusiasm in those who glory in the greatness of the English name. It is also one which has for the Canadian farmer attractions of a more prosaic kind. Such an empire would pretty certainly be bound together by preferential duties, if not actual free trade between the members and a protective tariff against outsiders, and this will give Canadian wheat a decided advantage on the London market over rival grain from Russia or The Argentine.

Evidently, Sir, that was exactly the mind of President Taft when in his statement in New York the other day he told his people they must take reciprocity now or leave it alone for ever. I continue to quote from Mr. Cooledge:

There is no valid reason for regarding this dream as chimerical simply because the principles which it embodies received a check at the last English election. In one form or another the federation of Greater Britain is quite possible, and, though the issue will not be settled in a day, it bids fair to become within a generation one of the most momentous in politics. From the point of view of the United States there would be no cause to welcome this federation. If it should be based upon internal reciprocity with protection against other nations, American exports, both raw materials and manufactured goods would suffer. So vast are the markets included in the domain of Greater Britain, so imposing is its situation almost everywhere, that if this greatest of empires were to follow a policy of exclusion towards others, it might provoke a league to break its power. In such a league, too, the United States might conceivably have a place; for from the closeness of its relations with British America, it might be forced either to become part of this Greater Britain or as a matter of self-preservation to oppose it. This may be fanciful speculation about the distant future, but it is a fact of the present that the drawing together of Great Britain and Canada is in no sense to the benefit of the United States.

Now, Sir, while I am keenly anxious to see the British family closely cemented together, still I do not see that it should be objectionable to other nations. Canada would be foolish indeed to enter into any pact with another country that might interfere with the cementing process in her own family being proceeded with as time advances. I have faith in our own people. I wish to see some organic union among the British people, not for the purpose of dominating other people, but because I believe it would be best for humanity and best for us. And, when we accomplish that I think there is something even greater for us to look to: the welding together in some form with other peoples, because I have the idea that the Millennium is coming and it will come in that way. So far as this pact is concerned I am opposed to it. I was first disposed to favour it, but the more I revolved it in my mind the less I liked it. I

have no interest in any railway in this country; I have not been approached by any interest as to how I should vote in this matter; I have absolutely done my own thinking in connection with it. If it is good for the western country, if it is good for Alberta, it is good for me financially. But, Sir, I question if it is good. In any case, Sir, I do not believe in any suggestion that we are going to place a certain section of our people in the position that they will have to sell in an open market and buy in a protected market.

Mr. ALEXANDER HAGGART (Winnipeg). Mr. Chairman, we are all more or less parochial. Some of us may think we are more cosmopolitan than others. Now, just consider the different elements and communities of which this Dominion, stretching from the Atlantic to the Pacific, is made up. Perhaps the only industry which is common to all the provinces is farming, in its various branches of grain growing, meat producing, dairying, gardening, and so on; but the varying conditions are such that those exclusively engaged in any one of the branches may have little in common with the others. In fact, what would beneficially affect the tillers of the soil in one particular district or in one particular province might have the reverse effect in another. The first impulse of the individual is to consider how a particular measure will perhaps affect his own calling, the business in which his own money is invested, or the locality in which he lives. We are consciously or unconsciously affected by the trade conditions surrounding us, and by the opinions of those whom we respect who are living in the same neighbourhood as ourselves. I will not attempt to be less provincial or parochial than others; but I would be satisfied if I gave a fair and an honest expression of opinion of the best and of the majority of the people amongst whom I live or whom I represent; because I believe that by so doing I would be carrying out the trust that is imposed upon me by those people. I am only one of the community, and I would be satisfied if I gave, as I believe I shall give, the opinion of the people of Winnipeg upon this great and important question. It is not difficult to ascertain what is the opinion of the people of Winnipeg. When these venerable politicians went to Washington, not at the command or instance of the people of the country, but at their own instance or of the instance of the government, the people of Winnipeg watched them closely. They waited for even any rumour that might come from behind the tyled doors where they were in counsel with the Americans, and they were not long in coming to a conclusion and expressing their opinion on the results of those negotiations which were presented to us in the resolution now before this House. As to what was the conclusion of the people of Winnipeg, we have sufficient evidence, and good evidence. We have a legislature there that had come fresh from the people, and after the matter was debated and considered in that legislature, which represented I think fairly the people of Manitoba, they unhesitatingly condemned this compact or proposal which was brought here from Washington by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs. We have another important body of men in that city, the board of trade, consisting of some hundreds of the best business men in that city, men who have grown up with the city, and have become prosperous with its prosperity. Then we have the grain exchange, consisting of a large body of commercial men, able men, clever men. They considered it, and the result of their consideration was that they also condemned this arrangement. I believe that to-day a majority, and a large majority, of the people of Winnipeg are satisfied with the conditions which exist there, the splendid conditions under which the city and they themselves have become prosperous, and they would have to be certain that what was proposed would be an improvement upon the present condition of affairs. Another gentleman whose opinion I think ought to carry some weight with hon. gentlemen opposite is Mr. D. C. Cameron. He is one of the first citizens of Winnipeg he is a wealthy man; he is engaged in a large business; he is first in every progressive and philanthropic enterprise in that city. There is no man in Winnipeg who is more respected than he is, and he is such a man that the supporters of hon. gentlemen opposite in the city of Winnipeg were very glad to have him as their candidate at the last election, and it is just possible, by reason of his standing and by reason of the manner in which he was treated and considered by the city of Winnipeg, that he might have represented that city to-day in this House, were it not for the fact that the poor man was burdened and handicapped by the sins of the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House. I will give another certificate of character to that gentleman. He received at that election nearly 7,000 votes of the people of Winnipeg, more votes than were given to any minister sitting on the opposite side of the House; more than were given to any gentleman sitting behind them. He is known as one of the most progressive gentlemen in the city of Winnipeg, and I will guarantee that he knows more of sane and proper business methods than any brace of gentlemen sitting on the

government benches. Now, Montreal, Halifax, St. John, Toronto, Hamilton, London and all the other large and important trade centres of this Dominion were in existence and doing business before and during the old reciprocity treaty and since it was repealed. Winnipeg and Vancouver, too, are the product of the conditions that have existed since that treaty was repealed. I do not want to boast, but I just want to say that the progress that has been made under existing conditions—conditions created by the National Policy and the railway policy of Sir John Macdonald, and the conditions created by that same policy in so far as it has been followed by the present government. Winnipeg, I say, is the result of the conditions that have existed under the policy which both governments of this country have pursued, the policy of interprovincial trade and the establishment of railways running east and west. It is now the third largest city, I believe, in the Dominion. It is practically the connecting link between these important provinces in the east, and the three or four provinces in the west which are greater in area and before long are likely to be greater in importance.

Just let me give some figures to show the progress we are making in the west, which will perhaps be a revelation to many hon. members here who have never been in that country. In 1870 Winnipeg was a little hamlet at the junction of the Assiniboia and Red rivers and its population consisted of about 215 people, living in a few scattered cabins lying outside Fort Garry. Twenty-five years went past, twenty-five years of dearth and hardship. We had the locusts destroying the crops and a series of years in which it was difficult to produce any crop, yet during that twenty-five years the population of Winnipeg increased to 19,000. The next fifteen years were more progressive. In 1910 Winnipeg had a population of 160,000, and in 1911, according to the census taken by the directory men—and I would have more faith in a census taken by the directory men and the assessors of the city than that taken by this government, because I know the kind of officials this government employs to take the census—we have a population of 200,000. There may be a few repeaters in that calculation but I am perfectly within the mark in saying that the population is at least 175,000. We have 59 miles of asphalt pavements, 38 miles of macadam and 27 of cedar block, or a total of 124 miles of good solid substantial pavement. We have 211 miles of graded streets, 81 miles of granolitic sidewalks, 322 miles of plank sidewalks, 177 miles of sewers, 197 miles of watermains, 62 miles of street railway, and 47 miles of beautiful boulevard streets, lined on each side by the finest modern residences. But perhaps what shows more accurately the progress of a city is the amount of money spent every year in the building of residences, warehouses, and factories. In 1909 the building permits in Winnipeg amounted $9,226,000 and in 1910 that was increased to $15,106,450; and if the present progress keeps up, this year we will have under construction buildings to the extent of over $20,000,000.

Winnipeg is not satisfied to be an agricultural and mercantile distributing centre. She wants to be a manufacturing city. Five years ago we produced $8,500,000 worth of manufactured goods. In 1910, five years later, our manufactured products amounted to $36,000,000 and the number of our factories was 236. These factories employed 15,000 artisans with a monthly pay roll of $750,000, and radiating from the city are 22 pairs of railway tracks.

The Americans tried to get our grain trade as well they might because Winnipeg to-day is the largest grain market on this continent. A couple of years ago Minneapolis claimed to be the largest grain market but she has had since to give way to Winnipeg. We have a milling capacity of 40,000 bushels daily, and last year 88,000,000 bushels of grain were brought to Winnipeg, inspected there and shipped from that city. Consider what that means. Consider what bearing the buying and selling of grain has incidentally on other businesses. Bank clearances are sometimes taken as an indication of progress. Well, the bank clearances in Winnipeg amounted last year to the sum of $952,415,182. With such progress, with a city making the substantial growth that Winnipeg is doing, and with this increasing business, I do not think we can come to any other conclusion than that we require better evidence than we have had so far that our progress, should this pact carry, will be greater than it would be under present conditions. Winnipeg has a laudable ambition, not simply to be a distributing point, but a great manufacturing centre, but we are handicapped by the want of fuel. Fuel is the origin of our power and energy now. We bring it from the Rocky Mountains 150 miles to the west and from Pennsylvania 1,500 miles distant to the east. That handicaps us in manufacturing, but we are making a heroic effort to overcome that difficulty. Running along the northeastern part of the province is the Winnipeg river, connecting Lake of the Woods and Lake Winnipeg. That river is of no use for navigation. It tumbles over a succession of falls in the course of 100 miles between those lakes, and we have undertaken to develop one of those falls. On the Winnipeg river a site is being developed which is going to cost four or five million dollars.

The city has been spending on that undertaking half a million dollars every year during the past five or six years, and inside of a year we are promised that 30,000 horse-power will be brought into the city and eventually 60,000 horse-power at the lowest cost, and that will be furnished manufacturers at actual cost for the purpose of encouraging these industries. It is said by the eminent board of engineers that the power can be sold for $18 per horse-power, and that the power to customers can be brought down to $12.50. But before we could take any steps towards building that dam, which is one of the most magnificent municipal works on this continent, we had to build 24 miles of railway for the purpose of getting in the plant and material. We are told that we need not be discouraged, that our manufactures are not to be interfered with by this proposed agreement. The hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller), I understand, told his constituents the other day that they might rest assured that manufactures in the town of Hanover had nothing to fear. But we know well that when our farmers have got one concession, they are not going to rest contented. Are the farmers to whom the alleged concession is now to be made to remain quiet? They tell us plainly, no; and this is but the commencement of an agitation greater than that which we witnessed last year. The present concession they will accept only as an instalment. The edge of the wedge is only being entered, and they will not be contented to sell their goods in an unprotected market and be compelled to buy everything they require in a protected market. By this pact, therefore, the government are opening the door for absolute free trade. We have said time and again on this side of the House that the people were never consulted, but my hon. friend the Minister Customs, the other night, in a solemn voice that sounded like the solemn tones of some cathedral bell, told us that the people would be consulted perhaps sooner than we desired. Well, we on this side want that election now. We want the people to be consulted at once. The government cannot bring on the election too soon to suit hon. members in the opposition.

You pass this reciprocity resolution, you pass an Act bringing it into force, it is an accomplished fact; then, after the people have made their adjustments, given up the old markets and tried to form new alliances, you come back to them again now that this is done, you invite them to come back to the old situation. They have made one change, they have suffered loss, there has been dislocation of business and ruin in some cases. Now the agreement is in force and you wish to go back again after you have severed connections with the old customers and have made new alliances with other people. We have been told by the Finance Minister that reciprocity with the United States has, from time immemorial, been the policy of all parties. This has been repeated by some newspapers. There is no question that after the sudden abrogation of that treaty in 1864, the people of Canada would have liked to have had a renewal of that treaty. They had had extensive trade relations with the Americans for the preceding 12 years and were suddenly cut-off from that market. They had not formed new alliances and new trade routes. We had not acquired new markets at that time, we had no communication with the Atlantic in the winter, we were dependent entirely upon the Americans, and our system of transportation was very primitive. But because reciprocity was a good thing at that time, and during the continuation of that treaty and because it was hard to suffer the rebuffs we then suffered when reciprocity was taken away from us without any particular reason being given except that it was not in the interest of the United States, it does follow that it is best now, we set ourselves to acquire new markets for our products and developed our own interprovincial trade, we set to work to build our railways and, perhaps, that is partly the reason why to-day we have the magnificent system of railways that we have, uniting our provinces and strengthening the bonds of confederation. We were told another story by the Prime Minister. He was in error in telling it. He said that in Manitoba in the early eighties, we had an incipient rebellion, and that the cause of that rebellion was that the people of the Northwest wanted to trade with the south, that they wanted to trade north and south. I cannot say that he did not read history aright, he was one of the makers of history at that time, and if he would brush up his recollection he would find that if we had had ten railroads running north and south we could not have made use of them in the absence of trade relations with the south. The same high tariffs were there, the gates were shut. The reason of the little trouble there was that the people of Manitoba wanted competition. They thought the Canadian Pacific railway was charging rates that agriculture would not bear. The merchants in Winnipeg thought they were charging rates on imports that the trade would not bear and they simply wanted competition. The local government finally chartered the Red River Valley railway and the monopoly clause in the Canadian Pacific railway charter was deleted. We had then in power one Joe Martin, subsequently a member of this House, and one Thomas

Greenway, who started to build the railway and then transferred it to the Northern Pacific railway, and shouted: We have got competition. They had handed it over to the Northern Pacific, and the competition when they were compelled to disclose it, consisted simply of a letter from the president of the Northern Pacific railway that his road would charge no more to bring wheat to Duluth than the Canadian Pacific railway charged to bring it to Port Arthur. Fortunately for the province of Manitoba that government was in its dying days, and it died and was buried, thank God, and there has never been any resurrection since. Another able government came into power, and they took hold of the railway situation. They had to buy back that railway, built largely with Manitobar money, from the Northern Pacific, and they made a new deal with the Canadian Northern railway by which they controlled the rates, and as a result of which there is in Manitoba to-day more mileage of Canadian Northern railway than there is of Canadian Pacific railway. The Manitoba government have control of the rates, and again there farming now is a paying business. Manitoba benefited, and every province to the west of Manitoba incidentally benefited. The Canadian Northern railway began in Canada, ran through Canadian soil in Canadian territory and terminated in Canadian ports at Port Arthur and Fort William. So that now all our grain instead of going by way of Duluth, by American cities, paying tribute to American railroads, now goes over our own territory through our own ports, over our own railways to the east, through our own elevators, into ocean steamers, to be carried to the markets of the world, or is carried to our own cities to be ground in our own mills to the profit of the whole people of Canada.

The monopoly clause of the Canadian Pacific railway, although irksome, at the time, was not altogether an evil. At this distance of time we must acknowledge the foresight of that great statesman, who desired to make the channels of commerce between the eastern provinces, and the western territory wider and deeper before that great work would be subject to the competition by diversion of our trade to the United States.

Members on this side of the House would welcome the execution of the government's threat of an election. We believe that the opinion of the people is against this pact, and it is only fair that they should have an opportunity of expressing an opinion on it before it becomes law.

I shall touch upon another question which has been referred to by the hon. member for Medicine Hat. With reference to the speech or address of President Taft at New York the other day, I am informed by one who was at that meeting that that address was in manuscript, that it was read closely by the president from that manuscript and that that manuscript was handed to the press. Evidently what he said was said with deliberation and not in the heat and excitement of a debate. I think that address ought to be read carefully by every Canadian, that it ought to be in every Canadian home so that every elector in this country might read it for himself. First the president speaks of wheat, oats and barley. We have heard a great deal of that from northwest Liberal members; they say that we are going to get rich on wheat, barley and oats. Take the province of Manitoba and the states of Dakota and Minnesota, follow that 49th parallel as far west as you like, make an excursion 40 miles to the north amongst our own people, and make another excursion 20 miles or 40 miles to the south, and you will find that, man for man, our farmers are better than the Americans, they are better educated, they are more intelligent, they are more industrious than the men on the other side of the line. Take farm for farm, and you will find that on our side we have better kept farms, we have better field conditions than they have; we have better and more comfortable buildings and farm houses than they have, and our farmers are getting wealthy and making more rapid progress than the Americans. These, Sir, are not the people with whom we should make a trade alliance. Now, with reference to wheat, barley, and oats, we are told that we should vote for this pact because we will get higher prices for our farm products, and at the same time the consumer will get his bread at cheaper prices. Now, let us see what President Taft says:

> With respect to wheat and barley and oats, conditions differ in different parts of Canada and in different parts of the United States. Classing them together as on the whole, the conditions are substantially the same. In prices of farm land the differences are no greater between Canada and the United States than between the different states in the United States. In the matter of farm wages, on the whole, they are about the same.
>
> It is said that this is an agreement that affects agricultural products more than manufactures. That is true, but if we are to have an interchange of products between the two countries of any substantial amount the chief part of it must necessarily be in agricultural products. As it is, we export to Canada more agricultural products than we receive from her and so it will be afterwards. The effect is not going, in my judgment, to lower the specific prices of agricultural products in our country. It is going to steady them and it is going to produce an interchange of products at a profit which will be beneficial.

How is it going to be beneficial when there is to be no increase in prices? The fact is that we have better prices on our side of the line. About two weeks ago, when I was in Winnipeg, I took up the St. Paul 'Pioneer Press,' which prides itself on the accuracy of its market reports, and I took up the Winnipeg 'Free Press,' which I presume is more accurate in its market reports than it is in its politics, and I compared the prices of the markets in St. Paul and Winnipeg on the same day, and with the exception of wheat, I found that farm products were bringing a higher price in Winnipeg than they were in St. Paul. In St. Paul wheat was two cents higher than it was in Winnipeg. Now, I wish to call attention to an extract in this remarkable speech of President Taft, on the 28th of April. He comes down from his throne, and steps upon the platform, where he talks to the newspaper men, and tells them what kind of a reciprocity gospel he wants them to grind out. There are thousands of them there from all over the United States. Now we have heard people talking annexation, but the spirit that animates the President's remarks is something more than that, it is the spirit of conquest. Now, listen to what he says:

Another and very conclusive reason for closing the compact is the opportunity which it gives us to increase the supply of our natural resources, which, with the wastefulness of children, we have wantonly exhausted.

He is looking with a jealous eye upon the riches God has given us in this Canada of ours. He continues :

The timber resources of Canada which will open themselves to us inevitably under the operation of this agreement are now apparently inexhaustible. I say apparently inexhaustible, for if the same procedure were to be adopted in respect to them that we have followed in respect to our own forests, I presume that they too might be exhausted, but, fortunately for Canada and for us, we and they have learned much more than we realized two decades ago with respect to the necessity for proper methods of forestry and of lumber cutting. And hence we may be safe in saying that under proper modern methods the timber resources open to us in Canada may be made inexhaustible, and we may derive ample supplies of timber from Canadian sources to the profit of Canada and four our own benefit.

There are other natural resources which I need not stop to enumerate which will become available to us as our own if we adopt and maintain commercial union with Canada; and this is one of the chief reasons that ought to commend the Canadian agreement to the farseeing statesmanship of leaders of American public opinion.

But there are other—even broader—grounds than this that should lead to the adoption of this agreement. Canada's superficial area is greater than that of the United States between the oceans. Of course, it has a good deal of waste land in the far north, but it has enormous tracts of unoccupied land or land settled so sparsely as to be substantially unoccupied, which in the next two or three decades will rapidly acquire a substantial and valuable population. The government is one entirely controlled by the people and the bond uniting the Dominion and the mother country is light and almost imperceptible. There are no restrictions upon the trade or economic development of Canada which will interfere in the slightest with her carving out her independent future. The attitude of the people is that of affection toward the mother country, and of a sentimental loyalty toward her royal head. But for practical purposes the control exercised from England by executive or parliament is imponderable.

Then comes that significant peroration in which the president refers to this as a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity. He says:

I have said that this is a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity. It is critical because, unless it is now decided favourably to reciprocity, it is exceedingly probable that no such opportunity will ever again come to the United States.

Might he not have said: We will never have another opportunity to appeal to a Prime Minister of Canada who is more willing to force this reciprocity pact through parliament than he is to go to the Imperial Conference; we may never have a Finance Minister in the government of Canada again who spent the days of his early manhood in trying to dismember this confederation; and we may never have another Minister of Customs in the government of Canada who will be so easy a mark as long as we protect his cookies and his candies.

The forces which are at work in England and in Canada to separate her by a Chinese wall——

Who built that Chinese wall, and how long has it been there?

——to separate her by a Chinese wall from the United States and to make her part of an Imperial commercial band reaching from England around the world to England again.

The hope, the dream, the vision of better men than those who occupy at present the treasury benches of this country, I hope will be realized, and that the efforts of the present government of Canada to break that commercial bond with England will fail. I am opposed to this reciprocity agreement, and I believe the majority of the people of Canada are opposed to it, and I hope it will not be for the historian in days to come to apply to the present ministry of Canada the words of Shakespeare in Hamlet's soliloquy, and to say : 'The evil that men do lives after them, their good is often interred with their bones.'

Mr. ARTHURS. As the hour is getting late I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Arthurs) prefers to adjourn we have no objection.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We will take up the various Bills and resolutions on the Order Paper, all except the Bank Bill, and if there is time afterwards we will resume in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. SPROULE. Will the Bills be taken up in their regular order?

Mr. FIELDING. Bills and orders; there is quite a number of them.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, May 4, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. GEORGE P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 197) to amend the Railway Act. He said: This Bill is somewhat lengthy, and I shall briefly refer to the changes it is intended to make in the existing Act. In the first clause it is proposed to apply the Act so as to require telegraph, telephone, and express companies to make yearly statements of their business as do the railway companies now. The next paragraph refers to the protection of forests from fire caused by a railway company, and it has been the subject of resolutions by the Conservation Commission, and by the Forestry Association of the Dominion. It was first suggested that the law be made specific and stringent as to what the company should do, but at a meeting between the Chairman of the Conservation Commission, a representative of the western farmers, a member of the Forestry Association, and the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, this clause was decided upon as meeting all requirements. It makes clear that the Board of Railway Commissioners can compel a railway company to provide facilities for the protection of property contiguous to a railway, to say how many patrolmen should be necessary, what fences should be provided, and to make general rules in this respect. The next clause is to make applicable to telephone, telegraph, and express companies the existing law with reference to railways which names an agent in any locality upon whom notice can be served. The next clause makes clear certain matters as to the location of railways, and that I shall explain on the second reading. The next clause is to provide that lands even though they belong to a railway company and are not for strictly railway purposes, can be treated like lands belonging to any other individual in the matter of expropriation for, say, another railway. The next clause is introduced by arrangement with the Chairman of the Ontario Railway and Municipal Board, and it makes provision by which a joint board can be formed of a member of any provincial board having jurisdiction over these matters, and a member of the Dominion Board of Railway Commissioners, to compel connection to be made between a provincial road and a federal road, and to make provisions for the interchange of traffic.

Mr. LENNOX. Will that be in harmony with the statute recently passed by the Ontario legislature?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but it will apply to any other province having a provincial board organized for similar purposes. The next clause provides for the appraisement of damages to land adjoining or abutting on a highway where the railway has been allowed to run on a highway. There is not in the present law any provision by which the owner of the adjoining property can get damages on account of the railway getting on the highway in front of his property. The next clause is to allow, under general regulations and rules of the Board of Railway Commissioners, wires to cross railways where the railway consents and where the regulations are complied with. At present application has to be made to the board in each case. The next clause is a similar clause with reference to sewers under railways where the railway consents. The next clause has reference to fencing along lines of railway under construction. Under the existing Act the railways do not have to fence unless ordered by the board, and the amendment will be somewhat drastic, and will compel the railways to fence unless excused by the order of the board. It places the onus on the railway companies to prove

that it is not necessary for them to fence. It also compels the railway company to fence right of way or take other effectual means, such as cattle-guards to prevent cattle getting on the railway. The next section repeals that clause of the Act which prohibits stock from running within half a mile of a railway. There will be some discussion as to the propriety of this in the older parts of Canada, but on the whole it has seemed to those who have considered it, that it is a wise provision in the interest of the western part of Canada where they have the right to graze on these lands that are not inclosed, and under the present Act it is impossible for them, in many cases, to get redress if their stock is killed. In the older provinces—I can speak more particularly of Ontario—most municipalities, by by-law, forbid cattle running at large on the highways, and they may continue to regulate that matter by by-law if they choose to do so.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the railways be bound to observe those by-laws?

Mr. GRAHAM. The by-law does not affect the railway; it affects the man who owns the cattle. But I presume that if a cow were on a highway contrary to a by-law of a municipality, it would be there contrary to law, and that would be a factor in deciding the liability of the railway. The next clause, 12, is merely to make clear a section that was passed last year. Section 13 is one giving the Board of Railway Commissioners powers, in addition to the power given to them by the Act as it now stands, to regulate the price of electric power under their jurisdiction. Further, if a person makes application to a company under the control of the board for a certain quantity of power, and the company declines to give it to him, he can appeal to the board for an order on the company to give the power asked for. Section 14 is in reference to returns to the department as to accidents. The statute says that they shall be made semi-annually. They have been made annually, and we are making it clear that an annual return in general terms is all that is required; but I will introduce a clause into the Bill providing that the minister may ask for a return whenever he sees fit. This is to cover two points: first, if a question arises as to an accident in which lives have been lost, in addition to the particulars required by the Board of Railway Commissioners, the minister may deem it wise in the public interest to ask for further particulars. Power is also given to the minister, where complaint is made that a large quantity of stock has been killed, to require a return to be made more frequently than twelve months, so that the matter can be investigated. Complaints have been made by farmers in the west that where stock has been killed, the railway company or some person has frequently buried the carcases, and it has sometimes taken a year or two for the owners to find out where the animals have gone, as no trace is left of them. This clause is desired to enable the department to get the proof of the killing of those animals if it is thought to be in the public interest, as often as may be required. Then we propose to add a section to the Act which is quite drastic and may cause some discussion. The main features of it are that where a railway company has been granted a charter by the parliament of Canada, or where a railway has passed into the ownership of a company holding a charter from the Dominion of Canada, if the line is allowed to become dilapidated to such an extent that it is unsafe to operate, the government may step in and declare that the subsidy granted to the railway company shall become a lien upon it to such an extent that the railway can be sold under it. This power may, perhaps, never, at all events not very often, be exercised; but something is necessary to give the department power to compel railway companies or companies owning railways to keep their line in a fit condition to operate. I beg leave to move the first reading of the Bill.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Has the minister dealt, in the Bill, with the question of commutation tickets, so as to prevent railway companies from discriminating in regard to them? I understood that the minister had some sympathy with the municipalities that made their wishes known in that respect, both in the press and by interviewing the government.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing in this Bill in reference to commutation tickets.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Does the section in regard to railways which are allowed to fall into disrepair apply to grants made by the Dominion of Canada in the future or to grants made in the past? In other words, will it be retroactive?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is debatable, as the Bill is drawn.

Mr. HENDERSON. Will the joint board have power to deal with electric roads incorporated by the province of Ontario as well as with electric roads and steam railways incorporated by the Dominion? I think the minister knows the case I refer to—the Hamilton case.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Bill gives power to the board to deal with provincial roads as well as Dominion roads.

Mr. HENDERSON. No matter whether electric or steam?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no distinction as to the kind of propelling power.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 196) to incorporate the Continental Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Molloy.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to ask the right hon. the Prime Minister if there be any truth in the statement I have seen in the newspapers that negotiations are now going on between this government and Germany for an improvement in the trade relations between the two countries?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is no truth at all in it.

THE INDIAN ACT.

Mr. OLIVER moved third reading of Bill (No. 177) to amend the Indian Act.

Mr. FOSTER. My contention, when this Bill was brought in, was that the matter should previously go to parliament—that is after the investigations had been made, and before any action was taken regarding this reserve. I see that an amendment has been inserted embodying that idea so that on that point I have no further objection.

Mr. DOHERTY. The hon. minister was good enough the other evening to say that he would consider an amendment I suggested to provide for representation before the courts of such Indians as may be opposed to removal from their reserve. I think the object would be obtained by adding to subsection 3 of section 49A the following words:

And shall assign counsel to represent and act for the Indians who may be opposed to the proposed removal.

Mr. OLIVER. The section as it stands, it seems to me, would permit the judge to take the action my hon. friend suggests, but he desires to make that mandatory.

Mr. DOHERTY. That is one purpose. No doubt the section dealing with the powers of the judge is very large, and it might be contended that under it he will have the power to assign counsel for these Indians. The section reads:

3. The judge shall have the like powers to issue subpoenas, compel the attendance and examination of witnesses, take evidence, give directions, and generally to hear and determine the matter and regulate the procedure as in proceedings upon information by the Attorney General within the ordinary jurisdiction of the court.

I am not prepared to say offhand whether in any proceeding upon information by the Attorney General, the Exchequer Court has the power to assign counsel to act for parties who are not represented by counsel. If there be a special provision to that effect, my amendment would not be necessary; but if not, I do not think that subsection 3 of section 49A would empower the judge to assign counsel to these Indians. It must be remembered that legally the Indians are represented by the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs; but where there is collision between him and the Indians, the Indians ought to be represented by an independent counsel. The machinery of this Bill will never be set in operation except when the Superintendent General and the majority of the Indians differ in opinion, and in such a case the Indians ought to have a special representative. We should not only give the judge the power to permit such representation, but we ought to make it his duty to appoint counsel for the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. I am quite ready to accept this proposed amendment. I only wish to say that, as I understand the wording of the subsection, adequate provision is made for the appointment of counsel, and as a matter of public policy of course counsel would be appointed. I am quite willing, however, to accept my hon. friend's amendment so that it shall be mandatory on the judge to appoint counsel under certain circumstances. I beg therefore, to withdraw the motion for a third reading .

Motion for third reading withdrawn.

Mr. OLIVER moved that the Bill be referred back to the Committee of the Whole with instructions to amend subsections 3 of section 49A by adding thereto the following words:

And shall assign counsel to represent and act for the Indians who may be opposed to the proposed removal.

Mr. BRADBURY. While I agree in the amendment suggested by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), I cannot but think that the Indians ought to have something to say in the choosing of counsel. In this Bill the Superintendent General takes power to himself which the department has never had, and which no Superintendent General has ever had. He is taking the power to take away from the Indians their reserves, and thus violating every treaty made with the Indians without giving them the opportunity to protest in any way against it. The amendment moved provides that the judge may assign counsel. In my opinion the counsel ought to be assigned on the recommendation of the band.

The band ought to have something to say as to who shall represent them. The experience I have had with regard to one of the reserves proves to me that it is quite possible a counsel might be chosen to take the Indians part, who may not have the best interests of the Indians at heart. I think that there ought to be some provision made that the Indians may have something to say in the choosing of their own counsel.

There is another phase of the Bill about which I wish to say a word. The first section of this Bill is to amend section 46 of the Indian Act. Now, section 46 reads as follows:

> No portion of any reserve shall be taken for the purposes of any railway, road or public work without the consent of the Governor in Council, and, if any railway, road or public work passes through or causes injury to any reserve, or, if any act occasioning damage to any reserve is done under the authority of an Act of parliament or of the legislature of any province, compensation shall be made therefor to the Indians of the band in the same manner as is provided with respect to the lands or rights of other persons.

I contend that this clause is contradictory. It starts out first by declaring that no portion of the reserve shall be taken for the purposes of any railway, and then it goes on to provide that if any railway, road or public work passes through and injures the reserve, the parties responsible shall be liable for damages. I believe that this part of this section should be rescinded. The amendment proposed by this Bill covers practically everything that is necessary. The change would make the Bill more logical and more easily understood.

As to the Bill as a whole, I desire again to enter my protest against the principle. The Indians are not represented in this House and have no voice in making this legislation. As I said a moment ago, the minister is asking for power greater than any Superintendent General before ever pretended to ask for. And, in view of the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve of which I know something, I cannot hope that the Department of Indian Affairs will administer this proposed new law in a manner to commend itself to the sense of justice of this country. I have no hesitation in saying that under section 49 of the Act, the Indian had some protection, as it remained for the Indian to say whether he was willing to surrender his reserve or not. And while I believe that the Act has been openly violated in connection with the surrender of the St. Peter's Indian reserve, yet the Indian has some redress. But, under the proposition before us, he has no redress; it will not be necessary to consult him in connection with the surrender. When these treaties were made, in most cases the Indians were a power in this country. The treaties had to be lived up to; the Indians were, in many cases, able to compel the white man to keep faith with them. To-day the Indian is weak. The guardian of the Indian, the Superintendent General, is all powerful in this House. This fact is all the greater reason why the parliament should guard carefully and sacredly the interest of the Indian, the wards of the Canadian people. I contend that the power that the Superintendent General is asking for under this Bill is altogether too broad and arbitrary. He is simply taking the power to dispose of people's property and rights without giving them an opportunity to refuse or to lay their views fairly before the court, or even to a protest against the proceeding. In this country, especially in the province of Ontario, we have some bands of Indians who are very intelligent; we have members of these different bands who are just as intelligent as the average member of this House. I think it is almost a crime against everything that is fair to say to such a band of Indians: We will take possession of your reserve in defiance of treaty rights, without giving you an opportunity of being heard or even protesting as to whether you wish to surrender your reserve or not. The minister, a few nights ago, brought in a Bill before this House to confer upon him power to take a reserve in Victoria. That was a special case. I submit that in every such special case that may arise, where the Indians may refuse to surrender their reserve, yet, where it is in the public interest that the Indian reserve should be surrendered, the Superintendent General can come down to parliament with a special Act. He need not take, as he proposes to do under this Bill, the broad power to apply this to every Indian reserve in Canada. It has always been our proud boast that we have treated our Indians fairly. But if this Bill becomes law we may sometimes have a Superintendent General who may not be as zealous for the best interest of the Indians as my hon. friend, yet in his hands would be placed the power to take any Indian reserve in Canada, within the scope of this Bill without giving the Indians the opportunity to make their protest felt. For these reasons, I think that the Bill should be referred to a committee for revision and elimination of some of these powers. If that is not done I would ask at least that the Indians may have the right to nominate the counsel who shall appear before this court to look after their interests.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to traverse again the arguments on the general merits of the Bill. All these were thrashed out

very fully when the Bill was up for consideration before, and the House in its wisdom decided that the principle should be adopted. With regard to the propriety of the Indians who object to the proposed readjustment of their affairs being authorized to name their counsel, I think that is a very dangerous proposal, and not in the interest of the Indians themselves. If the sound judgment of the Indians could be depended upon to be exercised in the protection of their own interests, then there would be no necessity for the Indian Act or for the supervision that parliament has placed over them. It is because it is recognized that they cannot be trusted to protect their own interests that this supervision is exercised, and I think it is within the judgment of the House that, under those circumstances to leave the question of the choice of a counsel to represent the Indians, in the hands of the judge of the Exchequer Court, is giving them better protection than to leave the matter at their own choice.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does not subsection 1-a cover all the provisions of subsection 1 of the old Act?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that off hand. I substituted this section for the section of the old Act in the belief that this section met the present requirements better than the previous section.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister has not done that. I do not see any provision repealing subsection 1 of the old Bill, and yet this seems to cover and go beyond the old section. This old section is inconsistent. It provides that no portion of any reserve shall be taken for the purpose of any railway, road or public work without the consent of the Governor in Council, and also that if any railroad, road or public work passes through or causes injury to any reserve, compensation must be paid; but it does not say in the latter case that they must have the consent of the Governor in Council, they may be trespassers. That is contradictory, but the section the minister has introduced now fully covers all the powers in the old section, and gives broader powers as well. Therefore, the old section is unnecessary and has not been repealed by the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill has been referred back to committee, and I would ask it to remain in committee until I have had an opportunity of considering the point raised.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The phraseology of the present amendment is defective. You have the phrase : 'without the consent of the owner, may with such consent as aforesaid,' &c. That might be read that he shall not take any land without the consent of the owner, and may with the consent of the owner. I think it is intended to refer to the consent of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, occurring earlier in the section.

Mr. OLIVER. Undoubtedly that is the intention, and I think that would be the reading of the section.

Motion agreed to, and House went again into committee on the Bill.

On section 1,

Mr. OLIVER. I think the objection of the hon. member for North Grey is well taken, but it may be overcome by a change of one word so that the introduction of section 1 would read:

Section 46 of the Indian Act, chapter 81 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, is amended by substituting the following subsection for subsection 1 of the said section.

Then, in the following line, strike out the letter 'a' after the figure '1'.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would the minister include in his amendment that in subsection 1 the words: 'such consent' where they occur in the seventh line be struck out, and that in lieu thereof the words: 'consent of the Governor in Council' be inserted?

Mr. OLIVER. That will be agreed to.

Section as amended agreed to.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Could the minister inform the committee how many Indian reserves will be affected by the wording of section 2?

Mr. OLIVER. I could not at the moment, but I think it is only the reserve situated in the city of Vancouver, although I may be mistaken.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). How does the minister interpret the word 'adjoining'?

Mr. OLIVER. That the reserve line will touch the line of the corporation.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What is the object and purpose of drawing the line in that way? If the principle is good why not apply it to all reserves? I do not say that the principle should be applied, but if you are taking such arbitrary power to remove reserves in this manner why not apply it to all reserves? The same argument would apply to a rural district where an Indian reserve is situated, as would apply to a city, although perhaps not quite so strongly.

Mr. OLIVER. We recognize that the power asked for is arbitrary, and that it should not be exercised except under exceptional conditions, such exceptional conditions being that the land of the Indians,

by reason of their being contained within or adjoining a city, has reached an abnormal value altogether out of comparison with the original value or intention in the setting apart of the reserve, the result being that it is in the interest of the Indians that the townsite value which their reserve has attained should be translated into cash so that they may get the benefit of it rather than that they shall merely continue to occupy land having that value, but of which they are not getting the benefit.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

DEPARTMENT OF RAILWAYS AND CANALS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. GRAHAM moved the second reading of Bill (No. 156) to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act. He said: Mr. Speaker, the object of this Bill is to put upon the statute authority for the establishment of certain funds in connection with the management of the Intercolonial railway. As a matter of fact, these funds have been established in a way for some years. We have a fund, for instance, for the renewal of equipment, that is for the purchase of cars, and another for the renewal of rails. I want to establish one also to facilitate the payment of loss by fire out of revenue where the loss should be paid out of the receipts of the road. In discussing this with the Finance Department, and with the Auditor General it was thought wise to amend the Act to give the department authority to establish these funds, so that there will be no question hereafter about it or about the depositing of money in them, and the payment of money out of them.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Have you at present any trouble in providing renewal of equipment under your general vote? What is the necessity of a suspense account?

Mr. GRAHAM. Each month we set apart a certain sum for this purpose, and if at the end of the financial year this money has not been expended it remains in the fund. The intention is to carry the account on, so that we will have it to pay for, say, work under contract.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). You are merely applying the money already voted to the intention of the appropriation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does it mean that the minister has not to come back for a revote, which has always been considered a salutary check? If the minister has $1,000,000 for a certain purpose, and he has spent $500,000 of it at the end of the year, he would now have to come back to parliament for a revote of the other $500,000? Does this propose that when once there is a vote of $1,000,000 there should be no reference to parliament again until he has expended that money, even though several years should elapse?

Mr. GRAHAM. Hardly that. At present we lay aside $25,000 a month for railway equipment, and that is accounted for. Every railway company has to do something like that in order to carry on its business. The Auditor General thinks that possibly under the statute it is not clear he has the right to allow us to continue to do that. This money is merely to renew equipment out of railway revenue, and there would be little in the fund at the end of the year, but under the present system if there is $30,000 left, we have to pay it back to the consolidated fund and get it revoted.

Mr. FOSTER. The idea of the Bill is probably all right. The minister gave me the impression that the money would not have to be revoted, but I do not see anything in the Bill which would enable him to use the money unless it were revoted. It is, I suppose, a proposal more in the way of keeping the accounts than touching the basis of parliamentary appropriation.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have to keep to the rule in that respect.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). How does the Auditor General get rid of the audit of this money?

Mr. GRAHAM. Every dollar expended has to be audited by the Auditor General, when we take a certain amount out of a vote to pay for cars, this makes it legal. He audits every account the same as now.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). This Bill does not alter the law of appropriation?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think so.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

ST. JOHN VALLEY RAILWAY.

Mr. GRAHAM moved the second reading of Bill (No. 150) to authorize the government of Canada to acquire by lease a certain line of railway in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is this Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. This is the Bill we discussed very thoroughly on the resolution. The provincial government is guaranteeing the bonds of the St. John Valley railway to the extent of $25,000 a mile, and this Bill provides for its operation by the Intercolonial railway, provided it is constructed. I would like to have the Act on the statutes so that if an arrangement is made by the provincial government with any company we will be at liberty to enter into a contract with them.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the Minister of Railways and Canals if this clause is in accordance with the Act which was passed by the legislature of New Brunswick. I think that when the resolution was before us some objection was taken to the fact that equipment was not provided for in this Act while it was in the provincial Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there was a question as to the initial rolling stock, it being contended that we had included the initial rolling stock in this Act, while it was not contemplated in the New Brunswick legislation. Personally I am not sure that it is absolutely necessary to retain the initial rolling stock. I find that it would be such a small matter in starting the new line that it is not worth while putting it in the way of the construction of the road or of its operation.

Mr. FOSTER. The minister would be willing to strike that out?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would be willing to omit the rolling stock in order to help out the arrangement.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Will the minister state what is the difference in length between this new line and the Transcontinental line and its connection with St. John? Will he also state what the government have calculated the loss would be, or the difference between what it would cost to run the road and the 60 per cent of the receipts which the government retain?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways has asked me to reply to the hon. gentleman, because I am familiar with the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. FOSTER. Have you ever heard of this railway before?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it has pleasant memories for me; I do not suppose I shall ever forget it. This road runs from Grand Falls to St. John, by one of the routes surveyed by the engineers of the provincial government. The distance is 207 miles from Grand Falls to St. John. The Transcontinental goes from Grand Falls to Moncton, and from there the distance back to St. John is 88 miles.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What is the distance by the Transcontinental?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) says the distance from Grand Falls to Moncton is 198 miles. This, added to the 88 miles, would make the total distance from Grand Falls to St. John 286 miles. This line reduces the distance about 80 miles. I think the Minister of Railways can answer the question as to the loss better than I can.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it would be some years before the road would pay its way and pay the 60 per cent. I go further: I think that with the vast majority of branch lines in the maritime provinces that will always be found to be the case. I had not any idea, in making this proposition, that the Intercolonial railway would make a cent out of it. In fact, I have always thought that it would cost the Intercolonial a considerable sum of money to run this road on the 60 per cent ; but, looking at it from the point of view of the convenience of the people who for many years have not been able to get a line of railway through this valley, I thought the people of Canada would be prepared, even at a loss on the operation of the road, to agree to operate it on a 60 per cent basis.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Haven't they a line on the other side of the river running in the same direction between the two points?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They have at certain points; but practically all the way from Woodstock to Fredericton it is 20 or 25 miles back from the river.

Mr HAGGART (Lanark). Is it much longer than this line?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is one road from Woodstock to St. John which first strikes McAdam. This must be 70 miles from the St. John river. From McAdam to St. John it also keeps away from the river until it reaches Welsford. For the last 14 miles it runs parallel with the river. There is another line from Fredericton to Woodstock running 20 or 25 miles from the river. But there is a very rich country from Woodstock to Fredericton, and also from Fredericton to Welsford, which is entirely without any accommodation. I would suggest that, with the unanimous consent

of the House, which I think would be necessary, the provision as to the company providing the initial equipment should be struck out. I am very glad indeed that the Minister of Railways feels that he can properly do that. It is exceedingly desirable that every reasonable effort should be made to secure the earliest construction of this line.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What does the Minister of Railways say? Will this interfere with the contract?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will not. Take line 17, and you will find the words 'with its appurtenances and rolling stock.' Strike out the word 'rolling stock.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is moved in amendment that the words 'rolling stock' be struck out.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. CROCKET. When the resolution upon which this Bill is founded was before the House I moved an amendment for the purpose of making the resolution agree with the Act passed by the New Brunswick legislature authorizing the Lieutenant Governor in Council to guarantee the bonds of the company. The objection I made to the resolution was that it did not follow the terms of section 1 of the New Brunswick Act. Section 1 of the New Brunswick Act provides that :

No such agreement shall be entered into with any company or corporation for the construction of the said line of railway or the guaranteeing of the said bonds, and no such bonds or debentures shall be guaranteed, unless and until the parliament of Canada shall enact legislation authorizing the granting of a subsidy in aid of the construction of the said railway to the amount of not less than $6,400 per mile, and authorizing the entering by the government of Canada into an independent agreement with such company or corporation and with the government of New Brunswick aforesaid, for the leasing of the said line of railway, when completed, with its appurtenances and rolling stock and for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the said government of Canada, as part of the government railway system of Canada for a period of 99 years.

What I wished to have inserted was the word 'equipment.' I understand that the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Railways objected to the word 'equipment' being inserted in the resolution, and it is not in the Bill. It seems to me that unless this Bill is made to correspond with the terms of the New Brunswick Act, the Lieutenant Governor in Council of New Brunswick will have no power to guarantee the bonds of the company.

Mr. CARVELL. My hon. friend must be in error. If he will read section 1, he will find in it these words: 'Including the supply of additional rolling stock from time to time sufficient to handle the traffic as it may arise, maintenance, upkeep and repair.' It seems to me it is all provided in that section. In my opinion the resolution upon which this Bill is founded really followed the legislation of New Brunswick. I may be wrong, but if the Minister of Railways is willing to eliminate the question of initial rolling stock or rather take that away from the company which builds the road, I can see no reason why the Bill should not be agreed to, because the company must, out of its own funds or the funds received from the sale of bonds or the subsidy, provide for equipment as the Bill now stands. All the Minister of Railways proposes is to eliminate the equipment so that it shall not be necessary for the company to make that expenditure, which makes it that much easier for the company to construct the road and have it operated by the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. CROCKET. My hon. friend from Carleton (Mr. Carvell) will see that these words in section 1 relating to rolling stock and operation are not in accord with the New Brunswick Act; and I do not see how the bonds can be guaranteed by the Governor in Council of New Brunswick until the condition prescribed by section 10 of the New Brunswick Act are fulfilled. That section requires an agreement for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the government of Canada. The first section of this Bill differs from the New Brunswick Act in that it does not provide for the equipment of the railway by the government of Canada.

Mr. CARVELL. Even by the New Brunswick Act it is not required that the railway shall be equipped by the government of Canada, but that it shall be equipped by the company, and the company will then hand over to the government of Canada the road with its original equipment. This amendment proposes to relieve the company from the necessity of providing the initial equipment, and I cannot see that that would prevent the government of New Brunswick from guaranteeing the bonds.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This change must be made with the unanimous consent of the House. Let the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) draw an amendment relating to the rolling stock, and let the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) draw one, and make them both agree. In the meantime I would suggest that there should be an additional section to accomplish this purpose. Section 1 authorizes the Governor in Council to enter into a contract with any railway, but there is nothing to authorize the railway company to enter into a con-

tract with His Majesty. I, therefore, move that section 2 be added:

Section 2. It shall be lawful for the board of directors of any railway company under the legislative jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada, with which the Governor in Council proposes to enter into the contract provided for in section 1 of this Bill, to execute said contract, and the same, when so executed pursuant to the order of the said board of directors, shall be legal and binding on the company.

A company ordinarily has not the power to lease its line of railway. This will give that power to any company with which the Governor in Council enters into a contract.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Has this company a Dominion charter?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. It is under the legislative jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament. I move that the following be inserted as section 2 of the Bill:

It shall be lawful for the board of directors of any railway company under the legislative jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada with which the Governor in Council proposes to enter into the contract provided for under section 1 of this Act to execute such contract and the same when so executed pursuant to the order of such board of directors shall be legal and binding on the company.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). 'We do not generally empower the directors to do that without the consent of the stockholders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, say 'The Board of Directors with the consent of the shareholders.'

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). You do not need the unanimous consent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Put it in this form:

It shall be lawful for the board of directors of any railway company under legislative jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada with which the Governor in Council proposes to enter into the contract provided for in section 1 of this Act, with the consent of the shareholders given at a meeting duly called for the purpose, to execute such contract, and the same when so executed pursuant to the order of such board of directors shall be legal and binding on the company.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend from York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket), will read what is proposed to be done, I think he will see that it meets his views and that the government proposes to provide the rolling stock. It is proposed to strike out in line 17 the words, 'and rolling stock,' in line 18 the words, 'equipped with initial rolling stock' and in line 20 the word 'additional,' thus making the section read:

The said line of railway with its appurtenances when completed and for the operation, including the supply of rolling stock, from time to time sufficient to handle the traffic as it may arise, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the government of Canada.

That would make it absolutely clear. Then, in the last line of subsection 3, leave out the words 'and equipped.' That would make it even clearer. Subsection 3 then would read :

Each twenty-five miles thereafter, until the line be completed from Grand Falls to St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. Our only object is that the legislation shall make it clear that the government of Canada shall provide the rolling stock. It may be, as the minister has stated, that the amendment he proposes will have the effect. But, in case there might be some doubt, I think the safer course would be to make the provision accord with the language of the New Brunswick Act. Section 1 provides that the Governor in Council of that province could not guarantee the bonds of any company undertaking the construction of this railway until there be an agreement with the government of Canada providing for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the government of Canada. This Bill, in its present form, certainly does not provide for that. What would be the objection to making the provision in the terms of the New Brunswick Act? Then, there could be no doubt. What I propose is to move that these words be struck out, and that the words of the New Brunswick Act be inserted in lieu thereof.

Mr. CARVELL. I think there is one objection to that. The words of the New Brunswick Act are found in Section 11:

For the leasing of the said line of railway when completed, with its appurtenances and rolling stock, and for the operation, equipment, maintenance, upkeep and repair by the government of Canada.

The object is to provide that before the government can enter into this agreement the rolling stock must be provided by somebody. As I understand, it is to be built by a company and handed over to the government. Of course, the company, under this arrangement, would not wish to provide the rolling stock. If the hon. gentleman will note the word 'rolling stock' near the bottom of page 41, in the New Brunswick Act, he will see the objection I am raising. Of course, it may be that that would be only an inference, but I am afraid it might be such an inference that some one would say we could not sign that agreement until the rolling stock was there.

Mr. CROCKET. Under the proper construction of section 11 the bonds cannot be guaranteed until there is an agreement for the equipment, maintenance and operation.

Mr. CARVELL. Not by the government of Canada until there is an agreement, with somebody.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With the amendment moved by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) it would read:

And with the government of the province of New Brunswick for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed, with its appurtenances, for the operation, maintenance, equipment, upkeep and repair.

Mr. CROCKET. If it reads in that way it would answer the purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That covers the ground. Even if it is not exactly word for word with the provincial Act I do not think that would make very much difference, because before a lease could be entered into, the provincial Act would have to be altered as it provides that the grade shall be fourtenths of one per cent, while this Act provides that it shall be sufficient if it is up to the general standard of the Transcontinental railway, which would, I think, allow a grade of one per cent. If arrangements could be made I should think everything could be agreed upon, and then any necessary amendment could be made at the next session of the provincial legislature.

Mr. GRAHAM. That suits me.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Are they to provide the rolling stock or the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government, under this amendment.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Does that conform with your resolution? Under that resolution the company have to provide the rolling stock. How can you alter the Bill in a most important point after you pass the resolution?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not very important, because it is only in connection with initial equipment, and I stated that I trusted this might go through with the unanimous consent of the House. It is really a matter of enormous importance that this line should be constructed, and I hope that upon consideration my hon. friend will be one of those here who will agree unanimously to this.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I am not making any objection, but it seems to me such a total change from what I understood was the meaning of the resolution, that is that the company should provide the rolling stock. Now we have it that the government have to provide it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was only the initial rolling stock. The minister might have that of great or little value.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). That would be only hand cars, &c.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is only the initial rolling stock, which would be poor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now, will some one follow me. In section 1, strike out the words:

And rolling stock when completed and equipped with initial rolling stock, for the operation, including the supply of additional rolling stock from time to time sufficient to handle the traffic as it may arise.

And insert in lieu thereof the words:

When completed with the appurtenances and for its equipment.

Then it would go on:

For its maintenance, upkeep, &c

That covers it.

Mr. CROCKET. Yes, that covers it.

Mr. GRAHAM. And on the second page, in subsection 3, strike out the words: 'and equipped'.

Mr. CROCKET. I think you want the word 'operation' in there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. 'And for its operation, equipment, maintenance', &c.

Mr. CROCKET. Yes.

Mr. CARVELL. You should strike out the word 'appurtenances' in line 17.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CROCKET. The word 'appurtenances' is in twice.

Mr. CARVELL. Strike it out of the amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, take it out of the amendment, and leave it in the original.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Strike out of the amendment the words 'with its appurtenances'.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is proposed that all the words in line 17, after the word 'railways', including lines 18, 19 and 20, be struck out, up to the word 'maintenance' in line 21, and that in lieu thereof there be inserted the words 'when completed with its appurtenances, and for its operation and equipment'. Starting from line 15 it will read as follows:

Twenty-five thousand dollars per mile, and with the government of the province of New Brunswick, for the leasing of the said line of railway when completed with its appurtenances and for its operation, equipment, main-

tenance, upkeep and repair by the government of Canada.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Then it is moved that in subsection 3 the words 'and equipped' be struck out.

Section as amended agreed to, Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

FISHERIES ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 185) to amend the Fisheries Act.—Mr. Brodeur.

On section 1: licenses in British Columbia for making seal or fish oil,

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). When the resolution on which this Bill is based was before the House I explained the object of the Bill. This clause is for the purpose of authorizing the minister to adopt some regulations governing the manufacture of oil from sealions, hair seals, sharks and dog-fish. As I explained the other day, we have had applications from people in British Columbia asking to be authorized to manufacture this product, provided regulations of this kind should be passed.

On section 2: license in British Columbia for salmon factories.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a provision by which a license fee of $50 shall be charged to canneries in British Columbia. This has been recommended by the British Columbia Fish Commission as explained the other day when we were discussing the resolution.

Mr. CROSBY. Does this apply to the whole of Canada?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, this part only applies to British Columbia.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to ask the minister whether he has thought of the objection I made the other day, that this provision against dealing in salmon, and the curing thereof prevents a man curing salmon in his own back yard. Does the minister intend by this law to prohibit the individual fisherman from curing salmon? Is the law in the interest of large corporations who alone are able to pay this fee of $50?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not intended to prohibit any person from curing fish in his backyard for his own use. For the protection of the salmon canning industry generally, it is absolutely necessary that the fish should be canned and cured under hygienic conditions and one reason why a licence is provided for is that we may have some control over the method of canning and curing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister says he does not want to prohibit a man curing his own fish, but as a matter of fact he does prohibit him under this clause, and I would suggest that he should so draft it that his intention be given effect to and that it should not prohibit a man from curing in his own house. I know where a man purposed curing salmon on his own premises, for his own use, and not for commercial purposes, and the officer of the department at New Westminster told him that under this Act he required to take out a license which, the fee being $50, was prohibitive.

Mr. BRODEUR. Was it for his own use?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Yes.

Mr. BRODEUR. What the Act has in view are establishments that are curing or canning for commercial purposes.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The Act does not so limit it.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the curing was for his own use I can see no objection to it, but certainly these large canneries ought to be licensed so we may see that they are conducted properly.

Mr. FOSTER. You can add the words, 'for commercial purposes.'

Mr. BRODEUR. There would be no objection to that.

Mr. CROSBY. I agree that the government should have such control over large canning establishments as will enable them to ensure that the canning is carried on under sanitary conditions. But, when you add the word 'curing' it means pickling salmon or smoking salmon, and when a person buys pickled or smoked fish he can see what he is buying and there is not the same necessity for taking precautions as in the case of canning. I do not see why a man should have to pay a license fee of $50 because he is going to smoke salmon or put it in barrels even for commercial purposes. Of course the Act does not apply to the Atlantic coast and the people of British Columbia know what they want.

Mr. BRODEUR. The curing establishments we have in mind in British Columbia are large establishments which do not exist in the maritime provinces and they can easily stand a fee of $50. In some cases the curing and canning is carried on in the same establishment. In order to meet the objection raised by the hon. member for New Westminster, I am willing that we should add the words, 'for commercial purposes.'

Mr. DOHERTY. I have diffidence in venturing on this subject, not being a salmon fisherman, but I would ask the minister if these canning establishments are carried on by persons who themselves catch the fish? The minister limits the operation of this Act to the province of British Columbia, and I more than doubt that this parliament has power to regulate trade and commerce in a particular province, because that does not seem to come within the general regulation of trade and commerce confided to us under the British North America Act. If this legislation is under the provision which gives the parliament of Canada control of the inland and coast fisheries, then I do not see how a man who buys salmon and proceeds to can has anything to do with the fishing. It looks to me as if this provision were in the nature of local legislation for British Columbia, as to how people will carry on a particular kind of business in that province.

Mr. SPROULE. You might as well provide for a license to can chickens.

Mr. BRODEUR. Under section 91 of the British North America Act we have the right to regulate the fisheries, and we consider that the number of canning establishments has an effect on the preservation of the fish, because the larger the number of such establishments the greater the number of fish caught. In regulating the canneries we regulate to a certain extent the quantity of fish taken. In most cases in British Columbia the canners also cure the fish. It was the unanimous recommendation of the commission that legislation of this kind should be passed in order to preserve the fisheries.

Mr. DOHERTY. I quite understand that parliament has power to make regulations to preserve the fisheries, but this seems to me to be a somewhat remote method of getting at it. Instead of restricting in some way the quantity of fish to be caught, we take it upon ourselves to prescribe regulations requiring a man to take out a license for a canning establishment, and we actually prescribe that there shall be not more than one such establishment within 50 miles. You are regulating the quantity of fish to be taken by the indirect method of imposing obligations on people who are carrying on businesses in which they handle fish, but which do not seem to me to form any part of the fisheries. If you carried that principle out to its logical conclusion, you might prescribe how many fish stalls there should be on the market in Montreal. It would all work back to the preservation of the fisheries. It seems to be doubtful whether this is an Act to regulate the fisheries, as you are regulating how the fish shall be handled after they have passed out of the fishermens' hands.

Mr. BRODEUR. The salmon of British Columbia is not like the salmon on the Atlantic coast, a large quantity of which is sold in a fresh condition. The sock-eye salmon has to be canned to be placed on the market. Therefore, to reduce the quantity of fish to be caught, which we consider necessary for the preservation of the fisheries, we think the best method is to regulate the number of canning establishments, so that they will not be more numerous than the fisheries can stand. I may say also that we recently came to an agreement with the British Columbia government by which a certain number of fishing boats could be licensed in that province. As a result of our researches, we think this is the best way to conserve the fisheries.

Mr. DOHERTY. As regards the number of boats to do the fishing, that would seem to me to be a part of the fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. Canning is just as important.

Mr. DOHERTY. No doubt it is just as important; but when the Act gave you the control of the sea-coast and inland fisheries, did it also give you the right to control the fish after they were caught, and to determine how many should be canned in a particular province? If it did, it seems to me that it would give you the right to determine how many fish any man should eat, because that would work back to the protection of the fisheries.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the province, for revenue purposes, imposed a tax of $50 or $100 on each of these establishments, where would you be then?

Mr. BRODEUR. I may inform my hon. friend that they are imposing a tax to-day.

Mr. DOHERTY. The provincial government might also impose a license.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, there is no doubt that under the British North America Act the provincial government could impose a license, and it is doing so.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to point out to the minister again, as I did the other day, that the effect of this clause is not in any way to preserve the fisheries of British Columbia, that it makes no difference to the fishermen who go out with their nets to catch fish, how many salmon canneries are licensed, that the only effect of this provision is to strengthen the monopoly in the production of this article of food. The regulation providing that no canning establishment may be conducted without a license, coupled

with the policy that no license shall be granted to any person not already in the business, continues in British Columbia the monopoly in the salmon-canning business now established; it does not operate to the preservation of the fish, but does operate to the increase of the profits of the canners at the expense of the fishing population of British Columbia. It creates a condition peculiar to that province, and not prevailing in the state of Washington where there are canners independent of the fishing combine. Now, I appeal to the minister to take further information on this subject if he is not possessed of it. I told him the other day, what seemed to be news to him, that there is in British Columbia an absolute fish combine; that all interests there are joined to establish the price which they will pay the fishermen, and the price at which they will sell, and to make for themselves whatever profits they see fit. I told him that this operates harshly on the fishing population, because they had in many instances to destroy a great portion of their catch, and I appeal to him before he puts this Bill through, to make provision in cases of that kind that when the licensed canners would not buy the fish which the fishermen caught, they should have some other market in which to sell them. I reminded him also that he not only prevented them selling their fish on the Canadian side by limiting the number of licenses, but also prescribed an absolute prohibition of export; so that when a Canadian fisherman has 400 or 500 fish in his boat ready to sell, and no Canadian canner will buy them, and when an American canner a few miles away holds out his hand for those fish, the minister says, I prohibit you by force of law taking those fish across the boundary line. That is the condition at present. It does not preserve the fish. On the contrary, it makes the cruel enactment that a man with this valuable property in his possession must destroy it because this government will not allow him to sell it in any quarter. It does not preserve the fish, but attacks the livelihood of the fishermen. In this respect the Canadian government is fostering as tight a monopoly in the production of food as any monopoly in the world. In the enactment of this law we confirm in cold blood what was perhaps an accident at the outset. We are providing absolutely that men with valuable property must destroy that property without getting any benefit to themselves, and for the profit of the salmon canners. The minister gives as a reason for this prohibition that the salmon canning establishments are also curing establishments; but if that is his only reason his purpose will be served by licensing them as canning establishments simply.

Mr. BRODEUR. There are some which are only curing establishments.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). There are private individuals who wish to go into the curing busines on their domestic premises, but who are prohibited by this because they cannot pay the license fee in competition with the large associations. We find the Minister of Fisheries standing up for the capitalists against the fishermen. The minister should be of all men the first to stand by the poor fisherman who is not able to protect himself. As I see no good that can result from the prohibition of curing salmon without a special license, but much evil, and as, so far as the canners are concerned, every good purpose is served by licensing their establishments as canneries, I move that the words 'or salmon curing establishments' be struck out of the section.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend's statement with regard to the combine is not at all well founded.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). In what respect is it not?

Mr. BRODEUR. Because there are several establishments. Take the Fraser river for example, Some are under the control of the British Columbia Packers Association, but there are also several independent concerns who are competing with the larger establishments, and doing fairly well.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Will the hon. minister give the names of any of these concerns?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we must have in the department the names of those independent concerns. My hon. friend himself said the other day that there were some.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to know the names of any which the minister has in his mind.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am giving the hon. gentleman himself as an authority because the other day he said that there were besides the British Columbia Packers Association some independent concerns. He claimed, however, that most of those independent concerns, and the British Columbia Packers' Association had a sort of board of trade or association like the Manufacturers Association, dealing with their interests generally. I do not suppose that any one would say that the manufacturers are a monopoly because they are members of an association called the Canadian Manufacturers Association. I understand that, so far as the Fraser river canneries are concerned, there is a large company, and some other independent companies which have absolutely independent management,

and I do not see why we should call them a monopoly. I may say also that we are not prevented by this legislation from issuing a license to any other company, or association which shows its ability to carry on a curing or canning establishment. Quite the reverse. My hon. friend said the other day that it was pretty evident there was a combine regulating the prices to be paid to the fishermen. Of course if there were any such close combine among the canners, the department would be anxious to come to the rescue of the fishermen, and give them or give any other association a license. We are taking the power to grant licenses simply in order to control more effectively those cannery establishments. To-day we have no control over them. I would be very glad to refuse a license to any company which would go into a combine to the injury of the fishermen. So that instead of opposing this legislation, my hon. friend, who has the interests of the fishermen at heart, should help the government to have it put on the statutes. If there be no legislation at all, what can be done to prevent those men combining amongst themselves? There are, of course, some general laws, but they could not be applied so effectively as this legislation. I might remind my hon. friend that some years ago we passed a law obliging manufacturers to take out a license, and providing that if they should combine to prevent the freedom of trade, we could refuse them licenses. In like manner if those canners should combine for the purpose of depriving the fishermen of their honest, fair profit, it would be the duty of the government to refuse them licenses; and when those people see that they might be deprived of their licenses, they will be careful about forming any such combine.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). What advice would the minister give now to a fisherman—and this is not a hypothetical case—who catches five or six hundred fish and brings them down to the cannery wharf, and finds a notice put up by the licensed canners to the effect that the limit to-day is 200 fish? What is the fisherman to do with the other three or four hundred?

Mr. BRODEUR. In such a case, these men should immediately apply for a license and they will get it.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). No doubt, the minister means that. But I would point out to him that it takes perhaps six or seven months at the shortest to get the machinery for a salmon cannery, and the life of the salmon after it is caught is about one day. Therefore, it is simply impossible for the man who brings his six hundred fish to the salmon cannery and finds all but 200 of them left on his hands to secure relief by applying for a license to start a cannery. I wish to tell the minister that the effect of this limitation is not to preserve the fish but to make it necessary that a large quantity of fish must be absolutely destroyed. His combine of canners refuse to buy the fish, the minister will not license any other canners, nor will he permit the export of the fish to the canners on the American side who are perfectly willing to buy these fish at any time. The fishermen can get absolutely no relief from the minister. He protects the combine at every point but refuses to protect the fisherman. I do not think the minister understands the situation. I think if he were on the ground and saw, as I have seen over and over again, large quantities of as fine fish as ever were caught dumped into the river, he would hesitate little about making the necessary regulations. I can assure the minister the effect of these regulations is absolutely cruel to the fishermen of the Fraser, and that they do not operate to preserve the fish but rather to destroy them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) ought to be fair and state to the House why it is that, occasionally, there is a larger catch of fish than can be handled in one day. He has stated that he has seen fishermen come in with four or five hundred fish of which the cannery man would take only one hundred and the other three or four hundred would have to be dumped into the river. I believe it is a fact that on several occasions during the big runs such conditions have existed, because the catch for the day, or for several days in succession, was so great that the canneries could not possibly handle the fish during the twenty-four hours or so which elapse before they spoil. Therefore it was that the surplus had to be dumped into the river. That has occurred on the Fraser during abnormal runs in a big year. It is understood that the big run comes once in four years But in the last fourth year the run was not so large as to bring about these conditions, while in the ordinary years there are not enough fish to keep the canneries operating. Consequently no new canneries have started. The hon. member (Mr. Taylor) says the policy of the department is to keep down the number of canneries, and so it brings about a condition of monopoly. As a matter of fact there have been no applications for canneries on the Fraser river for a number of years. I am quite sure that if my hon. friend or any of his friends want a license for a cannery on the river, the minister will give the subject his best consideration. The hon. gentleman knows that many canneries are not operated, including some owned by

the British Columbia Packers. They have been closed down. That has been true for a number of years. But it was unfair to convey the impression to the House that a large number of fish are being dumped into the river as a consequence of the policy of the department in limiting the number of canneries. Every person who has visited the canneries knows that ordinarily, in every fourth year the run is so great that the canneries cannot pack all the fish, and, therefore, take a certain number from each fisherman, which is fair. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster) said something about the prohibition of the export of salmon taken by British Columbia fishermen—that the fishermen are not permitted to sell them to the cannery men on the American side, which would mean the cannery men on the Sound. But that would operate two ways. If the Fraser river fish caught by Canadian fishermen can be taken over and sold to the American cannery men—they would only have a distance of twenty miles or so to go—then the salmon caught in enormous quantities in the traps on the American side of the line should be permitted to come into British Columbia canneries to be canned there. The hon. gentleman knows that the prohibition of the export of fish for that purpose on the Fraser, and the prohibition of the importation of fish to the canneries of that river was agreed to a number of years ago. I believe it is more in the interest of the Fraser fishermen than it is of the Fraser river cannery men. The cannery men especially would be anxious to have it removed, so that they could go down to the traps across the line and buy all the fish they want. The hon. gentleman says these fish are thrown away. That is not always the case. I know, that as a matter of fact, large quantities of fish—I think a whole steamer load—was taken from the Fraser river to a northern cannery to be canned. The hon. gentleman says there is a monopoly among the cannery men of British Columbia. I do not believe there is.

On the Fraser river, there is a combination of cannery men during the season which regulates, as far as the cannerymen can regulate, the price to be paid for fish. That may be a combination, no doubt it is to that extent. But the Fraser river is not the only fishing district in British Columbia; there are more canneries outside of the Fraser than on the Fraser, and there are very many independent cannery men who are not in the British Columbia Packers, which is a group of canners working as one company. There is the Bell-Irving Co., a large, strong company, outside the British Columbia Packers' Co. In the north you have the Wallace Bros., absolutely independent of the British Columbia Packers. Then there is Henry Doyle, J. H. Todd & Son, the original cannery men of the province. These men are not in the British Columbia Packers; they are scattered over the coast from Alaska to the boundary line of the United States, and it is idle to say there is a combination that is operating to the disadvantage of the fishermen or to the enhancement of the price of such a food product as fish. Of course most of our fish is sold in Europe, the consumption in Canada is very small, and the surplus of the United States goes to the English market, where we have to meet it in competition. There is no doubt that the cannery men on the Fraser get together and agree what price they will pay the fishermen for their fish. The price may start at 10 cents, and if it is a scarce year prices go up to 25 cents per salmon, according to the abundance or scarcity of the fish. The cannery men agree that they will pay a uniform price. To that extent there is a combination and that operates against the fishermen. On the other hand, the fishermen combine and say: We will not sell below a certain price. As a matter of fact, the fishermen and the cannery men agree that a fair price shall be paid; in scarce years a high price and in plentiful years a low price. I would suggest that in order not to interfere with the fisherman who wants to cure fish, the words 'for commercial purposes' should be inserted after 'British Columbia,' so that small curing establishments would not be included as curing establishments and be required to pay the license fee of $50.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have no fault to find with the conclusion at which the minister has arrived, but I must take exception to many of the statements he made on his way to that conclusion. I have no objection to curing establishments for commercial purposes being licensed and taxed in this way, but I have very serious objection to what has occurred in the past, that is individual fishermen desiring to cure on a modest scale being refused permission to do so unless they took out a license and paid the same fee as a cannery with a large pack. The minister is far from being posted on the condition of the salmon industry in British Columbia, evidently he has given very little attention to it. I would suggest to him that it is not fair to those who are posted upon the salmon canning industry that he, with his prestige as a minister, should in this House contradict the testimony founded on facts which we are in a position to give. No one stated in this House, what he is at such pains to controvert, that the

British Columbia Packers' Association control the industry in British Columbia or on the Fraser river. Five or six times the minister has made the statement that the British Columbia Packers are not the only persons in the industry in British Columbia. I have never heard any one say they were, in fact in the discussion the other day in the minister's absence that fact was made quite plain to every person here. There are on the Fraser river, for instance, three important interests, the British Columbia Packers Association, the A. B. C. Canners Association, the St. Mungo Cannery, and one or two others, all entirely distinct as to ownership and management, but all merged into one absolute combine as to the price to be paid for fish, and as to the price at which they will sell their product. The minister, when enlightening the committee just now, knew about the existence of these three separate associations of canners; evidently he did not know that these three were combined to fix buying and selling prices. In the absence of that knowledge, it is unfair to come to the House and say that no combine exists. Such a combine does exist, not sub rosa, not secretly, but openly; the combination has a public office and a public secretary; it issues to the press as well as to the members of the association day by day and week by week, during the canning season, its reports. We all know of its existence and it amazes me that the minister should say that no such combination exists. I must assume he does it innocently, I believe he does it unintentionally, but it is dangerous for him out of the mass of his misinformation or lack of information to contradict statements made to this committee by way of information. It is idle for the minister to say there is no destruction of fish. We on the scene, on the Fraser river, knows that this goes on all the time, and that the fishermen are absolutely helpless in the face of it. There is no notice given in advance of any limitation to be placed by the canners on the purchase of fish. The fishermen are sent out by the canners to catch all the fish they can get. They go to work at dark, they remain fishing until dawn; they may be rewarded with several hundred fish, and the first intimation they have that they are not to be paid for all their catch is when they arrive at the cannery wharf and see a notice that only a limited quantity of fish, it may be 100 or 200, or any other number arbitrarily fixed, will be bought by that cannery. I say to the minister and his colleague from British Columbia that any fisherman arriving at a wharf who is confronted by that notice has absolutely no recourse.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Does that limitation of the number of fish apply to every year, or is it only occasional?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The limitation as to the number of fish is put up by the cannery owners at any moment when it suits their purpose to put it up, and that is where the hardship comes in, that there is no certainty on the part of any fisherman when he catches fish that he will have any market for them. The minister does not seem to know that American fish from traps are imported.

At six o'clock, Committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On section 2,

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose, I was pointing out a few inaccuracies in the statement, then just made, by the minister from British Columbia. Amongst other matters the minister referred to the fact that under certain conditions fish caught in the traps on the American side might be imported into British Columbia. The minister referred to this possible importation of trap-caught fish as something to be discouraged at all hazards. It so happens that such fish have all along been imported, are every season imported and are canned in the canneries on the Fraser river. This is a sample of how extensive was the knowledge brought to bear on this subject by the minister who undertook to tell the committee that I was astray on the information that I handed out. Under the law as it has stood the fishermen are absolutely prohibited from selling their fish on the American side. They are prohibited from exporting it at all, but the canners have not been prohibited from importing fish. Upon bringing it into the country, it is true, they pay a duty, but as they export the greater part of their product, that duty, minus a very small charge for office fees, is always refunded to them, so that the transaction costs them nothing more than putting up a cheque from the time they bring the fish into the country until the time they export it. The minister from British Columbia, when he mentioned this as something which at all hazards should be prohibited, overlooked the fact that he is giving his warm, enthusiastic, cordial approval to the arrangement which has been made at Washington whereby that which he says should not be brought into the country at all, is to be admitted, not of our own volition, but is to be admitted

without any right on our part to interfere in any way with the process under the terms of this treaty, and is to be admitted free of duty. I would ask the minister what he thinks of that and upon what ground he can justify the attitude which he took here to-day of admiration for what he thought was the prohibition of the importation of that fish for canning with his attitude as a member of the government in bringing into effect 'a solemn bargain made with the authorities at Washington. whereby we are compelled to admit fish and have no means of keeping it out of our country unless we abro gate that arrangement.

There is another matter as to which I would like to say a word. It was the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, I think, who referred to this. In answer to my objection that under the regulations as they stand, fishermen are often compelled to destroy their fish, because the canners on the Fraser river have not the capacity to can them and put a limit on the catch, the minister reminded me that these fish are often taken on scows to the Skeena river, there to be canned, and he instanced this as a proof that there is no limitation upon the catch such as I have suggested. The minister omitted to state what is the fact, that when the fish are so bought for transportation to the Skeena river, they are bought at a greatly reduced price, so that the canner gets just as much profit from canning on the Skeena as he would if he canned on the Fraser, but the unfortunate fisherman gets a half or less price compared with that which he would get if there were facilities for canning on the Fraser river. I would like to direct his attention also to a circumstance connected with the restriction permitting only a limited number of licences to be issued to the canners, because he will see that the effect of that supposed precaution on his part for the preservation of the fishery is altogether destroyed so long as persons having a license to can on the Fraser are permitted to take a whole scow load of fish away from that district and can them at far distant places when their licenses were only supposed to apply to fish canned on the Fraser. I would like to point out to the minister also, to show how delusive is the idea that the catch of fish is limited by the number of licenses issued, that canneries vary a great deal in capacity, that under this Act, as I understand it—he may correct me if I am wrong—a cannery of the largest capacity pays the same license as a cannery of the most limited capacity, and that the process of enlarging canneries is so simple that an establishment that has but one unit this year may, next season, consist of two, three, or four units under the same control. Under the regulations now in force, if we have twelve canneries this year of one unit capacity each, we may have next year, under the same license, twelve canneries of four units each, or forty-eight units, making four times the quantity of fish that they may can, and yet the minister states that he is preventing the fish from being caught by prescribing that only the twelve present holders of licenses shall have licenses next year. I ask him what difference it makes to the fish whether we have twelve canneries of four units each or forty eight canneries of one unit each. The capacity would be precisely the same, but the monopoly created by the minister under the present regulations would be entirely destroyed. I think the time is opportune now, when the Bill is before us, for the minister to give this his serious consideration, so that when the fishermen complain, this year or next year, of being unable to sell their fish, they will not be told that an unconsidered provision of the law has brought about this condition, because here we have the whole subject up for review, the minister is fully informed of the present working of his Act, he has abundant opportunity now to correct the evil, he has noticed it and not more than three or four minutes would be required to remove all these disabilities to which I have referred.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The argument of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster), has only one object and that is to establish the fact—if it were a fact—that in some manner or other the department has, by its enactments and regulations, created a monopoly in the fishing industry in British Columbia. I desire to say that is not correct at all. The hon. gentleman stated that all the proprietors of the canneries in British Columbia were in what is known as the British Columbia Canners Association.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have heard that of the British Columbia Canners' Association, and I certainly could not have said so.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Fraser River Canners' Association was merged in what is known as the British Columbia Canners' Association which includes probably one-half of the canners in the province of British Columbia. On the Fraser river where twelve canneries operated last year, eight of these canneries were in the British Columbia Canners' Association, and four were not. The names of the independent canners are: Todd and Sons, Lee Company, Great West Packing Company, and Glen Rose Packing Company. There were twelve canneries operating on the Fraser

river, but about three times that number must have closed up because there was not fish enough to go round and probably most of these canneries are owned by the firms who are now operating canneries, particularly the British Columbia Packers. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster) has tried to establish the fact that the canners of British Columbia were combined in an association to regulate the price they shall buy the fish for, and the price they shall sell the fish at. That is not correct, inasmuch as of the 39 canneries that operated in British Columbia last year, only 20 were members of the British Columbia Canners' Association, and 19 were independent or outside the association. The report I have here comes from the secretary of the British Columbia Canners' Association, and is authoritative, and it shows that on the Skeena river—my hon. friend confines his attention to the Fraser river, but that is not the whole of the fishing industry in British Columbia by any means—on the Skeena river there are four members of the association, and four who are not, the independent canners being Todd and Sons, Kildala Packing Company, Wallace Brothers, Limited, and the Skeena River Commercial Company. At Rivers Inlet, there are three members of the association, and three who are not, the latter being Todd and Sons, Kildala Packing Company, Strathcona Packing Company. At Naas river two are members of the association, and two are not; in the outlying districts there are three members of the Canners' Association, and six outside or independent. The fact is, therefore, that one-half of the canners operating in British Columbia are not members of this so-called combine. But as a matter of fact the British Columbia Canners' Association is not a combine in the ordinary sense. As I understand it they are organized largely for the purpose of giving attention to the fishery regulations, keeping in touch with the Department of Fisheries with regard to the fishing regulations, and generally for looking after their own interests. It is true, as my hon. friend says, that at the opening of the fishing season the cannery men regulate if they can the price they are going to pay for the fish during the year, but on the other hand the fishermen who have a union, get together and try to keep the price at a higher rate, and by mutual concession the price is fixed. If the fish are plentiful the price is low, probably ten cents per fish, and if the fish are very scarce the price is high. I have known it to be 25 cents per fish, but I am not very well informed as to the prices. There is no evidence further than I have explained, of a combine to regulate the price paid. The remarks of my hon. friend appply to the Fraser river a little more than to the other districts. On the northern rivers it is true that more Japanese and Indians are engaged in the fishing industry than on the Fraser river where more white men are employed. With respect to the importation of fish for canning purposes, I am aware that some years ago it was a common thing for canners south of the boundary to come into Canadian waters and buy the fish caught on the Canadian side. That was objected to because some of the fishermen were under agreement to sell the fish to our own canners, and it was also undesirable that fish caught in Canadian waters should be taken south of the line to be canned in American canneries and form a portion of their pack. On the other hand some of our cannery men have gone south of the boundary line when fish were scarce in Canadian waters, and bought large quantities from the American traps and canned them at their canneries. That was a mutual interchange of fish. Some years ago the department prohibited the importation of fish from the American traps to be canned in our canneries; the Canadian fishermen having objected to the competition. On the other hand, our fishermen claimed the right to sell their fish to the Americans, if they could get a better price than they were getting from the Canadian canners. After a while the practice was stopped and there was no more selling of Canadian fish caught by Canadian fishermen to be canned in the American canneries. It is quite true that Canadian cannery men can go south of the boundary and buy all the fish they like and pay one cent a pound duty, and bring them to the canneries, and they can export them and probably get a rebate of the duty paid, although my information is that there is nothing of that kind done at the present time. As a matter of fact considering the catch of fish south of the boundary line there is none to sell to the Canadian canneries. If my information is correct that sort of importation of fish for canning purposes has not occurred for years. In my view our fish ought to be canned in our own country, and my friend will admit that if we permit our canners to go to the American traps and buy fish to can in Canadian canneries it would be competing with the catch of the Canadian fishermen and lowering the price of their fish. But, if our cannery men can buy fish from the American traps and bring them into Canada, and pay one cent a pound duty and export that fish and get a rebate of the amount of the duty, I would say to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that our fishermen ought to be treated equally favourably and be given the advantage of selling their fish to American canners. I do not think the practice prevails at all,

and I think my hon. friend will have some difficulty in establishing that fact.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think I made it abundantly plain that I was speaking for the fishermen of my riding, who are the fishermen on the Fraser river, and the Minister of Fisheries seems to be engaged in the rather dubious occupation of drawing a herring across this salmon trail. I made no reference to the fisheries on the Skeena river, which are entirely different from those on the Fraser. The seasons are different, the prices are different, the classes of people employed are different, the methods of the canneries are different. The two fisheries are entirely distinct. The canners on the Fraser river are combined under the name of the Fraser River Canners' Association, or whatever modification of that name has been recently made, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries told me the other day was the case. The combine is as tight now as it ever was, and was equally so last season. The usual notice was issued at the beginning of the season by all the canners that the canners of the Fraser river would pay such prices for fish, and the same prices prevailed in all the canneries on the Fraser river last season. There is a fish cannery combine, and if the minister does not know about it, I would advise him to pay due attention to the situation there, and the fact will be very soon forced upon his attention. It is nothing to the fishermen on the Fraser river that some of the operators of traps on the coast of Vancouver Island are not in the combine; neither is it anything to them that the conditions are different on the Skeena river. We are concerned about the combine on the Fraser river, and what we ask of the minister is, not that he shall issue more licenses on the Skeena river or allow more traps on the coast of Vancouver Island, but that if any of our interests on the Fraser river desire to open a new cannery, they may be permitted to get a license.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. May I ask my hon. friend if he knows of any person on the Fraser river or anywhere else who desires to establish another cannery on the Fraser river?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Yes, I have known of it, and when they have gone to the Fisheries office at New Westminster and made the preliminary inquiries—because you cannot establish a cannery in a day just as you buy a hat—they have been told that the decision of the department was that no new licenses should be issued.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I want to say, then, to my hon. friend that if any decent company wants to establish another cannery on the Fraser river, and makes application to the department for a license, it will have my strong commendation, and I have the word of my hon. friend the minister that he will give it fair consideration.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Am I to understand that the explanation of all these large words is that there is to be free trade in canning licenses?

Mr. BRODEUR. What my hon. friend is afraid of, I understand, is monopoly. He is afraid that this legislation is going to bring monopoly. I may tell him that it is quite the reverse. There may be to-day monopoly to a certain extent, though there is not practically, because, as has been stated by my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue, there are on the Fraser river a certain number of canners who are outside and independent of the Association. These companies have formed an association for the purpose of approaching the government and discussing the various questions affecting the fisheries generally, just as we have in all parts of the country various persons engaged in the same trade who have formed an association for the purpose of discussing their mutual interests. That does not mean that they have formed a monopoly. Nobody would say that all the members of the Manufacturers' Association should be called monopolists. I may say to my hon. friend that if there are some people who want a license, and who cannot get justice from the existing canners, they will be welcome; and if on any occasion it is proven that justice has not been rendered to the fishermen, and those fishermen want to form an association and establish a cannery, they will be welcome to a license. The legislation we are proposing to-day is to kill any monopoly. If the canners do not render justice to the fishermen, why should we be called upon to renew their licenses? To-day the ordinary rules of trade are regulating these canneries; there may be a large number or a small number; but in future every cannery will have to come to the government for a license; and if it is found that they do not treat the fishermen fairly and equitably, we shall have an opportunity to force them to render justice. My hon. friend, who claims to be a friend of the fishermen, should welcome this legislation as being in the right direction.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The hon. minister says that if complaint were made against the present canners, he would not renew their licenses. Suppose the fishermen made complaint against all the pre-

sent canners, and the minister refused to renew their licenses, how much better off would the fishermen be? They would be much worse off. What the fishermen want is not that the minister should interfere with the canners, but that he should cease interfering with other people. Then they will be able to keep the canners straight without the minister's intervention. If the canners ill-use the fishermen this year, and the fishermen organize next year to meet the conditions, the canners, with their powerful combination and unlimited capital will so alter the conditions next year as to freeze out the new people, and when they are frozen out, the canners will revert to the old conditions. That is the experience with all combinations of that kind. I would like to point out how weak is the minister's comparison with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, because there is no license or any other condition required before an investor can have a factory, and create the conditions which entitle him to become a member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. There is absolute free trade in factories. All the manufacturers do not belong to the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, and if any outside investor sees a chance of engaging in a business now controlled by any person in that association, he is at perfect liberty to do so.

Whereas in the case of the fisheries, no person ambitious to go into that business can do so unless he has a license from the minister; and for years it has been the policy of the minister to refuse a license to any one outside of those already engaged in the industry. He refers to the fact that many canneries on the Fraser are idle. But why are they idle? Because to create a monopoly, all the canneries on that river which could be purchased, were purchased by the British Columbia Packers' Association. Speaking from memory they purchased about fifty canneries and immediately closed about thirty of them. In New Westminster we had several cannery sites held under long leases from the city, but unfortunately the city did not foresee the possibility of outside capital coming in and buying out those concerns for the purpose of closing them. The British Columbia Packers' Association did close those canneries and made a condition in re-leasing the property that no canneries should be established on it. That was a profitable move from the standpoint of the association, but it did great injustice to the fishermen on the Fraser and the city of New Westminster. The hon. minister loses sight of the fact that all those interests are combined when there is question of fixing the price which will be paid the fishermen for their fish. He knows that in the last big year, when our fishermen might have expected to make a profitable harvest, the price of salmon on the Canadian side was exactly one half of the price which the same people were paying on the American side for identical salmon at the same time. When we got 10 cents per fish, the American fishermen got 20 cents; and when we got 12½ cents per fish, the American fishermen got 25 cents. My hon. friend's department alone is responsible for this condition, and it is a condition which we have only this opportunity of amending before the next big run is on.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am extremely sorry to find that my hon. friend still reiterates the statement that there is a combine in British Columbia, and that the fishermen are not well treated. If there be a combine, how does he account for the fact that there are several men in the business who are not in the association, but are absolutely independent of it? Besides, how is it that during the last three years no one applied for a license for the opening of any new cannery? Several establishments have been closed and my hon. friend says they were closed for the purpose of monopoly. That is contrary to the information we have in the department. The information we have is that these establishments were closed because they did not pay. But if other people wanted to start canneries, why did they not apply for a license? Within the last three years, not one has applied for a license.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). My information is to the contrary.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the information I have from the officers of the department.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The local inspector does not necessarily report applications for licenses. He has to inform prospective applicants that there is no use in his doing so because he has orders from the minister that no licenses are to be given.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the inspector had an application he would send it to the department. The inspector out there is a very efficient man, who would not refuse a license without referring the application to the department.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Is it not a fact that the minister notified the inspector that no new licenses were to be issued?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, we never gave any notification to that effect.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I certainly was under that impression. That was stated in this House last year in the course

of the session and was not contradicted by the minister.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the information I have from the Acting Superintendent of Fisheries. He says that he never gave such instructions.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If the minister will say that we shall have free trade in fishing licenses in the future, and that he will give a license to any one who wants to establish a cannery, that will be satisfactory.

Mr. BRODEUR. I shall be very glad to consider any application for a license. So far we have never had any.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The minister has never refused an application?

Mr. BRODEUR. No.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Why, then, will my hon. friend not remove this harmful impression by saying that he will not refuse a license in any case without some good reason?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly any man who applies for a license and proves that it is necessary such a license should be given, will get it.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). But how can any one prove it is necessary? How can any one tell what the future catch will be? We do not know what fish may be caught. It is an absolutely impossible premise which the minister lays down, and that justifies my suggestion that the reason he will not promise free trade in licenses is because he does not intend to grant new licenses.

Mr. BRODEUR. I can assure my hon. friend that if he has any one who wants a license, let him make the application and it will be duly considered; and if he makes out a good case the license will be granted.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am not here as the advocate of any special privilege or as an applicant for a special privilege for any one. I am speaking for the whole public and maintaining the rights of the fishermen to free trade in salmon licenses.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment is that the words 'Or salmon curing' be struck out of subsection 23a of section 2.

Amendment negatived.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The hon. minister from British Columbia (Mr. Templeman) suggested an amendment.

Mr. BRODEUR. I move to add after the words 'British Columbia' the words 'for commercial purposes' to subsection 23a of section 2.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Does the minister intend to extend this system to the curing of other varieties of fish, and to other parts of Canada than British Columbia?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not the intention now.

Mr. JAMESON. That is not the intention under this Bill, but let us understand whether, this principle having been adopted by this parliament, the minister will, later on, introduce legislation which would enable him to place under license any fish curing establishment in any part of Canada, no matter what variety of fish it might handle or what conditions had prevailed up to that time in regard to them.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not the intention of the department now to make any change of that kind.

Section 2, as amended, agreed to.

On section 3—amending section 36—annual fee for lobster cannery license.

Mr. BRODEUR. This clause is inserted as a result of the recommendation last year of the Committee on Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. JAMESON. What protests have been received by the department in respect to any of the recommendations made by the Committee on Marine and Fisheries last year concerning the lobster fishery? I understand from statements in the press that protests have been made against certain of the recommendations, and, indeed, against some of the regulations framed under the recommendations, more especially that relating to the standard trap. It seems to me, inasmuch as that committee made this report, all the suggestions they did make were to be accepted in their entirety, and any suggestion which they made had reference one to the other. So, if it is not the intention of the department to enforce the matter of standard traps, it seems to me questionable whether it would be the intention of the committee that these other provisions, especially the increase in regard to the license fee should be enforced.

Mr. BRODEUR. So far as the change proposed in this section is concerned I believe no protest has come from any person or company. Some protests were made concerning the date at which we should put in force the regulations concerning the traps. My hon. friend will remember that these questions came up at the opening of this session. (I was going to

say last session, because we have already spent some days upon this matter.) I thought I could not deal with these protests without having the matter referred to the Committee on Marine and Fisheries, as all the regulations that had been adopted were adopted upon the recommendation of the committee. Consequently, this complaint was referred to the committee. But the committee recommended —I think unanimously, but at any rate by a large majority—that the change asked for in the date of the coming into force of the regulations should be adopted. This report was made to the House, and as a result of that report I had the regulations amended to cover the recommendations of the committee. Since then I do not remember any complaint made to the department with regard to these recommendations. Perhaps I should except Prince Edward Island, where they have been asking for extensions. But we thought it advisable not to make extensions. The matter seems to be giving satisfaction now.

Mr. JAMESON. My recollection of the newspaper report I saw is that the legislature of Prince Edward Island had passed a resolution condemning in toto the regulation with regard to the standard trap and asking that it be rescinded. To be sure, there can be no active resistance to that regulation at the present time, because, if my memory serves me the regulation as to standard traps is held in abeyance until December 31, 1912. It may be that when that time arrives parliament, or the minister may see fit to either annul the regulation or extend it again indefinitely. If that were done, it seems to me, these other provisions when they were recommended by the committee, were contemplated to come into force simultaneously with the provision regarding the standard trap, might be left out. I would like the minister to state whether the legislature of Prince Edward Island has made a request that the regulation affecting the standard trap should be abolished altogether.

Mr. BRODEUR. I was under the impression that the objection made by the legislature of Prince Edward Island was simply concerning the time limit. It is some time since I read that. But, whether it referred to one or to the other, we thought as that was the deliberate judgment of the committee, we should not make any more changes, and so it will come into force at the time specified in the regulations,

Mr. JAMESON. The minister will remember that when the additional fee was proposed to be placed on the canners of lobsters, it was with the understanding that the revenue derived would be used for the protection of the fisheries. Now, we have this condition of affairs as a result of the postponement of the enforcement of the standard trap regulation—that there is no protection necessary, so far as preventing the taking of small lobsters is concerned. There is, as a matter of fact, no size limit to-day, generally speaking. Therefore, there is nothing to protect in that sense, and it seems unfortunate that the canners of these fish should be penalized by this additional fee when the revenue is not required for the protection of the fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. My hon. friend must remember that, in the regulations passed, it was provided that the standard trap would have to be made from January 1 last. So, the recommendations are now in force with regard to the new traps which are being made and so reasons exist for enforcing these regulations to ensure that the new traps are made according to the regulations.

Mr. JAMESON. I understand then from that what the minister has said he will see to it that the regulations affecting the standard trap are enforced from now on, so far as the new traps are concerned.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, certainly.

Mr. JAMESON. And that after December 31, 1912, that regulation will be enforced with respect to any of the old traps which may be still in existence.

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely.

Mr. JAMESON. Is the minister taking any steps to patrol the maritime provinces coast waters, for the purpose of affording additional protection to the lobster fisheries?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we are taking steps in that direction, and will likely ask for a vote of the necessary money.

On section 4: furnishing statistics to the department,

Mr. JAMESON. Has it been the custom of people operating these canning factories to report the number of traps which they fish?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, we have been receiving reports.

Mr. JAMESON. I did not know that many operated the traps; in most cases they operate the factories and purchase their fish.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have had reports

On section 5: keeping of lobster pounds.

Mr. BRODEUR. This is a new section to provide that pounds may be established in which lobsters caught during the open season may be placed and sold during the close season. Under the existing law it is illegal to be in possession of lobsters during the close season. This clause worked detrimentally to the interests of our fishermen, and as our close season occurs at a time when lobsters would bring a very high price on the American market, the American fishermen, having no close season, enjoy a great advantage in that market over the Canadian fishermen. Owners of these pounds may sell lobsters which they have caught during the open season, to American fishermen. This traffic must be surrounded with every precaution to avoid breaches of the law, and only after great hesitation and repeated requests have the department adopted this policy. I hope this policy will commend itself to the favourable consideration of parliament and that by it we can give a further advantage to the lobster fishermen.

Mr. JAMESON. On whose recommendation is this being done?

Mr. BRODEUR. On the recommendation of the officers of the department, and at the request of a great number of people who have asked for this year after year.

Mr. JAMESON. How many pounds is it proposed to license?

Mr. BRODEUR. As many as are applied for.

Mr. JAMESON. Will any assistance be given by the government towards the establishment of pounds?

Mr. BRODEUR. No provision is made in that respect. It is expected the revenue the owner will get by selling his lobsters in this way will compensate him for the expense incurred.

Mr. JAMESON. What will be the probable cost of construction?

Mr. BRODEUR. That will vary according to the location, in many cases it will be very slight.

Mr. JAMESON. What would the minister consider a large cost or a small cost?

Mr. BRODEUR. It depends on the location of the pound. There are places where pounds are naturally established, and only some further structures of small account are required.

Mr. JAMESON. As I understand, any person applying for a license will, on payment of an annual license fee of $75, be entitled to receive a license to keep a pound. I agree with the minister's statement that in some places the cost of construction of these pounds may be comparatively small, but such cases will be very few, comparatively speaking. In eastern Nova Scotia a pound was established some years ago, and the gentleman who operated it, informed me that although the situation lent itself naturally to the purpose, the cost of constructing and maintaining it was very considerable. The profit from its operation was not he stated very extensive, although, as I understand, he was receiving from the government a very respectable sum for handling seed lobsters. I know there is another place, in the county of Digby, where, some years ago, there was a pound in operation for the keeping of these lobsters during the close season. I am informed that it cost something like $10,000 to $12,000 to fit that up for the business, although the location was naturally one quite appropriate for the purpose.

But, the feature which presents itself most forcibly to my mind is that there are comparatively few places along our coasts which naturally lend themselves to the purpose which this regulation makes provision for, and that consequently there will be comparatively few people who will be able to avail themselves of the advantages of this amendment to the Act. That means then, in effect, that this particular business will, in different localities, become in the nature of a monopoly. There is, of course, another feature to it, and that is that the American palate is to be satisfied and gratified during the Canadian close season, while the poor Canadian will not be permitted to gratify his appetite, and he, as I understood the minister, will have to forego his dish of lobsters, during some months in the year. If the minister does not propose to make any relaxation with regard to the regulation in that respect it would not be lawful for a person operating a pound to sell these lobsters in the Canadian market during the close season, as he is only permitted to sell for use outside of Canada. The minister, during the discussion which we had some days ago on the subject of the lobster fishery, stated that it was possible for Americans and Canadians to fish for lobsters during the Canadian close season, outside of the three mile limit along the Canadian coast, and sell them in the American market, although they could not at the same time sell them in the Canadian market. It would seem to me that when we admit that that condition is possible, and when we erect these pounds along the coast, whether there be many or few, these two things working together will lend themselves to the violation of the law. The minister knows that there is a very pressing need for the enforcement of a close season, and that with-

out the enforcement of a close season the lobster fishery, if it does not cease to exist, will certainly decline seriously. Indeed, there are many people who think that under existing circumstances the lobster fishery will become depleted, and be a thing of the past before very long. But, it seems to me that there are two dangerous features in connection with this matter. One is that it is bound to create a monopoly in different localities because of the very great expense to which it will be necessary to go to provide these pounds, make them satisfactory, make them safe, make them so that the lobsters can be kept in a healthy and wholesome condition; the other is that where you have these lobsters taken in the open season available to be put in the pounds by the person who is operating or controlling it, you are open to the risk of having lobsters taken outside of the three mile limit, or inside of the three mile limit in all probability, during the close season, and put into that pound surreptitiously. So that, there are these two features which are going to be evident in the operation of this Act when it goes into effect.

I should think that it would be very wise on the part of the minister to have some information, definite and satisfactory, as to the probable cost of the construction of these pounds, and of their maintenance, because, if any person makes application to the department, as I understand it, and that application has the approval of the fishery officer of the department, I take it that the department would be, under ordinary circumstances, in duty bound to issue a license. May I ask the minister whether the department would in every case issue a license to any one applying for it who would be willing to pay the fee?

Mr. BRODEUR. The second objection which my hon. friend has mentioned against this policy——

Mr. JAMESON. I had not concluded my remarks.

Mr. BRODEUR. Oh, I beg the hon. gentleman's pardon.

Mr. JAMESON. Would the minister be good enough to state if the department will grant a license in any case when an application is made for it?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. JAMESON. That, it seems to me, is going to be the difficulty. Here you have a large number of people holding licenses from the department, each one of whom would be entitled to be in possession of lobsters during the close season. While I do not think there are a great many pounds, bona fide, which would actually be established, at the same time, the holding of these licenses would, on the face of it, give to the persons possessing them a legal right to be in possession of lobsters during the close season, and there would be a very serious danger of lobsters being taken during the close season under these licenses, although, the licenses, of course, would not be for that purpose, but merely for the purpose of enabling them to keep lobsters taken during the open season in their possession, and to dispose of them outside of Canada during the close season. I merely bring these matters to the attention of the minister because he has regulations intended to protect the lobster fishery, which is a declining fishery, but which is a very valuable one. These suggestions may perhaps be along the lines which he has himself considered, and perhaps he would give to the committee his opinion with regard to these different matters.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Jameson) that the fear which he entertains with regard to the possibility of violating the regulations in establishing these pounds has been engaging the very serious consideration of the department for many years, I was telling the committee a few moments ago that years ago we had applications from a number of people asking for the privileges which are now authorized to be given by the legislation under consideration. The department was afraid, as my hon. friend is, that there might be some violation of the regulations, that it would be inciting the people to violate the rules and regulations in the way he has just suggested. However, after giving the matter our most serious consideration, we have come to the conclusion that we should request parliament to give us the necessary authorization to establish these pounds. We will have at each of these pounds a man for the purpose of supervising the operations, and, having an officer in charge of the pound, nothing of an illegal nature can be carried on. There might be some violation, but the man who would do such a thing might incur very serious consequences. The owner of a pound will have to observe the regulations, and if he fails to observe them it is a matter of discretion with us whether we renew his license or not. That will induce him to carry out the regulations properly. In that regard I think that our fears, which appear to have been shared by my hon. friend also, will disappear, and that we may expect very good results from this policy. My hon. friend says that this is going to create a monopoly. I do not see how it can create a monopoly because we will issue licenses to every one who applies. I am informed that the cost of Mr. Baker's pound was $3,800, and I should think that the income

to the owner of the pound will be sufficient to give a fair return for the money invested.

Mr. JAMESON. I understand that Mr. Baker's was almost a natural pond, and that the outlay was comparatively speaking small.

Mr. BRODEUR. I have no doubt that in many cases the cost would be greater.

Mr. JAMESON. I understand that it cost Mr. Baker more than the sum mentioned.

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Baker stated to the department that it cost him between $3,800 and $3,900. The idea is to sell these lobsters on the American market as well as on the Canadian market, and no lobster will be allowed out of the pound during the close season except on the certificate of the fishery officer. With all these precautions I should think that the law will not be violated and that a new source of revenue will be opened up to our people.

Mr. LOGGIE. Is there any size limit on the lobster taken?

Mr. BRODEUR. No. Berried lobsters will not be permitted to be sold.

Mr. LOGGIE. The small lobsters are now used in the canneries and when the canneries are not in operation they may be put on the Canadian market out of season, which I think is very undesirable. If you put a size limit on the lobster when placed in the pound it would not be so bad.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not think there is any danger that these small lobsters will be sold as fresh live lobsters. Some years ago, as my hon. friend knows, we abolished the size limit regulation.

Mr. TODD. Coming from a fishing section of the country I wish to say that I heartily endorse this legislation. For a number of years, in my county there has been a great demand for the establishment of private lobster pounds, the idea being that when the lobsters grow in the pound to a large size they will be sold at a much higher price than if sold when taken first from the water. I believe that the license fee provided for in the Bill is none too high. In my section of the country there are places, small and large, where if cheap dams are constructed the lobsters can be held, and there fed and cared for. The size limit in Charlotte county waters is 10½ inches, and no lobster can be taken out of our waters and sold unless it is 10½ inches long or 4¾ carapace measurement. Those who establish these pounds buy live lobsters from the fishermen, and they cannot buy them undersize in our waters. I am sorry to say though that they can bring smaller sized lobsters from the waters of Nova Scotia, and they can keep these fish in the pounds and feed them until they grow to a larger size. The result is that often the growth of the lobster is from 150 to 300 per cent in say two years and by letting them grow to this larger size they get a much higher price for them in the American market. It pays those who own the pounds to keep the lobsters in them, and it pays the fishermen to sell to the pound keepers, and I cannot see how it in any way injures the lobster fishery. The lessees of the pounds have to take their chances on the lobster dying before growing to the increased size. Therefore, as all the risk is put upon the man who obtains the licenses for pounds, as the government is contributing nothing, and as the fishermen are benefited, I feel that the action of the government in this matter is highly commendable. I heartily approve of this measure as I believe it to be beneficial, judging from my own experience in the waters of my county and from what the fishermen have told me.

Mr. JAMESON. How long would the hon. member (Mr. Todd) expect these lobsters to be retained in the pound in order to grow to a marketable size?

Mr. TODD. Possibly the fishermen who put them in the pound would not care to keep them more than a year. I know of one case in Charlotte county waters where they have been kept for about two years. I may say that I have had a letter from one of the lessees of a large pound which comprises about sixty acres and he claims that his company has already lost about ten thousand dollars in lobsters, but a large part of that loss was due to losing eighty or ninety thousand lobsters in one season, not because of death or lack of care, but because they got out over the sea wall. The objection to using such a large body of water for a pound is that they have to use the traps in catching these lobsters as they do in the open sea. In the smaller places little dams could be built so that the water can be lowered, and the lobsters caught in the open season, and the fishermen are not put to the expense and labour of setting traps.

Mr. JAMESON. May I ask my hon friend what the system is in his county with regard to the storage of lobsters; whether the individual fisherman takes them there and puts them in the custody of the person who controls the pound, whether they are taken account of, and accounted for at the end of the season or when they wish to remove them, or whether they are sold to the operator of the pound at the time they are taken there.

Mr. TODD. The fishermen take these lobsters as near the pound as possible, and the licensee then sizes them and pays so much apiece for them. When these 150,000 or 175,000 lobsters were brought from these particular waters, I know, from the lobster canners of my own county, that they were complaining because they had to pay a cent a pound more for them than they did before it was found that the owners of these pounds were buying our lobsters and paying a higher price.

Mr. JAMESON. The proprietor of the pound takes the risk?

Mr. TODD. Takes all the risk.

Mr. JAMESON. I am glad to know, from what the minister says, that the Canadian epicure is also to have an opportunity of getting an occasional lobster during our close season. I understood, when he first explained the purpose of this amendment, that it was the intention only to allow lobsters taken during the close season to be exported. The minister states that an officer will be placed at each one of these pounds to see that there is no infraction of the law. I do not know whether that will entail the employment of additional officers, but I presume that it will. I have this to say with regard to the officers, and I think it will be endorsed by every hon. member of this House who knows anything about the lobster fishery, that the officers whom the minister may appoint for this purpose will have to be a little sharper and keener and more attentive to their duties than the officers who are at present supposedly looking after the lobster fishery. I think there has been very little attempt on the part of the outside officers of the department to protect the lobster industry, and, whether the minister appoints new officers or instructs the present officers to watch these pounds, I hope they will be given to understand that they are to watch them and see that the law is carried out; because I know that at the present time many of the officers of the department are winking at open violations of the law—the taking of lobsters in the close season and the taking of small lobsters at a time when there was a legal size limit. I hope the minister will give these officers to understand that they are to live up to the letter and the spirit of the regulations, because that is the only way in which the lobster fishery can be preserved. This amendment is opening the door to infractions of the law during the close season, and it is only by a rigid enforcement of the regulations that infractions of the law in that regard can be prevented, and the protection of the lobster fishery can be maintained.

The minister says that a license will be granted to any person making application for it. I would like him to inform the committee whether there will be any standard of pound, because I can very well apprehend that there may be individuals who, without having any proper place available for the construction of a suitable pound, men perhaps with the best of intentions, but lacking experience in this matter, may make application, thinking they may be able to carry out the impounding of lobsters in a satisfactory way. The minister may remember that two years ago, when the committee sat to take evidence with respect to the lobstery fishery, and particularly with regard to the impounding of lobsters, one of the witnesses, who knew considerable about the matter, declared that there should be certain standard regulations in regard to these pounds, because the sunlight impinging on the backs of these fish when the water over them was not sufficiently deep to protect them, brought about a sickness which made them unfit for human food or killed them outright. So I presume it will be necessary to fix some standard or have some regulation as to where these lobsters may be impounded, and that it will be on the certificate of some officer in that regard that the license will be issued. I would like the minister to inform the committee as to whether the license will as a matter of fact be granted only after an examination by some officer of the department, and when the department is satisfied that there is a proper pound available, in the possession of, or under the control of the person making the application for the license.

Mr. BRODEUR. We have not yet considered whether we should adopt a standard pound. This is a matter which should be left largely to the man who goes into the business. He will have to make a certain expenditure in order to get a proper pound. Then why should we interfere to prevent him from impounding lobsters in it? He might say that it was an interference with his business. So long as he impounds lobsters and disposes of them legally, that is the only thing with which I think the department should be concerned. We are glad to see a large number of persons going into this business. I think it will be very profitable if properly carried out. Of course, a great deal of latitude will have to be allowed to the man who goes into the business as to the selection of the site and the way he will manage the pound.

Mr. JAMESON. I am glad to have that explanation of the minister, because what I wanted to make clear was this, that in the granting of these licenses there would be no preference shown to one man over another, whatever his local standing or influence might be—I need not, perhaps, say

whatever his political leanings might be. But there are some people in the community who have a pull, so to speak. Any man who has the desire to enter into this business, I understand from what the minister says, will have as good an opportunity and right, and stand in as good a position before the minister and the department, as the man who may be more wealthy and more influential—every person will have a fair show and no partiality will be shown.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS ACT.

Bill (No. 48) to amend the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act, 1894—Mr. Brodeur—read the second time, and the House went into committee thereon.

Mr. BRODEUR. This Bill is for the purpose of correcting an error in the description of the boundary of the harbour of Montreal. In the description the southern boundary is used instead of the eastern boundary.

Mr. DOHERTY. If I understand correctly, the error consists in the fact that what is usually called the southern side is really the eastern side.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes. We are in the habit of saying that the lower part is the eastern part whereas it is the northern part.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATION OF THE MANUFACTURE OF EXPLOSIVES.

Bill (No. 79) to regulate the manufacture, storage and importation of explosives—Mr. Templeman—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I desire to amend subsection (g) in this respect. That section reads:

'Magazine' means and includes any building, storehouse, structure or place in which any explosive is kept or stored.

The provincial authorities have pointed out that possibly we might be infringing on provincial magazines licensed by the provinces, and after consultation with the provincial authorities we agreed to this amendment:

That after the word 'stored,' the following words be added: 'Other than at or in or for the use of a mine or quarry in a province for which provision is made by the law of the said province.

Mr. JAMESON.

Mr. DOHERTY. As this amendment is made in deference to a suggestion that some portion of the Bill might be an infringement of provincial rights, I should like to point out that this measure save in so far as it deals with the importation of explosives, is clearly something not within the legislative competency of this parliament. This Bill purposes to regulate the way people shall handle explosives, and that has nothing to do with any general regulation of trade or commerce. It undertakes to regulate how any man in his own factory shall handle and deal with explosives and its purpose is the protection of life. It does not seem to me to be anything but a purely local matter in each province, and if you cannot justify it on the ground that it is a regulation of trade and commerce, as the words 'trade and commerce' have been interpreted by the highest authorities—that is, the regulation of some general nature or affecting commercial interchange either between the different provinces or between the provinces and the outside world—I entirely fail to see how you can justify it at all. There is at least one section that makes quite clear how purely local this matter is. I refer to section 10 :

10. No license shall be granted for any factory or magazine hereafter established within the limits of, or within one mile of the limits of any city, town or incorporated village, or elsewhere except with the approval of the municipal corporation or other local authority having jurisdiction, and also with the consent of the minister.

That provision—in itself a most excellent provision—clearly indicates the purely local nature of this legislation. Methods of handling explosives which a man has stored may be perfectly safe in one locality and very dangerous in another; and here you are endeavouring to regulate the handling of explosives by one general law made applicable all over the country. And, because you are seeking to make the law applicable all over the country, I suppose it is inferred that that gives jurisdiction. I would respectfully suggest for the consideration of the minister that that is an unfounded idea. What determines the jurisdiction is the subject matter that is dealt with; and I should certainly be very much interested to know under which of the provisions of section 91 of the British North America Act the minister says he has power to declare how I shall handle explosives in my possession in the particular locality in which I live. So far as this is a licensing Act—for I believe there are provisions requiring licenses—it does seem to me that the provinces certainly would have power to license persons handling explosives. I know that in my own province people have

to take out a license for the sale of gunpowder. I think the minister ought to be in a position to point out to us where he finds jurisdiction in this parliament to regulate how people shall carry on their business on their own premises in the locality in which they live. I must confess that, even after some reflection, I have not been able to find the grounds on which this is brought within the jurisdiction of this parliament. I do not say that there are no provisions of the Bill that are within our jurisdiction. The regulation of importation is clearly within the power of this parliament. And there may be other provisions also. But the bulk of the sections seem to me to contain provision to secure purely local ends—to secure people from dangers that may result from the fact that somebody is handling explosives in the course of his business or otherwise in these localities.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I would not care to debate the constitutionality of this Bill with my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty). This is a Bill, as he sees, regulating the manufacture, importation and storage of explosives. The Bill was framed by Captain Desborough, the chief director of explosives of Great Britain, who came to this country last summer, spent several months examining the conditions of our powder establishments and presented to my department a full report which has been printed and sent to each member. The Bill was subsequently referred to the Department of Justice. I have conferred with Mr. Newcombe the Deputy Minister of Justice on the point of the power of this parliament to legislate on the manufacture of explosives and the regulation of magazines, and I was advised that there was no doubt that the Bill was constitutional. Great care has been taken in the preparation of the Bill not to trench in any way upon provincial jurisdiction.

Mr. SPROULE. Under what clause of the British North America Act does the minister claim jurisdiction? Was it under 'Trade and Commerce'?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, I think he quoted that as one of the clauses that gave this parliament supreme power. I should like to point out that this Bill is the outcome of a strong public demand. The first request we had for legislation by the Dominion parliament on this subject came from the Ontario Department of Mines. It appears to be impossible for any province to control by regulation the manufacture of explosives and to inspect the explosives to ascertain that they were of proper composition and not too easily exploded. There ought to be uniformity in the character of the explosives used if the very numerous accidents, such as we have had in the last twelve months, are to be obviated. After a conference with the manufacturers of explosives in Canada, the contents of this Bill were approved of. The provincial governments were consulted, and we had the very able assistance of Mr. Thomas Gibson, the Deputy Commissioner of Mines for Ontario. We exempt from the jurisdiction of this Bill magazines licensed by a province which has inspectors and the machinery for inspecting magazines. Thus this Bill is really introduced at the urgent demand of several of the provinces, and all the manufacturers and a general public demand. Such catastrophes as have occurred at Sand Point cannot possibly be prevented by any provincial legislation; at least every province would have to pass legislation regulating the character of manufacturing establishments, and would also have to establish an elaborate scientific staff to examine every explosive placed upon the market. The provinces have desired this government to deal with this matter so as to have uniformity.

I would not attempt to argue the constitutionality of some of the Bill's provisions with learned lawyers; I simply state that the Bill has had the endorsation of the Justice Department. It is highly in the public interest if we can avoid such terrible catastrophes as have occurred. The Hull disaster of a year ago is an example. Four tons of virite exploded. The day before the explosion there were 24 tons in the storehouse near Hull, and if the explosion had taken place while the entire quantity was there I am told the foundations of this building would have been shaken, and the walls might have tumbled down. It is a very serious matter. Even if there is a little doubt as to our power to license powder magazines, there is no chance of objection by any province on the ground that we are infringing on their rights, it is not a question that the provinces will be too anxious to assert their right to legislate upon.

Mr. DOHERTY. The anxiety of the provinces to maintain their rights is the smallest consideration. Just because this legislation is of the greatest importance, and because satisfactory legislation for the protection of the public against danger resulting from explosions is highly desirable, these are the very reasons that make it essential we should have effective legislation. If we have not jurisdiction this will not be effective legislation, and it will make no difference if the provinces do ask for it. If the provinces lie back and do not pass the requisite legislation, when the public good requires it, and leave the matter to us, and we have nothing to justify ourselves except that the public good re

quires such legislation, that fact will not make our legislation any more effective, and the result will be that we will have legislation which if it were effective would be most desirable but, if ineffective, would be quite useless and our intervention in the matter will simply serve to lull the people whose duty it is to attend to these things, into the idea that they are being attended to. It is precisely because of the great importance of this legislation that it should be effectively made. I have the very highest respect for the opinion of the Justice Department, and of the Deputy Minister of Justice particularly, and I do not want to criticise it, but it would be a certain satisfaction to us, who have some doubts on this subject, if we could be informed upon what provision in law the Deputy Minister of Justice based his opinion. In the very first section we have a provision that no person shall have an explosive in his possession without a license from the minister. If this provision is based upon the jurisdiction of this parliament to deal with the regulation of trade and commerce, I fail to see how this House can impose upon me the necessity of having a license from the minister in order to have an explosive in my possession. That surely has no connection with trade and commerce.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend will see that that is unless it is an authorized explosive.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am within the provisions of this law if I have it in my possession without any idea of dealing with it in any way. The provisions with regard to selling explosives are open precisely to the same objections. I have great respect for those who have asked for and recommended this legislation and for the provincial authorities, but all of these things constitute no answer to the question that may be raised as to the effectiveness of this legislation. The answer to the objection which will be made will have to be found in the British North America Act, and I think that certainly it is regrettable that we are not to be put in a position to know just in virtue of what power we are taking it upon ourselves to make this legislation.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The point that my hon. friend raises is that this Bill prohibits any person from having in his possession or selling explosives. That is true, but its application is to dangerous explosives; that is explosives that have not passed the test for which this Act provides. A chemical and explosive test will be made. All explosives covered by this Bill will be tested by experts, and none but authorized explosives may be sold. While it is in the interest of the public that this should be done, it is in effect, a matter of trade and commerce. No legislation of this kind would be worth anything unless the explosives were tested chemically in order that an unsafe explosive should not be put upon the market. What is or is not a safe explosive can only be determined by experts, and by the expenditure of a considerable amount of money. As to the constitutionality of this measure, I can only speak on the authority of the Deputy Minister of Justice, who told me that the provisions of this Bill were justified and that they were authorized, and that they were necessary to the general safety of the public. There may be a possibility that in granting licenses for magazines operated under provincial legislation we may be trenching upon provincial jurisdiction. But this Bill does not attempt to deal with the general public use of explosives, We are only dealing with the manufacture, transportation and sale of improper or unauthorized kinds of explosives. I have given my hon. friend all the authority that I have for saying that this Bill is within the competence of this House. It is an experiment. There is no legislation of this kind in Canada, and there is very little legislation in any of the provinces regulating the use of explosives. I do not know of any. Some of the provinces have legislation with respect to the way explosives may be stored, but there is nothing in respect to the quality, or the manufacture of explosives which this Bill attempts to regulate. I will have to ask my hon. friend not to press his constitutional point too strongly. The government will take the responsibility, if it is acting unconstitutionally in this matter, and rectify its error at a future time, if we find out that we have made one. But, I believe we have not made one.

Mr. DOHERTY. It may be a little late to rectify an error after the legislation that it is endeavoured to enforce is found to be unworkable. If you are relying on this legislation, when perhaps the jurisdiction is not here to prevent the great evil of the uncontrolled handling of explosives, you are running the serious risk of meeting a situation where you have nothing but the fancied security resulting from illegally enacted legislation. While I do not propose to press the point too far, still it is one which deserves serious consideration, and if the Department of Justice, have given it serious consideration, I suppose they have said the last word on the subject. At all events, I shall be able to feel that I can sleep soundly and that I have no further responsibility in the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the minister must be a disciple of the late Oliver Mowat. He said at one time that when-

ever there was a question as to the right of the legislature to legislate upon any subject although he was fully satisfied that it had such a right, still he went on the assumption that it had, went on and legislated and left it to the courts and the people afterwards to determine whether the legislature had or had not that right. He was not very much concerned whether he had authority so long as he honestly believed he had and he went on and legislated.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. And he enacted a lot of good legislation.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes.

Mr. ARTHURS. If the minister gives the ordinary meaning to the words 'kept and stored' I believe that this legislation will go farther than is contemplated by him. As I read the Bill it would prevent the sale or storage of any cartridges, or percussion caps in any ordinary store in any town in Canada. Let me read clause (g) of section 2:

'Magazine' means and includes any building, storehouse, structure or place in which any explosive is kept or stored.

Section 6 says:

The minister may issue licenses for factories and magazines, and no one shall manufacture, either wholly or in part, or store explosives except in licensed factories and magazines.

Clause 10 provides that:

No license shall be granted for any factory or magazine hereafter established within the limits of, or within one mile of the limits of, any city, town or incorporated village, or elsewhere except with the approval of the municipal corporation or other local authority having jurisdiction, and also with the consent of the minister.

If we take this language in the ordinary way I think it will prevent the sale of ammunition by any hardware store in Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that the province takes that right to itself? It is only during the last session of the legislature of Ontario that a law was passed prohibiting the sale of firearms, cartridges and such things for the peace and safety of the people. This legislation deals with explosives and firearms. The province must believe that it has the right to do so in the interests of the peace and safety of the people. We are dealing in explosives as well.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A great deal of this Act will be put into force by regulation. We will act on the advice of experts. Section 18, paragraph (e) provides that:

The Governor in Council may make regulations for excepting from the operation of this Act shops, stores and other places where small quantities of explosives are kept for use or sale.

There is no desire to interfere with the sale of explosives in stores. My hon. friend refers to the word 'magazine' in the interpretation clause. Of course, powder and cartridge in a country store, or in a city store for that matter, would not be in a magazine to be licensed by this Act.

Mr. ARTHURS. The Bill says that 'magazine' means any place in which any explosive is kept or stored. I do not see where any exception is made.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the minister's explanation that he is going to do by regulation what he could not do by law is rather a strange assumption of legal power.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Well, it is absolutely necessary to make proper regulations in this case.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the proposed amendment to subsection (g) be carried—that at the close of subclause (g) the following words be added:

Other than at or in and for the use of a mine or quarry in a province by which provision is made by the law of such province for the efficient inspection of mines and quarries.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN moved that the following be inserted as a new clause after clause 2:

This Act shall not apply to the Department of Militia and Defence or to the Department of the Naval Service.

The Department of Militia and Defence secure their ammunition under proper supervision, and they do not want any interference by the Department of Mines.

Mr. BARNARD. Is the Department of Militia and Defence allowed to manufacture and keep unauthorized?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. BARNARD. But this Act does not apply to them. Some of the provisions of this Act are framed to prevent injury to certain people living near the manufacturies and storehouses and it would be interesting to know if the Department of Militia is to be allowed to keep storehouses in places dangerous to the people in the neighbourhood. Can the minister say that an explosive belonging to the government would not have the same dire results as an explosive manufactured by private individuals? So far as the Department of Militia is concerned, there is no authorized explosive, because this Act does not apply to it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Department of Militia and Defence uses English explosives and all English explosives have for years come under a similar provision. There is no explosive sold in England that is not tested and that has not been authorized. The Militia Department uses proper explosives under proper conditions.

Mr. GOODEVE. The minister has not answered the question put by the hon. member for Parry Sound, as to whether it was the intent of the Act to prohibit the sale of ordinary gunpowder in the regular hardware stores?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Unquestionably and undoubtedly it is not the intention to prohibit or interfere with the sale of powder in stores except it be that we have machinery in this Act for the inspection and testing of explosives, and there will be no unauthorized explosives allowed to be sold anywhere. This Act will not interfere with their keeping small quantities authorized explosives in an outhouse, or a store, or anywhere else.

Mr. GOODEVE. The interpretation clause says that an explosive means among other things, fireworks, fuses, rockets, percussion caps, cartridges, and ammunition of all kinds, and clause 6 says that the minister may issue licenses for factories and magazines and no one shall manufacture or store explosives except in licensed factories or magazines. The Act certainly would seem to contemplate the prohibition of the sale of powders by small stores. How can the minister reconcile these provisions of the Act, what do they mean?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They mean exactly what they say. All that the Bill will have to do with these things is to provide as to the care and safety of the chemical combinations in them. If the Act is not clear that it does not apply to the storage of small quantities of ammunition, gunpowder and so forth by the retail trade or the wholesale trade for that matter, I am quite willing that it should be made clear. The word 'magazine' applies primarily to magazines in connection with manufacturing establishments for the storage of very large quantities of explosives. I read in the papers recently a good deal about a magazine on the Montreal road, within a few hundred yards of a considerable population, where explosives are stored in very large quantities. It is magazines of that kind that this Bill purposes to deal with, and I am quite willing to make it so clear that there will be no reason to interfere with small quantities of explosives kept for sale in stores.

Mr. ARTHURS. Would the minister be willing to have a separate section reading in this way:

Nothing in this Act shall apply to shops, stores or other places where small quantities of authorized explosives are kept for use or sale.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes.

Mr. GOODEVE. The minister has just explained that 'magaizne,' in his interpretation, means a large magazine for storing large quantities in connection with the manufacture of explosives. But the question is not what his interpretation is if the Bill becomes law. The Bill purports to make the explanation, and it says that 'magazine' means and includes any building, storehouse, structure or place in which any explosive is kept or stored. That is very clear. The Bill also says what an explosive is, and it includes in that term caps, ordinary ammunition and fireworks; so that ordinary ammunition could not be kept in any store or in any room without a license. I may say that I am not objecting to the Bill, because I think the principle of it is a good one.

Mr. ROBB. Will the minister define what a small quantity is?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I suppose such quantities as merchants keep.

Mr. BARNARD. A wholesale merchant might keep several tons, while a retail merchant might keep very little.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We might strike out 'small quantities' and say 'shops or stores where explosives are kept for use or sale.'

Mr. DOHERTY. The amendment apparently entirely destroys the definition of a magazine as set forth in section 2, or at all events restricts it to places where explosives are kept neither for sale nor for use. It would appear to me that a place where a man kept explosives neither for sale nor for use would be a very restricted number of places. The manufacturer who keeps his explosives in a magazine is keeping them for sale at some period, and this amendment would make the Act utterly inapplicable, no matter how large the quantity was, unless it were kept for sale or use. It seems to me that the amendment is absolutely contradictory of the definition of a magazine in the Bill.

Mr. BUREAU. Why not define the word 'magazine' as including any building in which any explosive is kept or stored except retail stores where explosives are kept for sale, and private houses where explosives are kept for the use of the owner thereof.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Better let that clause stand.

On section 3,

3. Except as herein provided, no person shall have in his possession, or import, store, use or manufacture, whether wholly or in part, or sell, any explosive unless such explosive has been declared by the minister to be an authorized explosive.

Mr. BARNARD. We have had to-day a Bill which provides that no one shall go into the salmon canning business without a license. We have on the statutes an Act providing that no one shall go into the whale fishing business without a license. We know that a monopoly was given to one company for the whole whale fishing business. It seems to me we are carrying on this license business a little too far. It is not always easy to get these licenses. There is no prescribed course whereby anybody who wants a license can come to the government and easily get it. It takes a long time, and in a great many instances the license is refused. And sometimes, when friends of the administration find out that other people are applying for the licenses, they come in and the first applicant does not get the license but the friends of the government do.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What kind of a license?

Mr. BARNARD. Any kind.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Name one.

Mr. BARNARD. I could name one if I chose.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is a very good time to do it.

Mr. BARNARD. I have one case in mind where that fact exactly happened. I would suggest that this matter should be safeguarded in some other way. It seems to me it could be safeguarded by having regulation and inspection with a heavy penalty for violation of the regulations. This matter is of very great importance to the province from which I come. In reading the report of Captain Desborough, and the suggestions he made, it occurs to me that this Bill is going to very materially increase the manufacture of explosives, and so increase the cost to the consumer. The Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) is well aware that the cost of powder is a very serious expense particularly in British Columbia where powder is used so extensively both in the mines and in the clearing of land. While I am not prepared to say that precaution should not be taken for due care and the prevention of explosion, yet, I submit that very great care should be taken that the cost of production is not unduly increased. Captain Desborough, I understand, is an expert in charge of the military powder manufactories in England.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Director of explosives.

Mr. BARNARD. At any rate he is connected with the imperial army, is he not?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He is an officer on the retired list, but belongs to the Home Office. He is enforcing the Explosive Act.

Mr. BARNARD. At any rate, he is a government official, and the factories he is familiar with——

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, he has charge of the inspection of all the manufactories in England.

Mr. BARNARD. At any rate, there can be no doubt that in a closely populated country like England greater precautions are required so far as storing explosives is concerned than in a country like this. In a country of that kind they are more likely to go into more expensive work and operation than is necessary in a sparsely settled country. Therefore, I would suggest to the minister that he should be very careful to see to it that the recommendations of Captain Desborough do not unduly increase the cost of production. It is curious—I do not say that there is any connection between the two facts—but I am informed that just at the time Captain Desborough came here in connection with this manufacture of explosives, a company was formed in England with a capital of $10,000,000 with the idea of making a merger of several large powder companies throughout the Dominion of Canada. And it is obvious, that while there may be, as I say—and I do not suggest that there is any connection between the two facts—but it would be obvious that the more expensive the manufacture of explosives is made, the less danger there is of competition against a trust of that kind.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no limitation to the number of licenses to be issued. Any person can go into the manufacture of explosives. I have no fear that because we are going to issue licenses and to regulate this business, we shall increase the cost. As a matter of fact, the English explosives are selling for less than others, and they are manufactured under careful regulation. There will be no limitation of the number of manufactories. Under the Department of Inland Revenue there is no limitation of the number of distilleries. You can all have licenses for the manufacture of alcohol if you like, and the same will be true with regard to this other kind of explosives.

Mr. BARNARD. The point I was trying to make is that if the cost of production is increased—as, undoubtedly, it must be—that would have the effect of deterring other

people from going into the manufacture. If I read aright the recommendation and report of Captain Desborough, he stated that in manufacturing they put too many machines of one kind in one building, also that too large a quantity of explosives was stored in one building, also that there should be embankments of earth between the different buildings—and generally made a number of recommendations which meant undoubtedly very largely increased cost of manufacture. The manufacture of giant powder and gunpowder, I understand, is a comparatively simple and cheap matter. But if you are going to hedge it about with restrictions of the kind I have indicated, you are going to increase the cost of production and the cost to the consumer. That would make it necessary to have more capital in order to start in the business and would certainly keep others out of it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend, I trust, does not wish to continue the present conditions. The conditions of manufacture have been condemned by Capt. Desborough, and the changes are all designed to avoid accidents. In my hon. friend's own country there were two or three disastrous accidents last year. I do not know the cause of those accidents and it is to deal with these questions that this Bill is introduced. As to the increase of cost to the manufacturer a representative of every manufacturer, especially in Eastern Canada, conferred with Capt. Desborough and heartily supported the provisions of the Bill. They are all prepared to continue manufacturing under the conditions of this Bill.

Mr. BARNARD. I hope my hon. friend did not think I objected because the cost to the manufacturer would be increased? Capt. Desborough states that they were not going to disturb to any extent existing plants, and I object to the minister saying I am not in favour of the principle of the Bill. I have not the slightest objection to every attempt being made to safeguard the lives of those engaged in this industry, but we must be careful not to so increase the cost of production as to make the purchase of powder any greater burden than it already is in British Columbia.

Mr. DOHERTY. What is meant by an authorized explosive and how is the declaration that an explosive is authorized to be made?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. When an explosive has passed the tests prescribed under the supervision of the inspector of explosives, and is approved by him, the minister will declare it an authorized explosive. The chemical composition will be the basic principle of the test.

Mr. BARNARD.

Mr. GOODEVE. I sympathize with the object of the Bill in regard to protecting the lives of those engaged in the manufacture of explosives, and also those who use them; with the largely increasing use of explosives in our various industries, it is essential to have an Act of this nature, so that any criticism I have to make is not because I am opposed to the principle of the Bill. It seems to me that the Bill will interfere with certain provincial rights, and will bring about confusion and conflict where the province has effective legislation. If the Bill was confined to the manufacture of explosives and their use for specific purposes, and did not embrace the sale and stronger of all kinds of explosives, some of these difficulties might be overcome. Has the minister consulted the various provinces to avoid conflict with provincial Acts? Once the Dominion parliament legislates, that legislation will override any provincial Act.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. member for St. Anne Division (Mr. Doherty) raised the question of provincial rights, but he has thrown responsibility for the constitutionality of this Bill upon the government, and is not pressing that point. As far as the constitutionality of the Bill is concerned, I am resting entirely upon the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice. The Bill was referred to all the provinces, and they were all satisfied with it and were very anxious that a general law for all Canada should be passed by the Dominion parliament.

Mr. MACDONALD. I did not have the opportunity of hearing all the discussion on this Bill, but the remarks that the hon. member made have attracted my attention to the possibility of a conflict of jurisdiction which might arise. In my province we have very complete regulations as to the use of explosives in connection with the mines, and these laws have been found to work very satisfactorily. I trust that the minister has made provision in the Bill, which I regret I have not studied closely, to see that there is no infringement with these regulations as they are already provided, particularly in the mines. Where you have to deal with the coal mining industry, where the lessees and operators of these mines, hold under the Crown, and where the Crown, represented by the government of a particular province, introduces regulations into the leases under which they hold and operate these mines, I think it would not be wise for the federal government to interfere.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Bill does not touch the use of explosives at all either in a quarry, or in railway construction, or in a coal mine. All it aims at doing is to

secure the manufacture of as safe an explosive as possible. We purpose putting on the market only authorized explosives.

Mr. SPROULE. Much of what is contemplated by this Bill is done already by municipal by-law under provincial authority. The legislative assembly has given power to the municipalities to pass by-laws regulating this same thing. Therefore, it must be in conflict with provincial legislation and provincial rights to that extent. The minister said, in reference to some observations by my hon. friend from Montreal St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), that we are not making a law to cover this condition, but that we are making regulations to cover it. It is done by regulation. Power to make regulations is under the statute law, and if the statute law is unconstitutional the regulations can certainly have no force or effect. When we are confronted with such an uncertainty as this the government have it in their power to provide a means whereby they can be satisfied. They can make a stated case, send it to the Supreme Court and have the verdict of the court whether this law is wholly constitutional or only partly constitutional. What has the minister to say about that? I think we should have some reply.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not agree with my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) at all that we ought to make a stated case. I do not know what stated case we could make or how to bring the case before the Supreme Court. There is no doubt in the minds of my officers that this parliament has power to regulate the manufacture and importation of explosives and the whole purpose of this Bill is to regulate the manufacture, storage and importation of explosives. We believe we have that power, but if we have not that power we will soon find it out when the law is put in force. I think that the best way to get a decision as to the constitutionality of a law of this kind is to put it in force, because we will find out much more quickly in that way than by taking a stated case to the court.

I do not think we are wrong and I do not know that I can say any more to my hon. friend than I have already said, that I am acting on advice with regard to the constitutionality of the Bill, and therefore, I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman that we should drop this Bill and have a stated case. It might take two or three years to get a decision on that point. As a matter of fact, this Bill was intended to be introduced last year, and we have been somewhat criticised for dilatoriness in not having brought it forward sooner. In the meantime there have been two or three most disastrous explosions the fatal results of which might have been avoided if a Bill of this kind had been upon the statute-books.

Mr. SPROULE. It is true that the minister says he has been fortified by the advice of the Justice Department, but this is not the first time that we have found the Justice Department wrong on constitutional questions which have been decided by the Supreme Court. I admit that while the favourable opinion of the Justice Department is a strong justification for legislation along that line when it is clear that there will be a conflict of authority, I think it is ample justification for submitting a stated case to the Supreme Court. The minister says that it would be two or three years before we would be likely to get a verdict. Does he mean to say that the Supreme Court is so impotent and indifferent that it would take two or three years to get a decision from that court? They might decide the case at the first sitting of the court, and consequently it could not be more than six months before the case was decided. I think it would be much better to avoid improper legislation if it can be avoided by stating a case for submission to the Supreme Court than to pass legislation and then afterwards find that a great deal of litigation might result from it, and that we are obliged to go back and abandon what we have done as being unconstitutional or ultra vires.

Mr. ROBB. It will be regrettable if the question of jurisdiction results in failure to safeguard the lives of those engaged in the handling of these dangerous explosives. This is not a new question. It has been before the public for some years and it is recognized that something should be done to safeguard human life. This Bill, as my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) points out, only deals with the manufacture of dynamite.

Mr. SPROULE. It goes further than that.

Mr. ROBB. It aims at preventing the continual sacrifice of human life by explosions. In the last three years 114 lives were lost from premature explosions on railway construction work in this country. The hon. member for Victoria (Mr. Barnard), a few minutes ago, expressed the fear that this legislation might increase the cost of manufacturing explosives. It seems to me that all Canadians should agree that human life should be of more consideration than dollars. The greatest cost that this country has paid for explosives has been the cost of human life. I hope my hon. friends will not press this question of jurisdiction, but will allow the Bill to go through and see if something cannot be done to safeguard the lives of those who

are compelled to handle these dangerous explosives.

On section 4,

Mr. DOHERTY. This is a class of legislation, of which we have had a good deal this session, by which we hand over blindly our legislative power with regard to a particular matter, to the Governor in Council. We say here that no man should have a right to do different things except as permitted by the regulations which are to be made under this Act, and the Governor in Council is empowered to make any regulation he chooses and to impose any conditions whatever upon the permission to be given. When the power of legislation was confided to parliament it was with the idea that parliament should use it and not hand it over blindly to be used by the executive government of the country. I quite understand that there may be details that are better dealt with by regulation than by statutory enactment, but when we simply say that no person should have the right to do the things mentioned here unless he gets permission in accordance with such regulations as the government may make, it seems to me we are going too far in the direction of delegation. The minister must have some idea in his own mind as to what the conditions are on which this permission should be granted and he should put in this Act some definition of what these conditions are, so that we may have even a general idea of what we are doing.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I can send my hon. friend the English Act, and there he will see that the regulations are very voluminous and very technical and highly scientific. This Act could not be administered in any other way than under such regulations.

Mr. SPROULE. How would this section affect chemists who are constantly experimenting with these explosives?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Permission would be given for keeping a small quantity.

On section 6,

Mr. SPROULE. The municipalities by by-law specify that merchants may keep these explosives in segregated buildings. Would not this section interfere with the municipal authority in that respect?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The issuing of license pertains to the province, and I do not think the federal government has any power to issue them.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We will let that stand.

Mr. ROBB.

On section 7,

Mr. ARTHURS. This clause is open to the same objections that I made to the Bill in the first place. The provisions and definitions in this Bill would make it impossible for any man to bring into Canada a box of cartridges, percussion caps, or fireworks. I do not think it is the intention of the minister to prohibit the importation of cartridges either from Great Britain or the United States.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Of course, the intention is to prohibit the importation of explosives that are not authorized. There is no explosive imported from Great Britain that is not authorized.

Mr. ARTHURS. The clause reads, importation of authorized explosives. Under this clause a man would require to have a permit from this government before he could cross the line with a box of cartridges. Is that the intention of the minister? The people dealing in these goods which come from Great Britain would have to get a permit from the minister for every shipment.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is not much use of our testing and inspecting explosives manufactured in Canada, and not permitting any except those authorized to be sold, if we are going to permit explosives that are not authorized to come from another country. All the explosives from Great Britain are authorized, and of course they will be admitted.

Mr. ARTHURS. Do I understand that the intention is to permit the importation only of those explosives authorized by the government and those authorized by Great Britain? Is it the intention to prohibit the importation of explosives from the United States?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am advised that in the United States the government is proceeding along similar lines and has in connection with its geological survey a testing station for explosives, and is now authorizing explosives. Explosives authorized in that way by the United States government would probably be approved of without any further examination by our testing officers. But explosives which are not tested or authorized by the United States government would have to be tested by our testing stations before they could be passed.

Mr. ARTHURS. I do not think the minister understands the objections I am raising. It is simply this. There are a large number of American rifles brought into this country by parties coming in the hunting season. They import cartridges

for these rifles, and under this clause they would have to get a permit each time they imported these cartridges, whether authorized or not.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think the minister does not perhaps understand the situation. Last season, in the hunting season, a number of hunters had purchased a certain kind of Remington rifle, which took a certain kind of ammunition. Within five or six days of the opening of the season those who endeavoured to secure cartridges for that rifle discovered that they could not obtain them from the hardware stores, and small retail stores and had to wire to the makers in the United States to secure that kind of cartridge. If a case of this kind arose under this Act, the small retailer would have to go to the trouble of getting a permit from the government, which would make it impossible for him to secure these cartridges at the time of the hunting season. I think an exception should be made there. I would like also to ask what is 'the manner authorized by the Railway Act' for transportation of explosives. We all know that the railways are authorized under the Railway Act to transmit ammunition or powder of any kind. If I remember rightly, a terrible explosion occurred on one of the railways at Stratford, in western Ontario. If this Act is to be of any use, I think these regulations should apply directly under this Act, and should not have any reference to the Railway Act. I would like to know if the minister knows what the regulations under the Railway Act are.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I confess I am not very familiar with the regulations, which occupy 25 pages. As the transportation of explosives is provided for by the Railway Commission under the Railway Act, we exempt it in this Bill.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Suppose these regulations of the Railway Act were transgressed by a railway company, and trouble arose, and a suit was brought, what authorization has the Railway Commission under the statute to make these regulations? The most dangerous thing in connection with explosives is the handling of them on the railways, and I think this Act should be made to apply to railways. For instance, a railway is carrying in the summer time dynamite that was made in the United States. It has saw-dust filler. When the warm weather comes the nitroglycerine will thaw out of the saw-dust filler and will leak through the box to the bottom of the car. If a drop of that happens to go on the railway track, there is an explosion and the car goes up in the air. That is what happened at Stratford. If this Act is to be of any use, it should be made to apply to cases like that. I would like to know if the Railway Commission has any power to make these regulations, and if they have the force of law.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The Railway Commission, in adopting these regulations, say that under the powers and in pursuance of sections 26, 230, 286 and 287 of the Railway Act, the board approved of these regulations.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Do these regulations limit the carriage to authorized explosives?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This does not refer to authorized explosives.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Why not have a reference made to those regulations of this Act, and have them authorized under this Act?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Why not let this clause stand and have a reference making those regulations legal under this Bill?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. These regulations are legal now. They have been passed by the Railway Commission under the Railway Act.

Mr. ARTHURS. Small arms and ammunitions should be excepted and there should be no necessity for a permit in their case.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think that the objection with reference to small arms is valid. The minister seems to be under the impression that unauthorized explosives can be taken into the country without permit. If he will read the section he will find out that permits may issue for the importation of authorized explosives and the unauthorized cannot be brought in at all. A man who tries to bring in 100 rounds of 22 cartridge in his valise or a dozen firecrackers will be liable to a penalty unless he gets a permit. A great number of hunters come from the United States to Ontario and Quebec, and they bring their ammunition. They should not be liable under section 7.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. But explosives under this Bill are meant explosives in large quantities. Under clause 18 the Governor in Council may make regulations, and he has ample power to exempt small arms and ammunition from the operation of this Bill.

Mr. GOODEVE. Take the two provinces of Quebec and British Columbia, which are largely advertising their game, that is becoming quite an asset of both provinces. They are coming, as the minister knows, all the way from Europe. I was given the names of several who have come on two or

three occasions from Germany with a party and who have spent considerable sums of money in order to engage in hunting the large game of British Columbia. I only mention that to indicate the importance of this section, for under this section, when these men arrive, any game warden or any body else can stop them on the border and hold up all their arms and ammunition, and before they can bring a single particle of ammunition in it will be necessary for them to get permission from the government here at Ottawa. I think it would be well that that question should be looked into, because it comes up in so many clauses of the Bill, and a proper section drawn, to cover the point, so that the Bill may be made effective. I think the minister will admit—in fact it is not discussable at all—that this is the effect of the section. This is not a mere objection for the sake of objection from hon. gentlemen on this side, but it is an important question. And, unless the Bill is amended it would lead to considerable trouble, especially as I have already pointed out in these two provinces.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I quite agree that ammunition for small arms especially, should be exempted from the operation of the Bill, otherwise it would lead to very considerable confusion. I would assume as a matter of fact—I am only giving this as an opinion—that all ammunition used in small arms should be of the best kind and certainly good enough to be authorized.

Mr. GOODEVE. But, even if authorized it would be necessary to get a permit. That is the difficulty. There should be some way of exempting ammunition for this purpose. I think it would be well for the minister to let this section stand, and draft a section that would cover that point.

Mr. SPROULE. It would seem that the Bill contemplates that, because 'safety cartridges' are defined in the interpretation clause. In making new regulations all you would require would be to provide that safety cartridges may be exempt.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 7 stand?

On section 8—special permits,

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). It does not say to whom this special permit is to be issued. I should think an analyst would be the only one person who would require it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This provides that for purposes of analysis and scientific research a quantity not exceeding two pounds may be imported. The Bill gives permission to anybody to submit an explosive for analysis. Scientific men may want to investigate, and, on payment of a small fee, they may be permitted to import in quantities not exceeding two pounds.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). For chemical analysis two pounds is more than enough.

On section 9—applicants for licenses to furnish plans of factory and premises.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). What authority has the minister to issue licenses? As I understand that under the law the power to grant a license to carry on business remains entirely with the provincial parliament. The law will permit the Dominion government to allow a person to carry on a business, or to prevent him carrying it on. But I do not think it will permit the department to license anybody. If the minister will consult the legal department of the government, I think he will find that he cannot give licenses. That has been tried by this parliament on several occasions, and I understand that the decision has been against it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We discussed that point at considerable length before the hon. member (Mr. Currie, Simcoe) came into the House. I said I would abide by the opinion of the Justice Department that this is a power we have a right to take—the power to license for the purpose of regulating the manufacture.

Mr. BARNARD. Subsection (a) provides that the plan is to be drawn to a scale, and is to include 'also all the lands adjacent thereto on which buildings are erected.'. I understand by lands adjacent thereto the lands of adjoining owners. I would think there would be some limitation on the word 'adjacent.' It might be mistaken to mean ten miles or half a mile.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is the meaning. Of course the interpretation would depend on the configuration of the land. A factory might be placed quite close to a building if there was a small mountain or hill between, possibly within 100 yards, while in a very flat district it might have to be a mile away. I see no reason to specify the distance more closely.

On section 10, factories not to be built near towns, &c.

Mr. PERLEY. Why is the distance of one mile from an incorporated village, &c., stipulated. Are there statistics to show within what distance from a city a factory would be safe?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is copied from the English regulation. They have statistics there, and I presume one mile has been found sufficient. The explosion at Hull was not more than a mile from where we are standing.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister is mistaken; it is nearly a mile and a half from here to Eddy's factory.

Mr. GOODEVE. I think I would move to have that read two miles. As we are giving authority to establish factories without the consent of a municipality, we should make it two miles unless with the consent of the municipality.

Mr. SPROULE. The distance which would be safe must depend largely on the amount of explosives kept.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I would move to insert after the word 'jurisdiction' in the 39th line, the words:

Or the government of the province in any province and in a territory where there is no local authority having jurisdiction, and also with the consent of the minister.

That is to meet the view of the government of Ontario.

Mr. DOHERTY. Does the amended section mean that a factory cannot be established within a mile of a city, town, &c., even with the consent of the municipality, that it can only be established a mile away with the consent and that within a mile it cannot be established under any condition?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The clause means that it shall not be nearer than one mile.

Mr. DOHERTY. Within a mile there cannot be a factory?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. DOHERTY. And more than a mile away they must have the permission of the municipal authority and the minister?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. SPROULE. Let us understand how that would affect the situation. Hardware stores that sell gunpowder and blasting powder, store it in a building.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. We have allowed one clause to stand for the purpose of meeting that point.

Mr. SPROULE. But that was with regard to ammunition.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Quite true, but we propose to narrow the interpretation so as not to include stores.

Mr. SPROULE. Yes, for otherwise you are in direct conflict with the provincial authorities, because they provide where explosives may be stored, and you may give authority with regard to handling and storing them in a way which under the provincial Act, could not be done.

On section 10: Consent of municipality and minister before license granted.

Mr. GOODEVE. It is suggested that even although a municipality might give consent a mile is very close. It might be necessary to have a two mile limit. Take the city of Ottawa; an outside municipality might give consent to have a factory within a mile although the city would not care to have a large factory of that kind within a mile, and so I think we had better make it 'within two miles.'

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not want to make the conditions too onerous. If the conditions under which the explosive will be required to be manufactured are lived up to, and if by close inspection the danger is minimized, and the quantities of explosives to be kept in buildings are also minimized to the lowest possible extent, the conditions as to the configuration of the ground and the proximity of other buildings being taken into consideration, I would think a mile not too close. I desire to be on the safe side and, on the other hand, I do not want to make conditions that would be too onerous to the manufacturer. I will be guided by the House in that respect, but I think that one mile should stand in the section.

Mr. GOODEVE. I can conceive from what the minister says that it might be a hardship to force a factory to go more than one mile from a village. It says:

Within one mile of the limits of any city, town or incorporated village.

But, it would make a great difference, if it were close to a large city where the damage and loss of life might be much greater. In a small municipality there would not be the same danger as where there were crowded buildings, and a large population. It might read 'within two miles of the limits of any city, or within one mile of the limits of any town or incorporated village.'

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I would rather not change it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). There are several cities which are fortified and there are magazines in the fortifications which are used by the dealers of explosives in those cities. How would you work it there?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. If the magazines are used by the Militia Department it would have no application.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The magazines of the Militia Department are used by the trade.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Then the Bill would operate.

On section 11: Permits for experiments, and testing new explosives.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is clause 4 the same as this? Clause 4 reads:

Nothing in this Act shall apply to the making of a small quantity of explosive for the purpose of chemical experiment, and not for practical use or sale.

And this clause provides that:

The minister may, on application and on payment of such fees as are prescribed by regulation, issue a permit to manufacture for experimental purposes or for testing any special blasting operations only, and not for sale, any new explosive upon such conditions and subject to such restrictions as are fixed by the minister.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A man might be experimenting with a new explosive. Many are doing that in the hope of getting something newer and better than anything on the market.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). But that is covered in both places.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No, clause 4 provides for chemical experiment and the making of explosive for scientific purposes, not for practical use. Section 11 authorizes the minister to issue a permit for manufacture for experimental purposes. An inventor thinks he has a new idea and he wants to experiment in the manufacture of an explosive. It may be permitted by this clause.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Clause 4 would allow a man to make small quantities of explosives for experimental purposes in his laboratory. He could endeavour to discover a new kind of explosive. In clause 11 you say that if he has paid the fees prescribed by regulation he can manufacture for experimental purposes. I cannot see how these two clauses can work together.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They might work together right enough, but one is for the making of a small quantity of explosive, for chemical experiment, and the other is for the testing or manufacturing of blasting powders or explosives for special blasting operations only. The section says that the minister:

May issue a permit to manufacture for experimental purposes or for testing and special blasting operations only, and not for sale.

They are two different permits.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is there any difference between 'making' and 'manufacturing?'

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Not much difference.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Not very much difference. In the one case a man could not make a large quantity of the explosive. It does not limit him as to whether he shall conduct original research or whether he is following in the footsteps of some other experimenter and developing the quality of an explosive which he might not have discovered or made.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The object of giving that permission is to allow people to experiment with blasting powder and the producing of a new powder. They must have that permission or they would be prohibited from doing that without a license.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). If you retain section 4 I do not see any necessity for section 11. Under section 4 a chemist can manufacture a small quantity of this explosive in his laboratory, but if he proceeds to test it he will come under the penalties provided in section 11.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is about time we should adjourn. There is no hope of our being able to get through this Bill to-night.

Progress reported.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 201) respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Co.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business will be taken up to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. We propose to move the House into Supply and give priority to a special estimate of the Minister of Railways for the year just closed; and then to take up the estimates of the Minister of Militia.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 12.25 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FRIDAY, May 5, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 198) to incorporate The Quebec and Great Northwestern Railway Company.—Mr. Hodgins.

Bill (No. 199) for the relief of Fanny Mary Healy.—Mr. Knowles.

Bill (No. 200) for the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. PATERSON moved that the House go into committee on Monday next to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act and the Acts in amendment thereof, and to provide as follows:

1. As section 39, subsection 2. That a person who has served over three years as a clerk in the outside service of the Customs may be appointed to the rank of senior clerk, subject to such examination on the duties of office and other qualifications as is prescribed by the deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department. The salary of such senior clerk shall be from $1,200 to $1,600 per annum.

2. That the part of Schedule 'B' of the Civil Service Act which relates to Customs be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

SCHEDULE 'B,' CUSTOMS.

Higher Classes

						Increase.
Collectors	salary per annum, from	$	300	to	$4,500	Nil
Chief inspector	"	"	3,200	"	4,000	Nil
Inspectors of ports	"	"	2,100	"	3,200	700
Assistant inspectors	"	"	1,600	"	2,000	200
Chief clerks	"	"	1,200	"	2,100	100
Surveyors	"	"	1,200	"	2,800	400
Assistant surveyors (comprising tide surveyors, chief landing waiters and chief lockers)	"	"	1,200	"	1,600	400

Technical Officers.

Dominion appraisers	salary per annum, from	$2,100	to	$2,600	500
Appraisers	"	"	1,200	"	2,400	400
Assistant appraisers	"	"	900	"	1,600	100
Gaugers	"	"	900	"	1,600	400

Other Classes.

						Increase.
Senior clerks	salary per annum, from	$1,200	to	$1,600	400
Clerks and landing waiters	"	"	400	"	1,200	Nil
Examining officers (including preventive officers whose duties are not chiefly clerical, and lockers)	"	"	100	"	1,000	Nil
Packers and messengers	"	"	400	"	800	200

Motion agreed to.

ST. PETER'S INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are called, I wish to give my hon. friend from Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) the information he asked for the other day in regard to the request by the Royal Commission appointed by the Manitoba government for access to the original documents connected with the St. Peter's reserve. The fact that the time has passed when under the rules of the House a motion can be made to secure the production of these papers changes the position somewhat from what it was. There is no desire to prevent the inspection of the papers by the Royal Commission, and at the same time it is desirable that the custody of the original documents should remain here or in the office in Winnipeg with respect to such documents as are there. So that if it will at all answer the purpose of the commission, they will be given, on their formal request, an order which will permit their inspection of the original documents in Winnipeg and the original documents here. If that will not meet their requirements, we will try to make some other arrangement.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would just like to point out to the minister that the object of obtaining these documents is to have them during the taking of evidence. They ought to be in Winnipeg in the custody of one of his own officers. It is impossible for the commission to establish the facts without having them there.

Mr. OLIVER. So that they would remain in our office in Winnipeg and in its custody, but subject to the examination of the Royal Commission. Although that has not been discussed, I think I may say that there will be no difficulty about making that arrangement.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will it be necessary for me to move a resolution?

Mr. OLIVER. No. A formal request from the commission will, I think, be all that is necessary.

Mr. BRADBURY. I think you have that formal request from the counsel. Mr.

Whitla wrote you a letter asking for the production of these documents.

Mr. OLIVER. I hardly think that the form in which we received the request would be sufficient warrant for our acceding to it. I think we are entitled to the courtesy of a formal request from the commission.

Mr. BRADBURY. I will see that you get that.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS IN TORONTO.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) if it is the intention of the government to erect any general federal buildings in the city of Toronto in connection with the erection of municipal buildings there, with a view to having a large public building erected jointly by the Dominion government and the city? Mention has been made of the matter in the 'Globe' and other papers of Toronto, and if the minister is able to make any statement upon it, I would be very glad if he would do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My attention has been called by prominent citizens of Toronto, including Mr. Gourlay, the president of the Board of Trade, to the desirability of considering the question of erecting public buildings, when we do erect them, all upon one of the blocks in that part of the city known, I believe, as 'the Ward.' It is centrally situated, and it has been thought that it would be desirable to place all the public buildings in that locality, but the matter has not been considered by the government for the reason that we have not in contemplation at present the erection of any new buildings in Toronto with the exception of an examining warehouse. It may be that in connection with that building, it would be well to consider this whole subject, but so far that has not been done.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to inquire of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) whether he has had any further communication from Washington under the International Fisheries Treaty?

Mr. BRODEUR. I have not got any further information on the subject. I have brought the matter, however, to the attention of His Excellency, the Hon. Mr. Bryce, who is going to take up the question with the American authorities.

SUPPLY—THE FISHERIES TREATY.

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

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I want to submit to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) some information on the point as to which I inquired just now, and which it seems to me, should have come to his attention a long time ago through some other channel. I have here a copy of the 'Pacific Fisherman' of March last, containing a great deal more information regarding the progress, or want of progress, of these regulations at Washington, than apparently has come to the minister. This paper reports that so far from the condition being as indicated by the hon. minister, namely, that the Senate at Washington was simply considering some unimportant changes as to the mesh allowed—so far from that being the limit of the alterations by the Senate, the American Senate on the contrary has already made the most drastic changes in the regulations submitted to that body by the joint commissioners. Let me read for the information of the House the article in the 'Pacific Fisherman.' It is as follows:

> The International Fishery Treaty, as framed by David Starr-Jordan and Prof. Edward E. Prince, the two commissioners appointed by the United States and Great Britain to formulate regulations for the control of the boundary fisheries of this country and Canada, was given short shrift by the session of Congress which has just adjourned.
>
> The energetic and logical protests which were made against the terms of this treaty by the fishermen of Puget Sound and Lake Erie had sufficient weight with Congress that the regulations proposed for those two districts were entirely stricken out by the Committee on Foreign Relations, to whom the Bill was referred. And even after these objectionable features were removed, the Bill, favourably reported by the committee, owing to the filibustering that was carried on in Congress during the last hours of the session, was never brought to a vote.
>
> The Congressional Record shows that the treaty, which came before Congress in the form of Senate Bill 6119, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and that, owing to representations made to this committee, regulations 62, 63, 64 and 65, relating to Puget Sound, were entirely stricken out, as were also regulations 45 to 50 included, relating to Lake Erie. Further records state only that this Bill was 'reported with amendment,' which means that it did not come up for vote.
>
> So far as the future of this treaty is concerned, its fate is problematical. The next Congress will be an entirely new session with many new members. The Bill, if again introduced, must necessarily go through all the routine that it has gone through in the last session. It will probably be handled by the committee in the same manner as before, and then, if Congress finds time, it may be passed. It is more than likely that the same representations made by the fishermen, even to a new committee, will have the effect of eliminating the clauses concerning Puget Sound and Lake Erie, and in this event Pa-

cific coast fisheries will have little concern in its further history.

If this be a correct presentation of events in the American Senate—and in the absence of information to the contrary we are entitled to suppose that it is—it seems to indicate an astonishing lack of knowledge on the part of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) of, or control over, the events relating to his department. It is no light matter that a treaty solemnly entered into between the governments of Great Britain and the United States should be implemented by Canada, as we did implement it last session, by taking authority for the minister to proclaim regulations whenever the United States was ready to proclaim them, and yet that the minister in charge of the department in Canada should remain indifferent to the fact that he is being played with by the other parties to the treaty, that not only have they committed a breach of international honour by failing during two sessions of Congress to adopt regulations which they were in honour bound to adopt, but they are guilty of a gross breach of their pledge in now undertaking to strike out important provisions in this Act.

I would recall to the minister the events connected with the long protracted negotiations of the two international commissioners. They have been referred to in this House at various times; and although we have had no formal information from the government on the subject and have had to content ourselves with such scraps as we could extract from time to time, by whatever questions we were permitted to ask, it is admitted that the making of these regulations had been a matter of mutual concession. Canada yielded on one point in order to secure an agreement by the Americans on another. It has been held up to us that one of the most valuable considerations we received for the part we allowed the American government in the control of the fisheries arrangements on the lakes, and the Atlantic, was their consent to regulate fishing on Puget Sound where, under present conditions, Canadian salmon are being wantonly destroyed. It has been held up to us by the Minister of Fisheries particularly that this was a most valuable concession to us, that we should overlook on that account many defects in that agreement, and that these regulations should be adopted because it was of so much value to us that we should have regulations in Puget Sound.

But we find that, after we have paid the price of adopting the regulations agreed upon in return for the American promises to regulate the Puget Sound traps, they calmly strike out their regulation of the traps and leave us in the position of having paid a price and getting no return whatever for it. Similarly, no doubt, with regard to Lake Erie. I am not in a position to discuss in detail the effect of striking out these regulations with regard to Lake Erie, but there must be other members of the House who are in a position to point out to the minister wherein the United States gain the advantage by striking out these regulations. It seems to me that the minister is confronted with a most serious duty, the duty of reporting to the other parties to this agreement, that, in an affair of this kind, honour must be observed, and that the time has passed when sharp practice can be indulged in—that this Dominion is not so petty, so inferior, a state that any larger community who have a treaty with us may violate that treaty at their will. They humbug us into making conditions by offering to give us a price, they accept the conditions and then deny us the price. That appears to be what is in progress at Washington just now. So far as we can ascertain our Fisheries Department has paid no attention whatever to the course of these regulations at Washington Only the other day, I inquired of the minister whether alteration was being made in the terms of the regulations. The minister answered in the most indefinite way, with no formal report, with no official statement from Washington to read to the House, and nothing to report except some trifling amendments with respect to the size of mesh of the nets to be used. I would like the minister to explain to the House how it comes that he is without information on these very important matters. Is it not possible for some of his array of officials to follow the course of affairs at Washington, so that the department here and this parliament may be kept advised? Does he consider that when the negotiation is completed his duty is ended? In fact, does not he think that it is the continuing duty of the commissioner especially appointed by the government to follow this treaty through all its ramifications at Washington and to report from day to day or from week to week to the minister, so that he may know what is being done in Congress with the regulations to which he and the government have given their sanction? I would point out further the anomaly of the position in which the minister has placed himself by his course in relation to this treaty compared with the course being followed at Washington. In the Fisheries Committee of this House two years ago I asked the minister that he should have the regulations of the international commission laid before the committee, so that we might examine them, and might call representatives of the fisheries interests to perform for us service similar to the service being performed at

Washington, by the representatives of the fisheries interests in various portions of the United States. But the minister took the extraordinary position that we were powerless in this matter, that it did not matter to us what was provided in the regulations, that our part with relation to them was merely to affix the stamp of this parliament to them so that they might become law. I brought the matter up again last session, in this House, with the same result. The minister had not learned wisdom from the example of his contemporaries in the United States, but again told us that it was absolutely impossible that this parliament could have any control over this matter or pronounce on the text of the regulations. As I said, we simply gave the minister power to proclaim the regulations as they were. Now, it is true that the treaty itself provides that both governments shall adopt the regulations as they are presented by this international commission. It is equally true that the treaty provides that the regulations as framed should not be altered until they have first been proclaimed and we have learned by experience in what respect they should be changed. But if the United States Senate is allowed to vary the terms of the treaty and of the signed recommendations of the commissioners, why should not the parliament of Canada have the same privilege. Why should we always remain in an inferior position, a position which is bound to work to our disadvantage in every arrangement we have with the United States, because we are not allowed to take the initiative in any proposition in connection with joint undertakings, but are allowed simply to scrutinize what is put forward by the United States government, put forward with their inner consciousness of the effect of their well studied propositions, communicated only to one or two officials of our government, while we in this parliament agree to take a leap in the dark, and adopt them as presented. I dissent from the minister's theory that parliament must sit here helpless and allow the interests of the country to be sacrificed to the interests of our neighbours in this connection and in many similar arrangements that we have with the American government. I would make another appeal to the minister, because it is of the utmost importance to the salmon industry in British Columbia that we should have some form of regulations for trap fishing in Puget Sound. I would also like him to place the matter forcibly before the British Ambassador at Washington, the official primarily responsible for this treaty. For, as the correspondence shows he urged the treaty upon this government, with rather more persistence than we should like to see, until at last he committed this government to it. If he was so insistent that we should enter into this treaty with the United States, it seems to me we have a claim upon him to be equally insistent in representing to the government of the United States that they must observe international honour in this matter. That they must regard every undertaking of the treaty, and that if it appears to them that the treaty is so defective as to call for amendment by the American Senate, or for direction by the Senate to the American commissioner, the door should be left equally wide open to us, that we might consider these regulations in every detail, take advantage of our experience and have the same right to freedom to make alterations in that treaty as the Americans are assuming. I appeal to the minister whether he will not rouse himself from his lethargy in this matter, whether he will not become the master of this item of his departmental work and see to it that we reassert and resume the control over our fisheries, which in my opinion, we should never have relinquished.

Hon. L. P. BRODEUR (Minister of Marine and Fisheries). The subject which the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) has brought to the attention of the House. I am glad he has given me the opportunity of making some explanations of the situation in regard to this freshwater boundaries fisheries treaty. The treaty was made nearly three years ago, and it provided for the appointment of a commission composed of one man representing the United States and one man representing Canada. Dr. David Starr Jordan was appointed on the American side, and Professor Prince was appointed by Canada. They went to work, and visited the country from one end to the other, and adopted regulations which, though not absolutely drastic, were in the right direction. We must bear in mind that it is, far more difficult for the American authorities to make concessions in the regulations than it is for Canada. The American authorities are to some extent checked by the different states. Those regulations concerning the fisheries were made formerly by the various states interested, and it was expected to be a difficult thing to get the states to agree to certain concessions in the regulations. However, regulations were passed and were accepted by the Canadian government, and also by the United States government, and then they had to be submitted to the United States Senate. It is contended in the United States that the Senate, along with the president, is part of the treaty making power, and consequently the regulations had to be submitted to the Senate. My

hon. friend says that he cannot understand why the treaty had to be submitted to the United States Senate, when it has not to be submitted to the Canadian parliament. This makes it necessary for me to point out to him that the cases of the two countries are absolutely different. In Great Britain, under British institutions, the treaty making power is vested in the King. The King can sign any treaty and make it valid without its being submitted to parliament, that is, any treaty which does not affect Canadian interests.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Canadian parliament desired to pass upon that treaty would not that desire be granted by the British government?

Mr. BRODEUR. The rule in Great Britain, which is also recognized in Canada, is that a treaty which does not affect taxation or commercial relations has not to be submitted to the British parliament. There are treaties made frequently in Great Britain which do not affect taxation or the payment of money, and such treaties can be made by the King without its being necessary to submit them to parliament. When a treaty not affecting taxation or commercial relations is signed by the King, it becomes obligatory throughout the empire. Now the same rule applies to treaties which affect Canada. If it is a treaty which does not concern our commercial relations and which does not require the payment of any money or levy taxation upon the subject, it may be signed by the King, and it immediately becomes operative without the consent of the Canadian parliament. But with other treaties which do affect taxation, a different rule prevails. For instance, take the treaties with France in 1893 and in 1907, those were submitted to the Canadian parliament. So was the treaty with Japan, because it affected taxation. This rule is adopted according to the underlying principle of British institutions that no taxation shall be levied without the consent of parliament.

In the United States the situation is not the same. The President of the United States is not the treaty making power. He negotiates, either through his Secretary of State or by himself directly, but a treaty thus agreed upon has no effect until it is assented to by the Senate of the United States. In respect to treaties, therefore, the United States Senate fulfils the functions which are discharged by the British government. In the United States, the treaty making power being vested in the president and in the Senate conjointly, a treaty must receive the assent of the Senate before it can come into force. There have been several treaties made affecting Canada which have been assented to by the President of the United States, but which did not receive the assent of the Senate. If I remember rightly, the treaty negotiated in 1873 was accepted by the president, but was not assented to by the Senate, and, therefore, it did not come into force. The same with regard to the treaty of 1888 which was negotiated by Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Bayard; that treaty was signed by the president and Secretary of State, but it was not assented to by the Senate.

Now with regard to the treaty which is under consideration, it is claimed by the American authorities that the regulations, in order to have force and effect, must be submitted to the treaty making power, namely, the president and the Senate. The president has sent a message to the Senate approving of the regulations under the treaty, with the exception of one clause therein concerning Lake Huron. My hon. friend referred to Lake Erie, but I think he was mistaken. The slight change which was mentioned in the message of the president related to Lake Huron, and not to Lake Erie. It is not, however, a matter of much importance.

The Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate had this subject under consideration and they made a report, I suppose, to the United States Senate. If I am rightly informed these proceedings before the Foreign Relations Committee are generally secret, and I do not know how far the information which my hon. friend has conveyed to the House is correct. But, I think, on the whole it is substantially correct that the United States Senate—or not the United States Senate, because the Senate have not passed judgment upon it—but the Committee on Foreign Relations made a report to the Senate during the last session. As far as the government of the United States are concerned, I may say to my hon. friend that when I was there last winter I took up the question with the representatives of the Secretary of State, and it was understood that with a little amendment which was suggested concerning the size of the mesh to be used on some part of Lake Huron, the United States government would be willing to accept these regulations. There were also some slight changes in regard to the size of the mesh used on Lake Ontario which was, I think, in the interest of our own fishermen. The United States government have, in so far as I can see, fulfilled that part of their obligation. It is now only for the United States Senate to pass judgment upon the regulations which are before them. My hon. friend has stated that we are not doing our duty. I think his charge in that respect is absolutely unfounded. Can we interfere with the power of the United States government or the United States Senate to pass judgment upon these regulations, to approve of this treaty or not?

Can we make any remonstrance to the American authorities?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I notice that by article 3 of the original treaty it is provided as follows:

The two governments engage to put into operation and to enforce by legislative action, with as little delay as possible, the regulations, restrictions and provisions, with appropriate penalties, proposed by the commission.

That article has been adopted by the United States Senate and by the Dominion of Canada. Does not the minister think that when once the United States Senate has bound itself in honour to abide by the regulations which the commissioners shall make, it ends its executive duties and must, therefore, accept such regulations as were made by the commission?

Mr. BRODEUR. The information which was given to me by the representatives of the government there, was that they maintain that the treaty-making power in the United States Senate is still in existence with regard to the consideration of these regulations, that it was part of their powers under the constitution, and that, therefore, the United States government could not force the Senate to take any action.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But the treaty has been made as far as that is concerned, and one of the express terms of the treaty was that they were to abide by the express terms of the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Now, when the commissioners make regulations they are going back and altering those regulations. If they have a right to do that we have a right to do the same thing.

Mr. BRODEUR. The government of the United States have done their part, but the other branch of the treaty-making power have not seen fit to pass judgment upon the treaty or the regulations that are before them.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think that my hon. friend perhaps has not grasped my meaning. The very body that is now attempting to amend these regulations—the Senate—is the very body that said previously: We will abide by such regulations as are made by the commission. Now, when they attempt to interfere with these regulations they are going back on the treaty which they formerly made, and if they have a right to say first: 'We will abide by what the commissioners do,' and then turn around and say: 'We will not abide by what they do,' this parliament has a right to do the same thing, and we should have the right now to revise these regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. These regulations are not in force yet in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Was the treaty ratified by the United States Senate?

Mr. BRODEUR. The first treaty, yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then they have no right in the world to change it.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is claimed that they have the power to legislate in reference, not only to the original document which was signed, but also with reference to the regulations which were to be submitted to them. That is their contention.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the minister understand when he asked parliament to ratify these regulations by Act of parliament?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, because we were bound by the treaty ourselves. The treaty-making power, as far as we are concerned, lies with the King. When the King signs a treaty of that kind we are bound by it, and we have no right to amend a treaty made by the King.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand that perfectly. Apparently I have not made myself plain. The minister asked this parliament to ratify these regulations because His Majesty had agreed by treaty to do that. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. BRODEUR. We simply provided by legislation for the necessary power to carry out these regulations. We did not ratify the treaty. My hon. friend will find that the legislation which was passed last year was not legislation to ratify the treaty, but it was legislation providing two things: First, the necessary money to carry out the regulations, and, secondly, the necessary power for the Department of Marine and Fisheries to carry out the regulations. That is all we passed last year, so that there was no ratification by this parliament of the treaty itself because it was not necessary. The only ratification was by the King, and that treaty having been made by the King we are bound by it. My hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) asks why, under these circumstances, should we not amend our regulations? I have explained that as far as we are concerned we have no right to amend these regulations.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to understand it. I understand that a treaty was ratified by the United States Senate and the British government on our behalf. If that is not so, it is entirely news to me. I understand the treaty has been ratified by both powers providing for the

making of regulations, and that both parties agreed to abide by whatever regulaitons the commission would make.

Mr. BRODEUR. Precisely, and the United States government maintain that the United States Senate have the same powers to pass judgment upon these regulations as they had to pass judgment upon the first treaty that was signed. That is the contention of the American authorities.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Can the minister point to any provision in the treaty which says that, notwithstanding the Senate has delegated it powers to a commission to make regulations, and has agreed to abide by the treaty and to put into operation the regulations made by the minister, it shall also have the right to revise its whole action and mutilate the regulations to suit itself?

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not ready to pass judgment upon the United States constitution. That is a matter for them to decide and it is not a matter for us to decide. I am obliged to take the situation as it is. As far as we are concerned the situation is this: The treaty has been made by the King. It was not necessary that that treaty should be ratified by this parliament because it came into force as far as this country was concerned willingly or unwillingly.

Mr. JAMESON. May I ask the minister if that treaty was not made with the consent and concurrence of this government?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

Mr. JAMESON. Certainly it was.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not want to say that we are not responsible for this treaty. We are responsible for this treaty. The treaty has been made as far as we are concerned. Now, on the other side, one of the branches of the treaty-making power does not ratify it. My hon. friend says that we should take the necessary steps to make a remonstrance. I do not think it is a case where we should interfere. Our interference, instead of doing good, might do harm. I am afraid that the reflections my hon. friend has to-day cast on the American authorities, instead of helping along this treaty will have a contrary effect.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the minister said to his deputy minister: I will abide by what you do, and in pursuance of that the deputy does something, would the minister have the right to say later on: I shall not abide by what you have done: that is the same position.

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not the same thing at all.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Exactly the same.

Mr. SPROULE. I wonder how the minister can be sincere in his statement that he was glad to have an opportunity to explain the situation in respect to this matter, in view of the fact that more than once has he refused to give information on the subject when asked to do so in this House. This treaty was entered into three years ago, and time after time since he has refused to take the House into his confidence upon the plea that it would not be proper to give information until the negotiations were completed.

Mr. BRODEUR. I never refused to give any information that I had. When the regulations were passed I brought them down right away.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard the minister more than once give the curt reply that he could not give that information or bring down the papers.

Mr. BRODEUR. All the papers are before the House.

Mr. SPROULE. Since when?

Mr. BRODEUR. Long ago.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard them refused not very long ago. We are told by the Minister of Finance that we cannot change a word in the reciprocity agreement before the House because the treaty-making power belongs to the mother country and not to us, but still we are supposed to have a say in what commercial treaties are made in our interest. Just as we are advised with regard to the reciprocity treaty so the Minister of Marine tells us that we cannot change a word or an item in these regulations, although on the other hand the United States Senate declare that they are at perfect liberty to change the treaty in any way they please. It seems to me that there is inconsistency there. If we have the right to ratify it surely we have the right to change it.

Mr. BRODEUR, The trouble is that we have not the right to ratify it.

Mr. SPROULE. I was speaking with regard to the reciprocity pact, and it seems to me we have the right to change that. and if the United States Senate will not ratify it with the changes we have made they can do just as they like about it. I do not think that the ministers of the Crown set before parliament the clear rights which this parliament enjoys and may exercise. The fishing industry of Canada is of very great importance not only to eastern Canada and western Canada, but to central Canada as well. I represent a district that is very deeply interested in the fishing rights of the Georgian Bay, and the waters

connected therewith. There is a great value involved in our fisheries, not only on account of the money value of the fish themselves, but of the large number of people who are engaged in and connected with the industry, and who have for years been waiting for the government to do something in their behalf. The fisheries will remain a most valuable asset to Canada, and a permanent asset, if they are wisely protected and proper efforts made to replenish them. I hold, Sir, that the government is not showing the live interest in that industry which its importance deserves. The people of Canada think that the government are indifferent and dilatory in the matter and indifference and carelessness on the part of those charged with the responsibility of protecting and replenishing our fisheries will some time or other be punished by the people. We on this side of the House have endeavoured to spur the government on to activity in dealing with our fishing interests, but so far we have not been able to succeed, and the people interested are suffering because of the lethargy of the government. We have unfortunately only a joint national interest in these fisheries, and it behoves us to make the best we can of that joint interest. The ministers took this subject up many years ago, and they have been dabbling with it ever since. It is true that these international affairs move slowly, but I would like now to ask the minister if he can tell me how many years ago it is since the negotiations commenced with the United States government with a view to reaching an amicable understanding as to what should be done for the perpetuation and protection of these fisheries.

Mr. BRODEUR. If I remember rightly, the question was taken up by the Joint High Commission which sat in 1898 and 1899, and it has been taken up since.

Mr. SPROULE. That is in accord with my own imperfect remembrance, that it was taken up 11 or 12 years ago. From time to time various questions have been asked with a view of ascertaining what has been done and with a view of spurring on the government to act with greater alacrity and with a stronger desire to bring these negotiations to a satisfactory conclusion; but we are to-day in practically the same position that we were in many years ago. Our fisheries are being injured and wasted, and they are not being protected or restocked as they should be, either in Canada or the United States. One of the provisions of that treaty was that both parties to the agreement were to exercise their best endeavours to restock these waters as rapidly as possible from year to year. Has that been done? Is any attention being paid to it? It is true, we have a few fish hatcheries in our country, and we are endeavouring in a half-hearted and unbusinesslike way to restock these waters; but we are not doing all that could be done. Neither of the contracting parties to that agreement is pretending to live up to it or to carry it out according to its letter and spirit. The treaty was signed in April, 1908. It is now 1911, and nothing has been done yet. That treaty provided that an International Commission should make regulations. That International Commission was appointed, and during the year succeeded in making what they thought were suitable regulations. Those regulations were made two years ago. What has been done in the meantime to carry them out? How many efforts have this government made to induce the American government to bring this matter to a finality? The Minister of Fisheries said: 'When I was in Washington last winter I spoke to them about it.' That is the only evidence we have that he showed any desire or made any effort to have the negotiations brought to such a conclusion that the regulations would be put into operation and carried out. Does that look like interest in what Canada is very much interested in? It seems to me that it does not. Then, certain regulations were to be made by the International Fisheries Commission. They were made, and were signed by David Starr Jordan for the United States and by Prof. Prince for Canada, in May, 1909. Now we are in May, 1911, and during those two years practically nothing has been done on our part. But what has been done by the United States? The Senate have taken the matter up, and in the meantime they have so mutilated and nullified these regulations that they are of little value. I take the regulation with regard to the Great Lakes, which includes the Georgian bay and that part of the country which I represent, and what do I find? I find that the Senate have either repealed or struck out the regulation prohibiting net fishing along the boundary line in Lake Erie. The regulations with regard to the construction of pound nets have also been struck out by the Senate of the United States.

Mr. BRODEUR. I am not aware that the United States has passed legislation on the subject. Perhaps my hon. friend is better informed in that respect than I am.

Mr. SPROULE. The information I have is that they have nullified these regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. Not the Senate.

Mr. SPROULE. Well, what power has the right to do it except the Senate?

Mr. BRODEUR. A committee has reported that to the Senate, but the Senate, I am informed, has not taken any action.

Mr. SPROULE. What I am saying would apply to the committe of the Senate whose duty it is to revise these regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would not be fair to the United States Senate to say that they have accepted the committee's report. I do not think they have taken any action upon it.

Mr. SPROULE. The committee has taken action so far, that they have considered and have failed to agree to these regulations. Therefore, so far as our interest in them is concerned, they are practically dead to us at the present time. Trap nets were prohibited by the regulations, but that regulation is nullified. The regulation prescribing the size of the mesh of the net has been nullified or destroyed also. The regulation regarding the amount of netting that may be done is struck out as well. These regulations on every subject have been practically nullified by that committee. Now, we are told that we are in honour bound to live up to this treaty, which was made on our behalf; that as a nation we have to maintain a high national dignity and are in honour bound to observe it in every respect. But is it not strange that one of the contracting parties is bound by it, while the other contracting party is at liberty to mutilate in any way they like, or pay no attention to it? At the same time, we must sit here in silence and be told that we have not the information before us, and cannot discuss the matter in this House because the treaty has not yet been dealt with by the Senate of the United States. The information goes out to the people of the United States, while we are denied the right to inquire into it or debate it in this House. One of the recommendations of the committee is:

It is recommended that the artificial propagation of the various food fishes in the treaty waters be continued by both countries and developed to the fullest possible extent and with the highest possible degree of efficiency. This work is regarded as of vital moment to the preservation and maintenance of the most valuable species of fishes.

Are we living up to that? Not at all. Is the United States? Not at all. So far as I am informed, no efforts are being made by either country to live up to it. We are treating it as though it were a dead letter. It is true, it is only a recommendation; but it is a recommendation by the commission who made regulations to protect and perpetuate these fishes, and this regulation is considered by them as important for that purpose. Two years have elapsed, and nothing whatever has been done. Why has not some effort been made on our side to enforce these regulations? Are we to allow these important and valuable fisheries to be gradually depleted, because we cannot get the Americans to act? I think we should show some determination to have these waters protected. The fisheries in Lake Erie and Georgian bay are of great interest to our people. They are of vital interest to the fishermen in that section, and these fishermen desire to get information and know exactly where they stand. Why have we not done anything? Has the minister been as zealous in looking after the interests of the people in that part of the country as he should be? I think not. The United States, he tells us, have not yet finally accepted the treaty and, therefore, we can do nothing. But what has our government done to expedite their acceptance? So far as we know, it has done nothing, and we are denied the right to get information or to debate this question because the United States Senate has not finally dealt with it. It seems to me that we should be just as free as the United States Senate to discuss this question, and that it is the duty of the minister to give us every item of information in his possession just as though these regulations had been ratified long ago. We are just as much entitled to that information, and to discuss the matter as we are with regard to the reciprocity pact now before this House.

This matter is in the hands of two parties and we are denied any information regarding it. What is done may be for our benefit or otherwise, but we do not know and are denied the means of finding out until such time as our hands will be tied and we shall have to abide by the agreement no matter what the consequences may be. That is how the representatives of the people are treated in this House, and the situation in which we find ourselves is a very pitiable one. We are told that we are debarred from doing anything at present by a high national code of honour, but the United States have not observed that high code of honour which is to be binding on us. If the other party is not willing to abide by it, are we bound to observe it? We are told that the regulations cannot be amended in any direction by us, but they can be by the other side. That seems to me very unfair. Is it not about time that we brought this childish play to an end and dealt with this matter in an intelligent, businesslike and courageous way, consistent with our own dignity? The government, however, are committed to a policy of drift. They are willing to let things drift in an indifferent haphazard way from year to year until our fisneries will be destroyed. But were the government to do their duty, they would not allow a mo-

ment longer to pass without seeing that our interests were protected. Has the minister given us any evidence that he has been remonstrating with the United States or submitting to them the great desirability of bringing this thing to a finality? If he has not he should do so without any further delay. In any event he should let us know whether anything is being done. If he is unable or unwilling to do anything, then let the House take hold of the matter and discharge the important duty incumbent on it as a parliament, of looking after the interests of Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. I want to get an understanding of this thing. I have been listening to the debate so far and especially to the minister's statement, and I am not quite sure whether I have the facts of the case correctly or not. Suppose we try to get the matter clearly in our minds. A treaty has been made between Great Britain and the United States. There is no doubt about that. That treaty has been ratified by the United States Senate. Am I right in that?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes, the former treaty has been ratified by the United States, but not the regulations.

Mr. FOSTER. I am not asking anything about the regulations. I am asking whether or not a treaty made between Great Britain and the United States has been ratified by the United States?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Then the treaty has been ratified by both the powers concerned. If that treaty has been ratified by the United States, and if all the forms of the American constitution have been complied with, and if all that is required by the British constitution has been met, that treaty is binding on both the United States and Great Britain and the latter acting on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, so far as these fisheries are concerned. Then all we have to do is ask what the terms of the treaty are; and if we find certain things as articles in that treaty binding and absolute, neither Great Britain nor the United States has any right to vary these. Either power has the right to ask for a revision of the treaty or, under the terms of the treaty, has the right to denounce it; but until either is done, neither Great Britain nor the United States has anything else to do than live up to the terms of the treaty. The minister will not contravene that position? He says nothing, but I know he could not. A treaty would not be worth the paper on which it is written if, after it had been solemnly agreed to and ratified, either one or the other could do as it liked with regard to carrying it out.

I want to ask another question. Article first is as follows:

The times, seasons and methods of fishing in the waters contiguous to the United States and Canada as specified in article 4 of this convention, and the nets, engines, gear, apparatus and plant which may be used therein shall be fixed and determined by uniform and common international regulations, restrictions and provisions.

Both powers agreed to that, and to that end agreed to appoint, within three months after this convention is proclaimed, a commission to be known as the International Fisheries Commission, consisting of one person named by each government. Both powers are bound by that and should live up to it.

Article 2. It shall be the duty of the International Commission——

Not the duty of the United States government; not the duty of the British government acting by way of the Dominion government; not that, but——

—the duty of the International Fisheries Commission, within six months after being named, to prepare a system of uniform and common international regulations for the protection and preservation of the food fishes in each of the waters prescribed in article 4 of this convention, which regulations shall embrace close seasons, limitations as to the character, size and manner of use of nets, engines, gear, apparatus and other appliances; a uniform system of registering by each government in waters where requird for the more convenient regulation of commercial fishing by its own citizens or subjects within its own territorial waters or any such part of such waters; an arrangement for concurrent measures for propagation of fish, and such other provisions and measures as the commission shall deem necessary.

So, it is not the British parliament, nor the British government, nor the American administration, nor the United States Senate, which is to do these several things; it is the duty of the International Fisheries Commission to do them, and under the treaty nobody else can do what is laid down there to be done by that commission. Now, the International Fisheries Commission—I want to be sure I am right—has met, has agreed upon these regulations, and has reported these regulations to the two governments? I am correct in that?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Very well, they have done their duty. Now, what does article 3 say?

Article 3. The two governments engage to put into operation and to enforce by legislation and executive action, with as little delay as possible——

What?

—the regulations, restrictions and provisions with appropriate penalties for all breaches thereof; and the date when they shall be put into operation shall be fixed by the concurrent proclamations of the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada in Council and of the President of the United States.

The Senate has nothing to do with regulations. The Senate, when it ratified that treaty made its last utterance on these regulations——

Mr. BRODEUR. But——

Mr. FOSTER. Wait a moment; let me finish my argument—made its last utterance on these regulations when it solemnly agreed, by the two-thirds majority necessary under their constitution, to put the matter into the hands of the International Fisheries Commission. When it did that, it divested itself of all authority in changing or making any of these regulations. They made an article of the treaty which provided how the regulations were to be brought into force. That is, the two governments were to bring them into force by proclamation—not proclamation of the Senate of the United States, or of this parliament, but proclamation of the President of the United States, and of the Governor General of the Dominion of Canada in Council.

Mr. BRODEUR. After the legislation being passed.

Mr. FOSTER. What legislation?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is mentioned in the clause the hon. gentleman read. It required some legislation to be passed by the United States authorities.

Mr. FOSTER. For what purpose?

Mr. BRODEUR. For this purpose: The administration of the fisheries was formerly under the control of the different states of the United States. By the treaty which was made concerning these boundary waters, these waters passed under federal control. It required, then, some legislation on the part of the federal authorities to carry out these regulations. It required also an appropriation of money.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not throw any light on the subject we were discussing, nor has it anything to do with the matter. What we were discussing, and what was brought up by my hon. friend from New Westminster was that regulations provided for under the treaty, and made by the International Fisheries Commission are proposed to be changed by the United States Senate. The two governments are not to make or alter regulations, but only to put into operation the regulations made by the International Commission. It is not to be understood or allowed that the Senate should change the regulations made by the commission. But then comes in what the minister has been talking about—that in order to have proper legislation for the enforcement, the administration is to have regard to the different states that have rights and powers in the matter, and to endeavour to get a unity of enforcement. Does the minister contend that that provides that the Senate of the United States, the body that ratified the treaty may go back upon the regulations which were made by the International Commission and change these regulations? I do not think he can pretend that. Now, have these regulations been put in operation by concurrent proclamation, or have they not?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, they have not been.

Mr. FOSTER. There is, therefore, no proclamation and consequently up to this time, the regulations made by the International Fisheries Commission are a dead letter. That is where the matter stands?

Mr. BRODEUR. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Now, what seems to me the unwarranted thing—and I say that with all due respect—is that a committee of the Senate of the United States, evidently with the idea of bringing up the regulations before the Senate for amendment after proposing changes in these regulations themselves. That is quite open to the Senate, and this treaty is torn into ribbons. There is here a provision by which a revision of these shall be made, if they are not satisfactory. Article 5 says:

The International Fisheries Commission shall continue in existence so long as this convention shall be in force, and each government shall have the power to fill, and shall fill from time to time, any vacancy which may occur in its representation on the commission. Each government shall pay its own commissioner, and any joint expenses shall be paid by the two governments in equal moieties.

The next section deals with a change of opinion which might occur with either of the parties:

The regulations, restrictions and provisions provided for in this convention——

Namely, those made by the International Fisheries Commission. not by the Senate, not by the Dominion of Canada, but by the International Fisheries Commission.

—shall remain in force for a period of four years from the date of their executive promulgation——

So that after the executives promulgate these, there is no power to destroy this convention, and those regulations remain for a period of four years.

—and thereafter until one year from the date when either the government of Great Britain or of the United States shall give notice to the other of its desire for their revision.

There is where you have a chance for revision. After these remain in power for four years, if one power says, 'we do not like them, notice is given, and they may be revised, and then the Senate may have something to say about it.' Either one of the contracting parties may refuse to abide by such regulations, and in such a case the treaty will become of no effect.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman says the matter could be referred to the Senate. I call his attention to the fact that this particular clause simply speaks of 'the governments.' I would not like to admit just now that the United States Senate would have the right even to revise, because the treaty simply speaks of 'the governments.'

Mr. FOSTER. (Reading):

And thereafter until one year from the date when either the government of Great Britain or of the United States shall give notice to the other of its desire for their revision——

Then revision can commence.

—and immediately upon such notice being given the commission shall proceed to make a revision thereof.

Not the Senate. My hon. friend is quite right. The Senate even then has no power to revise.

Mr. BRODEUR. It would be a question whether, in such a case, the Senate would have the right. It has been contended by the American authorities, and it has been so stated to me by them, that in every case under these different sections where the action of the government is involved or required, this action is to be exercised, not by the government alone, as we understand it here, by the president and his cabinet, but with the concurrence of the United States Senate. That is their contention.

Mr. FOSTER. Even suppose that contention is correct——

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not say it is correct, but that is their contention.

Mr. FOSTER—the time has not arrived for that, and will not until four years after the promulgation.

Immediately upon such notice being given, the commission shall proceed to make a revision thereof, which revised regulations, if adopted and promulgated by the Governor General of Canada in Council and by the President of the United States, shall remain in force for another period of four years and thereafter until one year from the date when a further notice of revision is given as above provided in this article.

If there be a revision by that International Fisheries Commission, which revision, if agreed to by the two executives, must then be promulgated, the Senate may then put in a claim that they are to advise the president as to whether he shall agree, and they may exercise their right in that advice. But until four years after the promulgation of this set of regulations which has been made by the International Fisheries Commission, the Senate does not seem to me to have lost power under this treaty to alter, change or interfere in any way with those regulations.

It shall, however, be in the power of the two governments, by joint or concurrent action upon the recommendation of the commission to make modifications at any time in the regulations.

To make modifications at any time in the regulations. That they can not do on their own initiative, it must be on the recommendation of the commission alone. So it seems to me that under the present condition of things the minister's stand is not a clear one. He has failed to inform us that he has taken objection to the contention of the United States authorities.

Mr. BRODEUR. I may say to my hon. friend that when this matter was brought to the attention of Mr. Bryce and myself, who were there together, we understood that in speaking of 'government,' the word meant what we understand it to mean here. But we were informed by the counsel of the Secretary of State, that in such a question it would require not only the action of the government, but the action of the Senate, because the Senate was a part of the treaty-making power.

Mr. FOSTER. That is in case of revision. But there is no chance for revision until four years shall have passed.

Mr. BRODEUR. But then action can only be taken after the proclamation, according to section 3.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have given the articles in the treaty, and they are as plain as words can be, and it seems to me they leave us in an unsatisfactory position. Of course, the minister may say that these regulations have not yet gone into effect on either side, and consequently they are not operative. But the sole reason of the treaty was to get at an understanding, and to provide a machinery which would protect the fisheries, and keep that inestimable resource of both countries in good condition, and prevent depletion of what is so great a source of food for the people of both countries. My hon. friend from Grey stated that here you have three full years

after the treaty has been made, and you have not yet had the official proclamation of these regulations——

Mr. BRODEUR. It is not our fault.

Mr. FOSTER—and as a consequence of that, you have a hesitation and loss in the fisheries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to say one or two words. Let me state at the outset that I would not presume for a moment to interpret the constitution of the United States contrary to the views of those who make it their study. What I say, therefore, must be taken subject to the consideration that the constitutional lawyers of the United States must be presumed to understand their own constitution, and that what we say in regard to it is only our own understanding of the meaning of the language. It seems to me that when the United States Senate ratified this treaty, then the treaty became just as binding upon the United States as it was binding upon Canada by the ratification of His Majesty the King. I would have thought that, under the circumstances, the regulations themselves would not become subject to the ratification of the Senate except in so far as the treaty itself plainly stated that such ratification was to take place. For example, it might be that at the end of the four year period such ratification for a further period might be necessary under the terms of the treaty. What did the treaty amount to? It simply amounted to this, that the government of Canada, through His Majesty the King, and the government of the United States entered into a treaty by which they agreed that these regulations should be according to the arbitrament and decision of the tribunal which the treaty appointed. That is the meaning of the treaty it it means anything. After these regulations have been made by the duly constituted tribunal it is said that the Senate of the United States claims the right under its treaty-making powers to revise them. I do not know whether I am correct in that. The Senate of the United States might interfere in two ways. It might interfere, as one of the legislative bodies of the United States, by declining to pass legislation enforcing these regulations unless some amendment were made in the regulations themselves. It would possess that power, and it could exercise that power, although such exercise would not be in accordance with the terms of the treaty, just the same as this parliament might decline to implement the treaty that had been made. That is one thing, but that is not what I understand is being done at the present time. The Senate of the United States is not interfering in that way, but it is interfering under that clause of the constitution which vests in the Senate a portion of the treaty-making power of the United States. It does not seem to me conceivable, subject to the superior wisdom of the constitutional lawyers of the United States, that that particular thing would be possible. Let me illustrate. Suppose the United States and Great Britain entered into a treaty by which they referred claims by the United States against Great Britain, or by Great Britain against the United States, to the arbitrament and determination of a particular tribunal. Such a treaty would not be binding upon the United States until it had been ratified by the Senate in accordance with the provisions of their constitution, but after it had been once ratified, it would be thoroughly binding upon the United States, and it would be imposible for the Senate of the United States, after the award had been made by the tribunal to which these claims had been referred, to say: We have now the right, under the treaty-making powers of the constitution, to vary and alter that award. If it could not do that, and it is plain to me that it could not, in the case of the arbitration by which I have illustrated my argument, then it seems to me equally impossible that it should do so in the case which the minister has brought to the attention of the House to-day. I would like to ask, in conclusion, from the minister, whether it is by virtue of the ordinary legislative power of the Senate, or whether it is by virtue of the treaty-making power of the Senate, that these regulations are now alleged to be subject to modification?

Mr. BRODEUR. That is the point upon which I have no definite information, but I assume, by reason of the message which was sent to the Senate, that it is being dealt with under the treaty-making power. I am under the impression that that is the way in which it is being dealt with, because the matter has been referred to a committee on foreign relations, and I would, therefore, be inclined to think that the Senate has been acting in its capacity as a part of the treaty-making power. But, as I have said, I have no definite information on that point.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister the resolution which was introduced in the Senate?

Mr. BRODEUR. I think we have. I think it was sent to the department by the British ambassador. I may inform the House that this morning I discussed this question with Mr. Bryce myself.

Mr. JAMESON. Mr. Speaker, this matter has been discussed in this House on more than one occasion, and I think its importance is sufficient warrant for the discussion which has heretofore taken place. The

question as to whether or not the United States Senate has the right under the constitution of the United States to revise the regulations which have been made by the commissioners appointed under the treaty of 1908 is of course a question which no person in this House to-day can speak with authority upon. The minister himself says that he is not positive upon the question, and, indeed, it is one that the United States Senate, I suppose, must settle for itself. But, at all events, there is this to be said that the people of this country and, I believe I may say the minister himself, when the treaty was entered into, and when the commissioners were appointed, believed that when these commissioners made their report, when they framed their regulations, nothing was left except to give the necessary legislative authority to the regulations and to provide for their enforcement.

I do not think that it was anticipated by any person in this country at least, whatever may have been in the mind of the Senate of the United States, or of the United States administration, that these regulations should be subject to review. I remember two years ago, when this very question of these regulations was discussed in this House, that I asked the minister why it was that we had not had the privilege, and why it was that the people interested, in this country, had not had the privilege of inspecting and approving these regulations, and the answer of the minister was that these regulations were drafted under the treaty, that we were bound by the regulations as framed, and that as a consequence we must give legislative sanction to them when they were brought down. The minister defended the ground which he then took very vigorously, although at the time I felt it would have been much better, had the people who were interested in the fisheries, and who probably could have given a great deal of assistance to the Canadian commissioner at least, had an opportunity of seeing the tentative draft of the regulations before they became official.

Now, the minister has said that the government of the United States have discharged their obligations in this matter. Perhaps they have in his view, but I do not think that we, who have been watching the proceedings for the last two years, can altogether agree with him in that, and I regret that the minister should seem to think that my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor), who introduced this matter and who spoke, I think, with great moderation under the circumstances, made remarks which were not appropriate to the occasion. I do not think that it is wise for us to sit silent while the United States takes advantage of us in these matters, and I think that the minister himself has yielded too gracefully to their request for further time, if they made it, or if he has permitted them to take further time without asking formally for it I think it is well that the matter should be brought to their attention in some formal way, so that they will understand that the people of this country expect that they, as well as ourselves, are bound by the terms of the treaty.

The changes which the United States Senate committee thought desirable to make in these regulations should, I think, be brought to the attention of the House. I do not know if the Minister of Marine is aware of the action which the Senate committee took. I am not sure if he knows what the present position of this matter is, whether it has been sent to a committee of the present Senate, or whether it has been left in abeyance since the adjournment of the late Congress. The 'Pacific Fisherman' an American paper devoted to fishing interests, in its issue of March, 1911, says that the Senate committee proposed to strike from the regulations framed by Professor Prince and Professor Starr Jordan, the Canadian and American representatives, the following clauses: namely, clauses 45 to 50 inclusive, and clause 62 to 65 inclusive. I shall read these clauses in order that the House may appreciate the importance of the changes which the United States Senate committee proposes. The following are the clauses which are recommended to be stricken out:

45. Net fishing along the boundary line in Lake Erie prohibited. No fishing with nets shall be permitted in Lake Erie within one-half mile of the international boundary.

46. Construction of pound nets. No pound nets shall be set within these treaty waters unless so constructed as to have in the middle of the back of the crib, reaching from the top to the bottom thereof, a vertical strip of netting, which shall hang squarely, the width of which strip shall not be less than one-half the width of the back of the crib, and the mesh of which shall not be less than two and three-quarter inches, extension measure, as actually used in fishing.

In those waters lying to the northward of a line drawn from Cape Hurd, in the province of Ontario, to Thunder Bay Light, in the state of Michigan, such vertical strip shall have a mesh of not less than three and one-eighth inches, extension measure, as actually used in fishing.

The above restrictions shall take effect January 1, 1911.

No web of fine mesh (locally called an apron), or any other device which may reduce the means of escape of small fishes through the meshes, shall be used in the crib of a pound net in these treaty waters.

47. Location of pound nets. The leader of a pound net shall be made visible, there shall be a gap of at least fifty feet open and clear to the bottom between one pound net and the

next of the series when set in linear order, and there shall be a lateral passageway or distance of not less than one thousand feet between one series of pound nets and the next on either side.

Not more than seven pound nets belonging to one person shall be set in a linear series.

No part of this regulation shall be so constructed as to interfere with recognized proprietary rights.

48. Trap nets prohibited. No concealed, movable trap net shall be used in these treaty waters. On and after January 1, 1912, no trap net of any kind shall be used for the capture of fish in these treaty waters.

49. Mesh of nets. No gill net or other movable net of less than four and three-fourths inches mesh, extension measure, as actually used in fishing, shall be drawn, set, placed, or maintained for whitefish or lake trout in these treaty waters.

No gill net or other movable net of less than three and one-eighth inches mesh, extension measure, as actually used in fishing, shall be drawn, set, placed or maintained in Lake Erie, or less than two and one-half inches mesh in Lake Huron, Lake Superior and Lake Ontario, for fish other than whitefish or lake trout.

The above restrictions shall take effect on and after January 1, 1911.

No gill net shall be drawn, set, placed or maintained within one-half mile of any pound net in these treaty waters.

50. Amount of netting. Not more than thirty thousand yards of netting, linear measure, shall be set in these treaty waters at any one time by one tug, and not more than eight thousand yards by one sail boat, except in the waters of Lake Huron and Lake Superior, where not more than sixty thousand yards shall be set by one tug, and not more than eighteen thousand yards shall be set by one sail boat.

62. Close season for salmon. From August 25th to September 15th in each year, both days inclusive, no salmon or steelhead shall be fished for, killed or captured for commercial purposes in these treaty waters; provided, however, that in the waters to the westward of a line drawn southward from Gonzales Point to the shore of the state of Washington, silver salmon or coho salmon, may be fished for, killed or captured from September 1st to September 15th in each year, both days inclusive.

63. Weekly close season for salmon and steelhead. From six o'clock Saturday morning to six o'clock on the Monday morning next succeeding, no salmon or steelhead shall be fished for, killed or captured in these treaty waters.

It is, however, provided that in the waters to the westward of a line drawn southward from Gonzales Point to the shore of the state of Washington the weekly close season shall begin twelve hours earlier, and shall end twelve hours earlier.

64. Construction of pound nets. All pound nets or other stationary appliances for the capture of salmon or steelhead shall be so constructed that no fish whatever shall be taken during the weekly close season. The erection or addition to the pound net of a jigger is prohibited.

65. Location of pound nets. All pound nets shall be limited to a length of twenty-five hundred feet, with an end passageway of at least six hundred feet between one pound net and the next in linear series, such distances being measured in continuation of the line of direction of the leader of such net, and a lateral passageway of at least twenty-four hundred feet between one pound net and the next.

On and after January 1, 1911, the mesh in pound nets shall be four inches in extension in the leader and not less than three inches in other parts of the net.

Now, Mr. Speaker, anybody who is familiar with fishery regulations will at once see that these clauses, recommended to be stricken out of the regulations by the Senate committee, are very important for the preservation of the fisheries, and from the information we have of the manner in which the fisheries have heretofore been conducted, we know that the enforcement of regulations similar to these I have read are absolutely necessary for the protection of the fisheries in these boundary waters. We have had some previous experience with the United States in regard to questions of this sort, and that experience leads us to believe that these matters should be looked after with very great care by the Canadian government. The difficulty which we experience in these matters is that after we arrive at an understanding with our neighbours, and after we, in perfect good faith, carry out what we regard to be the true intent and meaning of that understanding, we find, much to our surprise, that they have had an entirely different conception of the matter from that which prevailed with us. I would like to ask the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries whether, at the time this treaty was entered into, and the approval of this government was secured for it, it was understood by this administration that the United States Senate would have the right to revise these regulations which were framed by the commission appointed under the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. That question was not considered at all at the time.

Mr. JAMESON. Then I may gather from that, that the minister is as much surprised at the action of the United States Senate in that connection as are other members of this House. I assume that if the minister had known that the United States Senate were going to revise the action of the commissioners, he would have imparted that information to the House two years ago, when this matter was discussed; and the very fact that it was not understood is an evidence of the other undoubted fact, that all our dealings with the United States are entered into without a full and complete knowledge of where they

are going to land us. I think in matters of such vital importance as this—important to the fisheries and important to the people interested in the fisheries—there should be no room for misunderstanding; and that when this country agrees to a treaty entered into by Great Britain on our behalf with the United States, it should be with a knowledge of where that treaty is going to lead us, where it is going to leave us, and what we are going to get under it.

Now, so far as we are concerned, these regulations, I presume, cannot be reviewed. I will ask the minister, however, whether or not, in view of the situation which has unexpectedly developed in the United States, we can give to our commissioner, or, if not, to his department, or, if not to his department, then has this parliament, the right also to make changes and alterations in these regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. There is no doubt that under the treaty the regulations might be revised with the consent of this government and the treaty-making power of the United States.

Mr. JAMESON. Then may I ask the minister if he is giving consent to the alterations which are being imposed by the United States Senate?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly not. I may say, however, with regard to one of the changes, concerning part of Lake Huron which is a result of a difference in the size of the mesh, I stated to the American authorities that we would have no objection to have an amendment made; but it was of no importance.

Mr. JAMESON. Then we reach this conclusion, that while we on this side of the border can only make changes in these regulations with the consent of the United States Senate, they on the other side of the border can mutilate or alter them in any way they choose without obtaining the consent either of the government of Canada or of this parliament.

Mr. BRODEUR. But the amendment could not be put in force except with the consent of the Canadian government.

Mr. JAMESON. I can quite understand that, but in this case they are not proposing to add to, but are striking out.

Mr. BRODEUR. The same thing.

Mr. JAMESON. Not exactly the same thing. Consequently we would have a skeletonized form of these regulations, none of the remaining regulations, perhaps, being objectionable to us, and yet the form and substance of them, necessary in order that the fisheries should be conserved, being stricken out. So that I do not suppose that the minister will say at this moment that if these changes, which have been recommended by a Committee of the United States Senate, are made by the Senate, he will take the responsibility of refusing to proclaim the regulations in force in this country. Perhaps the minister may have reached that conclusion, and, if so, will state it.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, I have not considered that point at all.

Mr. JAMESON. That certainly indicates a very unfortunate position for Canada, for Canadian fishermen, and for the people of this country generally. Can the minister state at this time in what stage the regulations are in the United States Senate, or whether they have yet been submitted to the new Senate?

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether they have been submitted this session or not. I do not think they have.

Mr. JAMESON. I gather from what the minister says that the government on this side of the line have practicaly decided to abandon the regulations, as they do not seem to be in touch with the United States Senate. When the regulations come back here, they may be in such a skeletonized form that they will be simply worthless, as I think they are now. Consequently the advantages which we had hoped at one time we would get under properly-framed regulations, will be lost to the people of this country and to our fisheries. In my view, there is in this matter a question of international faith at stake. I believe that we should adopt a firmer policy in our dealings with the United States. I do not think we should consent to have them trifling with the administration of this country. It seems to me that they consider the government of Canada to be a pretty easy mark, from the manner in which they have been conducting themselves with respect to these regulations; and almost every other case in which we have had dealings with them of late, has indicated a similar disposition on their part and a similar state of mind on the part of the government of that country. In the meantime, the question is, how are we going to protect and conserve the fisheries which were to be protected under these regulations? It seems to me that the whole thing has so far fallen to the ground. It is a most regrettable thing that matters should have reached the stage at which they are.

I trust that the government will take the very earliest opportunity to see that whatever is going to be done under this treaty, in connection with these regulations, is done, and is reported promptly to this parliament, and that any rights which

we may have under that treaty are preserved to the people of this country.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to ask the minister whether or not legislative action is required for the purpose of putting into operation these regulations? If so, whether or not the ratification by the United States Senate can be considered as legislative action on the part of the United States or whether ratification is required by both the Senate and the House of Representatives. Article 3 of the treaty reads:

> The two governments engage to put into operation and to enforce by legislation and executive action the regulations.

The United States Senate have passed an Act ratifying the regulations subject to these changes they are making. I desire to know whether or not that is legislative action as required by the treaty.

Mr. BRODEUR. I do not know whether the United States Senate, in considering these regulations, has acted by virtue of its jurisdiction as a branch of the treaty-making power.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the hon. minister know whether the House of Representatives has sanctioned the regulations.

Mr. BRODEUR. No, it has not.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. This article says that the regulations require to be sanctioned by legislative action, and I would assume that means legislation by both Houses. It is the intention that these regulations, after going through the Senate, shall go to the House of Representatives for legislative sanction?

Mr. BRODEUR. The official information that I have is that a message was to be sent by the President of the United States recommending the necessary legislation and the adoption of regulations. I have no other information on the subject.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the minister know whether or not the British House of Commons has taken legislative action?

Mr. BRODEUR. No legislative action was required on the part of the British authorities because the matter concerned Canada alone. It was contemplated in the treaty that the legislation mentioned in article 3 should be passed by the Dominion parliament, and that has been done.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. So far as Canada is concerned, evidently we are absolutely bound by the regulations passed by the joint commissioners and the United States are not.

Mr. BROEUR. Nobody is bound to-day, because no final action has been taken and no proclamation has been issued.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Suppose Congress should pass the regulations mutilated as they are, would we be bound by them?

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly not. It would be for us to consider whether those amendments should be accepted or not.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who would have the power to alter the regulations—the commission or this government?

Mr. BRODEUR. It is provided in the treaty that the regulations may be revised by the two governments on the recommendation of the commission. It would be for this government to decide whether there was such a recommendation on the part of the commissioners.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. minister knows that such recommendation can only be made after four years. I think it is time this House should protest against being placed in the unfair position in which we are. That position seems to be that while the United States agreed to abide by whatever regulations might be made by this commission, and while we agreed to be similarly bound, yet the United States Senate is now mutilating these regulations to suit itself. Both countries having delegated their powers to that commission to make those regulations, all that remained to be done was to ratify them and neither country had any power to amend, yet we find the United States Senate amending the regulations to suit themselves. I want to protest against another thing in connection with this treaty, and that is this. Apparently the United States make public the contents of the treaties long before we have any information here as to what is contained in them. In the present instance these regulations made by the Joint Commission, as the Minister of Marine and Fisheries knows, were published and sent broadcast throughout the United States long before we in Canada knew anything about them. I had a copy of the regulations from an outside source long before I could procure them from this government. Then take the other case, that of the International Commission which it is proposed to establish and place in charge of railway rates, express rates, telephone rates and telegraph rates. Down to this day, we have no information from the government regarding the contents of the report on this subject. I asked for that information three months ago, but so far we have never had any information of what that report contained. The matter is a very important one, the establishment of an International Commission to regulate international railway rates, express, telephone and telegraph rates. Yet although we have no information from this government and none can

be obtained from it, there appeared three months ago in the American 'Review of Reviews' a full exposition of the contents of that report. The 'Review of Reviews' went on to state this:

It is expected that with the reciprocity treaty there will also be submitted to Congress the text of some sort of traffic agreement with Canada to regulate the railroad business over the border. . . . The report of Chairman Knapp, concurred in by Chairman Mabee, and presented to the Secretary of State on the last day of December, contains recommendations of such importance to those of our citizens who are interested in trade and travel across the border that we herewith summarize its most important points.

The writer of that article, as far back as last February, went on to summarize and give details of the contents of that report which our Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) said the other evening had not been divulged and that he was not at liberty to say anything about it. Notwithstanding the statement, this report was published last February in the 'Review of Reviews.' The article goes on to say:

The proposed treaty provides for a tribunal to enforce and administer its provisions to be known as the International Commerce Commission, and which shall consist of four members, namely, the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission and the chief commissioner of the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada for the time being, a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission to be appointed by the President of the United States, and a member of the Railway Commissioners of Canada to be appointed by the Governor General of Canada in Council. The powers conferred upon and the authority given to this commission in respect of international carriers would correspond to those exercised by the Interstate Commerce Commission in respect of interstate carriers within the United States.

The provisions of such a treaty should apply to telegraph, telephone and express companies and such companies should be subject as respect to international business to the authority of the International Commerce Commission.

Then it goes on to give other particulars. What I want to emphasize more particularly is this, that while we on this side are prepared to preserve secrecy regarding state documents, commissions or agreements, on the other side they are made public at once: and in that way they get an advantage over us with respect to treaties of that kind.

Mr. BRODEUR. With regard to the regulations which have been passed, I am not aware that the American authorities published them in advance.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I myself saw a copy of these proposed regulations. It came into my possession from a fisherman in my locality who got it from an American fisherman. That was the first intimation I had of what these regulations were.

Mr. BRODEUR. That must be a mistake. I may state what actually occurred in that connection. Professor Starr Jordan sent a draft prepared by himself to be considered by the different states interested. This draft, for reasons unknown, was published by the Ontario government as an official document, but it did not contain the official regulations which were adopted later on, as absolutely different ones were adopted.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. They were draft regulations, and the copy I had was marked confidential, yet it was being circulated throughout the United States. My hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) says they were published in the press of the state of Washington.

Mr. BRODEUR. But they are not the regulations adopted later on by the commission. It was merely a draft which was sent out by Dr. Starr Jordan, but which was not accepted by the commission.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is exactly what we complain of. The draft of the regulations was sent all through the United States to receive the approval or disapproval of their fishermen, before we had the draft here, or an opportunity to consult our fishermen or to receive the advice of our own commissioner.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If I understand the matter, my hon. friend finds fault with us because the results of the negotiations that we had with our American neighbours were disclosed by the American authorities and were not disclosed by us. That is the point the hon. gentleman makes against us. Let me tell my hon. friend that the American system is to divulge everything in matters of diplomacy even before they have got through, while the British system is to disclose nothing until the agreement has been put through, and the thing has become official by the signature of the parties. My hon. friend apparently, has a weakness for the American system. If I understand aright, he would change the British for the American system. But we do not want to do that, either on this occasion or on any other. We are not in favour of annexation; we want to remain British. I think my hon. friend ought not to try to induce us to go out of our way to favour the adoption of American methods.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. We do not want reciprocity in that kind of conduct. But if it is the custom of the American government to disclose these documents contrary to the

British system, it is the duty of our government to get the information from the United States as quickiy as possible after they publish it so that we may be in as good a position as they are in that regard. These regulations, I understand, were a compromise. The commissioners of the two countries sat down together and eventually agreed upon a certain set of regulations. Now, the compromise is being taken up by the United States Senate, and they are proceeding to amend it to suit themselves, as I contend, in direct contradiction of the terms of the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that the information has been given to the House, but as I have not the information, I would like to ask a question either of the Prime Minister or of the Minister of Railways. What authority was ever given to Chairman Mabee that led to his conference with Mr. Knapp? Was it a mere conference of good neighbourhood, or was there official direction and instruction?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot say at the moment, but my impression is that it was a purely friendly conference to ascertain whether the two countries could agree on a common system of that kind.

Mr. FOSTER. And not authorized by the government?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not say positively, for I do not remember at the moment, but I could ascertain.

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

SUPPLY.

Railways and Canals—Collection of Revenue —Intercolonial Railway—Further amount required, $353,000.

Hon. GEO. P. GRAHAM (Minister of Railways). This is for the adjustment of accounts, and does not provide for further expenditure except as it takes from the revenue of last year a certain amount which we wish to pay for rolling stock and other items. When the estimate for the current expenditure of the year on the Intercolonial railway was made up, it was on information available last autumn. In the supplementary estimates an amount was voted of $250,000 to add to that. As I said to the committee at the time, I was asking to be allowed to pay out of revenue a further sum of $200,000 for rolling stock. I thought I had got an estimate in the supplementaries, but evidently I had not. Then, there was $76,000 to pay out of revenue for the estimated value of the property lost by the fire at Campbellton. That was a new departure; we were taking it out of revenue. But evidently I did not get the vote for it. Further there was $58,000 increase of wages under the schedule, and this was unforeseen to a certain extent, at least at the close of the year we did not have the amount in our minds. Then there is a small balance to make up the $350,000. The only effect is that it will reduce the amount that would appear as surplus revenue of last year.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that no part of this vote will, under any circumstances, go to capital account?

Mr. GRAHAM. None of it.

Mr. BARKER. It is probably a reduction of what seems to be your profits on operation?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it reduces our surplus.

Mr. EDWARDS. Are the locomotives bought for the Intercolonial railway always bought by tender?

Mr. GRAHAM. Always.

Mr. CROCKET. Do I understand that part of this is to be applied to the purchase of rolling stock to replace what was destroyed at Campbellton?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, but $76,000 is the estimated value of the buildings destroyed at Campbellton, and we are taking that amount out of revenue this year to apply toward the new buildings.

Mr. CROCKET. Was no rolling stock destroyed in Campbellton?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but it will be replaced out of revenue.

Mr. CROCKET. What was the value of rolling stock destroyed there?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not the figures before me, but I placed them on 'Hansard' at the time I put through my Supply.

Allowances—Active militia, $110,000.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I have distributed for the information of the committee a memorandum which gives a pretty full explanation of the different items making up these main estimates. Perhaps it would be well for me to say a few words generally before proceeding to the items, and in doing so I will detain the committee but a few minutes. It is well known that in June last Canada was visited by one of the principal military authorities in the British Empire, Sir John French, the Inspector General of the British forces, who came here in accordance with an arrangement, I might say an understanding, made as long ago as 1902, when the Canadian

ministers were in England attending the Colonial Conference, as it was then called. They sent a memorandum to the Colonial Secretary indicating the course which Canada was prepared to take with reference to matters of defence, and pointing out that so far as military defence was concerned, we would be glad to have the benefit from time to time of an inspection of the Canadian forces by a distinguished British general. This is the first opportunity since that time that we have had the advantage of such an inspection.

Now, I am not going fully into the report of Sir John French, as no doubt questions will be asked as the different items are under consideration. But on the fourteenth page of the memorandum which has been laid before the members, special reference is made to recommendations of Sir John French, the Inspector General of the British forces, and I wish to confine my observations at the moment to the two points especially referred to in the memorandum. First, the question of organization, secondly, the training and education of the officers and the force generally. I may perhaps observe that Sir John French, being Inspector General of the forces of the empire, and being a soldier and a great general, naturally looks at all troops which he inspects from the point of view of efficiency as an armed force ready for active service. That was his point of view, and naturally perhaps, he was to some extent disappointed, or at any rate would be disappointed, with the Canadian militia as a force of that kind. We in Canada know perfectly well that the Canadian militia has never been a force ready to go to war, that has not been the principal idea in its organization. In fact it is only within a very short time, three or four years, that any such idea would have been suggested in connection with the militia. The purpose of the militia has been to aid, to assist, the British army when difficulties occurred in Canada. The British authorities have always maintained in Canada British forces in different portions of the country up to a very short time ago. In 1905 the last of the British troops were withdrawn from this country, from Halifax and Esquimalt, and Canada then assumed the direct responsibility for the defence of her own territory, thereby relieving the British taxpayer from responsibility in that connection. Previous to that time, while a British force was maintained in Canada, the Canadian government did not pretend to keep up many of the administrative branches of an army. There was always at Halifax or at Esquimalt the nucleus of an army which could supply, when required, the necessary administrative branches. After the troops were withdrawn from Halifax and Esquimalt, or about that time, it became necessary for the Canadian militia to organize the different administrative services, and that has been done, so that to-day in that respect, and in every respect, to some extent at least, we have in Canada a force able to take the field if necessary.

I was saying that Sir John French would naturally be disappointed if he expected to find a force absolutely ready to take the field for active service. We did not expect that, he probably did not expect it. But he was asked to make a frank criticism and report of what he found, and of the remedies which he would suggest, and that I am happy to say he has done. I may say that his report is very satisfactory indeed to the military men of Canada. General Lake, who was here at the time, felt quite satisfied with Sir John French's criticisms. One of the recommendations, or one of the criticisms perhaps I had better say, which Sir John French made, was that our organization was not what it ought to be, that is to say, he found that our peace organization was not such as would lend itself to the best efficiency if the force were ever required to take the field. If we are maintaining a military force at all it must be with a view of having it prepared in the event—much as we would regret it and unlikely as it may be—of war, but still a force which would be fit to take the field if required. The objection which he has made was that the different branches of the force were scattered, that there was not a proper balance in the strength of the different branches as between infantry, artillery, and cavalry, and he recommended that instead of the large commands and the districts which we have had for many years—long before I came into office—we should have divisions established, and that each division should contain within itself all the branches including infantry, cavalry, artillery and the administrative services of the army sufficient to defend completely the particular portion of the country included in the division. This proposal, fortunately, can be carried out without any serious difficulty and I will read here the words of the memorandum which are, as a matter of fact, the words of the present general who succeeded Sir Percy Lake—Major General Mackenzie.

> This reorganization can be effected with practically no dislocation of the existing system, as each divisional command will include one or more of the present military districts. The result of this change will be to place under each divisional commander the troops to form the division he would command on mobilization and tend to associate, during training, the units which would work together as a division in the field.

I do not know that I need enlarge at all upon that.

Mr. FOSTER. How many districts are there now?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Thirteen. But I may say by way of explanation that General French has separated eastern Canada from what he calls western Canada, in his report.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the line of division?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is the lakes. He proposes to leave western Canada under the districts as they are at present. The particular organization of which I am now speaking refers exclusively to eastern Canada, that is Ontario, or most of it, Quebec and the maritime provinces.

Mr. DANIEL. How many divisional commands are there?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be six divisions in eastern Canada. At the present time there are ten districts so that it really means a diminution in the number.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister give the boundaries of the different divisional commands of eastern Canada while he is on the subject?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. There will be three divisions in Ontario. One of these divisions will include two military districts. The province of Quebec is also divided into two divisions in place of the three districts which now separate the different parts of the province. The maritime provinces will be one division. As a matter of fact at the present time they are put under one larger command, but they are divided, and have been for many years, into three districts.

Mr. DANIEL. In the divisional command are all the officers who administer that division in the time of peace assembled at headquarters, or are there some remaining as they have been in different places, say in Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, all the staff officers are at the head of the division.

Mr. DANIEL. They will all be removed to Halifax then?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes. The other strong point which Sir John French made was that the training, or the education, both at the schools and in the camps, was not up to date, and he made some suggestions with regard to these matters, which will be carried into effect and which, I think, are very desirable. As a result of his criticisms, I am glad to say, that Major General Mackenzie is giving special attention to this matter. He proposes to take pains to see that officers from the permanent force shall be sent to the different parts of the country where they may be required in order to give the officers of the active militia an opportunity of learning their duties, so that they will be able to take their positions in the different units, regiments, &c., throughout the country, with advantage to themselves and to the militia generally.

Mr. FOSTER. What form will that instruction take?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is being carried out now, and we hope that during the present financial year it will be in full operation.

Mr. FOSTER. The officers of the permanent force are held at the disposal of the department to do this work?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. In what way do they do it? Do they hold schools or do they drill individually, or do they teach?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There are two or three ways. One plan is that the officers of different regiments throughout the country belonging to the active militia shall go to the schools to live in barracks, and pass through the necessary course of study. Another plan is to send men from the permanent force to the officers because the best of our officers perhaps are those who are men actively engaged in civil life, and cannot afford to leave for four or six weeks, or even three weeks It always has been to some extent done, but it is proposed to do it more than ever; that competent teachers shall be sent from the permanent force to teach the officers at their own homes and, of course, in camp.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that the improved method of training and education recommended by Sir John French?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. His reference there means up-to-date methods. For instance, Sir John French objected that the old-time method of marching past and presenting arms and all that sort of thing was a waste of time, and that instead of that the men in the different regiments should be taught the newer system of manoeuvres on a larger scale, conditions having entirely changed.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Will there be no marching past in future?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Not very much. The public are very much interested in the marching past, and they like to spend a day in camp and see it, and it

will be continued for one day or so in the year, but to nothing like the extent it used to be.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 170), to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Nipissing).

On section 1,

Mr. LANCASTER. This Bill raises the very-much discussed question of provincial rights, but it goes a good deal further, in the sense of having much less excuse for being brought into this parliament, than any other Bill that I have seen here, with the exception, perhaps, of one or two water-power Bills which have been much discussed. The purpose of the Bill is to incorporate a company professedly to build a railway from just outside the limits of the province of Ontario, in the province of Quebec at Lake Abitibi, across the northern part of Ontario for about 160 miles, traversing that part of northern Ontario which is being developed in the matter of railways by the government of Ontario at great expense to the people of the province, and by a policy which is just in its infancy, but in which a large amount of the assets of the province is involved. This professed main line, if it can be called such, does not traverse any part of the province of Quebec, and is practically of no use to that province. It is apparently put into the province of Quebec just as an excuse for this company coming to this parliament to get a charter. Then it proceeds 160 miles into that part of northern Ontario which is being developed at great expense to the people of Ontario by the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, which is a people's railway, projected for and by the people for that purpose. The object of this company is manifest, I think, from the fact that it asks authority to build two little branch lines, one running northeast and southwest, and the other north and south, right in the territory traversed by the Timiskaming and Northern, each of these lines being only 25 miles in length. Evidently that is the whole purpose of this railway company. If a charter should be granted for these two little lines, it should be got from the Ontario legislature. Under subsection 10 of section 92 of the British North America Act provincial legislatures have full power in regard to the following matters:

Local works and undertakings, other than such as are of the following classes:

(a.) Lines of steam or other ships, railways, canals, telegraphs and other works and undertakings connecting the province with any other or others of the provinces, or extending beyond the limits of the province.

(b.) Lines of steamships between the province and any British or foreign country.

(c.) Such works as, although wholly situate within the province, are before or after their execution declared by the parliament of Canada to be for the general advantage of Canada or for the advantage of two or more of the provinces.

Unless some of these conditions exist, the province has full power to incorporate a company for building these railways. A representative of the Ontario government appeared before the Railway Committee when this Bill was under consideration there, and stated that the Ontario government objected to this road being built, believing that it was not bona fide in regard to the so-called main line of 160 miles, and they asked for some guarantee that that line was going to be built. No guarantee was forthcoming other than the statement that the company intended to build it. It struck me that there was a guarantee that could be given, and I have therefore, given notice of an amendment which I will move if the committee thinks the Bill should pass at all. In these matters it is surely up to us to find out what the bona fides of a railway company are. We are surely not going to give a company a charter to build a railway through one province just from the threshold of another, if they do not intend to build it, but if they are simply using it as an excuse for getting a charter to build a provincial road. If this company, under the pretense of building an interprovincial railway, while intending to build only two little bits of railway wholly in the province of Ontario, secure a charter from this parliament, and then never build the road which alone gives them a right to come here, they would in that way perpetrate what is virtually a fraud both on this parliament and on the provincial legislature. If the House is with me in that view, it will not pass this Bill. But if it does not go with me that far, then when we come to section 7 I will move my amendment, which is to the effect that the company shall not be allowed to build these little roads unless they first build the so-called main line. If they are not going to build that road, they should not have the charter from this parliament. If they are going bona fide to build it, they should not object to my amendment.

On section 7,

Mr. BARKER. I should like to hear the hon. gentleman who is in charge of this Bill make some answer to the remarks that have just been made by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster). We have here a main line which may be of very considerable importance, and we have two short lines which can be of no use, I think, to this Dominion, so far as public service is concerned, unless the main line is built. I would like to know why there should not be a provision here that they might make the two short lines or branches after they have completed the main line. We ought to have some explanation of that.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). The member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster), was speaking when I came in, and I inferred from his remarks that his principal trouble was that he is afraid that the people who are at the back of this railway are not going to build it. Now, if they are going to build the main line and also these branches, I presume he would have no objection. He stated, I think, that the Ontario government required some kind of a guarantee that these people would go on and build this road. I would like to know what kind of a guarantee they should give other than asking for this charter. These people intend to build both the main line and the branches, and I think it is better to allow them to build either their branches or the main line, whichever they choose to build first, whichever will be most advantageous to themselves. I think if the member for Lincoln knew as well as I do how badly railroads are needed in that country, and what a great advantage they would be, instead of opposing a Bill like this, he would do everything he could to further it. I may say for his information, as well as for the information of the House, that the country up there is a great agricultural country, and unless it is developed by railroads it will remain as it always has been, of no use to any person. I think this is a very important road, and should be built. I have heard no good reason given why the branch lines should not be included, and certainly I have heard from the hon. member for Lincoln no good reasons for objecting to this Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought I had made it quite clear that I was contending for a different thing entirely from what the hon. gentleman has spoken of. I did not contend that this road should not be built, I only said that I wanted to be sure that this was not a trick played upon us by pretending to build a main line which they did not intend to build, and building the branches first and stopping there. I did not say the road was not needed, I do not want to retard railway development. But I want to make sure that this whole road is going to be built, and I want the big part of the road to be built first before the branches are built, because the branches, if built alone, are purely provincial matters and are to connect with a purely provincial railway. This Bill provides that the road is to be built from a point on the National Transcontinental railway in the province of Quebec, and then southerly around the east end of upper Lake Abitibi, which is in the province of Ontario, a total distance of 160 miles, and all in the province of Ontario except two or three miles.

If the promoters are sincere and intend building the whole of the railway, they will show their sincerity by accepting the amendment I am about to propose. I am heartily anxious to help them to build the whole of the road but do not want them never to touch the main line of 160 miles, which might be of some use to the Dominion as a Dominion road, and content themselves with building these two little branch lines of 25 miles each. The most vicious interference with provincial rights would be to incorporate a little railway 25 miles long, purely provincial, to connect with another provincial railway, a railway provincially owned, and in no sense under the control of this parliament. If the company want a charter for those two branch lines, they can get it from the Ontario legislature. Surely we are not doing a wise thing in incorporating against the protest of the province of Ontario, two little bits of provincial railway of 25 miles each to connect with a provincially owned and controlled railway. I beg therefore to move the following amendment to be inserted as section 2:

2. The powers of construction granted by paragraphs (b) and (c) of this section shall not be exercised until the line of railway authorized by paragraph (a) shall have been constructed to the respective junctions on that line to which the lines authorized by said paragraphs (b) and (c) are to extend.

Mr. NESBITT. The same argument which my hon. friend has used now was used in the Railway Committee, and the committee decided that as this was a peculiar section of country, and very probably the road would be built largely in the mining interests, we should give the company a charter. This is a peculiar section of the country, and it is very probable that these branch lines may require to be built first to accommodate people settling there. Therefore, the Railway Committee saw fit to give the charter to build the branch lines first.

Mr. BARKER. There are two arguments of which I am growing tired. One is that we have done a thing before, and therefore must do it again. The other is that a thing has been done in a committee, and therefore must be adopted in this House. In the committee we are told that a thing has been done before, and that is given as an excuse why we should do it again,—no question whether it is right or wrong, but only that it was done before—

Mr. NESBITT. If the hon. gentleman will allow me, I did not say that it should be done because it had been done before.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Nesbitt) said that it had been done in committee and therefore we should do it here.

Mr. NESBITT. That is what I said.

Mr. BARKER. The argument is precisely the same. Now, we have here a system of responsible government. It is useless for the ministers to profess that they are responsible only for government measures. Everybody knows that the ministry is responsible for the legislation of this House. Session after session we are deliberately violating the constitution of Canada, and the government know it. It is not done in so many words, but it is done. What would be said if I introduced a Bill in this House to construct a railway from Labrador to the western coast of British Columbia, with power at any or every point along that distance to construct twenty-five mile branches? Would not the allegation that such a thing was reasonable be something such as you would address to the occupants of a madhouse? But what worse would that be than what we have here? The gentleman asks a charter to run a line from one province to another, with two branches. And he objects—and it is important for members of the House to consider whether this shows good faith or bad faith—he objects to a clause being put in that he shall not make the branches until he has made the main line. What can more clearly show that this is an attempt to evade the constitution? Why the veriest simpleton in the country will understand that he wants the right to build the branches, and that is all he cares about. We have the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) here. I believe that he is trying to improve the railway law of this Dominion, and I think he has already done a great deal to improve that law. I ask him, what does he think of this deliberate, this evidently wilful and intentional attempt to break through the constitution? I have no interest in this matter, and do not know anybody connected with the company. But I appeal to the House to consider whether the man who promotes this Bill and professes to want to build a line from a point in Quebec to a point in Ontario with two branch lines, and says he must construct the branch lines first, is not deliberately trying to evade the provisions of the constitution. Are we in this House not to use common sense? Why do they try to evade the provisions of the constitution under which we live? I do not care a snap of my finger about the individual interest. The gentleman who is promoting this Bill is a friend of mine, and sits on our own side of the House. But I do not think that is a reason why I should act and vote contrary to the law of the land as I am asked to do. Why should not he put in a provision that if these parties want to build a branch line, they must make it a branch to an existing railway—that is they must build the trunk first, and then the branch?

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I think it is a disgrace to the intelligence of this House for any member to talk in that way about something that, as I believe, he does not know much about. Suppose the Transcontinental railway were completed from the junction to mileage 940, and not completed to mileage 1,000. And suppose one of these lines starts from one mileage, and the other from the other mileage, would there be common sense in the builders of the roads hauling stuff 60 miles by team to commence the building of another road? Is it not common sense to begin building a road from a point at which you have railway communication?

Mr. LANCASTER. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Gordon, Nipissing) wants an answer, this is the answer: There is a good deal less sense in parliament deliberately granting a charter under pretense of it being a Dominion railway, for two 25 mile roads that are entirely in Ontario. The hon. gentleman has not yet learned that the province of Ontario has power to incorporate railway companies. He proceeds entirely on the argument that if you do not hold a Dominion charter you have to haul stuff by horses. He does not know that Ontario has power to build railways, to build any railway entirely within the limits of the province and neither does he know that if the railway is entirely within the limits of the province this parliament has no jurisdiction to incorporate it at all. The hon. gentleman had better ask leave to withdraw this Bill, communicate with the promoters, and suggest that they take the Bill before the provincial authorities. As my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) says, it makes no difference whether this road is five or 125 miles long, if it is entirely within the province. The hon. gentleman promoting this Bill argues

that he must have the right to build these two little branch lines—he calls them branch lines although I believe they constitute the only road that will ever be built —that he must be allowed to build a road 25 miles long, but he does not realize that if they are in the province of Ontario not only is the province of Ontario the power to authorize their building, but this parliament has no power to authorize them to do anything. I repeat my hon. friend can do everything that he wants to do, without horses, without an automobile, without carts, under a provincial railway charter, and if my hon. friend knows that, probably he will see the necessity of accepting the suggestion, or else going to the province of Ontario, and getting his charter to build this line in all 50 miles long, which is entirey within the province of Ontario.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think we should have some idea from the minister how he views this matter. This may have to be a precedent. The House will have to decide upon this on the third reading. We cannot allow it to go through in a casual way, the House will have to take the responsibility ultimately, and if four other hon. gentlemen will stand up with me on the third reading we will divide upon it. I think the minister ought to say what the policy of the government is with reference to railways of this kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am interested in this discussion, because this is the first I have heard of this Bill. I confess I do not know much about it, because I was not in the committee. I hardly understand that it is divided into a main and two branch lines; it is rather divided into three sections. As a matter of practical railway construction I could understand a situation where it would be wise and, from a practical construction point of view, absolutely necessary to build the branch first.

Mr. BARKER. Is there any pretense of that here?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know; I am trying to get information. The Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway is not a branch of the Grand Trunk Pacific, but it will serve my illustration very well. It would have been very difficult on one section of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific to get supplies in if we had not had the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway to take them up. That branch, if we might call the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario a branch for the moment, was constructed before the Grand Trunk Pacific. If it had all been under one charter I imagine the construction company would have built that branch before attempting to construct the main line, in order to carry in its supplies. I could understand a situation where the cost of a railway could be materially reduced by building a branch line first in order to get the supplies in. I do not know whether that is the situation in this case or not. I am afraid that I am somewhat of a sinner—if sinner it can be called—in leaning to the view that it is better in the interests of the people and in the interests of transportation to have as many railways as possible under federal jurisdiction. I have had some experience during the last year. We have some railways under provincial jurisdiction—I am not speaking particularly of the province of Ontario now—to which the federal parliament has given aid. There is one case I have in my mind where a railway became so badly out of repair that it could not be operated and operations ceased. The rails were actually taken up, and there seemed to be no power on earth to stop the taking up and carting away of these rails by the owner of the road, although this parliament had given possibly $6,000 a mile towards the construction of the road. I am introducing legislation now with the object of effecting a remedy in such cases, but I found, in endeavouring to draw a clause, that we have no power within this parliament to deal with any road except those operating under a charter granted by the federal authority, or which has passed into the hands of a company that derives its power from the federal authority. That is one reason why I am very anxious to have all the railways possible brought under federal jurisdiction if it can be done without straining the constitution to the breaking point.

Mr. BARKER. Why to the breaking point?

Mr. LANCASTER. Where is the breaking point?

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe the constitution was devised for the good of the people.

Mr. LANCASTER. As the fellow says, 'which people,' the provincial people or the Dominion people?

Mr. GRAHAM. All the people. I think that the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada is the best machinery to be found in the world for the control of railways. I do not think it has an equal anywhere, and I think I am serving the interest of the people if I can get as many railways as possible under that jurisdiction. Take this railway, for instance, I see the view point of my hon. friend, and I do not like to think that we are being deceived in granting a charter for some line that there is no intention of constructing, but that the charter is merely to be used for the

construction of two small lines. It is not in my recollection that we have ever challenged the bona fides of a company when it places a plan before us which shows an interprovincial line, or when it gives good reasons why the line should come under federal jurisdiction. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), says that the application for the charter is fraudulent. I would not like to go that far. Perhaps I am too kind hearted, but I always give a fellow the benefit of the doubt, till I prove that he is wrong.

Mr. LANCASTER. It does not look it if he does not accept my amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may be the judgment of some, but perhaps the promoter says that he proposes to build the whole of the line covered by his charter, but it may be more convenient perhaps for financial reasons, or in connection with construction to build one of the proposed branch lines first, in order to facilitate the construction of the main line. The Bill can not get through to-night, and I will have an opportunity to look into it. I do not know anything about it, I was not at the committee, and I always hesitated to go against the finding of a committee particularly when I was not there and when I am not in as good a position to express an opinion as those who were present.

Mr. LANCASTER. The attendance at the committee was small, the yeas and nays were not taken but the majority was very close for carrying the Bill and rejecting the amendment.

Mr. NESBITT. My memory is that there were only one or two against it.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is neither polite nor fair for the hon. member to say that. I moved the amendemnt and half a dozen spoke in favour of it, and they certainly would have voted as they spoke, but as no vote was taken we cannot prove to a demonstration what the vote was. My hon. friend is entirely wrong in saying there were only one or two against it.

Mr. BARKER. Surely the Minister of Railways is not to set up his individual opinion against the clear terms of the British North America Act. If a railway asks a charter from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and wanted 25 miles in every province over that distance, surely the hon. gentleman would not force on parliament his individual opinion that the federal authority should take everything it could under its jurisdiction.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend's illustration were carried out he would get into a position where he would have no jurisdiction constitutionally or in any other way. As the Dominion we have jurisdiction in every province.

Mr. BARKER. The contention of the hon. minister in this respect is not in accordance with the clear terms of the constitution.

The order for private Bills having expired, the House resumed in Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I wish to make one or two more observations to conclude my general remarks with reference to the reorganization under Sir John French's scheme. This reorganization will not result in any considerable increase in the votes of money required; in fact, it will not result in any increase whatever. During the three years past and the present year the estimates show practically no increase whatever. It is proposed to carry out the general scheme of reorganization without materially increasing the vote. For the past six or seven years we have had an annual vote of about $1,300,000 for the purpose of purchasing equipment of various kinds, including artillery, saddlery, rifles, &c., and it is proposed under this scheme of Sir John French to go on at precisely the same rate. We will increase the artillery and cavalry—the only two branches of the service to be increased—precisely as we are able to purchase the necessary equipment with the annual vote of $1,300,000. That is the only other general observation I have to make with regard to the proposed reorganization.

Mr. BARKER. A great many people in Ontario have been anxious to know how far the report of Sir John French went. Was it with regard to a general reorganization or with regard to the personnel of the militia. Did he express any opinion as to the rank and file, as to the regimental officers, and as to the higher staff?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Sir John French spoke very highly of the rank and file; he spoke very highly of the officers; he spoke particularly well of the artillery; he was not so well pleased with the cavalry or with the infantry. But, on the whole, I think it is fair to say that he considered, in view of the short time of the annual drill, that the Canadian militia made a very good showing, and that with some changes which he suggested—some of which we can carry out, and some of which we will not be able to carry out—an effective force may be hoped for within a reasonable time.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the 3rd New Brunswick Regiment of Artillery drill this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes.

Mr. DANIEL. There must be some misunderstanding about that.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It was to have been disbanded, but I understand it is to be reorganized before the annual camp this year.

Mr. DANIEL. What is to be reorganized?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The battery to which my hon. friend refers.

Mr. DANIEL. They do not require any reorganization. I do not suppose there is a corps in the whole Dominion of Canada that is in better condition and has had better report for efficiency than the 3rd Regiment of Artillery. It has had a high record for years, and why this corps should have been dropped from the list of those to be drilled this year, I do not understand. Evidently the commanding officer has come to the conclusion, I presume with some good reason, that his corps was not to be drilled this year, and I shall read the order he issued.

3rd 'New Brunswick' Regiment, Canadian Artillery. Regimental orders by Lieut.-Col. John B. M. Baxter, commanding.

St. John, N.B., May 4, 1911.

1. In view of the fact that this regiment has not yet been ordered to perform annual training this year it is desirable that its organization should be preserved intact and that all ranks should endeavour, by the exercise of voluntary spirit, to maintain the corps in the state of efficiency which has been its pride for years.

2. The first battery of artillery in St. John was founded 118 years ago to-day. Since that time the artillery organization in this city and province has been continuous, and since 1860 there has not been a year when the regiment has not been on parade.

3. Under these circumstances the O.C. the regiment desires that all ranks shall join in performing voluntary drill during the coming season, paying particular attention to infantry drill and ceremonial, as the regiment will probably have several opportunities of appearing in public. It is to be distinctly understood that no one has authority to promise that any pay will be granted for the services so performed.

4. Roll books of attendance will be kept posted as usual. Recruits who are willing to serve on these terms will be accepted. O. C.'s batteries will make the usual arrangements for drill nights and other details.

5. The N.C.O.'s and men are particularly reminded that they are not in any way released from their obligation to serve in the militia by reason of the corps not being ordered to perform annual training. Any who may wish to join or serve in any other corps may apply for discharge in the usual way.

6. All ranks are specially reminded that it is not consistent with discipline in any way to criticise the action of their military superiors.

7. The officers of the regiment will attend a special service at St. Paul's church on the day of His Majesty's coronation. The hour, to be named afterwards, will be as nearly as possible that of the ceremony in Westminster Abbey. Full dress will be worn.

By order,
Major, Adj., 3rd Regt. C.A.

The name of the adjutant is not given here. It is quite evident from that order, issued by the commanding officer of this corps, that he must have had reason for believing that his corps was not going to perform annual drill this year. I do not know when the orders for annual drill are issued, but I presume that it has been customary to issue them previous to the present date. Of course, if the minister states that the corps is to drill, this adjutant must be labouring under a considerable misapprehension, and I would be glad to hear from the minister that the corps will be on the roster for drill as it always has been. While on my feet I would like to remind the minister that this corps is one of I think only three in the whole Dominion of Canada which, while it has been thoroughly efficient for years, a corps in which I take a great interest myself, having belonged to it for over twenty years, and one which I think stands as well on the records made by the inspectors who have inspected the various regiments as any corps in the Dominion, appears to be picked out in some way, so that it has not even one representative officer, non-commissioned officer or man—on the contingent which is to be taken to the coronation. I think there is good reason to ask the minister why this corps should not be granted the same privilege, if it is to be called such, that is given to every other corps, I believe, in the Dominion. If my memory serves me, the minister stated in his place in this House that there would be one representative of every corps in the Dominion in that coronation contingent. This corps, although it was asked to name one from each battery, named the men, but none has been chosen.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The committee will of course understand that it is impossible for me to keep in touch with the doings of each one of the 150 or 200 corps throughout the Dominion. I know Colonel Baxter, who is one of the most enthusiastic and keenest officers in Canada, and is a personal friend of my own. I am rather surprised, if matters are in the melancholy condition in which my hon. friend from St. John paints them, that Colonel Baxter had not intimated the fact to me, because he has not hesitated in the past, when he thought things were not being done as they ought to be done, to ask my direct intervention, and I have had the very great pleasure on more than one occasion of giving it. I did not know until

my hon. friend mentioned the fact that there was any difficulty of any kind with the 3rd Battery in so far as the coronation contingent is concerned. I shall be greatly surprised if it turns out that this regiment was not asked to send men. There were no non-commissioned officers invited to be sent; but men were to be chosen from every corps according to a certain rule laid down, and from those men, when they assemble at Quebec, non-commissioned officers will be selected. I will look into that matter at once. The selection of officers is an entirely different matter. We have about 40 officers to select from the active militia of Canada out of over 3.000 and from between 100 and 200 different corps, so that it is absolutely out of the question that we should select an officer from every corps or from perhaps one in ten.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister mistakes me if he thinks I made any such suggestion.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I understood my hon. friend to say that this is one of the few corps which have been slighted in the selection of officers.

Mr. DANIEL. As far as having any representative either officer, non-commissioned officer or man.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. As to the men, I agree that the matter must be investigated, but as to officers not at all. The province of New Brunswick has the very great honour of supplying the commandant of the coronation contingent. When I made up an estimate of the number of officers which should be sent from each province, it was then decided that the number from New Brunswick would be two. Colonel Maclean was selected as commandant, and Captain MacKee of the New Brunswick artillery was selected.

Mr. DANIEL. What for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Moncton battery.

Mr. DANIEL. How long has that been in existence?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know. He was selected because he had distinguished himself in South Africa, and wore the South African medal. He was selected by General Drury, who commands the maritime provinces.

Mr. DANIEL. What will the minister do with regard to having a representative from that corps on the contingent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Is my hon. friend sure that the colonel of that regiment was not asked to select men for the coronation contingent?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN.

Mr. DANIEL. I have my information direct from the colonel himself.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That he was not asked to do it?

Mr. DANIEL. That he was asked to name three men, one from each battery, and that he did so, but that not one of them was selected. He felt, and the whole corps feel, that they have been slighted. I believe I am correct in saying that the minister declared it was the intention that each corps should have a representative, in which case this corps is an exception, and some explanation is due.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. It is not an exception, and my hon. friend has admitted that the colonel was asked to make a selection. If he did not make any, that was his fault.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury). My hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) is under some misapprehension. I was told this evening by Colonel Baxter that he had been asked by the department to select men to go on the contingent, but that not seeing his regiment's name in the general order, he thought that had been cancelled. I asked him why he did not bring the matter to the attention of the department, and he said that he intended to do that today, but was not able to see the proper officer.

Mr. DANIEL. I am not labouring under any misapprehension at all, though my hon. friend may be. I am simply repeating the statement that the colonel made to me. If he has found out something else since, I did not know it. He told me that no man had been selected from his corps to go on the contingent.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury). Although he had sent in the names?

Mr. DANIEL. He named one from each of the three batteries, and those names were sent in. But not one of them was selected.

Mr. McLEAN (Sunbury). No notices have been sent out to the men who have been selected from the different corps, but I understand they will be sent out in a day or two.

Mr. DANIEL. If one of those men be selected, that will be satisfactory.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have no doubt but that the three men have been selected, and are going on the contingent.

Mr. BARKER. There are some others of us who may have some little discussion with the minister on this subject, and perhaps we might take up this item and resume the discussion on some other item.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. There will be a special item brought down on Monday to provide the necessary money to take the contingent to England, and that will be a very convenient time to discuss the coronation contingent generally.

Mr. DANIEL. What about the annual drill?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. That will come up more appropriately on resolution 81.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister has made a general statement, and there is a good deal of matter which we want to discuss in a general way.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would suggest that we might pass a few items and allow any discussion concerning them on any other item. There is one item, that of the annual drill, which I want carried, as we cannot have our annual drill without it, and that drill will be coming on in a very few days.

Mr. PERLEY. We have no desire to make any obstruction to the providing of money for the annual drill of our militia. If the minister will undertake that any question regarding annual drill may be asked on any other item that will be satisfactory, and when we next go into committee we may discuss the general question and the minister's statement.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like item 80 passed as well, because that involves payment to officers in the active militia and is connected with the annual drill.

Mr. DANIEL. Is there any increase in these allowances this year?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I think not. There is a decrease of $15,000.

Mr. MADDIN. I would like to ask the hon. minister what considerations prompted him in making appointments to the coronation contingent from the 78th regiment in Pictou? And why Captain J. W. Macdonald, 78th regiment. I would like to know what prompted the minister to appoint this young man, who has not yet attained his majority, and was only appointed last fall to a commission.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The young gentleman served in camp last year. he had passed all his military examinations, and is well reported upon by his senior officer. And, so far as I know, he is an admirable representative of the 78th regiment. He certainly has the right name to entitled him to represent a highland regiment.

Mr. MADDIN. I would inquire further if, when this matter comes up on Monday, we may discuss this aspect of the matter—a general discussion?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. General discussion, of course.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall item 80 carry?

Mr. DANIEL. On that consideration. It is with great regret that I came downstairs to-night. I think that, under all the circumstances we might not have met at all this evening, considering that half the House, or nearly half—and the better half I may say—are employed so very pleasantly elsewhere. But I think we will give the minister all his annual drill vote if he will close up shop.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Quite satisfied.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fisher. House adjourned at 9.33 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MONDAY, May 8, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates for the year ending 31st March, 1912, which on motion were referred to the Committee of Supply.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH GERMANY.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to call the attention of the right hon. Prime Minister to what appears to be a more definite statement regarding a matter I brought up the other day. In the morning paper I read the following:

The 'Standard's' Berlin correspondent wires: An understanding has been arrived at between Canada and Germany that negotiations for a reciprocal commercial treaty shall take place after Canada's commercial relations with United States have been regulated by the treaty now in sight. When the tariff war between Canada and Germany was terminated last year both governments agreed it was desirable to bring about a reciprocal commercial pact in the near future. At that time the Canadian and German governments concurred in the view that negotiations for a German-Canadian commercial treaty could not ensue until reciprocity had been established between Canada and United States.

Another portion of the dispatch says:

The truth is when the last tariff arrangement with the Dominion was effected in February, 1910, it was planned to renew the negotiations at no distant date for a definite treaty, but it was understood on both sides that such negotiations could only begin after Canada had regulated the tariff relations with the United States.

The assertion is also made that a definite understanding has been had between the two countries to that effect.

Mr. FIELDING. There is no understanding and there are no negotiations. I have no doubt the German government will be glad to open negotiations, but we have no such negotiations and no understanding as to when they will be taken up.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. RHODES. When may I expect a return with reference to the Parrsboro post office which was ordered on the 16th of January last?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that was brought down some little time ago. I shall make inquiry.

THE NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon, Nipissing.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is on amendment to section 7.

Mr. LANCASTER. That was an amendment which I submitted on Friday evening and which the Minister of Railways, who is not present, promised to consider. The question was how far we should interfere with provincial rights, and the minister said he would consider that point before the Bill came up again. I see that the promoter of the Bill (Mr. Gordon) is not here either. I am prepared to submit my amendment, but do not want to take advantage of anybody's absence.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Railways is confined to his room to-day, and the Bill, therefore, better stand.

Progress reported.

TORONTO HARBOUR.

House in committee on Bill (No. 175) to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto.—Mr. Macdonell.

Mr. MACDONELL. The Bill, with the exception of section 16, passed this committee. Section 16 was held over for the consideration of the Minister of Public Works. Some point arose in that connection which seemed to call for investigation; and possibly since the committee last sat, the Minister of Public Works has seen the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and may be able to make a statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I made a few remarks on this Bill at the last meeting of the committee, I was not aware that all the powers of regulating and developing the harbour front could only be exercised by the Harbour Commissioners by by-law, which must be submitted to the approval of the Governor in Council. And considering that amendment, I have no further objection to offer to the section.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

GRAIN GROWERS' GRAIN COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 171) to incorporate a Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—Mr. Rutan.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The Bill has been considered in committee and sections 1 to 12 inclusive have been carried.

On section 13,

Mr. FOSTER. When this Bill was before the committee on a previous occasion the sections up to the point you have named, Mr. Chairman went through without anybody, seemingly, paying atention to the matter. Some questions that were asked found no answer. This is an important Bill, and somebody ought to take responsibility with reference to it. The powers asked for are very wide, and I am not sure whether the government has looked into the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have looked into it. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) has gone into the matter, and I think he satisfied himself that the powers given under this Bill, though certainly very wide, are not wider than the company could have obtained by simply applying to the Under Secretary of State for letters patent of incorporation. The Senate has looked carefully into it, and, though the powers are wide, yet, for the reason I having given or for some other reason, the Senate have not thought it right to refuse the powers. And, so far as I can see no interest can be prejudiced by the measure. Certainly no representations on the subject having been made to me. The House, no doubt, will hear from the promoter.

Mr. RUTAN. The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated about all that is to be said on the matter, except perhaps on one point. The other evening, when the Bill was before the committee, some objection was raised to the powers respecting banking. But the Bill as it is

now in your hands, Mr. Chairman, includes a new section which reads as follows:

18. Nothing in this Act shall be deemed to authorize the company to issue any note payable to the bearer thereof or any promissory note intended to be circulated as money or as the note of a bank, or enter into the business of banking or insurance or railway construction or operation under the provisions of the Railway Act.

Mr. FOSTER. The statements that the powers are not wider than those which may be got under the Companies' Act without recourse to parliament is not altogether a recommendation of this Bill. I do not know how much supervision the Finance Department exercises or what responsibility it takes with reference to the issuing of these charters, but certainly most extraordinary powers have been given to companies as I have noticed them going through the 'Canada Gazette.' I think it is an axiom that will be pretty well assented to that the title of a Bill ought to be an indication of the powers granted under it, so that one who reads the title may thereby understand generally what the Bill is intended to do. Now the title of this Bill is 'An Act to Incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company.' But when you look at the Bill you find that it goes away beyond grain, and by what connection or process of logic I do not know. Here is section 13:

The objects or purposes of the company shall be to produce, manufacture, import, export, buy, sell, deal in and deal with all cereals——

Now, that is grain, and comes fairly within the limts of the title. It goes on:

—fruit, vegetable, animal, or other products of the farm——

That does not go very far away, for it all comes from the farm and there is a logical connection.

—all products or by-products thereof——

That is logical also.

—and all machinery, implements, goods, wares and merchandise which may be used in the production and manufacture of products of the farm,——

That also has a connection with the purposes of the Bill.

—and all articles, substances and things which may be utilized in the said production or in the maintenance, cultivation, improvement and development of farms.

That seems to me to go almost as wide as the horizon. It would enable them to become a plough manufacturing company or a harvester company, or a company for the production of anything that may be used on the farm. It will make them almost universally a manufacturing company. A man is not (in the Northwest) likely to go out to work without a shirt on his back, and it might be logically taken from these powers that if a shirt was necessary to a man working the company would have a perfect right to go into the manufacturing of shirts, to clothe farmers when they work, and the same with shoes caps and other articles of wear. It goes on:

And, without restricting the generality of the foregoing expressions——

That is a pretty rich phrase. After taking in the universe, you say you do not want to be restricted because there may be other universes that you may wish to conquer. There may be abstruse problems relating to the farms of the future, such as the manufacture of sunlight, or the using of the vital forces——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Sunbeams from cucumbers.

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, if they wanted to manufacture sunbeams they would annex the Premier (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), and their factory would be complete.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I wish you would appreciate that.

Mr. FOSTER. I do.

And, without restricting the generality of the foregoing expressions, to carry on the business of a farmer in all its branches.

Now, section 14 goes on. And, really, has the Prime Minister looked into this at all?

For the objects and purposes set forth in section 13 of this Act, the company may:

(a.) Manufacture, buy, sell, deal in and deal with timber——

It may become a timber company.

—lumber,——

It may become a lumber company.

—hardware,——

It may become a general hardware company.

—bricks, stone, tiles, wood products of all kinds, building materials of every description, and all kinds of merchandise and supplies.

It may become a haberdashery, anything, almost, in the wide world in the way of merchandise and supplies. It goes on:

(b.) Manufacture, develop, transmit, distribute and use pneumatic, hydraulic, electric or other power or force for any purpose for which the same may be used——

Now there would be a logical connection if it were allowed to engage in the manufacture of these things as an agent or instrument of the farm; but it is only restricted by the phrase 'for the objects and purposes set forth in section 13.' In fact,

it does not only not restrict, but it carries away from it any possible restriction.

—for any purpose for which the same may be used——

They may become an electric lighting company to supply electric light for a town; they may become a hydraulic company, a pneumatic company, and may lay tubes for the transmission of merchandise all through the country, not for the sake of spouting grain or other products of the farm, but 'for any purpose whatsoever.'

—and manufacture, buy, sell and deal in all machinery, implements and material necessary for the manufacture, development, transmission and distribution of pneumatic, hydraulic, electric or other force: Provided, however, that any distribution or transmission of power or force beyond the lands of the company shall be subject to local and municipal regulations in that behalf.

(c.) Purchase, acquire, develop, operate, hold, dispose of or otherwise turn to account timber lands, timber licenses, coal lands, quarries, water-powers and other lands for the purposes of the company;

(d.) Subscribe for, purchase or otherwise acquire and hold, sell or otherwise dispose of the shares, bonds, debentures or other securities of any bank, or of any printing or publishing company, but in the case of a bank, to no greater extent than one-fourth of the capital stock of such bank.

That is a strange power to give to a grain company.

(e.) Purchase or otherwise acquire, build, operate and charter ships, barges, vessels or other means of transporting passengers and cargo by water.

That clause is not limited to the purposes of this company, it is widened until there is no restriction upon it at all. They may become a shipbuilding or ship running company for the transportation of passengers and freight other than those necessary for their own operation.

(f.) Enter into any arrangement with any authorities, municipal, local or otherwise, that may seem conducive to the company's objects, or any of them——

May seem conducive to themselves.

—and obtain from any such authority any rights, privileges and concessions which the company may think it desirable to obtain and carry out, exercise and comply with any such arrangements, rights, privileges and concessions.

(g.) Acquire or undertake the whole or any part of the business, property and liabilities of any person or company carrying on any business which the company is authorized to carry on, or possessed of property suitable for the purposes of the company.

The company is authorized practically to carry on every business; they are not only authorized to carry on any business, but to enter into financial arrangements for the sake of the company, into buying, selling and the like of that.

(h.) Apply for, purchase or otherwise acquire, any patents, licenses, concessions and the like, conferring any exclusive or non-exclusive, or limited rights to use, or any secret or other information as to any invention which may seem capable of being used for any of the purposes of the company——

That is for any purpose whatsoever.

—or the acquisition of which may seem calculated directly or indirectly to benefit the company, and use, exercise, develop or grant licenses in respect of, or otherwise turn to account, the property, rights or information so acquired.

It seems to me that is wide enough to send them up to the Yukon and get gold concessions.

(i.) Construct, improve, maintain, work, manage, carry out or control any roads, ways, tramways, branches or sidings on lands owned or controlled by the company,——

Not only gives them the right to own any kind of lands, any kind of concessions, but it gives them every particular privilege.

—bridges, reservoirs, water courses, wharfs, manufactures, warehouses, elevators, electric works, shops, stores, office buildings and other works and conveniences, and contribute to, subsidize or otherwise assist or take part in, the construction, improvement, maintenance, working, management, carrying out or control thereof.

Pretty wide power that is.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is the standard called for in the Ontario Act.

Mr. FOSTER. What does my hon. friend think about the wideness of the powers? Can he imagine anything that they cannot do?

(j.) Lend money to customers and others having dealings with the company——

That is, they may lend not simply to their own people, they are authorized to lend money generally, no restrictions to whom they may lend.

Mr. RUTAN. That clause has been amended in the committee.

Mr. FOSTER (reading):

—and guarantee the performance of contracts by any such persons; notwithstanding the provisions of section 167 of the Company's Act.

(k) Draw, make, accept, endorse, discount, execute and issue promissory notes, bills of exchange, bills of lading, warrants and other negotiable or transferable instruments.

There is no limit to it.

(l.) Sell or dispose of the undertaking of the company, or any part thereof, for such consideration as the company may think fit, and in particular, for shares, debentures or

securities of any other company having objects altogether or in part similar to those of the company.

How large a part? A very infinitesmal part, I suppose.

(m.) To do all or any of the above things as principals, agents, contractors, trustees or otherwise, and either alone or in conjunction with others.

(n.) To do all such other things as are incidental or conducive to the attainment of the objects or purposes of the company.

It struck me as I read that over that, although such things may have passed this parliament, it is an exceedingly wide franchise to give to a grain growers' company or any other company. I suppose some good-hearted individuals will be ready to say that I oppose this Bill because it belongs to the grain growers, that they are introducing it. I give every privilege to any person to make that assertion who wishes. I am used to that kind of thing, and it doesn't bother me a bit. I do not go as far as the Minister of Finance went the other day, when he intimated that almost he would let a poor thing go through rather than have somebody say that he didn't like to do a thing for a certain class of people. I think that legislation like this is extremely dangerous. Time was in this House when no legislation like that could possibly go through, and that not very long ago. But the government must take the responsibility. Mine is but a voice in the wilderness, but it will be raised for a moment to direct the attention of the treasury board, if they take any interest in these things, to the almighty powers that are being given to this company.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I quite agree with the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in his remarks as to the wideness of the powers granted by this charter. When the Bill was last before the committee I drew attention to the same feature, and was then assured by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that the same powers would have been granted automatically if the company had applied under the Companies' Act. To that assurance there is now added a further assurance to the same effect by the Prime Minister. Consequently, while I cannot but sanction many of the remarks by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) as to the danger of such almost indiscriminately wide powers passing this House, still I must again take the point that, under the assurance to which I have referred, this is not the stage at which to take the objection. If this company, merely by application under the Companies' Act, could secure all the powers granted in this Bill, surely I would not be justified in saying to them: If you come openly before parliament individually and make application we will shut you out of powers that you might have got automatically under the Act that we have ourselves passed. Surely such a position on the part of parliament would be inconsistent and unreasonable. If there are dangers in the general granting of such utterly limitless powers as this Bill provides, then the place to remedy that condition, and to curtail the powers is in the Companies' Act itself.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the hon. gentleman think that if they have all these powers they should have them under the name of the Grain Growers' Grain Company?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I was coming to that point. I have said nothing that can be urged as an argument in favour of the title of the Bill, in fact to my mind the gravest point of danger in all this legislation is in chartering a company with indiscriminately wide powers under a distinctive name. In that way the public is liable to be deceived. It may tax the ingenuity of the promoter of the Bill, it may even tax the still greater ingenuity of the fathers of the Bill, to provide a name that can be called distinctive and at the same time can be called a safe one for the proposed company to assume, but an attempt should be made to make such name better conform to the general character of the charter. It seems to me that the word 'grain' when it occurs the second time in the title of the company, might very well be omitted in favour of something more general; the grain feature of the purposes of the company is surely well enough to emphasize in the expression 'Grain Growers.' So if the difficulty as to name could be met it seems to me that parliament would not be justified in raising further objection to the Bill, on the general ground at least.

The applicants for this charter are just as much entitled to secure it as any other applicants; consequently if parliament—and I believe the assurances we have are correct, that a reference to the 'Canada Gazette' will show that as wide powers are granted under the Companies' Act—if parliament by its Act confers on individuals the right to go to our Department of State and secure just as wide powers as these, then, we have no justification for stepping in and in an individual case refusing the powers asked. The only objection that I take is as to the title. Under that title I fear shares will be purchased with an assurance as to the purposes of the company that really is a false one. The point is doubly important when we remember that heretofore in Manitoba a company under the very same name has been operating, and that company is much

more restricted in its powers than this company will be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend sure of that? The promoter of the Bill tells me that the powers are wider than these.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How can you make them wider?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They could be made wider. In this Bill the powers given by section 14, must be exercised solely for the purpose of carrying out the objects and purposes set forth in section 13. There is a limitation. I have only the word of my hon. friend who is in charge of the Bill as to the powers granted by the Manitoba charter being wider, and he tells me they are wider. I have not seen the Manitoba charter.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The Minister of Public Works says that one clause of the charter provides that the powers therein granted shall only be utilized in so far as they serve the general purpose of the company, and argues that that is a restriction. If the general purposes of the company are utterly unlimited, how is that a restriction?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not unlimited under section 13.

Mr. MEIGHEN. My reason for saying that the Manitoba powers are not as wide is that I have myself, as solicitor, applied to the Provincial Secretary's Department at Winnipeg, where the charter of the original company would be granted, and I know that if the application made anything like so large a demand on the generosity of that department, the powers asked would be very seriously curtailed before the charter was issued. I have not examined this particular charter, but I would be surprised if the powers under which they have been operating are as wide as those contained in this Bill. The company in Manitoba has done business for many years, and the scope of its business has been limited to such pursuits as should be contemplated under the old title. It is evidently the intention of the company to widen the scope of its operations, as I gather from other sources than the Bill. If that is the intention, the title of the Bill should be altered. I do not think that is raising an insuperable objection, and I have no intention of raising such an objection. My objection is one that could, within reason be overcome, and if it is overcome any opposition, if it may be called opposition, that I have raised to the Bill would be at once withdrawn.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I cannot see the force of the objection raised by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, to this company being incorporated under the name of the Grain Growers Grain Company, Limited,

for the obvious reason he mentioned, that the company has been doing business in Manitoba, under a joint stock company charter, and I believe in Alberta, under a foreign company's license, for almost five years. I am not positive that they have been doing any business in Saskatchewan, but they have acquired certain assets in Alberta, and certain large assets in Manitoba. To my mind it would be manifestly unfair for parliament to change the name of the company after it has been doing business with that name for five years.

Mr. FOSTER. A name exactly similar?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Yes. The statement made by the Minister of Public Works with respect to the powers granted to this company by the government of Manitoba being as wide as the powers contained in this Bill is, to my mind, perfectly correct.

Mr. FOSTER. In what year was that charter granted?

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I have here what purports to be a copy of the letters patent granted by the Provincial Secretary of Manitoba, and dated July 20, 1906, almost five years ago. It is a copy of the charter of the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited, which is the same name as we are asked to grant, under the proposed Act of incorporation. I beg to call attention to some of the powers granted in the charter of the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited—the same name exactly—and it will be seen that these powers are exactly the same as asked for in this Bill. They have power to buy, handle, and deal in all kinds of grain and seed, both as owners and agents; power to manufacture, buy, handle, and deal in agricultural implements and machinery, coal, coal oil, gasoline, and a large list of other commodities; power to acquire by purchase, lease or otherwise, with the consent of the owners, mines, mining lands, minerals, of all kinds; power to acquire by purchase, lease, or otherwise, with the consent of the owners, water-powers, water-power rights and privileges; and to develop for the purposes of the company or lease, or sell, electrical, steam, pneumatic gas, hot-air, and all descriptions of power. There is a clause here permitting them to manufacture bicycles and automobiles which one would not expect the farmers of Canada to deal in. The original letters patent contain everything contained in the purposed Bill, and why should parliament curtail the powers they have for five years enjoyed under a provincial charter? Although the powers asked for are wide, they are properly limited by section 18 prohibiting them from building railroads, which the hon. member for Prince Albert asks to add to the Bill. There is no reason why the Bill should not go through with that amendment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If this were purely an abstract question I would be disposed to agree very generally with my hon. friend from North Toronto. The wide powers asked for by this company have shocked his Conservative principles, and I tell him frankly that they shock my Liberal principles, or rather the principles I learned in the school I was brought up in. But my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) must observe that the ideas in which he and I have been brought up have been very much enlarged of late years. When first the creation of corporations became somewhat general, parliament was very chary in the granting of charters, and the powers given were severely scrutinized, and restricted practically to the special object for which incorporation was sought. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Foster) knows that in his experience, as in mine, there has been an everincreasing tendency to widen these powers until now we give to companies, as he has said, a sort of omnibus charter to do any kind of business at all. When you look into the rationale of the thing, I do not think there can be any danger in granting these wide powers except the possible danger of deceiving the public.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very great danger.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is. But the public is educated to the change, and it is realized now that if you authorize a grain company the title would not at all deceive those who deal with that company into the belief that its powers would be restricted to operations in grain. There would be no deception of the public because it is now generally known that there are wider powers granted than the title would indicate. This company has been granted already powers by the legislature of Manitoba, and we are now asked to confirm these powers, but with certain restrictions added. I understand that in the western states you can file your application to build a railway at the Capitol and some officer corresponding to our Secretary of State looks into the matter, and the charter is granted as a matter of course.

Mr. FOSTER. Without any guarantees?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So I am told. I understand that some such powers were sought by this Bill, but that is further than I would go, and that, I think, parliament should go. The granting of such wide powers may be contrary to the views of my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), and, perhaps, contrary to my own views, but the western farmers and the western people generally, are disposed to seek corporate powers which we would never think of asking for in the east. It may be that we will have to advance to the same views as they have. Though this granting of wide powers in charters has been going on for some time, it has not come to my notice that it has produced any ill results.

Mr. FOSTER. I admit there is something in what my right hon. friend has said, although I do not admire his dialectics in this respect. He says that I am a Conservative and that he used to be.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no, I never said that.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there is more than a modicum of truth in that, if history informs us correctly, but I think that even he is not quite liberal enough to swallow so extensive a programme with so modest a name. My chief objection is the possible danger of deception because of the wide divergence between the name of the company and what it may do. There are two forces in the world: one Liberal, and the other Conservative, and if you go through the world's history it is difficult to award the palm to either as being the most beneficial to the race.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is not difficult for me.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be if my right hon. friend studied it a bit. The maddish projects of Liberalism have been nipped in the bud by the quantum of Conservatism which has always existed in the world, and which I hope always will. On the other hand, Conservatism advances from year to year, because changed conditions necessitate a widening process in the application of old principles of Conservatism. I hope the day will never come when there will not be these two forces in the world, the one tending to restrict mad, headlong haste, and the other tending to stretch out and broaden that which would otherwise be cribbed, cabined and confined.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And in the interests of the people, progress and advancement must come.

Mr. FOSTER. These two forces have their cycles; one comes down and the other goes up, and they keep their balance pretty well, and so my right hon. friend had better prepare for the balance which will swing the other way pretty soon. I sound the note of warning that this Bill represents Liberalism gone too far. They cannot carry on all these projects without getting money, and they appeal for money under the distinctive guise of a grain company and under that distinctive badge ninety-nine men out of a hundred will subscribe to it because of its purpose in that respect. There is great danger that under a certain guise a company could carry on almost every kind of operation under the sun. To show my right hon. friend just what took place, I may say that in my

time, and it was not so very long ago, a company was restricted to the simple purpose indicated by its name, and even subsidiary operations were not allowed, because they were not considered a legitimate part of that purpose. That idea has completely passed away. Such has been the extension of work in the world that the next step was to allow not only the prime object of the company, but what might be subsidiary thereto, and what might be necessary for its operation. That was a legitimate and fair extension, and I am willing to go as far as that principle can extend. But I think it is dangerous to put a big company, which acts as a grain company, into the business of mining, stock-buying and all that sort of thing. I think that goes beyond where we ought to go, and I take exception, mildly but still firmly, to the idea that because some other legislature has granted extraordinary rights and powers, therefore we should do it. I am sorry the Finance Minister is not here, because I would like to inquire of him whether there is any supervision at all over these companies who are getting charters without coming to parliament, or any revision of the powers asked for by them. I am loth to take the statement of the Prime Minister, and of the Minister of Public Works that company charters have been granted equally wide with this. Some very wide ones, I know, have been granted, but I think it would trouble them to find one as wide as this is. I would like to know whether the government applies any supervising machinery at all to keep within bounds the companies that ask for charters without coming to this House. Does the Companies' Act require that a return should be made to the government of the operation of these companies?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only as to loan companies, I think.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is well worth consideration whether every one of these companies should not be required to make a return to the government.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). There is a Bill before the House this session making provision for that. I do not think that under the Bill the companies are bound to supply the returns, but they may be called for.

Mr. FOSTER. I am stating my general objection to the granting of these wide powers in this Bill. If it is allowed to pass, the government will have to take the responsibility, and it will not be in the power of the First Minister, or of the Minister of Finance, to say that I am equally responsible, because I did not object to the Bill when it went through parliament.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend has called attention to a difficulty that might arise by reason of the name. I may say that that is the only objection I saw to the Bill; but, on considering the matter, I do not see that we could choose a name for the company if my hon. friend in charge of the Bill was not willing to have the name changed. I do not see why we should refuse these powers, which are substantially the same as were contained in the charter granted by the Manitoba legislature, and they are no wider than the powers that might properly be given by letters patent issued by the Secretary of State.

Mr. FOSTER. Does my hon. friend know that, or is that a general statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know that, because when I was Attorney General in the government of New Brunswick, I took objection for some time to the granting of wide powers, and my attention was called to the powers granted for years by the Dominion government, and also by other provinces. The government of Ontario is the chief sinner in this respect, if there is any sin about it.

Mr. FOSTER. It used to be, I know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The province of Ontario first gave these broad powers. My hon. friend made a very pleasant speech in regard to the Prime Minister and his own Conservatism. I presume that if my hon. friend saw that the present government of Ontario had recognized and granted a license to a company incorporated by the parliament of Great Britain conferring upon it practically the same powers as are contained in this Bill, he would say that was Conservatism enough.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not take my Conservatism from anybody.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let me call attention to a license which has been granted by the government of Ontario, as late as the 15th of April of the present year, to the Alberta Land Company, to do business in the province of Ontario. It is incorporated, says the notice published in the 'Ontario Gazette,' by the parliament of the United Kingdom of Great Britain, and it is given the power first, to acquire lands; secondly, to improve the lands; thirdly, to stock the same; to go into the buying of all kinds of stock, cattle, sheep and produce; to buy, manufacture, sell and deal in all kinds of goods, chattels, merchandise and effects; to carry on the business of farmers, graziers, meat and fruit preservers, planters, miners, metallurgists, quarry-owners, brick makers, builders, contractors for the construction of works, both public and private, merchants, importers and exporters, printers, publishers, ship-builders ship-owners brokers and any other businesses which may seem calculated, directly or indirectly, to develop the company's property or business; to search or prospect,

excavate, quarry, dredge for ores, and to extract, reduce and treat the same by any process whatsoever; to pay for any property or business in shares or debentures; to sell, lease, license, mortgage, turn to account or otherwise dispose of any of the property, concessions, rights or privileges of the company; to exercise within the province of Ontario all such powers under the laws of Ontario. There you find a company incorporated under the name of a land company, and yet given the power to engage in mining, quarrying, buying and selling merchandise of all kinds, owning ships and doing a large business, which could in no way be associated by the investor with the business of carrying on a land company.

Mr. FOSTER. The hon. gentleman will not say that it is at all as wide as this Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Substantially so, because if you take this Bill you will find that after all section 13 is the one which sets out the objects of the company. These are limited to manufacturing and dealing in cereals, fruit, vegetable, animal or other products of the farm, all products or by-products thereof, and all machinery, implements, goods, wares and merchandise which may be used in the production and manufacture of products of the farm, and all articles, substances and things which may be utilized in the said production or in the maintenance, cultivation, improvement and development of farms. All these are pretty closely connected with the foregoing business of farming. Then, 'without restricting the generality of the expressions, to carry on the business of farming in all its branches.' When we come to section 14, you will see a limitation. It may not be very perfect, but still it is a limitation. 'For the objects and purposes set forth in section 13 of the Act, the company may do certain things.' It seems to me that in the bona fide carrying out of the powers contained in section 14, the directors must always have in mind the purposes and objects set forth in section 13. They may build electric railways through their properties, develop electricity to supply their farms with motive power, buy steamers for the purpose of carrying grain produced by their operations, to the different markets of the world, and do all these things connected with the carrying out of the object mentioned in section 13.

Mr. BLAIN. Is the hon. gentleman taking his politics from the province of Ontario now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not know there were any politics in this. I am surprised at the suggestion of my hon. friend.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). It seems to me that one of the objections is that this is a very small name for a large company. I give this suggestion to the promoter. Call it the almighty powers of the grain growers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear. There is something in that.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that there ought to be one extension of the powers to be given this company. It ought to have the power to manufacture M. P.s of the Liberal persuasion.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the reason this company has made application to this House for a charter? Why did it not apply for letters patent?

Mr. RUTAN. The only reason is that they were taking over a growing concern, the Grain Growers' Company, and assuming all its liabilities, and took this method of getting a charter.

Mr. BARKER. The only reason why the company did not ask for a charter from the Secretary of State is because, when a charter is granted by the Secretary of State, the company is bound to make returns to the provincial government. The right hon. gentleman is probably aware that there is a Bill before a special committee for weeks, and a great deal of care has been taken to secure such returns as will give to the shareholders in these companies the fullest information; but by getting the charter asked for here they will not be under the obligation of disclosing their proceedings.

On section 14,

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The section (b) has been amended to read as follows:

(b) manufacture, develop, transmit, distribute and use pneumatic, hydraulic, electric or other power or force for any purpose for which the same may be used, and manufacture, buy, sell and deal in all machinery, implements and material necessary for the manufacture, development, transmission and distribution of pneumatic, hydraulic, electric or other power or force: Provided, however, that any distribution or transmission of power or force beyond the lands of the company shall be subject to section 247 of the Railway Act and so far as applicable to the Electricity Inspection Act of 1907, and the local and municipal regulations in that behalf.

Mr. NESBITT. In all of these companies we put in a clause that they cannot do anything of that kind without the consent of the municipality by by-law. But the words here 'shall be subject to local and municipal regulations' are not as strong as permission expressed by by-law.

Mr. MACDONELL. In the Railway Committee, Bills for the incorporation of railway companies are always safeguarded with provisions to the effect mentioned by the hon. member for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt).

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The clerk of the committee says that this is the standard clause taken from the other Bills.

Mr. MACDONELL. There is power here not only to manufacture, but also to distribute electrical energy. That distribution would involve the right to distribute in the usual way by wires and poles. Yet there is no provision as to the assent of the municipality for entering or crossing highways or public places. These safeguards have been put in Bills in the Railway Committee. And, unless section 247 of the Railway Act covers the regulation of rates to be charged for power, there is no provision to limit through the Board of Railway Commissioners the rates to be charged by the company, for electrical energy. And the same in regard to telegraph and telephones —there is no regulation either of rates nor is there any safeguard of the rights of municipalities.

Mr. NESBITT. These precautions are provided in other charters. There was one the other day that the Finance Minister sent back to get this clause put in. And this one should be treated the same as the others.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). So it is. The committee has that in.

Mr. NESBITT. I do not so understand it. Section 247 of the Railway Act does not cover it—certainly does not cover the question of charges.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It was the clerk of the committee who had this prepared, and he said it was a standard clause put in the other Bills.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the objection is well taken by my hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell). There does not seem to be any control over this company as to entering the bounds of municipalities, nor is there any safeguard as to the rates to be charged. There is no reason why the safeguards put in other Bills should not be put in this.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). Does not the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) think that the clause subject to local and municipal regulations in that behalf would prevent the company from distributing power within any municipality unless it got the authority of a by-law?

Mr. FOSTER. I have been in the Railway Committee and have seen the committee jump like a panther on a clause in a Bill which did not provide in the most explicit way for the guarding of municipal rights. That safeguarding of municipal rights, so far as my experience goes, has been expressed in this way. Then, again, it does not say anything as to rates. Here is a company which is going to carry on telephones and telegraphs and the transmission of intelligence, and there is absolutely no control over its rates. We must be consistent. No matter for whom the Bill is we must have these safeguards put in.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the purpose of the amendment is to bring in the whole of section 247 of the Railway Act, then, both hon. gentlemen are partly right. I have the section before me, and it proposes that the consent of the municipality must first be obtained. But, unfortunately for the powers of municipalities this section provides that, if the consent is not given, the Board of Railway Commissioners may override a municipality and grant the power desired. Personally, I do not think that a municipality ought to be shorn of its power over its highways. I think they are the best judges in this matter. The section is a very long one, with many subsections, but I will read the parts that apply:

When any company is empowered by special Act of the parliament of Canada to construct, operate and maintain, lines of telegraph, or telephone or for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, the company may, with the consent of the municipal council or other authority having jurisdiction over any highway, square or other public place, enter thereon for the purpose of exercising the said powers, and, as often as the company thinks proper, may break up and open any highway, square or other public place, subject, however, in the following provisions:

It then proceeds to lay down a lot of rules with regard to wires, and poles, supervision by an officer of a municipal council, and so on, until we come to subsection (g):

Whenever any city, town or incorporated village is desirous of having lines of telegraph, or telephone, or lines for the conveyance of light, heat, power or electricity, placed under ground, the board may,——

That is the Board of Railway Commissioners:

—may, on the application of such city, town or incorporated village, and on such terms and conditions as the board may prescribe, require the company to thus place its lines or wires under ground, and abrogate the right given by this section, or by the special Act, to carry lines on poles, in such city, town or incorporated village.

That is a section for the benefit of municipalities. Where the company does not serve the municipality they can apply to the board. Then the converse is provided:

If the company cannot obtain such consent from such municipal council or other authority, the company may apply to the board for leave to exercise such powers, and upon such

application shall submit to the board a plan of such highway, square, or other public place, showing the proposed location of such lines, wires and poles.

Then it goes on that the board may, notwithstanding the refusal to consent of the municipality, allow the matter to be so done:

Mr. FOSTER. How about the regulation of rates?

Mr. LANCASTER. That is under another section. Then, at the end of the section it is provided:

Nothing contained in this section shall be deemed to authorize the company to exercise the powers therein mentioned for the purpose of selling or distributing light, heat, power or electricity in cities, towns or villages, without the company having first obtained consent therefore by a by-law of the municipality.

There is another quasi-protection so far as cities, towns and villages are concerned, but not to all municipalities. There are many other municipalities whose roads are valuable to them, municipalities in an embryo state, but growing. I think that all municipalities ought to be protected, whether in their infancy or in an advanced state of growth. But, because of the want of satisfactory provisions, or to meet some complication, we do sometimes insert a general clause providing that these things are only to be done by consent of the municipality expressed by by-law. We also make a distinct provision that rates and charges are to be subject to the control of the Railway Commission. I think we ought to put that clearly in this Bill. I do not offer an amendment at this stage, but I would suggest that the amendment before the Chair be so worded that the consent of the municipalities be obtained, and that the rates be subject to the control of some authority.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How would it do to put in a clause like this:

Provided, however, that in no case shall the company place any poles in or upon any highway, or stretch any wires along such highway or over any public square or park without the consent of the municipal council in which the same is situated.

That would still send it to the board for regulation.

Mr. FOSTER. But it does not meet the question of rates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But it makes it subject to the local municipal regulations. They would make a condition of having reasonable rates before they would give consent.

Mr. NESBITT. I agree with the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) that the two standard clauses usually put in Bills should be put in this Bill.

Mr. MACDONELL. There are two regular clauses spoken of as the standard clauses. One is in regard to the consent of the municipality to the company stringing its wires, or erecting poles upon, or across any highway, or public place; then there is another clause with regard to rates. I think these clauses should be put in, and for that purpose I would suggest that this subsection (b) be allowed to stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Let us report progress, and have these two standard clauses drawn up.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is wise. If anybody ought to be tender about the rights of municipalities and reasonable rates it is the grain growers. I do not see why there should be any objection to inserting these two standard clauses.

Mr. RUTAN. I see no objection to letting the section stand over for the purpose of inserting these clauses. But we can go on with the rest of the Bill,

On subsection (d),

Mr. FOSTER. What is the purpose of this clause:

Subscribe for, purchase or otherwise acquire, and hold, sell or otherwise dispose of, the shares, bonds, debentures, or other securities of any bank, or of any printing or publishing company.

What does the Grain Company propose in that?

Mr. RUTAN. This company owns a publication called the 'Grain Growers' Guide,' that is a part of their business.

Mr. FOSTER. But that is their own paper. Here they have authority to take over other papers, it gives them authority to buy up every newspaper in the northwest.

Mr. RUTAN. They have the same right as other people with regard to that.

Mr. FOSTER. It is funny that a Grain Company is becoming a great publishing company.

Mr. MACDONELL. It seems to me an improper thing to give an ostensible grain company power to embark in the banking business by allowing them to purchase shares, or stocks in a bank to the extent of one-fourth of their capital. They can use the bank for the purpose of exploiting funds, for the purpose of dealing in grain; and they have an additional power of being able to build up a press and publish papers which could be used for the purpose of advancing or depressing prices. This company are also dealers in, and buyers of grain. It seems to me a most unusual thing to give a company power to do all these things under one corporation. They

can exploit the funds of a bank, and deal in grain, and by their press they can exploit public opinion for the purpose of raising or depressing markets.

On subsection (e),

Mr. MACDONELL. There should be the same clause with regard to the regulation of rates that I spoke of in regard to subsection (c).

Mr. PUGSLEY. You do not regulate rates on vessels. No other vessels have their rates regulated.

Mr. MACDONELL. I think where railway companies are given charters, as they are in the Railway Committee from day to day, and where these companies have also navigation powers, the Railway Board has the power to regulate the rates.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is in error as to that. Where a subsidy is granted the government may make some provision, not otherwise.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the Minister of Public Works say that the present Railway Commission has not a right to regulate rates for a railway which does business by land and by water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand we have no power to regulate rates on the steamers. When subsidies are granted the government make certain provisions, but I do not think the Railway Commission has any power to regulate steamship rates.

Mr. FOSTER. That is a rather important point because the purpose of the Railway Commission to regulate the rates might be entirely set at nought, provided you had a railway company which also ran ships, if there was no power to regulate the water passage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That would not apply to this company because they do not build railways.

Mr. FOSTER. They are getting powers here to carry passengers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a clause that nothing herein contained shall give them power to build railways. They are expressly barred from building railways.

Mr. LANCASTER. Section 333 of the Railway Act is important in view of what has been said by the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster). In this section the word 'company' of course means a railway company. The section reads:

> Subsection 3. If the company owns, charters, uses, maintains or works, or is a party to any arrangement for using, maintaining or working vessels for carrying traffic, by sea or inland water, between any places or ports in Canada, and if any such vessel carries traffic between a port in Canada reached by such company and a port in Canada reached by the railway of another company, the vessel and the railway of either company shall be deemed to constitute a continuous route in Canada within the meaning of this section.

Thus the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) is right, and the minute you allow this company to do business in water carriage you should put them under the control of the Railway Commission.

Subsection (e) allowed to stand.

On subsection (g), power to acquire other companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is a very wide section. Is not the minister afraid of a combination? This might lead to a huge monopoly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the usual clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. If that is the general Act it ought to be amended. The danger is the very simplicity and wide nature of the language. We are authorizing this company to do everything except practise medicine and law, and now we are saying that in all these lines of business they may buy up everybody in opposition to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what is always done in letters patent; the company being incorporated may acquire the business and undertaking of any company authorized to carry on a similar business. I venture to say that the same powers will be found in the charter of incorporation of the Canada Cement Company. It is the usual clause in commercial or industrial companies.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think we should pass the section without further consideration. I doubt if the Grain Growers' Company wish to be made into a huge monopoly like that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they wanted to buy out a flour mill would it be any more harm than for them to build a new mill?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. Suppose you have only two companies operating in a certain way and have competition between them, then the minister's question answers itself; you allow one company to buy out the other, and you immediately lose all competition and have a monopoly.

Mr. NESBITT. It is not necessary to buy them out in order to have no competition, so far as price is concerned.

Mr. FOSTER. My point is that if a person is a strong opponent to monopolies, he should oppose this section because it has a decidedly monopolistic tendency. If they have capital enough they can buy out every single business, and you would have

most certainly a most complete monopoly. It would not be possible to frame a more monopolistic clause. I leave it to my hon. friend for Oxford (Mr. Nesbitt) if that is not so.

Mr. NESBITT. I think the clause is too wide, and that all similar clauses in all these Bills are too wide, but I think we should commence the reform by revising the Companies Act. Take all these mergers that have been formed in the last few years, and they just last until some one else has time to build a factory. I do not believe there is any particular danger in this clause, but I do think, generally speaking, that all such clauses are wrong from a legislative standpoint.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When, earlier in the session, I called attention to a similar clause in the McClary Manufacturing Company's Bill, promoted by my hon. friend (Mr. Beattie), my remarks got no sympathy from either side of the House.

Mr. FOSTER. Were I here you would have mine.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The McClary Bill authorized the company to purchase the stock of any other company which manufactures any goods similar to those manufactured by the McClary Company.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is a vast distinction between that provision, and the provisions of this Bill. That company was engaged in manufacturing stoves, and it was authorized to acquire any company similarly engaged.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A monopoly in stoves would be hurtful.

Mr. LANCASTER. This Bill authorizes the grain growers to do everything except build railways or practise law or medicine. You allow this company to buy up everything that is in its road, and you create an evil tenfold greater than that which the Minister of Public Works says existed in the McClary case.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The House did not think there was anything wrong in the McClary case.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is the minister so modest that he will recede from his opinion, and now say that what is tenfold worse than the McClary case, is right?

Mr. RUTAN. The very day this Bill passed the Private Bills Committee, the McClary Company was given the right to purchase an interest in every retail business throughout the country, and no objection was raised. That is much more dangerous than any provision of this Bill. The McClary Company are doing business with retail merchants throughout the whole country, and if they get into the debt of the McClary Manufacturing Company they, the company, can say: 'We must protect ourselves, and we will insist on you giving us an interest in your business,' a power which tends to enable them to monopolize the retail business throughout the country.

Mr. LANCASTER. And under this Bill the grain growers can buy up a retailer, or a wholesaler, or any one else that comes in their road.

Mr. RUTAN. This is not an opportune time to say that the farmers, who are the Grain Growers Company, should not be given the same privilege as is given to others. I do not see why a manufacturing company should be allowed this power, and why it should be refused to farmers.

Mr. LANCASTER. This Bill says that they are going to do everything else except farming. They are going to deal in real estate, and have a printing house, and run banks. I am as good a friend of the farmer as is the hon. gentleman, or anybody else, but when a farmer ceases to be a farmer, and is not satisfied with growing grain and dealing in grain, but wants to do everything else except farming, then he has no right to come here and plead for sympathy because he is a farmer. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Rutan), comes here and pleads, that under the name of a farmers association they can rope people in just as in the case of the Farmers' Bank. When farmers are acting as farmers they deserve our sympathy, and encouragement, and support, but when they cease to be farmers they should go on the same plane as other people.

Mr. FOSTER. The clause in the McClary Bill makes provision as to the conditions under which the company may do these things, such as authorization by by-law, and a meeting of directors, and so on. These appear to be salutary conditions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The McClary Bill allows the directors to do it, and in this case the shareholders have to do it.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). If the provisions of the Bill are not satisfactory in that respect, they can be made so.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish the hon. member for Essex would keep that in mind as we go through the clauses of the Bill.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It is all very well to talk about creating a monopoly, but there is another view which may be taken. The apparent object of this Bill is that the farmers desire to cut out the middlemen. For instance, instead of getting their lumber from a sawmill they may manufacture it themselves, and in like manner they take power to manufacture agricul-

tural implements, and such necessaries which, under the present conditions, they have to purchase from other concerns. No doubt if this association is a success every farmer will become a member of it, and if they find a sawmill in a small town in the west where there is only room for one sawmill, they can buy that mill out by agreement with the owner rather than start another mill which would be ruinous to both. If it is a necessity for one to sell, and the other to purchase there can be no harm in giving this company power to purchase.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Does not the hon. gentleman see that the legitimate inference to be drawn from his argument is pure socialism? Is that the object of the hon. gentleman, or diversity of trade and occupation in the country?

Mr. TURRIFF. The farmers in the west not only grow grain, but afterwards have to dispose of it. The experience of the western farmers for a good many years has been that in disposing of their crop, more especially their wheat, to the ordinary purchasers of grain, they were not able to get the full value of the grain when it left their hands owing to combinations among the purchasers or middlemen. The farmers organized themselves into this Grain Growers' Grain Company, and for two or three years past they have been handling the grain to a large extent through this company, with the result that they have been able, owing to the fact that this association has about 30,000 members in the three prairie provinces, to get nearer to the full value of their crops than they ever did before. The company was in a position to handle a large enough proportion of the crop to prevent other buyers organizing and putting down the price as formerly. The farmers have learned, by their experience in organizing and co-operating among themselves, that they can get better prices for the goods they have to sell than they could without the organization; and they now come to this parliament to get authority to go a little further in co-operation, in order to cut out the middleman on some of the articles that they use in connection with the operation of their farms. It has been pointed out that they may not succeed if they go into too many lines of business, and that the shareholders may lose in the end. While that is true, why should we sit in judgment and say that 30,000 farmers shall not be allowed to do that if they want to do it? In the final result they have to depend on the honour and honesty and ability of their own men whom they put in charge to carry on this work, just as any other corporation has to do. You cannot take the responsibility away from the shareholders. They elect their directors,

and they have to abide by the consequences. I have no reason to doubt that this Grain Growers' Grain Association Company will be able to handle the purchasing of the various articles needed by the farmers, and do it as well as they have handled the selling of wheat in the past. They come here and ask for certain powers which are not greater than have been given in dozens of other cases, and I do not think we would be justified in refusing to grant their request. At the same time I think all the restrictions that we impose on other companies should be imposed on this company.

On section 14, subsection (j),

Mr. FOSTER. What is section 167 of the Companies' Act?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That provides that the company cannot lend money to its directors.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why should this company be allowed to do that when other companies cannot?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Their idea, as stated in the committee, was that they might make advances on grain before the crop was ready for the market. The committee has amended the clause so as to limit the amount that they can lend.

Mr. FOSTER. There must be a principle involved in 167, I would like to know what it is?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The clause is 'No company shall loan any of its funds to any shareholder.' That is the whole section.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is very necessary to prevent a great evil—to prevent what we know means fraud. This company has no more right to do that than any other.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The people they are dealing with are almost all members of this company.

Mr. LANCASTER. That would apply to any company. If a company manufactures or does a banking business or anything else, its own shareholders are its best customers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Banks can lend money to their own shareholders.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is a reason for that which does not exist in this case. This company has the power to do everything under the sun, which is all the more reason why there should be some restriction put on it. It may guarantee the performance of contracts by other persons, although we have guarantee companies specially chartered for that purpose.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that the clause allowing the company to guarantee the per-

formance of contracts should be struck out. I would suggest that this clause be allowed to stand over also for consideration. I do not see much objection to authorizing the company to lend money to its shareholders. It might be most desirable for the farmers that they should be able to obtain loans from this company on their warehouse receipts for grain.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not restrict the advances to the shipping of grain alone?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That can be considered when we deal with the clause again.

On subsection (l),

Sell or dispose of the undertaking of the company, or any part thereof, for such consideration as the company may think fit, and in particular for shares, debentures or securities of any other company having objects altogether or in part similar to those of the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why emphasize that section by these words 'in particular?'

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is a standard clause in the Act.

On subsection (n),

Do all such other things as are incidental or conducive to the attainments of the objects or purposes of the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. Can any one tell us what are the objects and purposes of this company?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is a standard clause.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 14 is carried with exception of subsections (b), (e) and (f).

On section 15, subsection 2,

Nothing in this section contained shall limit or restrict the borrowing of money by the company on bills of exchange or promissory notes made, drawn, accepted or endorsed by or on behalf of the company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry I shall have to oppose this subsection. It makes the borrowing power unlimited. Under the Companies' Act there is a limitation, and the borrowing and issuing of debentures is limited to a certain proportion of the paid up capital stock. I think that under the Companies' Act there is a limitation of the power to issue debentures to a certain portion of the capital stock. If there is not there ought to be. I know there is in the Provincial Joint Stock Companies' Acts. Under the provision now before us, the company might issue debentures for many times the capital stock. The limitation ought not to exceed two-thirds the paid-up capital stock of the company.

Mr. NESBITT. I think the lenders will control that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to have that clause stand to have it amended.

Mr. MACDONELL. This clause is exactly in the words of the Joint Stock Companies' Act.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have in mind the New Brunswick Act, which is taken from the Ontario Act. It may have been amended

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Yes, formerly it was limited.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 15 stands for further consideration.

On section 17: Superannuation, pension funds, &c.,

Mr. NESBITT. This section is peculiarly worded.

The company may, on resolution adopted by a vote of shareholders present or represented by proxy at any general meeting of the company——

—and so on. On these conditions they may establish these pension funds. It should provide at least for a two-thirds majority. As it stands it means nothing but a majority of those present.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), is it usual to give companies powers of this kind? I confess I do not know. It looks to me like affording an opportunity for some people to vote money into their own pockets under the name of superannuation or pension fund.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is certainly unusual. I understand the railway companies do it, and the banks.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why should an omnibus company like this have such powers? That is one of the difficulties in granting these wide and varied powers,—it makes every concession granted to the company all the more dangerous.

Mr. FOSTER. This seems to be an innovation.

Mr. NESBITT. Something new every day.

Mr. LANCASTER. They justified the general clauses of this Bill by appealing to the Companies' Act. And now, they ask something that is not in the Companies' Act at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it had better stand.

Mr FOSTER. See what it allows them to do. They need not have the vote of any particular number of shareholders.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). They must be notified.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, but anybody who has had experience in companies knows how easy it is for interested parties to get proxies and carry a vote. I do not think this power should be given at any rate until this company shall have some experience. When it gets into working order, if it wants to come back and get a superannuation system under proper conditions it should have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. NESBITT. I would like to see the clause stand until it can be redrafted,—make it conditional upon a vote of two-thirds of the shareholders or something like that.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not want, by silence, to seem to agree to that proposition. I do not think that such a power should be given to this company at all. It practically makes it an insurance association. Why should they not have safeguards that are required by other concerns of that kind? Why should there not be, as the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) says, a certain experience of this company sufficiently long for us to know that there is need of this system? I want to find out what this company is really doing before adding this clause.

Mr. FOSTER. When you come down to the fact of the matter, what are you doing? By this clause you are making an insurance company without any of the safeguards.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Stand.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall I report progress on this Bill? I think, perhaps, I should mention to the committee that any proposed amendments to this Bill should be given notice of lest they should infringe the rule.

Progress reported.

CANADA WEST LOAN CORPORATION.

House in committee on Bill (No. 169) to incorporate the Canada West Loan Corporation.

On section 7,

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to call the attention of the hon. gentleman who has this Bill in charge, that this section brings up the same thing we have discussed in reference to the Bank Act. As this is a loan company, and is no less important than a bank in many respects, it would seem as if this required more notice:

And no certificate shall be given until the board of directors has been elected as required by this Act, nor until it has been shown to the satisfaction of the Minister of Finance that at least $500,000 of the capital stock of the company have been subscribed.

The amounts outlined by the Finance Minister for the Bank Act have put in the word 'bona fide' before the word 'subscribed.' I think these words should be added after the 'capital stock of the company':

Have been bona fide subscribed, and at least $100,000 thereof have been paid.

That is, of the sum bona fide subscribed. What you want to make sure of is that there should not be a fake subscription, and that the amendment which goes in as a certificate of deposit, should be of actual moneys bona fide subscribed and paid in, and not borrowed on notes and securities, as in the case of the Farmers' Bank.

Mr. McCRANEY. I do not see any need of it, but I have no objection to the hon. gentleman's suggested amendment. The clause is the usual one which has been inserted in the other company Bills.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps it does not make any difference provided everything is honestly carried out. But it was thought to be of so much importance that the Finance Minister has outlined that as one of the necessary amendments to the Bank Act; and one can see where it might be made use of if there was a suspicion that things were not properly carried out.

Amendment agreed to.

On section 30,

Mr. LENNOX. Why is this company exempted from the requirement to use the word 'limited' after the name of the company?

Mr. McCRANEY. It is not usual with loan companies.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am inclined to think that the word 'limited' ought to be used to convey to the public the knowledge that there is not an unlimited liability of the shareholders. Of course, the use of the word 'corporation' signifies to the public that the company is incorporated, but does not signify that it is limited as to its liability.

Mr. MILLER. The word 'limited' is not used in connection with financial corporations, such as trust companies and loan companies.

Mr. FOSTER. Perhaps the minister would let this Bill stand, as I have received one or two representations with reference to it which I have not yet had an opportunity of looking at. I do not want to put anything in the way of its passing.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. McCRANEY. My hon. friend from South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) asked if I could obtain any information as to why the word 'limited' has not been used as a rule in Acts passed by this House for the incorporation of loan and trusts companies. I inquired from the Superintendent of Insurance, through whose hands this legislation passes, and he told me that he knows no special reason, but that the custom has been to omit the word 'limited' in the title. I can only suggest to my hon. friend that as corporations of this character are not trading companies, but loan and trust companies, the public is put on its guard as to the character of the business carried on. I would point out further that if a loan company were receiving money, the argument for the use of the word 'limited' might be strong, but the money it receives, apart from what it may get on deposit—concerning which safeguards are put in such a Bill—is from bond and debenture holders who are well-to-do people, and usually very well advised. I shall give my hon. friend the names of a number of loan companies which have been incorporated by this parliament within recent years, and none of which have the word 'limited' in the title. I have not come across any name which does include the word in the list of trust companies. There were incorporated in the year 1890 the Colonial Investment and Loan Company; 1903, the Acadia Loan Company, and the Eastern Canada Loan and Saving Company; in 1898, the Central Canada Loan and Saving Company; in 1899, the Canada Permanent and Western Canada Mortgage Corporation; in 1906 the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company; in 1910, the Pioneers Loan Company, and the Northern Loan Company; and this session, the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation. Then the following trust companies: In 1893 the Eastern Trust Company; in 1894, the Toronto General Trust Corporation; in 1905, the Title and Trust Company; in 1907, the Western Trust Company; in 1908, the Prairie Provinces Trust Company, and the Prudential Trust Company. In the titles of none of these is the word 'limited'.

Mr. LENNOX. My hon. friend has gone to a good deal of trouble and has shown what the general practice is, whether it be a good practice or not, and I shall not make any further objection on that score.

Mr. FOSTER. A number of the Ontario companies that I know have the word 'limited'

Mr. McCRANEY. If my hon. friend will look through the recent statutes of Ontario, he will not find that any loan companies have been incorporated by the Ontario legislature at all. I have looked through the last five years, and have not found any. I presume that the companies prefer getting their charters in this House.

Mr. FOSTER. I asked that this Bill stand over, but I find that the representations I had were with regard to another company.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

CASUALTY COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 174) to incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Mr. MACDONELL. I regret that the Minister of Finance is not here. He was not in the Banking and Commerce Committee when this Bill was before it. I would suggest that this Bill stand until he is here, as the name of this company is of considerable importance, and I should like to have his opinion concerning it.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I do not see why this Bill should be allowed to stand. There was a representative of the Finance Department in the Banking and Commerce Committee, and that committee adopted this Bill.

Mr. MACDONELL. I think my hon. friend will make more headway with his Bill if he will allow it to stand until the Minister of Finance is here.

Mr. OLIVER. In view of the statement made by my hon. friend in whose name the Bill stands, I do not see why we should insist on the presence of the Minister of Finance. If it is absolutely necessary that he should be here, we can send for him rather than have the Bill lose its place on the Order Paper.

Mr. MACDONELL. I think that, in the interests of the promoters of the Bill, and the public, the Minister of Finance should be here.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would suggest to my hon. friend that he should make any objections he has to the Bill, and then the committee will consider whether it should stand over. The Bill, as I understand it, passed the committee of which the Minister of Finance is a member. I think we should learn that there is some objection to the Bill before we allow it to stand over.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). The objection made in the committee was to the fact that this company is seeking incorporation under a name which, if not sim-

ilar to that of another company, would be apt to be confused with it, and in the interest of the older company, which has been established in a similar business for several years, and in the interest of the public who are interested in avoiding the confusion of names, my purpose in making the motion was that the Minister of Finance might be aware of this similarity of names.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the name of the other company?

Mr. MACDONELL. The Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company, known commonly as 'The Canadian Casualty Company.' The present company seeks incorporation under the name of 'The Casualty Company of Canada.' I think the Bill should stand until the opinion of the Minister of Finance is had on the subject.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I know that the opinion of the Finance Department was available at three or four meetings of the Senate Committee, and at least one or two of the Banking and Commerce Committees of this House. I submit that we should be in no better position to judge concerning the name if we had the Minister of Finance here. It is a matter of opinion. The facts are that this company advertised in the 'Canada Gazette'——

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). Let the motion be put and disposed of, and then we can go on.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I do not see why we should not consider the merits on this motion. This company advertised in the 'Canada Gazette' its intention to apply for incorporation under the name 'The Lloyds' Casualty Company of Canada.' Before the Senate Committee an Ottawa solicitor, representing the Lloyds' Plate Glass Company, of New York, opposed the granting of the name 'Lloyd's.' The Senate Committee held three successive meetings, and finally gave this company the name. 'The Casualty Company of Canada.' The Bill was reported to this House and referred to our Committee on Banking and Commerce. That committee discussed the name and finally decided that the company was entitled to the name 'The Casualty Company of Canada.' The hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonell, Toronto) says there is a similarity between the names 'The Casualty Company of Canada' and 'The Canadian Casualty and Steam Boiler Insurance Company.'

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). There is no word 'steam' in the company's name.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). My instructions are that there is in it the word 'steam,' but if I am mistaken it does not make any difference. My hon. friend (Mr. Macdonell, Toronto) says that the company opposing our name is generally known as 'The Canadian Casualty Company.' That is not our fault. As the solicitor for this corporation said before the Banking and Commerce Committee, that company is really travelling under an alias, and has no status, under that alias, to oppose the name of this company. In any case, the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company, I understand, has been bought and is run as a side-show by a Scottish company, known as the General Accident Insurance Corporation. These being the facts, and it being merely a matter of opinion whether the names are similar or not, I think the Bill should be proceeded with.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been usual, where there has been a dispute about a name, to get the opinion of the Minister of Finance. I do not see that there would be anything to find fault with if we were to take up all the sections of this Bill except the first, which deals with the name, but to leave that until the Bill could be taken up again with the Minister of Finance here. There is no disposition to prevent the passing of the Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have made inquiry of the Superintendent of Insurance, who is in attendance, and he tells me that the matter was thoroughly threshed out before the Banking and Commerce Committee, and that it was decided to leave the name exactly as it is. He tells me also that the Minister of Finance has left no information with him that he desires to express any opinion with regard to the recommendation of the committee. I do not see why we might not dispose of the Bill this evening. It seems to me there is no similarity in the names of these companies, and no likelihood of confusion. What weighs with me is that the committee, after discussion and careful consideration, decided to recommend the Bill with this name.

Mr. BLAIN. I was present when this matter was discussed in the Banking and Commerce Committee. The Minister of Finance was not in his place. True, the Finance Department was represented. As my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) has pointed out, it is usual, when a similarity of names arises, that the Minister of Finance is questioned in the House with regard to the matter. Surely the hon. member who has charge of the Bills will not press it. If it is not put through tonight that will not interfere with its passage, and it is only fair to the committee to have a statement from the Minister of Finance on the question. Surely, if the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) had looked closely at these names he would not have said that there is no similarity. One company is known as 'The Canadian

Casualty Company,' and the other 'The Casualty Company of Canada.' Surely it will not be said that there is not great similarity between these names. It is usual, as I have said, in cases of this kind, to have a statement from the Minister of Finance.

Mr. LENNOX. I certainly think the suggestion of the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) should be accepted. The Minister of Finance usually has strong feeling on the question of names of companies. He has on many occasions, both in committee and in the House, expressed himself very clearly and strongly on such matters. And we are all of the opinion that it is unfortunate if the name given to a new company leads to confusion with some existing company. Now with great deference to the Minister of Public Works, I hardly think he is right. The words that catch the ear and arrest the attention are that this company, which we propose to incorporate, is a casualty company and a Canadian company, The Casualty Company of Canada; the other words in reference to boiler insurance are likely in ordinary language to be left out. The company may preserve its identity, it may print all its papers properly, and sign its letters with the full name of the company; and yet the public, speaking of the company, may abbreviate it and speak of this as The Canadian Casualty Company, although it is a Casualty Company of Canada, so that after a little while one company will be confused with the other, to the great disadvantage of the companies themselves and of the public. The Minister of Finance has communicated to this company his objection to this incorporation, and we assume that he still maintains his objection. I do not think we should have this unseemly difference in the cabinet; I think the expressed opinion of the Minister of Finance ought to be concurred in.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Do I understand my hon. friend to say that the Minister of Finance has sent word to this committee of his objections to the Bill? I have not so understood it. If that were the case, I would yield my view at once to the view of the Minister of Finance.

Mr. LENNOX. No; I was saying that the Minister of Finance had expressed himself clearly through his representative in the committee, and we are bound to assume that he is still of the same opinion. That being the case, I think his colleagues in the cabinet ought to defer to his judgment in this matter, as it pertains more especially to his department. I understand that his representative was in the committee and expressed himself as opposed to the name.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). That is not correct. In the Senate committee when this Bill was considered, the present name was given to this company, with the consent of the Superintendent of Insurance, the representative of the Finance Department. If I thought that the Minister of Finance was at all opposed to this name, I would not attempt to press the Bill. I do not wish to be discourteous to the hon. member for North Toronto; but the only reason I have for asking that the committee proceed with this Bill is that I have to leave for the west in two or three days, and may not have another opportunity of bringing it forward.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have authority from the Department of Finance to say that the Senate committee examined this very question which is now under discussion as to whether the name of this company was liable to be confounded with the name of another company, which I understand is the Boiler and Casualty Company; and that the contention that there was a conflict between the names was rejected, and the present name was accepted. I understand also that objection was taken in the committee of this House, and that the present name was accepted upon a division in the committee. I understand that the Superintendent of Insurance was present in the committee as representing the Department of Finance, and that he raised no objection to the present Bill. Therefore it is not exactly correct to say that the Minister of Finance does not concur in this legislation.

Mr. LENNOX. Of course I accept the Prime Minister's version of the case as he understands it, but I do not understand him to say that he has had any direct communication with the Minister of Finance in the matter. I am informed by some gentlemen around me that they understand that the Minister of Finance does not approve of the name.

Mr. PUGSLEY. On what does my hon. friend base that statement?

Mr. LENNOX. I am so informed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend is misinformed.

Mr. LENNOX. I gather it from members of the House in whom I have great confidence. I may say to my hon. friend who is promoting the Bill, that we do not wish to prevent his Bill going through; I want him to get his Bill through. But I do not think that what is suggested by the member for North Toronto will have the effect of preventing this Bill going through. We will probably reach it again before he leaves.

Mr. MILLER. I do not think any members of the House whom the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has spoken of as informing him that the Minister of Finance is opposed to the Bill, will get up in their places and say that they have heard him so express himself. The member for Simcoe argued a few minutes ago that there ought not to be any division in the cabinet on this matter, and that because the representative of the Minister of Finance is opposed to the name, therefore the other members of the cabinet ought also to be opposed to it.

Mr. LENNOX. It is not as bad as that.

Mr. MILLER. Now when he finds that the superintendent of insurance, representing the Minister of Finance, expressed himself favourably to the name, will he still think that there ought not to be a division in the cabinet, although the committee did agree with the opinion thus obtained?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I think there is a valid objection to the name, no matter what the opinion of the Minister of Finance is, and also no matter what confusion may arise with the name of any other company. The name which is proposed for this company is simply the Casualty Company of Canada. Now the casualty business is one line of business, the banking business is another line, the trust business is another line, and so on all through the commercial life of the country. It seems to me it would be well to forbid any company using a name like this in any line of business. The Minister of Finance set a good example in connection with a bank which proposed to monopolize the name The Bank of Canada. It would also be just as objectionable to incorporate a company calling itself The Trust Company of Canada, whether there was any other similar named company in existence or not. It would seem to me also to afford an unfair advantage to any other company to be allowed to call itself The Loan Company of Canada, or to any set of incorporators to be called The Life Insurance Company of Canada. In all these cases I think so comprehensive a name gives them an undue advantage over other similar companies. So, even though there were no other companies, or no special circumstances, the better course for this parliament to pursue would be to forbid to any company so unfair an advantage as would be given by allowing them to use this name. But in this case there is an additional objection. There is a company now in existence known as the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company. That is an additional objection, but in the very nature of things a similar objection would lie to almost any attempt to assume so comprehensive a name as this. For instance if a company asked to be known as the Life Insurance Company of Canada, objection would at once be taken that there would be confusion with the Canada Life Assurance Company. It is argued by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) that because the first company, the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company, has the additional 'Boiler Insurance Company', it is distinguishable. No doubt to a lawyer and those familiar with the company it is very readily distinguishable, but as the hon. member knows, the general public do not like writing long names, and as a matter of fact, the company will be known by the first part of its name almost invariably. I have been furnished with a series of envelopes selected out of one mail of the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company. Seven of these are addressed to the Canadian Casualty Company, Toronto, and one of them is a letter addressed in typewriting from another large company in Toronto, so it can easily be understood how the ordinary man would address them. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) says that is not the fault of the applicants for this Bill. Certainly it is not, who would suggest it was? But it is similarly not the fault of this company. I am instructed that this company never signs itself or refers to itself as the Canadian Casualty Company, but it is rooted in human nature that they should be so addressed. There will inevitably be confusion, and that confusion means a direct financial loss to the existing company. The Minister of Finance strongly opposed the use of a comprehensive title like this in the case of a bank, and he was upheld by the House. Surely there could be no objection to the name applied for by the incorporators of the bank now known as the Banque Nationale of Canada that will not apply to this one. If the Minister of Finance had a policy at that time, the same policy must apply in this case. We should not allow any company in any line of business to say that it was the company of that line of business of Canada. We should adopt that as a first principle in legislation of this kind. If there was some other adjective such as the Casualty and Guarantee Company of Canada the objection would be partly overcome, but a casualty business is one line of business, and no company should be allowed to say that it is the Casualty Company of Canada. To my mind that is the extreme limit of error.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I differ from the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). I think the distinction is sufficiently clear, and if the present casualty company allowed themselves to be called by the two first words of their name, and they write letters or allow themselves to be so addressed without calling atten-

tion to the error, it is their fault. I think the House is going too far in the direction in which my hon. friend would lead it, it is too exacting already. Casualty is a general term, and in how many companies do we find such general terms, as British, Canadian, Western, Eastern, Northern, Dominion, National? I suppose casualty means no more than insurance, a casualty contract would be an indemnity contract, and when we see those two names written on sign boards, one the Casualty Company of Canada, and the other the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company, there is no confusion. I would favour giving this name. I think the applicants are entitled to it, and that those objecting have not shown a sufficient cause.

Mr. MACDONELL. It would be well, perhaps, to ascertain how these people lit upon this name. In the first place, in their published advertisement of their intention to apply for this Bill they gave the name of Lloyd's Casualty Company. In that they were treading on the corns of Lloyd's Limited and Lloyd's Limited appeared before the Senate Committee and objected. This Bill was initiated in the Senate. In the Senate Committee the objection was taken, and it was quite apparent it was well taken, and the promoters of this Bill cast about to find some other name. In a moment, before the committee and without any published notice to anybody, without notice to the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company or anybody else, this name was settled upon and taken.

It is absurd—that is a strong word to use, but I think it is well applied—it is absurd to say that there is no similarity between these two names. This company seeks incorporation under the name of the Casualty Company of Canada, and the name of the old company is the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company, and as has been abundantly proven the Canadian Casualty and Boiler Insurance Company is known generally to the public as the Canadian Casualty Company and is very generally addressed that way through the mail. The hardship of passing the Bill in this shape is that you have this old insurance company engaged in the casualty business in the city of Toronto, and this new company, proposing to embark in an identically similar business, with its head office in the same city, takes a name that is bound to be confused with the other. There is no reason whatever why these people should want to be incorporated under this name unless it be that they desire to acquire the name for the purpose of sharing in the good will of the business of the existing company. I am not suggesting that, but it certainly looks as though such were the case. This House may not have much to do with the confusion that may arise in the business of the two companies, but it certainly has to do with the protection of the public and in the public interest such a name should not be given the new company. There is, of course, the larger objection that this House would never incorporate a company under the name of the 'The Railway Company of Canada' or 'The Steamship Company of Canada,' and there is no reason why they should incorporate an insurance company under such a name. The Minister of Finance has years of experience in dealing with just such cases as this, and I am satisfied that if he were here he would share my opinion. I do not agree with the statement of the chairman of the committee that the Finance Department agreed to this name. The Bill was before the committee twice; on the first occasion the representative of the department was adverse, and on the last occasion when he was asked squarely what was his opinion he said he had no opinion to offer. There is no desire to force these people into any particular name, but I think they should make their reputation under their own name and not under the name of a company established in business.

Mr. BLAIN. If the chairman of the Banking and Commerce Committee will say that the Minister of Finance has been consulted and that he offered no objection to this name I will be satisfied.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am informed that the Minister of Finance was not consulted. I am informed by the Superintendent of Insurance that the matter was discussed before the Senate Committee, and they rejected the objection. I am informed further that in the committee of this House the objection was overruled by a majority vote, and by the Senate Committee unanimously. I am also informed by the Superintendent of Insurance that whilst there may be some doubt he raises no objection.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Let me inform the right hon. the Prime Minister of the exact facts. There was no objection made in the Senate Committee because there was no notice given, and no one knew until it was suggested by a senator present what name this company would get. The people whose business is now being invaded had no notice and could not take objection in the Senate Committee, but they brought their objection before the Commons Committee and the vote was almost a tie. It was felt by many that had the Finance Minister been present and given his opinion the result would be otherwise.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that before the Senate Committee the Super-

intendent of Insurance suggested the name, and there was no objection.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). There was no objection by the Casualty Company at that time because they did not know.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The question is not new and no one can be taken by surprise. The question was discussed in the Senate Committee on the suggestion of the Superintendent of Insurance, and objection was taken before the House Committee upon the application of the other parties interested, so that it has been passed upon by the committees of both Houses. The rule is, unless there is a very grave error, to agree with the report of the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. If the Bill passes now it will pass without the consent of the Minister of Finance, whose duty it is to look into matters of this kind, and who holds strong views on this very point. It is very important that before this Bill passes the opinion of the Minister of Finance should be obtained.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think all will agree that there is no parity whatever between this case and the case of the Bank of Canada mentioned by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie. The name proposed in that Bill was 'The Bank of Canada,' and as the capital was largely taken from France it was thought that such a name would suggest to the people of Europe an idea which the character of the bank would not justify. It might be thought that La Banque du Canada was on a parity with La Banque de France or the Bank of England, that is to say, that it had some state connection. That was the objection taken by my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Finance. In this case there is nothing of the kind to be apprehended.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know whether the right hon. gentleman was here or not when I made the suggestion that, as the Minister of Finance was not here, and as there seemed to be some question about the matter, we might pass the other sections of the Bill and leave simply the section which has reference to the name until the Minister of Finance can be questioned about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As the Bill will come up again to-morrow, I think my hon. friend from Regina might accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from North Toronto.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 7,

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest that before the word 'subscribed' there should be put the words 'bona fide,' and after the words 'thirty-five thousand dollars' there should be put the word 'thereof' and the word 'thereon' should be omitted. These are in line with the emendation we made to-day in another Bill.

Mr. MILLER. I would suggest that the words 'bona fide' should be inserted also in the other subsections of this section.

Amendments agreed to.

Mr. FOSTER. With reference to the use of the word 'limited,' I have the Ontario sessional papers which show that that word is very much more used in connection with the names of companies than the impression given to the House this afternoon would lead us to expect. I find, for instance: Brantford Trust Company (Limited), British Canadian Loan and Investment Company (Limited), Brockville Loan and Savings Company (Limited), Canada Landed and National Investment Company (Limited), Canadian Northern Prairie Lands Company (Limited), Guardian Trust Company (Limited), Imperial Loan and Investment Company of Canada (Limited), London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company (Limited), London and Western Trusts Company (Limited), Mercantile Trust Company of Canada (Limited), National Trusts Company (Limited), North British Canadian Investment Company (Limited), North of Scotland Canadian Mortgage Company (Limited), Real Estate Loan Company of Canada (Limited), Scottish American Investment Company (Limited), Scottish Ontario and Manitoba Land Company (Limited), Trusts and Guarantee Company (Limited), Union Trust Company (Limited), Walkerville Land and Building Company (Limited). I wish again we had the Minister of Finance here, so that he could explain to us when in his opinion the word 'limited' should be used with reference to these corporations. The Canadian Loan Company seems to be on a line with these companies in Ontario to whose names the word 'limited' is attached.

Mr. McCRANEY. Was the hon. gentleman here when I quoted the names of loan and trust companies which had been incorporated by this parliament and as to which the word 'limited' was not made a part of the name?

Mr. MILLER. Taking up the 'Monetary Times' and going through the list of loan company advertisements, I find the Canada Permanent Mortgage Corporation, the Huron and Erie Loan and Savings Company the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society. none of which has the word 'limited.' The next is the London and Canadian Loan and Agency Company, Limited. Then follow a number without the word 'limited'—the

Toronto Mortgage Company, the Standard Loan Company, the Reliance Loan and Savings Company of Ontario, the Agricultural Savings and Loan Company of London, Ontario, the Ontario Loan and Debenture Company, the Dominion Savings and Investment Society. In all about a dozen without the word 'limited,' and I do not think they all have Dominion charters.

Progress reported.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 164) for the relief of Walter Harvey Kirkland.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 180) for the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.—Mr. Rhodes.

Bill (No. 181) for the relief of Pauline Winslow Saunderson.—Mr. Carvell.

Bil l(No. 182) for the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.—Mr. Harris.

Bill (No. 183) for the relief of Francis Whittington Truesdell.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY.

House in Committee on Bill (No. 158) to incorporate Revillon Freres Trading Company.—Mr. Devlin.

On section 8,

8. The property and assets of Revillon Brothers, Limited, to be vested in the company incorporated by this Act shall be deemed to be and consist of the properties specified in the schedule to this Act; but nothing in this Act shall affect the rights of any creditors of the said Revillon Brothers, Limited.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to call the attention of the committee to this section, also to sections 6, 9 and 11. In the first place, I presume the committee has considered the matter, and I would hesitate to criticise their action in passing this Bill. But it strikes me as about as extraordinary a Bill as I have ever seen. This Bill purports to vest by Act of parliament all the assets of another company in a new company, and it repeals the charter of the old company, it revokes and annuls the letters patent, and repeals the statute passed in 1906 confirming these letters patent.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that the new company or the same?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Another company. Each company has a separate existence and may have separate liabilities. Then by section 9 it seems to recognize another company; still it is a company incorporated in France, and whose assets are alleged by this Bill to be handed over to the new company, whereas this Bill does not hand over the assets of the French company at all, but only the assets of the company which was incorporated by letters patent in 1904. In this case it may be all right, there may be no creditors, but what we do to-day may be a precedent for legislation to-morrow. Suppose there was a man who had a claim against the existing company and a suit was pending; the moment this statute comes into force the charter of the existing company is annulled, its letters patent become void, the statute recognizing these letters is repealed, and there is no old company in existence; so the man would find himself out of court at once. It is true his rights are protected by a provision that this company shall be liable for the debts of the old company, but every man's suit would be discontinued. It seems to me the proper course would be to authorize the existing company to convey their properties to the new company by the proper conveyance, and then make this company liable for the debts of the existing company, and make provision that any suits pending might be carried to a conclusion in the name of the old company, but that the new company should be liable for judgments which might be obtained. But by this statute we wipe out at once, by a stroke of the pen when this statute comes into force, the charter of the old company, and wipe out all suits that might be pending. It strikes me as entirely new legislation, and objectionable.

Mr. BARKER. I was on the committee when this Bill was brought up, and I certainly felt as the Minister of Public Works has just said. The applicants for the Bill were two gentlemen of very high professional reputation, Mr. Lafleur and Mr. McDougall, and there was an indisposition to doubt the correctness of the measure, because these gentlemen were vouching for it. The whole story was of the most intricate character. There had been two blunders, apparently, in the course of the existence of these companies. The first charter appeared to be a blunder, then there was another blunder, and this was an effort to redeem the two blunders, and put the corporations upon another footing. Feeling the importance of the matter, I suggested in the committee that we should appoint a committee of four legal gentlemen to act with the counsel and go over this Bill with extreme care, and see that now, after all the troubles they had been involved in, we did not make another and a worse blunder still. I do not think it was possible for any member of the committee clearly to understand what they were doing. I have no doubt whatever that the promoters of the Bill, the legal gentlemen present, were strictly truthful in everything they said, and said nothing they did not know. But I think also that the committee were re-

sponsible, and I felt that we ought not to act entirely on the opinion of the legal gentlemen present. I was not able, on the statements made there, either to approve or disapprove of the Bill. I can only say that as a member of that committee, and now sitting in the House, I have no more idea whether the passing of the Bill will produce the result that was intended, than I have as to whether there are inhabitants in Mars. I doubt whether any member of the committee thoroughly understood it. It was passed largely upon the reputation of the two legal gentlemen who were present, and who had been acting all through for the Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited. There is a Revillon Frères in France, and there is a chartered Revillon Brothers under a charter issued by the Secretary of State, and there is now this Bill. Who will be who by and by, I do not know. I am not surprised that the minister is in doubt about it, and I do not think that any member of the committee has the slightest idea what it means. I think that for the sake of the reputation of parliament something should be done. I do not think we are justified in passing legislation that we do not understand. I think it ought to be referred to a special committee, who would report to the general committee. That is what I suggested before, but my view was not accepted by the committee.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As the promoter of the Bill is not here, and the objections of my hon. friend seem to be very serious, I would move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FOSTER. Has my right hon. friend any suggestion to make in the way of getting this where it can be intelligently dealt with? It is rather stunning to hear a competent member of that committee say that he does not know any more about this Bill than he does about the people in Mars; and I do not think the Minister of Customs knows any more about it, either, than he does about the people in Mars. I am sure, in reading this Bill, I do not know anything about it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If anything comes from Mars, my hon. friend the Minister of Customs will look after it, I know. In the meantime, the suggestion made by the member for Hamilton seems to be the most sensible one under the circumstances. The promoter of the Bill not being here, I suggest that the committee rise and report progress.

Mr. HENDERSON. I can fully endorse everything my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has said. It was the most confused Bill I ever saw come before the committee, and I think the committee were just about as confused after the Bill was passed as when we took it up. I think it would be advisable for this committee to take some step to put this Bill in a form that it would be workable, at any rate.

Mr. BARKER. I do not think there was a member present in the committee who wanted to interfere with the Bill; we only wanted to do what was right, but we did not know what we were doing.

Mr. MILLER. As I understand it, the Revillon Frères were a French company having a charter and doing business in many countries in Europe. They desired to do business in Canada, and they applied to the Secretary of State under the Companies' Act for a charter. That charter was granted, and it was a very peculiar charter, a copy of which was produced before the committee. The charter stated that all the property of Revillon Frères, the French firm, should thereafter be vested in Revillon Brothers, the Canadian company. It did not even limit the property so vested to the Canadian property, but that all the property of Revillon Frères should be vested in Revillon Brothers, the Canadian company. I asked Mr. Lafleur the solicitor for the promoters why they did not ask for legislative authority to have the Canadian company convey their Canadian property to the new company. It appears that when Revillon Brothers were incorporated in 1904 there was no application filed, that there were no provisional directors named, and that the charter vested the property of Revillon Frères in the Canadian company, but the Canadian company had no entity and no directors who could convey the property. The French company is really the whole company. They supplied all the caprtal, they did business in Canada under the name of Revillon Brothers, under a charter granted by the Secretary of State and without any one finding fault for a number of years. The Bank of Montreal who were their bankers suddenly said: We do not think you have the right to carry on business in this way, and we will not advance you any further money because the charter granted by the Secretary of State conveys nothing to anybody, there being no directors, and they have never organized and could never organize under that charter. They answered: We will get the French company to endorse our paper, but the bank said: That is worthless because the French company have vested all their property in the Canadian company, and, therefore, it is divested from them and nobody has it. It was absolutely impossible for the Canadian company to reconvey, and the only thing that could be done was to get this Act of parliament vesting the property in the new company.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) had better sleep over it, and find another explanation.

Mr. MILLER. My hon. friend might not understand it, but most members of the committee did.

Mr. FOSTER. I do understand that, according to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Miller) the Dominion government issued a charter to nobody for nothing. They granted a charter to a company which had no directors provisional or otherwise.

Mr. MILLER. That is quite right.

Mr. FOSTER. And consequently it was not worth the paper it was written on, and yet it was given to conduct a large business. That is pretty good proof that there is something wrong in a department which would issue such a charter.

Mr. MILLER. I am not defending the charter; I am simply stating the facts.

Progress reported.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 186) respecting the Jolliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

Bill (No. 190) for the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 191) for the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 187) respecting a Patent of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 188) to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Trussed Concrete Steel Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 192) to provide for increasing the capital stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 193) respecting the Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 195) to incorporate the Western Canal Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 196) to incorporate the Continental Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Molloy.

Bill (No. 200) for the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 198) to incorporate the Quebec and Great North-Western Railway Company—Mr. Hodgins.

Bill (No. 199) for the relief of Fanny Mary Healey.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

CANADA NATIONAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 201) respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company.

Mr. McCRANEY. There is a corporation having its head office at Saskatoon which bears the name of the Canadian National Insurance Company. I have a wire from the company to-day asking when this matter will be considered in the Banking and Commerce Committee, because they wish to have some of their directors present at the committee. I hope that the chairman of the committee can give an appointment to-night, so that I may wire the Saskatoon people to be down here when that committee meets.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 202) to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 203) respecting certain patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited—Mr. Macdonell (Toronto).

Bill (No. 204) respecting the Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.

Bill (No. 205) respecting the Canada Cement Company, Limited.

Bill (No. 206) respecting the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RELEASE OF VICTOR DINI.

* Mr. NORTHRUP:

1. Is the government aware that on the 21st of February last, 1911, one Victor Dini was sentenced by His Honour Judge Bazin of Montreal, to twenty-three months imprisonment for stealing $4,000 from the Dominion Express Company?

2. Is it a fact that the said Victor Dini, as alleged, has since been liberated from prison? If so, by whose order was he liberated?

3. Was he pardoned or liberated on a ticket of leave, for what reason was he liberated or pardoned, and on whose recommendation?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. The answer to the first question is in the affirmative, with this qualification that the statement in the question is the first intimation which has been made to the Department of Justice as to the amount of the loss, or as to the name of those who suffered the loss.

2. Dini was released from close custody on March 31, under order of His Excellency the Governor General upon license to serve the remainder of his sentence at large subject to the conditions prescribed by the Ticket-of-Leave Act.

3. On the recommendation of the Minister of Justice, upon the statement that the prisoner was seriously ill as the result of

a recent surgical operation, and that detention in prison would be dangerous to his life—the certificate of the jail surgeon as to the prisoner's physical condition, and stating that he was likely to become strangulated at any time, and the recommendation of the convicting police magistrate, who stated that Dini had always enjoyed a good reputation, that his offence was the result of inexperience in business, and that the sentence he had undergone was, for the prisoner, a sufficient punishment.

PURCHASE OF SUB-TARGETS.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. How many sub-targets have been purchased, at what price and what is the total expenditure to date?
2. Who are the officers of the company with whom the government has contracted in regard to the purchase of these sub-targets?
3. Has the government contracted to purchase any specified number of these sub-targets? If so, how many, and upon what terms?
4. To what use are the sub-target guns put at present time?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. (a) Five hundred and fifty-two (552).
(b) $250 each; except for 200 machines purchased in 1907 at $249.25.
(c) $137,850.
2. The only officer of the company known to the department at present is Mr. George I. Riddell, the manager.
3. No contract has been made for the supply of any additional number of these machines.
4. For the preliminary musketry training of the militia and cadets.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—CUSTOMS DUTIES.

Mr. LENNOX:

Does the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company pay the regular customs duties, or any customs duties, upon goods, supplies and material imported by them and entering into the construction of the western division of the Transcontinental railway?

Mr. PATERSON. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company pays the regular customs duties upon goods, supplies and material imported for and entering into the construction of the Western Division of the Transcontinental railway.

JOHN R. BARLOW.

Mr. LENNOX:

Is there a Mr. John R. Barlow in the service of the government or the geological Department as a surveyor? If so, what is his address?

Mr. TEMPEMAN. There is no person of the name of John R. Barlow in the employ of the Geological Survey.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH.

NICOLET PUBLIC WORKS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What is the total amount paid each year since 1907 up to this date for works done at River Godfroy, River Nicolet, and at the post office at Nicolet, to John O'Shaunessy?
2. What is the amount of stone purchased by the government from John O'Shaunessy during the year 1910 for the works at Sorel?
3. How many toise of stone, at what price, and what is the name of the person who measured this stone?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

	River Godfroy.	Nicolet Harbour.	Nicolet Public Building.
1906-07	$4,271	Nil.	Nil.
1907-08	Nil.	$ 77 50	"
1908-09	"	159 00	$3,703 55
1909-10	"	93 00	457 68
1910-11	"	Nil.	Nil.
	$4,271	$329 50	$4,161 23

2 and 3. Nothing from this department..

NICOLET CUSTOMS COLLECTIONS.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What was the total amount collected at the Nicolet customs office for each of the fiscal years, 1906-7, 1907-8, 1908-9, 1909-10 and 1910-11?
2. What was the amount paid to the collector of customs at Nicolet for each fiscal year from 1906 to 1911?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The total amount collected at the Nicolet customs office was as follows: 1906-07 (9 months), $372.71; 1907-08, $10,-464.02; 1908-09, $5,358.53; 1909-10, $1,284.53; 1910-11, $697.89.
2. The amount paid to the collector of customs at Nicolet for each fiscal year was as follows: 1906-07 (9 months), $300; 1907-08, $466.68; 1908-09, $700; 1909-10, $700; 1910-11, $700.

NICOLET POST OFFICE.

Mr. PAQUET:

Has the government received a petition from Nicolet asking for the construction of an annex to the post office, for the occupation of the postmaster?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. Does the government know, as alleged, that the mail clerks on the Intercolonial, as well as on the Delaware road, between Nicolet and Montreal, are accustomed to permit their friends to travel in the mail cars?
2. If so, is the government going to permit this abuse to continue longer or have it discontinued?

Mr. LEMIEUX. 1 and 2. The government is not aware that mail clerks on the

Intercolonial or on the line between Nicolet and Montreal, permit their friends to travel in mail cars, as such action on the part of clerks is against the rules and regulations, and any violation thereof is followed by the suspension of the clerk at fault. In 1905 one clerk, running between Montreal and Nicolet, was dismissed and one suspended for three months for violation of this rule.

NICOLET MILITARY ACCOMMODATION.

Mr. PAQUET:

Does the government intend to put the military arsenal of the 80th battalion in the upper story of the post office, as well as the office of Weights and Measures, as proposed at the time of the building of the post office at Nicolet?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no military arsenal at Nicolet. The Minister of Militia informs me that this question may relate to the use of a part of the public building for an armoury. This may be considered as answer to the question.

RIVER NICOLET DREDGING.

Mr. PAQUET:

What is the amount voted for the dredging of the River Nicolet from the mouth of the River St. Laurent up to the bridge of the village, and is this work to be done by day labour or by contract?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work will be done by contract and paid for from the general vote for dredging, provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

LEGALIZATION OF MARRIAGES.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Has the Dominion government to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized anywhere in Canada?
2. Has the government taken any steps to ascertain the power of this parliament in that regard?
3. If not, does the government propose to take any steps for that purpose?
4. Has the opinion of the law officers of the Crown been asked or obtained upon this question?
5. Does the government propose to obtain the opinion of the law officers of the Crown thereon?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. The government does not consider that it possesses any such power.
2, 3, 4 and 5. The government has not considered the advisability of taking any of the courses suggested.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved that the House go into Committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act by providing (a) for annual increases to the salaries of the superintendents of city post offices until a maximum salary of $2,500 is reached; and (b) for raising the minimum and maximum salaries of railway mail clerks to $500 and $1,400 respectively; and making the yearly increases for all railway mail clerks $100 instead of $50 until a salary of $800 has been reached.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved that the House go into committee to-morrow to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by:—

(a) changing the classification of the clerks in the city post offices, offices of the post office inspectors, office of superintendent of railway mail service, and in the money order exchange offices by abolishing the stampers and sorters class and fourth class clerkships, and substituting therefor third class clerkships, ranging from $500 to $1,000, and divided into two classes known as third class 'A' and 'B.'

(b) abolishing the junior and senior second class clerkships and substituting therefor classes 'A' and 'B' of the second class, and increasing the maximum of the class formerly known as junior second, and now known as class 'B,' to $1,200, and increasing the maximum of class 'A,' corresponding with the former senior second class, to $1,400.

(c) dividing the first class clerkships into divisions 'A' and 'B' with maximum salaries of $1,800 and $1,600, respectively, and increasing the minimum of the first class clerkships from $1,200 to $1,400, and creating a new class of clerks to be known as chief clerks in the city post offices, subject to certain restrictions.

(d) improving the position of office superintendents in city offices, and changing what was formerly a fixed salary of $1,800 to a minimum of $1,800 and a maximum of $2,500.

(e) providing for the employment of temporary clerks in the above named offices for a period of not more than one year, at a fixed salary of $500, and temporary helpers to meet the exigencies of the service at a salary not exceeding $2.50 a day.

(f) increasing the salaries of certain inspectors, assistant inspectors and superintendents of railway mail service in recognition of years of service.

Motion agreed to.

SUPPLY—PASQUA'S INDIAN RESERVE —CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE.

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

Mr R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I wish to call the attention of the Minister of the Interior in his capacity as Superintendent General of Indian Affairs to a matter that has been brought to my notice quite recently. It has reference to certain damage done by a fire caused by a steam threshing machine operated by government officials

on Pasqua's Indian Reserve, which is situatd near Fort Qu'Appelle, on the 29th of October, 1910. At the time the threshing was taking place the wind was blowing a perfect gale. Practically all the machines in the neighbourhood shut down though another fire was caused by one of the machines which continued threshing that day. The fire, according to my informant, burned the separator, and was allowed to run out over the country, doing damage which was estimated by the North West Mounted Police to amount to between $8,000 and $10,000. Mr. Nichol, the Indian Agent, who at the time was in charge of the machine, was summoned by the North West Mounted Police for allowing the fire to run at large. He appeared before a justice of the peace at Fort Qu'Appelle, and was fined the sum of $25 for the offence. My informant informs me that the inspector of Indian Agencies, Mr. W. M. Graham, took occasion to go through the district and inquire as to the amount of damage which had been caused by the fire which took place after the burning of the machine. It is stated that he made an estimate of the losses, and sent that estimate to Ottawa. Several settlers made application to be reimbursed for the losses they sustained; and the only word they had from Ottawa was to the effect that the department did not consider themselves responsible. Now, it is well known all through the North West that it is a very dangerous thing to continue threshing with a steam threshing outfit when there is a very high wind blowing. On such occasions very few farmers will allow threshing to go on, as the number of accidents that occur from that cause are very numerous; but when such accidents do occur, the responsibility is placed on the owner of the threshing machine to see that all damages which result to the people are paid. In the same neighbourhood as the case I mention a fire starting from a threshing machine of Mr. Guy May got away and burned several bins of wheat and oats belonging to his neighbours, and he had to pay for the damages done. Mr. May had some excuse, perhaps, for threshing on that particular day. It seems that he had only five acres of crop to finish his whole season's work, and on such occasions men will try to finish their threshing. But I am rather at a loss to understand why a government official should consider it necessary to take risks under such circumstances, and to continue threshing on a day on which the wind was so extremely high. The fire in question burned out a number of settlers in the neighbourhood. I have a list of some of them, but not a complete list. Three of those settlers have written to me asking me to try to get the government to consider the losses they have sustained and to reimburse them. It seems to me that when a fire of that sort is caused by the recklessness or carelessness of a government official, the government who employ that official should be in the same position as the owner of a private threshing machine, who in similar cases is required to reimburse those who suffer loss in consequence of his recklessness or neglect. One of my correspondents writes me to this effect:

I have practically lost all my grain and buildings, and it seems strange that I cannot get common justice from the Interior Department, when it was proved that it was their employees who caused it. This is the second time that I have lost grain and buildings by fire from the same cause. I came to Canada from England with a little capital and bought this farm. Now I have nearly lost it all by these fires.

Another man wrote to me that he had lost two-thirds of his crop, which was threshed and in the granaries. Yet another writes about the considerable losses that he sustained. I know that settlers living in the neighbourhood of Indian reserves frequently suffer very seriously from fires which accidently or carelessly start on these reserves. I presume this is due mainly to the fact that there are very few settlers on the reserve, and a very small amount of land is broken up, and the fires get great headway before they are brought under control. In this particular case the fire started from a threshing machine which was being operated by an employee of the government, who was threshing the grain of the Indians. The fire must have been a terrible one because it jumped across both railway tracks at a point where there is a siding and continued unchecked on the other side of the line. I thought it necessary to bring this matter up to-day as rumors are current that the government are likely to move an adjournment or prorogation before very long; and it is only within the last day or two that the facts have come into my possession and the sufferers have asked me to bring this matter up. This fire occurred in the end of last October, and it is very desirable that the payment of damages should not be delayed. If these people have suffered these losses owing to the fault of the government, they should be reimbursed immediately. A great deal of hardship has been inflicted on a number of innocent individuals, and they consequently are perfectly entitled to compensation just as much as they would be, had the fire been set by the owner of a private threshing machine or some one in his employ. I hope the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs (Mr. Oliver) will have the matter looked into and give orders that the government pay whatever damages have been inflicted.

Mr. W. M. MARTIN (Regina). Like my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) I have a good deal of sympathy with the farmers who suffered such severe loss by the prairie fire that started on the Indian reserve. This matter was brought to my attention some two or three months ago, and I at once wrote the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs. I wrote to him on two or three occasions giving him all the facts. In my opinion, under similar circumstances a private individual who owned that threshing machine would be responsible, because there was evidently negligence on the part of those who were handling it. But unfortunately the government does not stand in the same position as a private individual in respect of damages. On referring to the file in connection with this matter, I find that it was referred by the Indian Department to the Justice Department, and the following opinion was given by the latter:

Sir,—Replying to your letter of the 15th December, 1910, in which you request to be advised whether your department is liable for the claims of various persons for loss of property by fire which originated, it is alleged, from the negligence of those in charge of a threshing outfit on the Qu'Appelle Agency, Saskatchewan, I have the honour to say that I am not aware of any grounds on which your department could be held liable for such negligence, if proven.

There is, therefore, a great difference between the liabilities of a private individual in a case of this kind and the liability of the government. Not having met with much success in the Indian Department, I saw the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who took the position that the department did not want to shelter itself behind a technicality of the law, but would be willing to pay damages if they were assessed. The great difficulty, however, even if negligence were proven, lay in the assessing of the damages. Were an action in damages brought against the government in the Exchequer Court it would not succeed; but it is possible that an action against the man who was running the threshing machine—and running it on a day when the wind was so high that it was absolute folly to do so—would hold good; and the Minister of the Interior was good enough on one occasion to suggest that if an action were brought against this man, and he was held responsible, the department would stand behind him, and pay the damages. Of course when a man has had his crop destroyed by fire, the crop is always worth twice as much as he would have realized out of it. The whole difficulty is in the assessment of the damages, and that is the position taken by the department to-day.

Mr. PORTER. I cannot see on what grounds the Deputy Minister of Justice distinguishes between the liability of an individual who is running the machne and the liability of the owner of the machine.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). The difference is this, that the government cannot be held responsible for wrong done by one of its servants, unless there be some statutory obligation.

Mr. PORTER. That seems to be the opinion of the Deputy Minister of Justice, but upon what authority does he base it? I do not know of any such distinction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the distinction?

Mr. PORTER. That when the government employs an agent to operate a machine, and that machine causes damages, the agent would be responsible but not the government.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). On the well known principle that the King can do no wrong.

Mr. LAKE. What practical steps would the Minister of the Interior suggest that these settlers should take? The fire caused a great amount of damages and suffering to these individuals, and that fire was due to the fault of a government employee. I would ask the minister what action these sufferers should take, in order to prove their loss and be paid compensation?

Mr. OLIVER. As my hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Martin) has said, I have had several discussions with him, and the conclusion arrived at was that in order to avoid the difficulty which was stated by the Department of Justice to stand in the way, the parties should take proceedings directly against the individual at fault, who was in charge of the machine, and was also an employee of the government, with the understanding that any damages assessed against him the government will be prepared to pay on getting a vote from parliament. The position is an unfortunate one in which the settler stands at present, but it is one we ourselves cannot avoid, the law being as it is. But by the procedure that I suggest, it seems to me that would be avoided, and the payment of the claim would be a matter of policy which I would recommend the government to recommend to the House and, for which I am sure, the House would provide in due course. I wish it distinctly understood that the department does not wish, as a matter of policy, to avoid the responsibility which would rest upon it if, instead of a department it was an individual and damage had resulted to private citizens from any act for which it is responsible.

The difficulty about settling and awarding damages as a departmental matter must strike any one who gives the subject attention. It is not wise for any branch of the government to undertake to adjudicate over its own matters which, under other circumstances, would be decided on by an action in court. There is room for all sorts of discussion as to motives, and as to the result which would be achieved by such procedure; and it seems to me that, in the interest of both the country on the one hand and of the sufferers on the other hand, the responsibility should be decided by an impartial tribunal, and amount of damages should be assessed by such a tribunal. Such a tribunal, of course, are the courts of the country, if the matter can be brought before them; and it seems to me the matter can be brought before them in the way I suggest. At first, as the House has been informed, the question was asked the Department of Justice: Can we deal with this matter in the ordinary course? We were informed we could not. The matter was then taken up for further consideration with the result I have indicated

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The principle that the Crown is not responsible for the negligence of its servants has been very largely cut down by legislation in this country, in connection with the operation of the Intercolonial railway and in connection with public works. And I do not think it has been further extended by statute, certainly not so far as I am aware. As to the case to which the minister refers, it is highly probable that the servant guilty of the negligence himself would be liable. But what the minister suggests, I understand, is that action should be brought against him. and then the Crown should take into consideration whether they should pay?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That does not seem a very satisfactory or definite attitude. In the first place, if these men have suffered damages by the negligence of another person, that damage ought to be made good, even though the person who caused it was a servant of the Crown when he did it. There is no reason why this farmer should be out of pocket by reason of the negligence of another person, simply because that other person happened to be a servant of the Crown. Some person ought to reimburse him; and, if the Crown is disposed to take cognizance of the matter, they ought to say: Go on and make your case against this man who was acting as our servant. and if you make out that he was guilty of negligence in the course of his work, we will see that it is paid, and the cost of the action also. It does not seem to me to be dealing with this farmer in a fair way to say, after he has gone to the trouble and expense of an action against the party: We will take it into consideration.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to be understood as leaving the matter in the position which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has suggested. But he understands that in my place I cannot bind the government, nor can I bind parliament to vote the money. But I am, on the responsibility of my position, stating what is the policy of the government in this particular case. And, of course, that is binding upon the government so far as its recommendation to parliament is concerned. If we could go further I would be glad to do it, but that is as far as I can go, and I should think it would be satisfactory.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax) If the minister means that the government will submit an estimate to parliament of the amount of damage, that is perfectly satisfactory.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I understand he is simply dealing with the technical consideration that he is not able to bind parliament, yet I think the government undertakes to bind parliament with matters of more importance, or rather, not undertakes to bind parliament, but undertakes to submit to parliament and carry through, which is much the same thing.

Mr. PORTER. Might I suggest, as a way out of this difficulty, that if the department is satisfied that this is a case deserving of compensation, and in view of the fact that a collective action could not be brought, but that there would have to be separate or individual action on behalf of every one of these farmers, which would mean great expense, the government, instead of going through the forms of trial in each case, should appoint an assessor to assess the damages for all the farmers and then submit an estimate to parliament to pay these damages. That would avoid the trouble of individual trial. And some of these people may not be in a position to incur the expense of a trial. But if the government, recognizing its liability, would take the course I suggested I think it would overcome the difficulty.

Mr. OLIVER. While the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) could be adopted, I do not think it is wise, as I have already said, either in the interests of the country or in the interests of the claimant, that the amount of the damages should be settled in that way. I am satisfied that my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury) who sits beside

the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) will suggest to him that if the government undertook to make an assessment of the damages, the assessment might be varied according to the political predilections of the claimant rather than the merits of the case. I think it is fairer to everybody and in everybody's interest that there should be full opportunity given to have the matter brought to court and tried out in the ordinary way, so that there may be no question about the rights of the country or of the individual being affected by anything but the merits of the case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the negligence admitted?

Mr. OLIVER. No; I forgot to mention that point. There is no actual admission of negligence in the proceedings that have gone forward so far against the man who operated the engine. When the fire took place a summons was issued against the agent of the reserve; he was brought up and pleaded guilty and was fined $25. But the agent was not on the reserve on that day, so that his plea of guilty, while it may have had some merit in some way, did not really bear upon the point, it did not bring the question to an issue. It was a general allegation, and he made a general plea of guilty. But my hon. friend will understand that it was not a satisfactory solution of the question. The question of whether the man who ran the engine was directly responsible, has not really been tried out yet.

Mr. LAKE. Would not the fact that a high gale was blowing at the time be sufficient evidence of negligence? Any one knowing that country would say so.

Mr. OLIVER. That question illustrates my point. Courts exist for the purpose of doing justice between man and man, that is their primary object, and that question was the very question the courts should decide; it should not be a question of the judgment of one of the interested parties.

Mr. BARKER. It seems to me the minister puts the case in this way: There has been damage done to some farmers, and he will not take the trouble to investigate for himself, and ascertain whether the government is responsible, but the proper way is for the courts to decide the question. That is very well for the legal profession, they must have every case fought out in court, with law costs for the plaintiff and law costs for the defendant, and then the government will pay the damages. Why should not the minister inquire into the facts, and if he finds there is negligence why should he call a jury to pass upon it? That question comes up every day with railway companies, and they have to pay. They do not insist upon providing law costs on both sides of the case before they pay. Surely the hon. gentleman can take the trouble to ascertain whether the agent of the government was wrong or not, and if he finds he was wrong he will pay these damages.

Mr. LENNOX. This is one of the special cases in which the minister might depart from what he says is a general rule, and a very good rule. The minister says that as a general rule it is not a good thing for the government to take matters of this kind in hand, and settle them without a lawsuit to establish the liability, and the amount of damages. The minister says he has not actually admitted the liability, and technically he has not. His agent admitted liability, and was fined, but he was not there when the fine occurred, and negligence consequently has not been established. There is the fact, I understand, of a very high gale, and it was negligence to run the machine at all in such a gale. Now, if the minister is satisfied that it is a case in which the government ought to pay these people, he does not need to stand on technicalities. This matter has been before the House and the House I think is of the opinion that there ought to be compensation. Why then have a lawsuit about it? I would suggest that the minister have an investigation to ascertain the facts. Let him appoint a judge to look into this matter. I think there has been sufficient negligence to justify the country in paying these farmers. If the minister thinks that there has been negligence, then he need not refer that point to the judge, but let him refer the question of how much damages in each case was sustained. I would not under such circumstances recommend the minister to refer the question of negligence to the judge, but to ask the judge to take evidence as to the amount of damages. It has been suggested to me that a farmer might recover only $200 or $300. But there are some farmers who cannot bring an action at all, and when the minister is here, and has the whole parliament as his advisers, I think he can act upon their advice and make this an exceptional case.

Mr. MACDONALD. I am at loss to understand how my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) who is a good lawyer, could undertake to say that he has heard enough about this case to give judgment upon it, and that the minister would be justified in dispensing with the usual preliminaries of legal proceedings before he settles these claims. If the Department of Justice has investigated this matter thoroughly, and has advised that there is no negligence, then there is no right of action.

Mr. LENNOX. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman (Mr. Macdonald) if the facts are as he understands them, that is that the Department of Justice has advised that there is no negligence. I understood that all the Justice Department were consulted about was the question of liability on the technical point as to whether the government were liable for the negligence of their servant, and that they advised they were not. If the Department of Justice took the facts into consideration, and said on the evidence as well as the law that there was no liability it would assume a different position.

Mr. MACDONALD. I have here the letter of Mr. Newcombe, in which he says:

I have the honour to say that I am not aware of any grounds on which your department could be held liable for such negligence, if proven.

The opinion of the Department of Justice upon that question seems to me to close the door as far as the minister is concerned, and the proposition he has made appears to me very reasonable. When dealing with this question of claims, it is all very well to say: It is a good general rule, but we must make an exception. I do not think that, sitting here as members of parliament and hearing the facts presented, ably as they were, by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle, we are able to form a judgment which ought to be arrived at only by a court of competent jurisdiction which could determine whether there was negligence as a matter of fact or within the law. My hon. friends cannot blow hot and cold. We frequently hear them complain that the departments have settled claims by appointing commissioners, but here is a case where the minister takes the course they have advocated. The minister is prepared to treat these gentlemen fairly and to recognize any verdict given in the case after a thorough investigation by a court. That is the proper way to deal with claims, and it is not right to make exceptions.

Mr. BARKER. Would the hon. member say from the papers who paid the fine?

Mr. OLIVER. The fine has not been paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Every one understands that the Crown is not liable for the negligence of its servants; we got beyond that an hour ago. The minister was considering what he could do in case negligence was proven by a servant of the Crown, by submitting an estimate to parliament.

Mr. MACDONALD. The question was whether there was any negligence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I agree for the most part that the Crown should determine these matters by some tribunal. On the other hand if there was a perfectly plain case, if the negligence was so clear that no question of its existence could be raised, it would be of no use to send the matter to the courts, if for instance a man took off his spark arrester in a gale.

Mr. OLIVER. Because it was a windy day it does not follow that negligence is established. My information is that the thresher was working in the shelter of the woods, and for that reason it was believed to be safe. If that is the case, there is sufficient doubt to warrant it being referred to court.

Mr. BRADBURY. In case the courts found there was no negligence, then would the minister do anything to help the farmers, or drop the case? As a matter of equity, the farmers should be compensated.

Mr. SPEAKER. The discussion is very irregular at this stage, and I will have to stop it.

LABOUR CONDITIONS ON THE NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. LENNOX. I wish to call the attention of the Minister of Labour to an item in the Toronto 'News' of Saturday. It is headed:

Robbing Foreign Labourers on the Transcontinental Railway—Startling charges from Port Arthur that stores are used to swindle hard-working foreigners who leave in debt after months of toil.

The article states that labourers are advertised for, $2.50 a day being offered. Upon arrival at the point where they are directed to apply they are told there is no employment. Then whilst they are deliberating, it is suggested to them that not being able to obtain work in the ordinary way at wages, they had better become subcontractors, and that a few of them should band together as subcontractors. They agree and then work for weeks and months, perhaps for six months, under a contractor as subcontractors. During that time, they get their supplies at a small store which belongs to the contractor. These facts are said to have been ascertained by the counsel at Port Arthur, who investigated the matter and obtained a considerable amount of evidence. The 'News' states that it has in its possession a good deal of material upon which to found its article, that these men, after moving solid rock and loose rock and all the rest of it for six months, working harder and longer than they would by the day, and imagining they are making money, finish their contract, their account is made up, they are credited for the work they have done and debited

for the supplies they have received, and the result is that they are found not to be entitled to anything but are in debt. It is said that the contractor generally comes to the rescue to the extent, that being anxious to get rid of them he transports them to civilization, adding the cost of their passage to their indebtedness. Thus, having worked for six or seven months very hard, they receive practically no compensation. The "News' says they have copies of these accounts in their possession, and adds:

This is the story which the Port Arthur council will tell to the Labour Department at Ottawa. The story will be substantiated by all the figures, contract forms, &c., of a representative case. The foreigners in the particular case to be submitted to the Labour Department bought ten cakes of rough soap, a very laudable thing to do.

For this soap they were charged ten cents per cake, almost enough to make them cease using that article altogether.

Shovels cost these men at the stores $2.50 each; one sack of potatoes, $4; flour, $6; coarse towels, 80 cents a pair; a tin dipper, $1; jam, $1.05 a pail; dynamite, for two cases, $24; lamp chimneys, 25 cents, and so on through a long list with one overcharge piled upon another.

I hope there will be a thorough investigation into these statements in this newspaper. This is not by any means the first rumour that the workmen are being swindled by the contractors, and if there is found to be any foundation for that rumour, I trust the investigation will be general.

Mr. PORTER. I had a case in court only two weeks ago, the action being between a contractor and three subcontractors and the facts as stated in this newspaper were sworn to by witnesses and corroborated by the accounts produced in court. The contractors took the work at a certain price, re-let to subcontractors, furnished them with supplies and material, and when at the end of the operation a statement of account was asked for, each of the three sub-contractors was found to be in debt rather than having anything to his credit.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). Cases of this kind have been brought to the attention of the department, and on investigation the complaints have been reported to be well founded in some cases and the contractors obliged to redress the grievances, while in other cases there appeared to have been much exaggeration. I have no notice that the particular complaint referred to by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) has as yet been brought to the attention of the department. I have seen some reference to it in the newspapers, and I had intended having it looked into irrespective of a formal complaint, but as a rule it is advisable that the government should wait until its attention is directed to these difficulties. The government has recognized the necessity of a somewhat closer supervision of these construction camps, and an appropriation has been passed for the appointment of one or two officers whose duty it will be to look into just such cases as this.

Mr. PORTER. I will be pleased to give the minister the names of the contractor and subcontractor in the case I have mentioned.

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

SUPPLY.

Royal North West Mounted Police—pay of force, $340,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the same vote as last year except that the pay of the force is increased by $10,000 and the subsistence by $10,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How many men are there?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Six hundred and forty-nine men, but this vote is estimated for 700 men which we intend to have.

Mr. LAKE What is paid by the two provinces?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Seventy-five thousand dollars each.

Mr. PERLEY. Some of the force lost their lives recently on a trip to the Yukon. I have not been able to understand why they were sent on this journey. Will the Prime Minister explain?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The policy has been to keep a constant patrol in the remote parts of the Dominion—the Hudson Bay, the mouth of the Mackenzie river, Fort Churchill, Fort McPherson—which patrol carries the mail and gathers information. We have been very lucky up to the present time; this is the first casualty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Inspector Fitzgerald was a native of Halifax, and had very long and very distinguished service.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The unfortunate fatality is greatly to be regretted. What is the distance between the two posts they were travelling between?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Three hundred and fifty miles from Fort McPherson to Dawson.—Inspector Fitzgerald was a very good officer, and the men under him were good men.

Mr. PERLEY. Do I understand that these men were making the trip in the ordinary discharge of their duty?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. Can the department say what was the cause of the fatality?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The diaries kept by the men have been received at Regina and are now on their way to Ottawa. They will give the particulars.

Subsistence, forage, fuel, light, clothing, contingencies, &c., $341,666.67.

Mr. PORTER. Is the number of the force increasing or diminishing?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It has remained stationary for the last five or six years. We thought at one time that it would be possible to decrease the force, as the provinces might take over their municipal police business. But we find a great reluctance on the part of the settlers in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta to see the force reduced in any way. It is difficult for us to reduce it. We are under contract with the governments of Alberta and Saskatchewan by which they pay us $75,000 each per year for the services of the police. I am afraid we may have to increase the force, because, as settlers go in beyond the limits of the provinces the force has to be extended. Settlement is now going on north of Edmonton in the Peace river and Mackenzie River districts, and I am sure that we shall have to extend the force in those two districts. Whether we shall be able to reduce it I have serious doubts. At the present time the men are distributed as follows: In Alberta, five divisions and ninety-nine detachments; in Saskatchewan, four divisons and eighty-nine detachments; in the Yukon, one division and ten detachments; in the Northwest Territories, one division and five detachments. A division is a settled place in which there is an officer and several men; a detachment consists of one or two or three policemen at a particular point. These men are in the midst of the settlers, ready to give information on almost every point, and to assist them in various ways. For instance, if a settler loses an animal, he goes to a policeman, and the policeman looks after it. If a fire takes place, the settlers go to the police for assistance. In a multitude of ways the police are of great utility to the settlers. Under present circumstances, if any change takes place, it will be in the direction of increasing rather than diminishing the force.

Mr. PORTER. I have heard the force spoken of with great commendation; but in travelling through that country it has occurred to me that as the provinces become more settled, the officers might be more and more transferred to the outlying districts, and in that way the force might be decreased.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I also have travelled in the two provinces, and I have not yet heard it suggested that the force should be diminished at all in either of the provinces. On the contrary, I think it was suggested that if we were to reduce the force which we have in these two provinces, there would be loud protests.

Mr. RHODES. What oath of office, if any, is required from the officers of the force? What I wish to know particularly is, are any aliens employed on the force?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, British subjects only.

Mr. LAKE. What is the nature of the oath that a man has to take on enrollment?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The oath of allegiance, nothing else.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman what is the number of the patrol at the head of Lake Winnipeg, and what are their duties?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have a force stationed at Hudson bay, and in winter time the patrol is from Hudson bay to Lake Winnipeg.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the distribution of the force?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In the Hudson Bay district, 12 men, no horses, 41 dogs—they are at Churchill and Fullerton; in Athabasca and Mackenzie district, 39 men, 34 horses, 27 dogs; in the Regina district, 192 men, in the Maple Creek district, 39 men; in the Dauphin district, 60 men; in the Battleford district, 38 men; in the Macleod district, 63 men; in the Calgary district, 40 men; in the Prince Albert district 66 men; in the Edmonton district, 51 men; in the Lethbridge district, 12 men. So that the whole force is practically distributed all over the continent, from Macleod near the boundary line up to the mouth of the Mackenzie river, to Hudson bay and Dawson city.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What particular use is made of the men at Regina, Calgary, Macleod and other cities and large towns?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The station at Regina is the central station for all the force. At a station like Maple Creek there is an inspector, and a body of men, and there are a certain number of stations throughout the district with one or two or three men at each station, all under the command of and in touch with one officer.

Mr. LAKE. Is the location of the various detachments absolutely in the hands of the commanding officer of the Mounted Police within the area of the two provinces, or do the local governments exercise any control as to the various places where the men shall be located?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The whole distribution of the force is absolutely in the hands of Commander Perry, the commissioner.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What I do not quite understand is this: Take Regina, a city of 20,000, and Calgary, a city of 40,000, why should you have detachments of the police there? If there be any place in the Northwest where the people should be able to take care of themselves as in eastern Canada it should be in those large centres. I thoroughly appreciate the very great importance of this force, and the great work it has done, and I am not suggesting that it should be decreased, but I do not understand why we should have a detachment in Regina or Calgary any more than in Ottawa.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. At Regina we have 192 men. Regina is the capital of the province, and a trading post for all the forts. Recruits are brought to Regina and there drilled and prepared for their work. At Calgary we have some 49 men. All these men are not kept in the city of Calgary, but are distributed throughout the district. In the Calgary division there is a certain number of detachments, and the men are distributed throughout the division. We have so many men at Calgary, and so many men at Regina, but these do not cover only each city but the whole radius.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Every one realizes the necessity for this force, and I am not prepared to say that the necessity for it has decreased, or that the force should be decreased, or that it should not be increased. But I would like to know on what principle the government acts in maintaining or not maintaining it in any particular district. Take the district between Regina and the American boundary. You have population pouring in there, the country becoming pretty thickly settled, under what conditions do you take your force away from there and transfer it to some more remote district, less thickly populated?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The divisions were made long ago. Take the country between Regina and the American boundary, we have a division at Lethbridge, another at Macleod, and another at Calgary. At each of these places we have barracks. We may decrease or increase the number of men at each station according as there may be crime, or fear of raid or invasion by cattle raiders, and the force is increased or decreased at each place according to the judgment of the commissioner. Sometimes we are asked to send a contingent where there is trouble expected on account of a strike. There is no fixed rule as to how the force is to be moved. That is left to the judgment of the officer in charge.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On what principle do you act in determining that the ordinary civil authorities shall be responsible for the prevention and detection of crime on the one hand, or that the Northwest Mounted Police shall be responsible on the other hand. For instance, about a year ago the posse comitatus of various counties in Ontario or Quebec was employed in chasing half a dozen criminals who roamed through the woods, and finally some of them were captured. It would be very convenient if we had a force of the mounted police to do this, but here it is done by the ordinary civil authorities. How do you get at the proper responsibility when you consider undertaking a duty of that kind?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When the western provinces were organized we made an agreement with them under which each province pays us $75,000 a year, and we look after the administration of justice. We are at their service, and the Attorney General commands the services of the police when needed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The mounted police had in the first instance an authority or initiative. They did not wait for the warrant from the ordinary civil authority, but the inspectors issued warrants and the men served them. Is that initiative still retained?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. When the police were organized the officers were all justices of the peace, and also some of the non-commissioned officers, and they were continued in that capacity by the provincial government, so that there was no conflict.

Mr. PERLEY. If each province paid in proportion to the number of men in it, it would pay a much larger sum than $75,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is quite possible.

Mr. PORTER. Is it a fact that the Northwest Mounted Police officers do the ordinary police work of the city where located? Take Calgary the city to which the Prime Minister has just referred. I am informed that in that city the Northwest

Mounted Police do the ordinary patrol duty of the city.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that at the present time Calgary and Regina have their own city police.

Mr. PORTER. They have some, but it is said that the Northwest Mounted Police perform that duty as well.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that Calgary and Regina have their own police who look after city ordinances. But in case of a crime against the common law, the services of the Northwest Mounted Police may be still required. We are still bound, under our agreement, to act when asked by the Attorney General of the province.

Mr. PERLEY. Was the arrangement with the provinces made for any considerable time?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For five years.

Mr. PERLEY. From what date?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We had an arrangement for five years, and we renewed it last year.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina). I would like to substantiate what the Prime Minister has said with regard to the policing of the city of Regina. True, the headquarters of the Mounted Police are located within the town limits of the city of Regina, and usually a large number of policemen are stationed there. I think that there is also a small Mounted Police station maintained there that is absolutely separate from the police organization of the city and maintained for Mounted Police purposes alone. We have our own police organization headed by the chief and with constables under him. I cannot make it too plain that the two organizations are separate and distinct. I had not intended to take part in this discussion, but while I am on my feet I desire to say a word further. Representations have been made to me with regard to the pay given to the constables of the Northwest Mounted Police. I do not speak of the pay given to the officers, but in my opinion the pay given to the constables is not sufficient to induce the best men to go into the Mounted Police, and remain as policemen. We, who come from western Canada know that the cost of living is higher than in the east. I put some question on the Order Paper with respect to the pay of the Mounted Police, and I find that of the constables is from 60 cents to $1 per diem, and a living allowance estimated by the department to be worth $335 per annum. The department estimates the pay of the constables as beginning at $554 and increasing to $700 in the course of five years. That pay is not as much as the ordinary constable is given in the ordinary towns in the province of Saskatchewan, and not by any means as much as the ordinary constable obtains in the city of Regina. I asked if any difficulty had been experienced in the obtaining of recruits, and the reply was that no difficulty is experienced, but the rate of wages in the west induces a number of the best men to purchase their discharge. The reason is that they can obtain better positions by acting as constables in the various towns. It may be a good thing for the Northwest Mounted Police to educate constables for the towns of the west, but unless we give additional pay, as things are, I fear we cannot obtain the best men for the Mounted Police force.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Up to the present time, we have had no difficulty in getting the number of men required, and it is, I believe, the universal testimony that the force is a high class one, and that the quality of the men could not be better. The men start on 60 cents a day and increase gradually until they reach an average sum, with allowance, of $700 a year. My hon. friend (Mr. Martin, Regina) must remember also that when a man has served 20 years in the Royal Northwest Mounted Police he is entitled to a pension. I know of some men who started early in life who served 20 years, and, when a little over 40 had a pension,—which, of course, they had well earned, and which the country did not grudge. I think that, on the whole, with the pay, the allowance, and the pension in addition we have been able to keep the force on a very high footing, indeed. We are exposed to lose men, and we do lose some men, because of the attractions offered to young and vigorous men in the west in business, or farming, or other occupations. But I think the pay is reasonable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am glad to hear the Prime Minister say that the standard of the force is kept up. It ought to be kept up, and so far as I am concerned, if it were necessary to increase the pay to keep up the standard of the force, I would not hesitate to support an increase for that purpose.

Mr. LAKE. What is the practice of the department in regard to obtaining supplies? For instance, at the headquarters at Regina a large amount of clothing and provisions must be provided. What is the practice of the department in regard to the matter?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All supplies are obtained by tender and the order is given to the lowest competitor. This applies to all except 25 per cent; there is a certain amount of small items which, as my hon. friend (Mr. Lake) knows, could not be obtained by tender.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It is now 11.30, and time to adjourn.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Oh, no. We are just on the eve of working.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I did not understand that the hon. gentleman wanted much work done. I thought he wanted in bulk—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But I do not want to lose my time. There are items I want to put through.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I thought the arrangement was to give a certain amount in bulk——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We shall get a certain amount of bulk, I hope. But surely we are not to lose time?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). There is lots of other work to go on with, to clear the Order Paper.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope to do that, but we cannot do it if we stop at 11.30.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The difficulty is that we do not get very good notice of the work that is coming up. On Friday night we were told that Bills were to be taken up, and after that, railway estimates. Later we were told that militia estimates were to be taken up. Finally, the Prime Minister takes up his own estimates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, the militia estimates were taken up on Friday night. We said that Bills would be taken up in the afternoon and Supply afterwards. We should have gone on with the estimates of the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), but that hon. gentleman being confined to his house, I thought that, as I shall be leaving for Great Britain, I would ask my hon. friend to take up my estimates.

Mr. PERLEY. After the House rose on Friday night, I was speaking to the Minister of Agriculture, and he mentioned an item of the Minister of Customs which had already been passed that day, and the Minister of Agriculture said he did not know that item had been passed. So he said: We will take up the estimates of the Minister of Militia on Monday after we get through with Bills.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). There are gentlemen here who are prepared to discuss militia, but some gentlemen who wish to discuss the North West Mounted Police are not here.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Very well, there are some items for pensions on page 45 to which no one will take exception, and we will pass them and then rise.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What business will be taken up to-morrow.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Bills first, then Trade and Commerce, Customs and Excise.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 11.36 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, May 9, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 85) respecting forest reserves and parks.—Mr. Oliver.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). This Bill was before the committee on a previous occasion, when somewhat full explanations were made in regard to it, and a map was laid upon the table which would give, perhaps, a clearer explanation than anything I could say. That map will be laid on the table again in a few minutes. Unless another resumé of the purposes of the Bill is required, I would suggest that it be taken up clause by clause.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister might explain the general purposes of this Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I have just stated that I explained the Bill at some length on a previous occasion, but if another explanation is required, of course, I can repeat. The Bill is practically a revision of the present Forest Reserves Act. Perhaps the most important feature of it is that which sets apart by statute the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains as a forest reserve. Certain parts of that area are now under reservation. The Rocky Mountains Park, of which Banff is the capital, is a reservation by Act of Parliament—a park reservation, not a forest reserve. The Waterton Lakes reserve is a reserve by Act of parliament. The large area of which Jasper House might be called the capital is under reservation by order in council as a forest park. It is proposed to place the whole of the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, including these reservations, in the position of a forest reserve, under restrictions as to surface occupation and regulations as to the protection of timber which prevail in regard to all other forest reserves under the present Forest Reserves Act. But this Bill contains a provision which differs from the existing Forest Reserves Act in this—that any portion of the area included in a forest reserve may be placed under the additional

restrictions or provisions which would enable that particular area to be used as a park or pleasure resort. These are the two distinctive features of the Bill.

Mr. HERRON. Does the government own all the timber that is going to be protected?

Mr. OLIVER. There may be some small isolated areas taken up by settlers. There are certain small areas which we propose to take out of reservation. On examination it has been found that they do not meet the conditions considered desirable in a forest reserve, and we think the public interest is best served by withdrawing them. Besides the reserves shown on the main map, there are reserves in the railway belt of British Columbia which are shown on another sheet.

Mr. MAGRATH. Is there not a reserve on the American boundary of Alberta? And has not some effort been made to have some other regulations on both sides of the line?

Mr. OLIVER. None that have come to my attention. Any representations that have been made have looked to securing the setting apart of the reservation on our side. With that done, perhaps some question of uniform regulations might come up.

On section 2,—lands in schedule withdrawn from sale and occupancy,

Mr. FOSTER. What area is included in these reserves, and of the total what portion is on the Rocky mountains' slope?

Mr. OLIVER. Under this Bill there are twenty-four reserves, with an aggregate area of 16,760,640 acres, as compared with twenty-one reserves, with an area of 3,379,200 acres under the present Act.

Mr. FOSTER. Within those sections that are set apart and are within these boundaries, are there any private ownerships, leases or anything of that kind?

Mr. OLIVER. There are some mineral claims in this proposed Rocky Mountain reservation, and there may be an occasional settler. But the number of settlers is very limited, and of course their right would have to be dealt with; and there are some timber limits.

Mr. HERRON. As the minister is aware, there are a number of settlers in some of these reserves, and is it the intention of the government to let them remain in peaceful possession where they are now, or to remove them?

Mr. OLIVER. It depends on circumstances. If the settlers have gone upon the reservation after it was declared a reservation, then they are not recognized as having any right, and are subject to summary removal. But if there are settlers now in legitimate occupation of land covered by a reservation at the time the reservation is declared, then of course they are dealt with on the basis of that right, whatever it may be. There is no intention or desire on the part of the government to interfere unduly with any man's right. But if parliament, in its wisdom, sanctions the action of the government in setting apart a certain reservation, and if, in pursuance of the purpose of parliament, it becomes necessary to clear that area of settlers, then of course that clearance must be effected, always having due regard to the value of the rights of the settlers. If a man has a right, and it is the will of parliament that he shall not retain that right, then he must be compensated.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I understand these reserves will only be declared as such when this Bill becomes law. There is no declaration of reservation yet, is there?

Mr. OLIVER. These lands will only become a reservation when this Bill becomes law. But there are now a number of reservations under the existing Act which will be included under the terms of this Act when it becomes law. In the territory that is put under this Act, rights existent at the time of the passing of the Act of course must be recognized.

Mr. BRADBURY. Are there any timber limits held under license and abutting on these reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, there are timber licenses both abutting on the reserve and included in the reserve. The owner of a timber license would be in just the same position as the owner of a mineral right or a surface right. Whatever rights he had he would retain, or else be compensated for them.

Mr. BRADBURY. Do I understand the minister to say that the holder of a timber license may still retain his right in that reservation?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. These timber licenses will not be expropriated by the government?

Mr. OLIVER. It has not been the policy to expropriate them. Of course we propose to handle the timber question in these reservations when we get to it, and have the means, and we propose to handle the timber question in a more detailed manner than we have yet been able to do. But up to the present time, we have not interfered with the right of limit holders whose limits happen to be included in the various reserves. Of course they are subject to more

stringent regulations in regard to preservation from fire than the general regulations governing reserves. So far as they have a proprietary right, we have not interfered and do not propose to interfere with that right.

Mr. FOSTER. Will the minister tell the House how many acres of timber reserves there are in this portion now set off?

Mr. OLIVER. I think I would be safe in saying that the area is the difference between the area of the existing reserve, and the total area of the proposed reserve; that is to say, roughly speaking, the area of the Rocky Mountain forest reserve, if my information is correct, will be about 13,000,000 acres.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the minister mean to say that of this whole reserve of 16,000,000 acres odd, some 13,000,000 acres are already held by timber licensees?

Mr. OLIVER. Oh, no.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the question I asked.

Mr. OLIVER. I could not answer that question offhand. But I would say that the land held by licensees at the present time is not all in proportion the proposed total area.

Mr. FOSTER. Approximately.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not think I could give that just now. The area of this reservation is very large, it includes the whole of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains. Therefore, the area that could possibly be timbered under conditions suitable for commercial operations is very small as compared with the total area.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister any information which he could give to the House as to the proportion of that which is timbered?

Mr. OLIVER. Not now, but I could get it. We have gone into the matter fully, we have very detailed information, and any question in regard to the area or quantities I can give at a later date.

Mr. FOSTER. What the House ought to have, and what would be useful, is, in the first place, the area which is fairly well timbered, and the area which is not timbered but which is suitable for planting or forestation. These two figures put together would give us the area suitable for forest land. We might have 16,000,000 acres and a very small proportion, or a comparatively large proportion of it, might be land which might be useful for the purpose for which a forest reserve was set apart, namely, that timber may be grown on it, and that all the atmospheric and climatic effects may be gained from it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I suppose that these timber licenses were granted before these reserves were set apart?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Have any been granted since?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. And will not be?

Mr. OLIVER. And will not be. We do not propose to hold the timber which is in these forest reserves from use, but we propose to inaugurate a policy which will look to the utilization of the timber and to the reforestation or continued forestation of the land. We have not arrived at that point yet but we hope to do so. In a great measure the public requirements are met by the holders of timber licenses inside and outside the forest reserves, but our purpose, in dealing with the timber in the reserves is, first, the economic utilization of the timber which is useful for commercial purposes and, next, the reproduction of timber so that there shall be a continuous supply.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. That puts a little different face upon the question of these timber reserves and rather changes our ideas. What is the primary object that the minister has in mind in setting apart these timber reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. The primary object is to conserve the sources of water supply by the protection and production, or reproduction, of timber or wood around the sources of the water supply. It is to be supposed that the sources are elevated areas, otherwise hills, and, they being elevated areas, are not the most desirable areas for agricultural purposes. We propose to utilize that land which is, under ordinary conditions, either waste or of much lesser value in this work of conserving the water supply, and at the same time to reproduce the timber growth for the benefit of the dwellers on the prairies surrounding these areas.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I understand that the primary object in setting apart these reserves is to conserve moisture and rainfall. What idea can the minister have in his mind when he wants to utilize the timber that is at present growing on these reserves? The minister must not lose sight of the fact that if this timber is once utilized it will be very difficult if not impossible to reproduce it. I think that the minister will agree with me that that will be the result in the case of most of these reserves. If what the minister has stated is the primary object, it seems to me that it is not good policy that this timber should be utilized, and that he should depend upon

the reproduction of the timber for the purpose of conserving moisture. I cannot see what good object the minister has in his mind.

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, we are quite aware that we cannot eat our cake and have it too, that we cannot take coal out of a coal mine and still have the coal mine; but we do know that we can grow wheat on a certain area one year, harvest the crop, grow wheat again on that same area next year and continue the process indefinitely. So, by the present existence of forest growth and the proved adaptability of the area to the growth of forest trees, we have hoped and we believe, judging from the experience of other countries, that we will be in a position to harvest our crop of timber and reproduce that crop.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. How long does it take to reproduce average kinds of timber? I assume that it takes some years anyway.

Mr. OLIVER. It depends upon the kind of timber. Poplar will reproduce in fifteen or twenty years, spruce takes much longer and other kinds of timber will take a still longer time. I am not suggesting that we can harvest our crop this year and again harvest another crop next year. We have to take it according to the term of years that intervenes before the next crop will be matured, but still I believe it is possible to harvest those trees in the forest which have attained their maturity, or their reasonable maturity, leaving the trees which have not yet attained that maturity to be harvested within a few years after that when they shall have attained their maturity. With a tree, as with an animal, or with any crop, up to a certain period of its life, its growth will be faster than at any other period, so that, after having arrived at a certain period in life, whether it be an animal or a tree, the growth will be very slight. We believe that when a tree has arrived at the period when its growth has done its quickest work in the production of timber, that is the time to harvest the crop and leave room for the neighbouring tree also to come up to that standard of growth. That is the theory of forestry as I understand it.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The minister has undertaken quite an important work, and he will require to use a very great deal of judgment as to which of the reserves he shall utilize in the manner he has stated. Certainly none of the reserves on the prairie can be utilized in that way. I have brought the question of our own Turtle Mountain reserve before the House on several occasions, but I shall not say anything particularly with regard to it to-day. I may say that the policy of the minister in retaining these timber areas for the purpose of conserving moisture is a very laudable one, indeed, and one to which governments might long ago have given their attention with beneficial results, but I am not much in favour of a policy of destroying the timber on these reserves, and depending upon the reproduction of the forest growth. I think the minister will have to use a great deal of judgment in deciding as to what timber he shall destroy. What he says about the life of a tree, and the life of a man is all very well, but the comparison does not extend any great distance. I repeat, that it will require a great deal of judgment as to what timber shall be destroyed in the expectation that it will reproduce itself.

Mr. OLIVER. I quite appreciate everything that my hon. friend has said, and I may say that we are hastening slowly in this matter. We are studying the conditions as they exist in our own country. We have a vast mass of information with regard to forestry, and forest reproduction in other countries. What applies in other countries may not apply in our own, and for that reason we are studying the question very carefully to see what the possibilities are. We hope that we will be able to work out a system such as they have adopted in other countries of harvesting our crop, and still having another crop to harvest, all the while protecting the sources of water supply as they can only be protected by some measure of forest growth. We must always recognize that timber in our own western country is of special value. It is worth so much per thousand feet, but it is worth a great deal more than any actual economic value in the settlement of the country. While it is desirable that we should see that the sources of our water supplies are preserved it would not be possible for the government—at least I do not think it would be possible—to sit tight and say: We will not allow this timber to be utilized. I know that in order to meet public opinion, even if we had no other reason, we would have to provide for the utilization of the timber as it reached the point when it was most useful as a commercial article.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Will it be your object to select only timber which has fully matured, leaving the younger timber an opportunity to grow? License holders will not be allowed to cut down acre after acre of timber, young and old.

Mr. OLIVER. That is absolutely our policy, that is the ideal we are working to, but of course we have to meet the immediate pressure of public opinion, of the settler who wants wood and wants building logs. We are at the same time doing our best to consider the proper conservation and reproduction of the timber. I want

to assure my hon. friend that the idea he has expressed is exactly the object of our administration of the forestry branch.

Mr. BRADBURY. That is a very old clause in the timber limits, there has been such a provision for the last 30 years, that no timber shall be taken below a certain size. How much of this area is now held under license by timber men, how much has been operated and who are the licensees in each reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. As I said to the hon. member for North Toronto, I have not that information under my hand, but we have it in the department and I shall produce the figures within a day or two.

Mr. BRADBURY. In case of a man holding a timber license in the area which you are including in the reserve, does he contribute anything towards the protection of his timber?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, limit holders under any circumstances, must pay a share of the cost of fire protection.

Mr. BRADBURY. Nothing special is added for the protection when the area is taken within the park?

Mr. OLIVER. No, the limit holder does not ask to have his timber included in the forest reserve, and I do not see that we would be justified in placing him under any penalty because of our adopting this policy.

Mr. BRADBURY. What inspection is provided to insure the carrying out of the regulations as to the size of timber to be cut and the protection of the reserves from fire by the removal of brush from the cutting of the timber? The regulations under which they are allowed to operate in the reserve ought to be stringent and strictly enforced.

Mr. OLIVER. It is the intention and policy of the department, to see that the cutting of timber inside the forest reserves is done in conformity, not only with the license that has been issued, but also with our general regulations for cutting timber within forest reserves. We pay men to enforce those regulations, and if they do not do their duty they ought to be fired.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is there any provision for replanting areas that have been cut over, or are the government simply protecting the younger trees that are left growing? More timber has been destroyed in Canada than has been used by the people, and the fires which have caused this destruction are often caused by brush left on the ground that has been cut over. Are the government providing for the protection of this timber by having the brush removed or destroyed?

Mr. OLIVER. The cutting within the reserves is expected to be done under the special regulations which are applicable to the forest reserves. We have not entered upon a policy of replanting in the areas that have been cut over. So far, we have contented ourselves with providing as well as we may for the opportunity of the younger growth to develop and for its protection. We have made some small experimental efforts in seeding and planting, but the committee will understand that with 16,000,000 acres of forest reserves, the resources of Canada are not adequate to undertake a general policy of reforestation.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). This is legislation in the right direction which will have the sympathy of every member in this House. I suppose that the details of the regulations for the prevention of destruction and for reforestation will be the subject of the rules and regulations that may be made from time to time by the department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. HERRON. When the Waterton Lakes Reserve was set apart I understood that it was the policy of the government to set apart a townsite within the reserve. Is that still the intention? Will the government survey a townsite, and by lease or in any other way give outsiders an opportunity of going in to establish a town or places of business and recreation within the limits of the reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. The case of the Waterton lakes reserve is one of the cases not provided for in the existing Act which we hope to provide for in the present Bill. The Waterton reserve is a forest reserve, the primary purpose of which is to preserve the timber growth and prevent occupation by people. Under the present Bill we propose to take power to withdraw or cut out of any forest reserve any certain area to be brought under proper regulations for occupation. Under the present Act we are not legislatively empowered to deal with the Waterton reserve or with other like reserves as they require to be dealt with if used for purposes of recreation; but under the present Bill we shall have full authority to set apart a portion of a reserve as a place of recreation, and deal with it as may seem best. My hon. friend said something as to places of business. It may as well be understood at the beginning that it is not proposed that these parts of reserves set apart for purposes of recreation shall be primarily places of business. There will be no business there except such as is absolutely necessary for the recreation of the people. That is the principle that is embodied in the Bill.

Mr. HERRON. I wish specially to urge on the minister that provision be made for settlers to have access to a portion of the timber at all times. I refer particularly to the dry or half-dead timber. It is hard to make regulations which would be just to everybody, but I think there might be more liberal regulations with regard to that than we have had in the past. I think the minister might make provision for the removal of dry timber up to a certain size for firewood and building purposes. It would be an advantage not only to the homes of the country, but to the timber area, to have it cleared of dry timber, which is liable to cause fire and to make it spread. I would like to know what the minister proposes in that regard.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot at the present time give my hon. friend the details of our regulations; but we quite appreciate the desirability of getting rid of the dry timber. At the same time, we have to use a certain amount of care in giving people permission to enter a reserve and take timber. As between the two objects we have in view, the preservation of the good timber and the useful application of the dead timber, I want my hon. friend to understand that the Department of Forestry has quite a busy time. It is our desire to have the timber which has reached its growth, even if it is not killed by fire, but all the more if it is, utilized as freely as possible, always having regard to the proper protection of the timber generally.

Mr. HERRON. While I would strongly recommend liberal regulations in that regard, I am aware that it is often overdone. There are many cases in which settlers unduly draw away timber without making a proper use of it, at great loss to their neighbours. So that while I would recommend liberal regulations, I would also recommend that the department see to it that those who are over-zealous do not get more than their fair share.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I am sorry to have to differ a little with my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron); but if such a regulation were enforced, there would be great danger of there being more dry timber to handle than there is at present. I also am in favour of giving the settlers every possible advantage, but I would rather provide for them getting green timber, for the simple reason that I think it would be putting a premium upon unscrupulous people seeing that they always have dry timber ahead.

Mr. OLIVER. That is one of the difficulties of the situation, and the department is very well versed in the different sides of the question. As a settler myself, I have had to fight the government of Canada for the right to cut timber, and I have backed other people in doing so. Nobody appreciates the value to the settler of the right to cut timber for his own use, and nobody will go further to protect him in that than I will. On the other hand, the wisdom of the country, as expressed by parliament, is that the timber shall be protected, that certain laws shall be enforced, and it is my duty loyally to carry out that expressed will. I put the matter frankly before the House, and only say that the situation is very delicate and very difficult, but we bring to the discharge of the responsibility the best information we have and the best good-will both to the settler and to the wisdom of parliament in declaring the reserve.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Something has been said about reforestation. In my opinion too much is said on that subject. What this government and other governments which control timber should emphasize the most, and what they emphasize the least, is the preservation of the small timber. If the small timber of the country had the protection which it should have, until such times as the country is in a position to spend more money for reforestation than it is at present, the better it would be for the country. In many parts of the country the small timber is not marketable, but it has probably taken fifty or seventy-five years to grow. This is the timber which should be protected, and the more we do in the line of protecting that timber and the sooner the department gets down to that basis, the sooner posterity will reap the benefit.

Mr. HERRON. After this Bill passes, and a forest reserve is set aside, what steps are to be taken to increase the park reserve in the forest reserves. On whose recommendation will that be done? Are the local governments to be consulted with reference to setting aside park reserves or game reserves? There is a reserve close to the boundary line, which, if protected, would be a great place for shooting big game, such as bears, and mountain sheep, and goats. I hope that a large portion of this forest reserve will be set aside as a game or park reserve for that purpose. Will the local governments be consulted?

Mr. OLIVER. All forest reserves are game preserves under this Act, that is to say, so far as the jurisdiction of the Dominion government extends. It is our intention to patrol these reserves, and exercise our rights of proprietorship in the protection of game. We of course will have to come to an arrangement with the provincial governments regarding any general law concerning game, and that we hope to do as the occasion arises. As regards the setting apart of areas within the forest re-

serves as park reserves, it will not be necessary to consult any particular person or government. Whenever it appears to the department that the need exists, it will be within the rights of the department to make a recommendation to council setting apart a certain area as a park reserve and bringing it under direct regulations which will make that particular area available to the public as a pleasure resort.

On section 4,

The said reserves shall, subject to the direction of the Minister of the Interior, be under control and management of the director of forestry or such other person as is from time to time selected for that purpose by the Governor in Council.

Mr. FOSTER. What powers does the minister propose to give to the director? Does he propose just to work this as a department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And the director of forestry becomes simply a clerk in the department?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Is there any mutuality of advice and consultation outside of the department between the management of these reserves and the Forestry Conservation Commission?

Mr. OLIVER. There is no direct connection. Of course all the information which the Conservation Commission collects regarding forestry work in all the provinces, and in other countries as well will be available to the forestry branch of the Interior Department just as all the information of the forestry branch is available to the Conservation Commission.

Mr. FOSTER. So that practically it will be under the system of patronage the same as every other department of the government. Will the Civil Service Act apply to the officers of the forestry branch?

Mr. OLIVER. To those who are in the city of Ottawa, of course it will, but until the Civil Service Act is made to apply to the outside service, it will not apply to those outside.

Mr. HERRON. Will the hon. minister allow any further homestead entries within the bounds of these reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. HERRON. Will stock be allowed to graze within the areas contained in these forest reserves? Has any complaint been made to the minister personally with reference to sheep being driven into that locality under consideration?

Mr. OLIVER. As set out very clearly in clause 2, there will be no homestead entries within the forest reserves. There will be no ownership, no alienation of surface rights. With regard to grazing, it is contemplated that grazing will be allowed within a forest reserve, where it is thought that such a right may be granted without prejudice to the special purpose of the growth of timber. We have not yet, however, arranged any policy in that connection. Complaints have come to my personal attention that too many sheep were being driven into the foothills for grazing, but I have also had demands from the owners of the sheep to be allowed to drive them into the foothills for that purpose. That is one of the nice little questions in the same class as the question of settlers timber, and a good many others. There are two sides to it, and each one thinks that his side is the only one. My hon. friend may be sure that the men who do not want the sheep among the foothills, and those who do, can be depended on to bring their claims and alleged rights to the attention of the Interior Department.

Mr. GOODEVE. Under what authority are these licenses for sheep grazing granted and what regulations are proposed?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not yet decided upon any regulation regarding grazing within these park reserves. Sheep at present have no right to graze within the area covered by this Bill. Under the law certain portions of the prairie country are set apart as sheep grazing areas, and sheep are allowed to graze on public lands within these areas, but none of them are in the Rocky Mountain district. Any sheep grazing in the mountain or foothills are outside the protection of the law.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is there anything in the Act to provide a certain section in which sheep can be allowed to graze?

Mr. OLIVER. It will be in the right of the minister or the Governor in Council to provide regulations under which, if it is thought wise, sheep may be allowed to graze within that area. As I have said, no decision has yet been reached. We do not feel that we have enough information on the subject to warrant us in formulating a policy as to grazing within that area. But once the Bill is passed, if it is passed, we will undertake, of course, to go into the matter very fully and decide what is to be done.

Mr. GOODEVE. Is it only by order in council that certain areas may be used for sheep grazing? As I understand it there is no authority given in this Bill to allow the department to use these as sheep grazing areas. I would like to know where the minister has his contemplated authority.

Mr. OLIVER. In section 16, subsection (b). The word 'cattle' is used there, but

I am under the impression that for the purposes of the law, sheep would be included under that term.

Mr. GOODEVE. Then, I will leave the discussion of that until we come to the section referred to. I consider it very important, if the minister so understands it, that the matter should be carefully considered in this House. Speaking for myself, I have very strong objections to leaving with the minister or the Governor in Council such powers as these. It is a great liberty for the minister to exercise, to say who shall and who shall not use the public domain for his individual advantage. What I claim is that regulations of that kind should be general and every man should have an equal right.

Mr. OLIVER. The objection of my hon. friend (Mr. Goodeve) does not lie especially against this Bill, but against all the law regarding the administration of land in all the three prairie provinces, for, at the present time, the disposition of grazing rights is a matter of regulation by the Governor in Council throughout the total area. This Bill does not change the existing conditions, but merely carries it on.

Mr. GOODEVE. That is the reason I asked my first question, as to whether the government would have this right under the present Bill. Apparently, according to the minister, we are giving him that right. It is to guard against it that I raised the question, but, as it does not come under this clause, I will reserve further discussion on the matter.

Mr. SPROULE. What does the government propose to do with timber leases within the territory covered by this Bill? One method of granting these rights was what might fairly be regarded as a perpetual lease, which I think is a radically wrong principle. There was a provision in the lease to the effect that the lease should be renewable from year to year as long as there was merchantable timber standing on the tract. It is only necessary, then, for the holder of the limit to leave a few trees of merchantable timber here and there to secure a renewal of his lease. Is there any provision either in this Bill, or elsewhere that would enable the government to cancel that lease? In most of the leases it provides that if the land is needed for settlement it may be taken, but I am not sure that there is such a provision in the leases to which I have referred. If part of these areas is covered by leases of that kind, what does the government propose to do with them?

Mr. OLIVER. As I have already said, it is not the intention of the government to interfere with rights existing at the time of the inclusion of a certain area within a forest reserve. If a man has a homestead right, he holds it—even if he is a squatter before survey, he holds his right. And the timber-limit holder keeps his rights to his limit as if the reserve had not been created, with this difference, that under the Act, in the handling of his business on his limit he must conform to the special regulations which the government considers it desirable to enforce within the forest reserve. Otherwise, there is no interference or intention of interference with the rights held by a party before the reserve was made.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood that the government contemplated taking over some of these timber reserves and converting them into parks. That is what we were told in the discussion of a Bill some years ago, and I presume that there would be a similar clause in this Bill. Is it the intention of the government to take over any of these old timber reserves and keep them for park purposes, allowing no cutting of timber to go on?

Mr. OLIVER. We have no present intention of interfering with licensees beyond the point I have mentioned—to require them to conform the conduct of their affairs on the limit to the regulations of the reserve. We do not desire to interfere with what may be called their vested rights. If we did, it would simply mean a burden upon the public treasury, which, at the present time, with so many responsibilities in connection with forest reserves we hardly think we would be warranted in imposing.

Mr. TURRIFF. One word with reference to the point raised by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) that the license holder by leaving a few trees on a limit or part of a limit could make his lease perpetual. I may say that there is also a clause which says that the department may give the licensee notice with regard to any portion of the reserve on which there is only a little timber that he must take the timber off within a specified time. This done, the government has the right to withdraw it. So, the licensee cannot retain the lease of an area on which there is practically no timber if the department does not wish him to retain it.

Mr. SPROULE. I remember putting the question directly when these were under consideration before, and the answer I got from the government was that as long as there was merchantable timber there they could not cancel the lease, making it practically perpetual. I think such a lease is one of the most absurd business transactions a government could perpetrate, to the injury of the people. We have example

after example in the province of Ontario of leases given thirty, forty and fifty years ago; the original leaseholders have died and the family own them still, practically holding them for ever. Timber has gone up in value six or seven times, but the royalty to the Crown is just the same as it was forty or fifty years ago. I regard it as piracy, it is little less than highway robbery of the people's property, and it is improper and wrong for any government or Governor in Council to grant leases in that way. There are leases in that country, according to the interpretation of that law by good lawyers in this House, grazing leases, held practically forever. There are timber licenses which will be held practically forever, as long as there is merchantable timber on the land. That any government should give leases of that kind is contrary to reason and common sense.

On section 5,

Mr. GOODEVE. Is it the intention of the minister to appoint as forest rangers men having certain qualifications and technical training? This section leaves it optional with the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. It leaves it optional, and I do not know that we can make it any better. What is wanted is a man who knows when a fire starts and knows how to stop it. If we can get such a man, who is willing to do the best that is in him, we are doing as well as it is possible to do. The country is getting good service from such men. Our difficulty is to find such men, even without any restrictions. Under the present circumstances, the less restriction there is upon our freedom of appointment, the better men we are likely to get.

Mr. GOODEVE. Nearly all the universities in the country have forestry departments, and are turning out trained foresters. It would be a great advantage to the government to have as forest rangers men who have some knowledge and training in the science of forestry. A man may have ever so good an intention, he may be honest and all that, and yet be of little service as a firefighter because of lack of training. In certain conditions in our forests, a man requires to have a considerable amount of knowledge to be a good fire fighter.

On section 11: Act does not apply to land to which Crown has no title.

Mr. SPROULE. There is no provision that enables you to take this land if it has not become denuded. If the leaseholder does not see fit to take off the standing, merchantable timber, he can hold it as long as he wishes. The annual growth of timber would cover a very heavy rate of interest on the money invested, even if he held it for a hundred years.

Mr. OLIVER. It is not the purpose of this Bill to interfere with existing rights. If we undertook to interfere with vested rights we would raise a great many questions which are not pertinent to the purpose in hand, and are not now to be dealt with in this Bill. We have carefully avoided raising that issue. The policy or impolicy of the granting of the original form of license is not a matter that necessarily comes into this Bill. We take the licenses as we find them and we do not interfere with the rights under them.

Mr. SPROULE. You take power to expropriate in several clauses.

On section 12: timber licenses.

Mr. FOSTER. Has the minister thought about extending that to officials in the department?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not understand the point.

Mr. FOSTER. It refers to the purchase of timber, does it not?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is not section 12 inconsistent with section 10? Section 10 says that:

> The Governor in Council may secure from the holder of any title to or interest in any land within the limits of a forest reserve a waiver in writing, &c.

Mr. SPROULE. And section 7 as well.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Section 12 says that the Governor in Council may not.

> Neither the Governor in Council nor the minister * * is authorized * * to expropriate.

Also, as my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) points out, section 7 gives power to expropriate any land in the reserve. Standing timber is, in law, considered land, and, therefore, would come within section 10.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is in error. Section 10 is provided for the case where certain land is owned within a reserve and by reason of it being owned outside of the Crown any regulation which the Crown might make with regard to the protection of game would not apply on that particular area. It is merely to provide for the effective enforcement of any game protection that the Dominion might see fit to inaugurate within the limits of a reserve provided an arrangement can be made with the private holders, as section 10 contemplates. It might easily be that the government could not arrange with a private owner to dispose of his actual right and yet might make an arrangement to provide for a waiving of his right in so far as game protection is concerned and allow of effective protection throughout the entire reserve. This

has no connection whatever with the abrogation of proprietary rights. Section 12 is a provision that was inserted in the present Act at the suggestion of my hon. friends opposite who rather thought at that time that there might be a possibility that the extraordinary powers of acquirement which are given to the Governor in Council might be used to the undue advantage of the owners of timber limits, and a provision was put in to say that the rights of limit holders should not be acquired. I hardly think that the section is necessary, but we simply preserve it in this Bill, as it was in the original. We have no objection to its being there, as we do not think it would be a wise policy to undertake to acquire these timber limits. We had not that in contemplation when we framed this Bill, and therefore, we preserved this section in the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. In reference to the protection of game, does the minister contend that a private owner has the right to say we shall not protect game if we are so disposed?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. If I understood him correctly, he said that provided the Governor in Council thought it desirable to protect game the carrying out of that policy is subject to the rights that a private individual possesses. How does a private person become possessed of the right to control game under a timber license or a grazing license?

Mr. OLIVER. We are not thinking of those cases so much as of the fact that the Hudson Bay Company own two sections in every township within these forest reserves and they have not disposed of their right. They may not be willing to dispose of their right at the present time but they possibly might be willing to waive their right with regard to the game in order that the protection that we might establish in the reserve would be efficient Otherwise, owning these sections of land, they could, in spite of this government, so long as they were in compliance with the law of the province, lease shooting rights or do anything else they pleased upon these areas, and, therefore, could set at naught our efforts for the special protection of game within these reserves.

Mr. SPROULE. How could the Hudson's Bay Company do that any more than a private individual could?

Mr. OLIVER. Any private individual who owned the title to his land, if it were included within a forest reserve, could say to us, when we undertook to make a special arrangement with him for the protection of game. I am subject to the laws of the province in regard to game, I am not subject to any guardianship of yours, I do not know you in the transaction, this is my land, I treat the game on the land as my property and I will not allow you to interfere with it. We have made this provision, so that, while we would not expect possibly to make such an arrangement with a small private holder, we have thought that probably we could make such an arrangement with the Hudson Bay Company.

Mr. SPROULE. It appears to me to be an anomaly, that might be very awkward to handle in the future, to draw a distinction between a private owner in observing the game laws and the Hudson Bay Company, allowing one to ignore the law and compelling the other to observe it. We have regulations with regard to game in that country, have we not, under the Land Act?

Mr. OLIVER. The province legislates with regard to the protection of game. As proprietors of the land we have the right to deal with the game on that land, but we have not the right to legislate generally speaking with regard to game except upon our own land. We have no right to legislate with regard to game on another man's land.

Mr. SPROULE. I always thought that the laws that we had regarding game applied to all land held by the Crown as well as land held by the Hudson Bay Company. I did not understand there was any distinction; my idea was that if you made a law to protect game, it protected the game whether on a Hudson Bay lot or on a government lot, so long as the government had the constitutional right to make the law, and so with the provinces within their sphere.

Mr. OLIVER. The Dominion has not a constitutional right to make a game law applicable to any property except what the Dominion owns. The province has a right to make a game law which applies to all land, including Dominion land, so that when parties own land within the area of a reserve in which we desire especially to protect game and exercise our rights as proprietors it is quite clear that those who have a proprietary right as against us, are not under our regulations.

Mr. SPROULE. You have control of all territory not coming under the control of the provinces. If in that territory you pass a law providing a close season for prairie chickens, that would apply to all land whether owned by the Hudson Bay Company or any one else.

On section 13, protection from fire along railways under construction.

Mr. OLIVER. This section is extraordinary in its character. It is not properly a part of the Forest Reserves Act, but as it is a matter that would come under the

Forestry administration and is intimately related to the protection of forests, it was thought well to introduce it into the Act. The section here given is an amendment of a corresponding section in the existing Act, the difference being that in the present Bill we make the section applicable to railways in operation, while in the existing Act it applies only to railroads under construction. I wish to withdraw section 13, and to substitute section 10 of the present Act, which applies only to railroads under construction. In the amendments to the Railway Act recently introduced by the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) provision was made for the control by the Railway Commission of the protection from fire along all railway lines in operation. When this Bill was drafted that provision had not been made, but as that provision is to be incorporated in the Railway Act I think it advisable that this section should be withdrawn.

Mr. PERLEY. I understand the present Act applies to Dominion lands which have been erected into forest reserves. It might be wiser for this government to have a special clause in this Bill, with reference to railways in operation, which would be different from the clause which the Minister of Railways would put in force against all the railways in the country; in other words, a railway going through a forest reserve might well be subjected to more stringent conditions in reference to fire protection than a railway in the ordinary country.

Mr. OLIVER. Since this matter has been taken up and the responsibility is distinctly placed upon the railway company to guard against the setting of fires, there is no greater necessity for precautions where the railway runs through a forest reserve than where it runs through valuable private property. I think that the special protection which is adequate in the one case is adequate in the other. I think it is better to leave the matter as it is in the Railway Act with the provision in this Act that is now the law in reference to railways within forest reserves. I have a further amendment which I would like to propose if the House agrees to the new section 13.

Mr. PERLEY. What are the provisions in the amendment to the Railway Act with reference to railways in operation through forest reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. The Bill is before the House and I am not absolutely familiar with its terms. The main point is that the railway companies are themselves required to pay for the patrolling of their own lines in operation.

Mr. PERLEY. The entire cost?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot say whether they pay the entire cost or only half the cost. But they have to pay for the patrolling of their own line in operation, whether inside of a forest reserve or outside.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. In this connection I wish to make a few remarks in regard to fires on these reserves. I think the minister will agree with me that one of the most difficult things to contend with in connection with these reserves is their protection from fire. There should be some better method of protecting them, in the interest not only of the reserves themselves, but of adjacent property. I think the minister said it was possible for the department to control the game reserves in these forest reserves. That may be, but I think it would be better for the department in that respect to work in harmony with the provincial governments, who control the game reserves. Fires are often caused on these reserves by hunters. Nearly every year the Turtle Mountain reserve is burned over. Last fall a fire started on this reserve and extended to the private property of a poor man named Balfour, of Bannerman, and destroyed everything he had, including 100 tons of hay, his house and other property. The matter is before the department; I do not know whether it has come to the notice of the minister himself or not. We had a somewhat parallel case before the House last night, in regard to a fire caused by a threshing engine. It was considered that because that fire extended beyond the limits of the Indian reserve, the government was liable for the damage done to private property, and would be willing to pay it. I think the same thing applies to this case. This man's property was destroyed from a fire which originated in the Turtle Mountain timber reserve. I ask that an investigation be made as to the origin of the fire, and the extent to which it destroyed private property, and if the minister finds that the fire originated on the property of the government, and extended to this poor man's property, he should be compensated for the damage done.

Mr. OLIVER. The case mentioned by my hon. friend is hardly parallel with that which was under discussion last night. In that case the allegation was that the fire and the resulting damage was due to the carelessness of an employee of the government, and therefore, as in the case of a private individual there would be a legal responsibility, if the government had a similar responsibility it should not avoid paying the cost. In the case mentioned by my hon. friend, it is not alleged that the fire was due to the carelessness of an employee of the government. It merely started on government property. I think we had very much better go out of the forest reserve business, and go out of it quickly than to assume the responsibility for every

fire that might start on any one of these reserves. I think that would be assuming a responsibility altogether beyond the strength of the Dominion government to carry.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. If these prairie reserves were fenced, and were leased for grazing purposes, I believe the danger from fire would be greatly obviated. Every year a large amount of grass grows on these reserves, and in the summer it becomes dry and forms a great fuel for fire. If cattle were allowed to graze on the reserve, it would be a benefit to the farmers, and be at the same time a great protection from fire.

Mr. OLIVER. That view of the case has been presented, and we hope to try it out very shortly, and I think the reserve my hon. friend mentions is one we have particularly in mind. Of course, our experiment may not be successful; it may be found that the cattle will destrov the young growth. Representations have been made to us that the grazing of the cattle would be a protection from fire, and would not injure the young growth. At any rate, we hope to try the experiment on a small scale before long.

Mr. PERLEY. The Railway Bill to which the minister refers does not seem to be printed yet. I have not seen the amendment, but I doubt if it extends to five miles on each side of the track; it is probable that it refers only to the right of way. While I agree with the minister that private timber is as worthy of protection as government timber, at the same time this parliament has special interest in protecting its own timber, and these forest reserves, I understand, are especially necessary on account of the watersheds. The whole reason for setting the Rocky Mountain park on the eastern slope aside as a forest reserve is to protect the rivers of the hon. minister's own province, so that this parliament has a special interest in protecting the timber in that section. It would be a national disaster if that timber should be burnt. Even if the railway companies are to pay compensation in case of damages, that would by no means make up for the national loss should there be a big fire. While this section provides for taking care of the timber, and while the railways are to provide certain protection for five miles on either side of the track, my impression is that the Railway Act will not go that far. I submit to the minister, if he wants to keep the timber on the eastern slope of the Rockies, that it would be better to have some special provision more stringent and extending a greater distance from the railway than the Minister of Railways probably thinks advisable.

Mr. OLIVER. I am under the impression that when we have laid upon the railway companies, as the Minister of Railways proposes, the burden of patrolling all their lines in operation, we are asking as much as is fair from them, and it is for us to take efficient measures for the protection of the property of the Crown at the distance my hon. friend suggests. We only propose this measure not knowing what is to be included in the Railway Act. I desire that the railway companies shall bear a fair share of the burden of fire protection because certainly they are the most incorrigible and persistent fire setters, but I do not wish to be unfair to them. We lay the burden upon the railway corporations very strongly under this Bill during construction. Then during operation, I think that the Board of Railway Commissioners is really the proper authority to have control, and I would prefer to leave the matter in that way for the present. I propose, however, to add another clause to read as follows:

Every fire-ranger appointed to patrol a line of railway under construction or in operation shall be furnished by the person constructing or operating such railway with free transportation on all trains running on such railway, whether passenger, freight or construction trains, while in the discharge of his duty.

So thus we shall take that advantage of the railways by compelling them to transport free our men engaged in the fire protection service.

Mr. PERLEY. I am not desirous in any way of imposing heavier burdens on the railway companies. I had no intention of claiming that the railway companies should pay a larger share than the minister is providing in this Bill, but what I was concerned about is the efficiency of the protection. I thought that since we have not the proposed clause in the Railway Act before us, it would be wise to go a little slowly until we find out whether the Minister of Railways is providing in his Bill as efficient protection to the national parks as this measure proposes.

Mr. OLIVER. When we ask from the railways the same protection in the parks that we ask everywhere else, we ask as much as we should, and it will be for the forestry branch of the Interior Department to see that, over and above that, efficient protection is given. If, after this new provision of the Railway Act comes into operation, we still find that the railway companies are not bearing their fair share of the expense, it will be quite in order to make a further change. But I think we are going as far as we are warranted now if the House will adopt the further provision which I have just moved, and which will compel the railways to give our patrolmen free transportation.

Mr. HERRON. If this clause should pass, would it include only the officer in charge of the fire-patrol or also the men fighting the fire? For instance a number of men might be brought for a distance of ten or twenty miles to fight the fire.

Mr. OLIVER. This will apply to every one employed. 'Every fire-ranger appointed to patrol.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The following amendment is proposed:

Every fire-ranger appointed to patrol a line of railway under construction or in operation shall be furnished by the person constructing or operating such a railway with free transportation on all trains running on said railways, whether passenger, freight or construction trains, while in the discharge of his duties.

Mr. OLIVER. Call that section 14, and then renumber all the others.

Mr. HERRON. Would a settler, for instance, who was ordered out to fight a fire, be an officer in the sense meant by the Bill?

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid he would not. I would not like again, when introducing a new principle such as this, to carry it too far. If we do not find the clause sufficient, we can go further another time. We are making a long step in advance in this Bill, and the Railway Act over what we have had before.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does not that give an inspector very large powers of travel over a railway? He might travel on the Canadian Pacific railway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and say he was in the discharge of his duties. Should not this free transport be limited to within the confines of the reserve of which he is inspector?

Mr. OLIVER. This section does not apply merely to the reserve, but to anywhere in the Dominion where there are fires to combat.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would a ranger appointed in British Columbia have the right to go down to Manitoba to look after a fire there?

Mr. OLIVER. I would think not. I think that the words 'in the discharge of his duties' place a sufficient limit. That means within the limits of his patrol.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I should think it would be better to say 'within the limits of his jurisdiction.'

Mr. OLIVER. That would be all right. Mr. Chairman, will you make the change suggested by the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro)?

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose the railway was not one under federal charter, but under provincial charter?

Mr. OLIVER. I am under the impression that this section would apply just the same. I am very well satisfied that it ought to; and, so far as this parliament has jurisdiction, it will. I think this parliament has sufficient jurisdiction, but, if it has not, we cannot do better than adopt this provision, anyway.

Mr. SPROULE. When members of parliament and senators were given the right to travel on railways, it was held that this parliament could only give that right so far as railways under federal jurisdiction were concerned. Will you be able to go further in the case of a fire ranger than you did in the case of a member of parliament? Here are two provinces, Saskatchewan and Alberta, each of which has power to charter railways. They are building railways through federal property. Fire rangers would be employed along these railways to prevent fire. If we have not the right to give authority to a member of parliament to travel on a provincial railway, would we have that right to give authority in this other case?

Mr. OLIVER. I think that, all things considered, and it being a case in which it is conceded that private and public property is being protected from these very railways, I think that in the public interest we should assume that we have the power.

Mr. SPROULE. I would rather hear the opinion of some eminent lawyer on that subject, for it seems to me if we have not the right in one instance we have not it in the other. It does not depend upon a question of protecting property, constitutionally we have the right or we have not the right.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not quite see the point the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule), makes. If we have not this right, we do not need to say we have not it; but by declaring it, if we have it, it becomes effective, I think it will not be wise to enact any exception to this provision; I do not think it is called for.

Mr. SPROULE. What I contend is this: When we were dealing with the question of members of this House and of the Senate travelling on railways, I think, it was agreed that we had not the power to deal with provincial railways. If we have control for that purpose, it seems to me we cannot possibly have the right of control for this purpose.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not learned in the law, any more than my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule), but I think the two purposes are radically different. In the case of the transportation of members of parliament, the railway could not be assumed to have any direct interest or responsibility, whereas

in the case of the protection of property from fire, the railway has a direct interest and responsibility. And it seems to me, that the conditions being as they are, our business is to say that they shall carry these fire-rangers, and it is for them to say they will not if they do not wish to.

Mr. SPROULE. It might be all right in equity, but in law I think both cases would be the same.

Mr. PERLEY. If we pass this legislation and a locally chartered railway wishes for free right of way across the Dominion forest reserve, it must apply to the minister, who could make it conditional that they shall comply with this law.

Mr. SPROULE. That would be all right, but it would be done by negotiation.

Mr. PERLEY. Yes, when we pass the legislation it may be made applicable to them by negotiation, whereas, if this were not in the Bill, the minister might not have the necessary power.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think that as to railways actually constructed under provincial charter, we should not have the right to impose conditions on them. But in the case of a provincially chartered railway wanting to go through the reserve, it could be made a condition that they shall comply with the Act.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The proposed section reads:

> Every fire-ranger appointed to patrol along the line of a railway under construction or in operation shall be furnished by the person constructing or operating such railway with free transportation on all trains running on such railway through the district for which he is appointed and while in the discharge of his duty, whether they are passenger, freight or construction trains.

Mr. ROCHE. Are there any mounted policemen attached to the Interior Department and looking over the forest reserves? I believe that was a case in years gone by?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 14,

Mr. HERRON. Under this clause will any person be prohibited from carrying arms within a reserve? Are the regulations in this clause going to govern the carrying of arms?

Mr. OLIVER. These are not regulations; the regulations will be made by the Governor in Council from time to time. This is a measure for the enforcement of the regulations.

Mr. BARNARD. In reference to subsection 3, will the forest ranger have a right to search any house in the reserve without a warrant?

Mr. OLIVER. It is a question how far we are warranted in carrying the jurisdiction of these forest rangers. If we are going to take efficient measures for the protection of the game, we must have some authority outside the limits of the reserve. Perhaps ten miles is too far, I am not going to insist upon that, but they should be allowed some jurisdiction outside the boundaries of the reserve if there is to be efficient protection of the game.

Mr. BARNARD. How does the minister arrive at the distance within which he can search for arms? If you are going outside the reserve at all, you must have some reason for stopping within the prescribed distance.

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give any reason why we should either go as far as ten miles, or less. This is an arbitrary right which we consider necessary for efficient protection of the game, and when we are giving such an arbitrary right we should not extend it to any great distance. It is a matter of opinion whether the distance should be limited to ten miles, or five miles, or whether it should exist at all.

Mr. SPROULE. If the Hudson Bay Company sells their land, it will be to provide owners, and how are you going to deal with those people to prevent them from having a gun?

Mr. OLIVER. We have in a previous section of the Bill taken authority to purchase, or even to expropriate, such rights within the reservation, either to acquire them by purchase, by exchange or by expropriation. Already under the Act of 1896 in relation to these reservations, we have spent a considerable amount of money in buying out the rights of settlers, homesteaders and even squatters, for the reason that we must have the ownership of the land in order that we may exercise proper jurisdiction for the protection of game. In regard to the Hudson Bay Company, they have not disposed of any of their lands within the reserve. Since we passed the Act of 1896 they have retained their land, and they are in negotiation with the government on the subject of an exchange of that land, but so far we have not yet reached a conclusion. It is hoped that later on we will be able to make a fair exchange with the Hudson Bay Company, so that their rights within the reservation will pass entirely to us.

Mr. PERLEY. Is the minister taking steps to see that no squatters go on this reserve in future? If a man goes there and builds a house, what instructions does the department give its officers in regard to such a person?

Mr. OLIVER. The instructions are to secure his removal by mild means if possible, and if not possible, to take legal proceedings to eject him. So far we have not had to take such proceedings very often, because when people find that they must go they go without being forced. But that is one of the many features of the administration of this law that is anything but pleasant.

Mr. PERLEY. I can understand that. The reason I ask is that I have known good provincial laws placed on the statute-book under which no man had a right to squat on Crown lands, but it was broken every day because there was no enforcement of the law to prevent squatting.

Mr. OLIVER. If my hon. friend had been here in previous sessions, or at a previous time, he would have heard some strong complaints as to the action taken by the department in this respect. My apology at that time was that we were instructed by parliament to clear the reserve, and we had to clear it.

Mr. PERLEY. Those references were to squatters that were previously on the land, were they not?

Mr. OLIVER. Squatters who had gone on the land after the reservation had been declared. The reservation was declared by departmental order, and squatters came on even after that departmental order had been given, and they had to be disposed of.

Mr. SPROULE. In what position will the federal authority be, provided a provincial authority pass game laws in conflict with those of the federal authority? A good deal of this land will be in the province of Alberta, which has a right to pass its own game laws. What will happen if there is a conflict of authority between the province and the Dominion in regard to game laws?

Mr. OLIVER. I think not. The whole purpose in setting apart this reserve, in so far as game is concerned, is to preserve the game. Therefore, any law of the province that contemplates the prevention of the killing of game at some time or other will be acceptable to the Dominion, in this way, that the Dominion will not be anxious to issue authority to kill game at a time when the province says it shall not be killed. There will be no conflict between the two authorities in that way. The only difference will be that under our law there may be greater restrictions against the killing of game than there would be under the provincial law. We will operate within the provincial law and therefore, there will be no conflict. If we undertook to operate outside of the provincial law and authorized the killing of game when the provincial law said it should not be killed there would be a conflict, but so long as we keep within the provincial law and not only say that game shall not be killed, when the province says it shall not be killed, but that it shall not be killed at other times, there can be no danger of a conflict.

Mr. SPROULE. There might be conflict if the provincial law should set aside as a time for the killing of game the time that you say shall be a close season. The question that naturally arises is, who has the authority to pass the game laws? It is admitted that the province has. To assume that the game laws will be exactly the same always will be assuming something that is not likely to happen. It seems to me that there would be very great chances of a conflict of authority.

Mr. OLIVER. I will guarantee that there will be no conflict

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Under the provisions of this section, while a fire-ranger may be permitted to seize an animal fifty miles from the reserve, he could not search for an animal ten miles from the reserve, and very often they require to search before they can make a seizure.

Mr. OLIVER. There is a radical difference between the right of search and the right of seizure. The right of seizure has not in any degree the same objection as the right of search. The right of search is a very objectionable authority to give unless under special circumstances. It is contrary to the principle that every man's house is his castle and all that sort of thing, and it is an authority that should be given very sparingly. It is quite different from the right to seize an article which, if it is known to have been taken in trespass, certainly should be seized wherever it may be found.

Mr. BARNARD. I think the minister is quite right in what he says, but that is hardly the spirit of his Act because he has also provided that, although you can search ten miles outside for guns and ammunition, you can only seize these articles within the reserve, which is rather a direct answer to the argument he has made.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If you found them outside the reserve you could not seize them at all.

Mr. OLIVER. I hardly follow the hon. gentleman.

Mr. BARNARD. You say in the second part of subsection 2 'and within a reserve may seize all fire arms, ammunition, explosives,' &c., while subsection 3 gives power to search for anything mentioned in subsection 2 ten miles outside the reserve. The search will be unavailing because you could not seize.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that it is absolutely necessary that these things should be seized if found outside, but it should be known who has the timber, mineral, birds and fish and if found they can be seized.

Mr. BARNARD. But you do not take the power to search for these. You take the power to search for that which you cannot seize and you take the power to seize that which you cannot search for.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend is mistaken. Paragraph 3 says:

For the purpose of searching for anything mentioned in subsection 2 of this section, any forest ranger may, without warrant or legal process, enter and search any house, dwelling, structure or camp within a reserve, or within ten miles of the boundary of a reserve.

Paragraph 2 provides that:

Any forest ranger may seize, whether within a reserve or elsewhere, all timber cut or removed, all mineral removed, all animals, birds and fish captured or killed.

Mr. BARNARD. But there is a limitation of the right after that.

Mr. OLIVER. That is perfectly clear.

Mr. BARNARD. Read the remainder of the section.

Mr. OLIVER. By the remainder of the section he is not authorized to seize the articles mentioned outside of the reserve. I do not know if that is necessary. It should be known who owns these articles and who handles them, so that if it is necessary to identify any person who is concerned in breaking the law on the reserve the authorities will have that information.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is it the intention of the minister to give power to search ten miles outside of a reserve for articles which the ranger could not seize?

Mr. OLIVER. For articles which you can seize, and there is no exception in the case of articles that you cannot seize. I cannot see any reason why, in the interest of the preservation of game, it is not altogether desirable that the ownership and the place of hiding and keeping of these articles should not be known even if it were not necessary to seize them.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Suppose I have a gun hanging innocently in my house ten miles outside of the reserve, what right would you have to search my house and find that I have a gun when you cannot seize it?

Mr. OLIVER. If there is a suspicion that my hon. friend is poaching on the reserve, a suspicion which cannot be verified otherwise, and if it is desirable that the game guardian should know that my hon. friend has a gun, he should have the right to make a search. Yet, it would not be right that my hon. friend's gun should be taken from him on that ground.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is an infringement of the principle that the minister laid down a few minutes ago that every man's home is his castle. Even if that gun has been illegally used in the reserve, while you may search for it, you cannot seize it when you have found it.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to adopt the principle in the Bill of seizing these implements mentioned outside of the reserve, but I do wish to maintain the principle of seizing the result of the use of these weapons when found outside the reserve. I think my hon. friends are drawing the case very finely when they make the objection they do.

On section 15: Lands withdrawn from reserve for railway purposes.

Mr. ROCHE. Has there been any addition to the Duck or Riding Mountain reserves or any subtraction from the same?

Mr. OLIVER. We are proposing to add to the Duck Mountain reserve, by the terms of this Bill, a very considerable area to the west of the reserve. There has been no addition to the Riding Mountains reserve, and I do not think there has been any withdrawal from it.

Mr. ROCHE. The reason I ask the question is that I have had some correspondence with the department with regard to a petition that was sent in by some of the residents of the municipality of Boulton, in the province of Manitoba, with regard to the withdrawal of certain lands that form part of the municipality of Boulton, and which are within the Riding Mountain timber reserve. The petition reads as follows:

To the Hon. the Minister of the Interior—

We, the undersigned reeve and councillors of the municipality of Boulton, humbly showeth that townships twenty-four and twenty-five in range twenty-seven west of the first principal meridian are in the Riding Mountain timber reserve. The municipality of Boulton comprises townships twenty-two to twenty-eight in ranges twenty-six and twenty-seven west, and is cut in two by these townships, causing much inconvenience and unnecessary expense to settlers in their intercourse on account of there being no road through these townships. These townships are as fit for settlement as the townships north, which are thickly settled, there being no timber of any commercial value on either of them. These townships if thrown open would be settled in a very short time, principally by friends of the settlers adjoining them, who are very anxious that they should be thrown open. By throwing these townships open the western boundary of the re-

serve would be straightened, thus insuring its permanency. And by these townships being settled there would be more inducement for a much needed railway to come through the municipality.

We, therefore, humbly ask that you in your wisdom may see fit to throw these townships open.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

Signed on behalf of the council and ratepayers of the municipality of Boulton.

WM. HEMBROFF,
Reeve.
JOHN MINN,
JONAS P. FIELD,
Councillors.
EDWARD ARMSTRONG,
Secretary-treasurer.

I understand the minister did send an inspector last winter to make an inspection of that reserve, and in this connection I received a letter dated March 21 from Shelvin, Manitoba, which reads:

At a public meeting held at Shevlin on March 20, a resolution was passed unanimously that our member, Dr. W. J. Roche, be requested to bring in a Bill to amend the Forest Reserves Act to withdraw a part of township 25, range 27, west of the 1st meridian.

Whereas, these lands being more suitable for farming purposes than forestry purposes as can be proved by the earnest desire of settlers constantly squatting upon them, by the large amount of farm produce they raise on these lands and that is raised by the farmers on the adjoining lands. As the main line of the Canadian Northern railway runs through this township 25, it is most desirable for the saving of the growing timber that it should be settled upon on the south side of its tracks, thus giving a fire protection to the growing timber.

Here is how it relates to this particular section:

The Shevlin siding on this railway being in the reserve, we cannot have access to receive any railroad benefits through being liable to prosecution by the forestry officials.

In other words, there is a siding within this reserve on the railway and the people apparently cannot get access to this siding for fear of being prosecuted for trespassing on the reserve.

The municipality of Boulton being diverted by townships 24 and 25 in the forest reserve, we are debarred from municipal privileges, causing discontent and deserted homesteads.

Having been promised that it was the intention of the Minister of the Interior to withdraw these lands at this session of parliament, but no action having been taken by him in this matter, we respectfully request you to bring this Bill in for us to give us the relief we desire.

This was duly proposed, seconded and carried.

I had a communication from the department stating they had caused an inspection to be made of the lands referred to, and the inspector apparently did not approve of their being thrown open for settlement. In answer to that I received the following letter dated March 21, 1911:

Yours of the 16th received, and in reply beg to inform you that an inspection of these lands was made last January, when it was 40 below and two or three feet of snow on the ground, after ordering a few squatters off of the sections that the Hon. Minister of the Interior had promised them would be withdrawn from this forest reserve. And spending an hour or so on the reserve, after such a thorough and full investigation and under such favourable circumstances they made a full and honest report contradicting all that has been said and written by hundreds of persons who have petitioned in favour of them being opened, and the resolutions that have been passed by the municipalities interested in the withdrawal of these lands from the reserve. We claim that there is no better land for ranching or mixed farming and grain growing in Manitoba than these sections we are asking to be opened.

We earnestly desire you to bring this matter up in the House and bring in a Bill to amend the Forest Reserve Act, to withdraw a part of township 25, range 27, west of the 1st meridian, in the Riding Mountain forest reserve, thus giving us free access to the Canadian Northern railway, and putting it outside of the forest reserve, as was done in other cases.

Hoping you will give this matter you earnest support and push it through the House at this session is the sincere wish of the electors of Marquette.

I have also had several communications from individuals, and councillors, the reeves, all urging that the lands be thrown open and taking direct issue with the inspector who inspected the lands at a most unfavourable season, according to this letter. Apparently the settlers, who are best acquainted with the nature of the lands, claim that they are especially well suited for mixed farming; and it would straighten the reserve and allow the municipality that is now cut in two to be made compact. The settlers would also derive the full advantage from the railway siding of which they are now deprived. Has the minister caused any subsequent inspection to be made in view of communications that have reached his department recently?

Mr. OLIVER. The two townships mentioned were included in the first reserve made by departmental order about 1900. They have been under reservation ever since, and the objections that have been urged against the reservation are the objections which are to be urged against every forest reserve that is established anywhere in the Dominion. The man or settlement established next a reserve does not want the reserve there for obvious reasons. I am glad my hon. friend has brought this matter up because that is a side of the question that does not strike the average

member of parliament; but, the member who has a reserve in his constituency understands that each forest reserve is necessarily a cause of irritation to the settlers immediately adjacent to the reserve. Under all the circumstances I cannot hold out any prospect of the withdrawal of the two townships mentioned.

In regard to the small corner of one township where the Canadian Northern enters the reserve, we had the inspection made to which my hon. friend alludes and to which the settlers in the vicinity object. The inspector is as positive in his view as the settlers are in their view, and it seems to me, in view of the very positive representations made by the inspector, that we would not be warranted in asking parliament to withdraw the sections at this time. I had hoped that this Bill would have been passed during the winter and so assumed that it would not be possible to have a second inspection of the ground made after the snow was off the ground; otherwise I should have had a second inspection made. Under the circumstances I did not see that I could do anything but accept the representations of the inspector. I think it is an unsafe principle to adopt that when we have set aside reserves by Act of parliament, have spent large amounts in securing the removal of people from the reserves, have held out to all the world that they are going to be reserves, we should then undertake to throw them open unless there is a very well established case.

Mr. ROCHE. Apart from the general objection of settlers in a district to the establishment of a forest reserve near them, there is in this case that very strong objection on the part of the municipality from a municipal standpoint. It is a serious thing for a municipality to be cut in two and not have any settlement between the two sections of it; it causes all taxes for schools, roads and bridges to fall upon a smaller number of people than would otherwise be the case, and, therefore, they cannot secure the improvements they would desire. I would urge this objection more strongly from the municipal standpoint than from the individual standpoint. What is the name of the inspector who made the inspection?

Mr. OLIVER. I cannot give the name offhand. I can give it later on.

On section 16,

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to move to add after the word 'cattle' at the end of the third line on page 5, the words 'or other animals,' so that horses or sheep may be grazed if it is thought well.

Mr. GOODEVE. While nearly all of the subsections of this section have primary reference to the protection of the park,

Mr. OLIVER

and, therefore, are quite necessary and quite within the prerogatives and rights of the Governor in Council, this remark does not apply to subsection (b), which has to do with an entirely different matter. It refers to certain special privileges which may be granted at the will of the minister. Nearly all of them are very valuable privleges, for instance: 'The cutting and removal of timber, the working of mines, quarries and mineral deposits, the removal of sand, gravel, earth, stone or any other material, the pasturage of cattle or other animals.' The minister has stated the difficulty that he has found in dealing with persons who desire special privileges; and yet by this subsection he is asking for an unlimited, arbitrary and extremely valuable power. This section names privileges, which I do not hesitate to say would run up to millions of dollars in value, which it is proposed to place arbitrarily in the hands of the minister. If this Bill passes he becomes an absolute czar in regard to the granting of these privileges. I do not think this parliament should place any man in that position. In the past such absolute power in the hands of a minister has led to a great deal of trouble, and many instances have occurred in which its exercise has been very much to the injury of the public domain. Private individuals have been able to make large gains, in some cases immense fortunes, in cases exactly parallel to this. Hon. gentlemen know that some years ago there were scandals in regard to leases granted to certain men in the western provinces. Yet by this Bill we are placing in the hands of one man the sole authority to grant similar privileges. One man might go to the minister, and ask for the special privilege of grazing sheep or cattle, and might apparently make out a good case for it. Another man who came afterwards might have an equal right, but in the mind of the minister might not make out an equally good case, and be refused. I say this power is a dangerous power to place in the hands of any man. I think the minister should first submit to parliament the regulations which he proposes to apply to these matters, and they should be such that all men would be placed on an equal basis.

Mr. OLIVER. What the hon. member has said is absolutely true. But the responsibility supposed to be assumed here by the Governor in Council and laid on the shoulders of the minister is exactly the responsibility he has now, and for my part, I do not know any other way of handling the business under the circumstances. All these matters mentioned in subsection (b) of section 16 are now under the same control, throughout the three prairie provinces, the Northwest Territories and the Yukon

Territory, and always have been. So that the condition is not new. It is a condition which has prevailed for many years. The particular objection to providing by statute for each of these matters mentioned in subsection (b) is that we are undertaking the administration of a new responsibility for a purpose which is only in embryo in the public mind, which has not yet been worked out to a detailed conclusion.

We do not know yet how best we can carry on the business in these several parts so as to get the best result. We have to provide to use the timber and at the same time provide for the protection and reproduction of the timber. Then we have to provide for the mineral development and make that provision under such restrictions as will still protect the timber. We must also make provision that the public shall not have the free right of ingress and egress, but that, under certain restrictions, they shall have the enjoyment of these parks. I need not say more to show that in dealing with a new condition, we cannot be expected to provide legislation which will prove in every respect satisfactory; and under the circumstances, it is much better to administer by order in council so that regulations may be adopted from time to time as the conditions change and our information increases.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

House in committee for the further consideration of certain Bills.

Mr. NORTHRUP. Mr. Chairman, there are a number of Bills on the Order Paper for their second reading, and I am informed that unless they pass their second reading to-night they cannot possibly pass before the 24th of May. If the committee should rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, these Bills, none of which are contentious, I believe, could be given their second reading. Only two or three minutes' time would be occupied, and then the committee could resume the consideration of these other Bills. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again this day.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill (No. 203) respecting certain Patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited.—Mr. Gordon (Kent).

Bill (No. 204) respecting the Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 205) respecting the Canada Cement Company, Limited.—Mr. Northrup.

Bill (No. 206) respecting the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Kent).

HIGH RIVER, SASKATCHEWAN AND HUDSON BAY RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. MARTIN (Regina) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 202) to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

Mr. SPROULE. This is one of the exploiting Bills a number of which we have had in this House before. I think we cannot take too early opportunity to express our dissent from the whole thing. The idea of building a canal from Nipigon to Hudson bay, as is proposed in this Bill, must seem so absurd to one who knows anything about the matter that we can hardly entertain that idea with patience. But if that were the real purpose and intention, whether it would result to the good of the country or not, it would not be so bad. But any one who has given the slightest consideration to the matter, I think, must have come to the conclusion that this is simply an exploiting Bill to get hold of water-powers and other privileges that belong to the country, under the pretext of building a canal. Personally I am entirely opposed to it, and will avail myself of every opportunity to oppose it so long as it is in this House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Nipissing).

Mr. LANCASTER. When this Bill was up on Monday last, the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) said he would take the matter under consideration and declare his policy with regard to it. This Bill involves the question of provincial rights, which is surely an important matter. But, as the Minister of Railways is not here I do not see how we can proceed. I am prepared to debate my amendment to the Bill, but I suppose we ought to hear from the minister first.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the gentleman in charge of the Bill say? I do not think that the Minister of Railways and Canals desires the Bill to stand, and I am sure that his view is, that as this Bill has passed the Railway Committee, it should be accepted by the House. I know also that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Graham) is strongly in

favour of having railways under Dominion authority as far as possible. The railways connect with trunk lines, and are linked up in a general railway system, and it is desirable in the opinion of the minister that all should be brought under the Railway Commission. I am sure that, unless there is something very exceptional about this Bill, he would favour going on with it.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I submit that there is nothing exceptional about this Bill making it necessary to hold it over. With regard to the objection of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) there is one point I might mention. The branch line we are proposing starts in from mileage 1,000 of the Transcontinental railway. But I do not think that the hon. gentleman is aware that the Transcontinental railway is already built to a little east of that point, and the other line starts in from mileage 940. It will be some time before the Transcontinental is built to that point, and, in the meantime, these gentlemen say they are getting legislation passed to build this road, and, as mentioned in clause (b) they can get at the line from both ends, which they cannot do by going over the line which the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara desires that they should build first.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have had some experience of railway legislation in this House, and I know the views of the Minister of Railways, perhaps, as well as does the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). The Minister of Railways, quite properly, sometimes changes his views when he hears matters discussed. After hearing this discussed the other evening and noting what I said with regard to this measure interfering with provincial rights, he said he desired to take the matter into consideration. If he authorizes the Minister of Public Works to say that he would favour the passage of this Bill, why we can debate the matter. I think the Minister of Railways should be here to say whether he does not think that the amendment I have proposed is a good one. The Minister of Railways has gone further than I was proposing to go with some charters that interfere with provincial rights. I am not opposing the building of this road, but I am trying to prevent a trick being played upon the country by this company getting Dominion legislation to control a railway that ought to be a purely provincial railway. I think it would be well for the committee to rise and report progress on this Bill, or at least wait until the Minister of Railways himself comes in when we can discuss it with him.

Motion to rise, negatived.

Mr. LANCASTER. Hon. gentlemen will notice, by reading this Bill, that the railway's eastern terminus is just across the boundary line between Quebec and Ontario, and runs southerly down the easterly side at Lake Abitibi and then into Ontario, a total distance of 160 miles. If that clause were not in the Bill no one would pretend that this was anything but a provincial railway. The rest of the railway is the so-called branch lines, about 25 miles long each, running down to connect with the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Provincial Railway, a railway owned and operated by the government of Ontario. If these two branch lines, 25 miles long, were all that there is in this Bill, no one would say that it was necessary to come here; because they are not only entirely within the province of Ontario, but almost entirely within one county. The representatives of the Ontario government who appeared before the Railway Committee contended that if this company did not intend to build anything but these two 25-mile strips of railway they had no occasion to come here at all to get a charter, because these two small lines should be controlled entirely by the provincial government. The Ontario government, through its representatives, asked that some guarantee should be given that this other line of railway running to the east side of Lake Abitibi would really be built. No one could suggest any form of guarantee that would be practicable. I thought the solution would be to pass this Bill, but with the express condition that they are not to build these two branch lines until they first build their main line, which line is their only excuse for coming to this parliament at all. Let them first undertake to build this main line 160 miles long, before they undertake to build the two branch lines. Now, if the promoters of this Bill are bona fide and really intend to build the main line, they cannot object to such a provision as that. Therefore, I thought it wise to put upon the Votes and Proceedings a notice that I would move to amend section 7, so as to oblige them to prove their bona fides in coming to this parliament by building their main line first. The amendment is to add to section 7, as subsection 2, the following:

The powers of construction granted by paragraphs (b) and (c) shall not be exercised until the line of railway authorized by paragraph (a) shall have been constructed to the respective junctions on that line to which the lines authorized by the said paragraphs (b) and (c) are to extend.

Paragraphs (b) and (c) are the two little branch lines which, as I have already explained, have each a length of 25 miles. This railway starts from a point on the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, which is a provincial railway, to the carrying on of which the whole of the provincial assets of Ontario are pledged, a railway inaugurated before the present government was in power and continued by the present

government, a railway to which both sides of party politics in Ontario are committed and which is being extended and carried on, for the development of the northern part of Ontario, by the present provincial government, for the benefit of and at the expense of the people.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). This will be a feeder for it.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it is a feeder for it why do they not get a provincial charter? The hon. gentleman wants to feed a provincial railway with a federal railway. If it is going to be a feeder for it, can he not trust the common sense of the authorities of Ontario to give him a charter? My hon. friend, and those behind him should go to the province of Ontario and get a charter, and build the railway if it is going to be a feeder for a railway owned by the provincial government. How is this railway to be controlled? My hon. friend will be in a condition of chaos. I am a better friend to him than perhaps he thinks, because I point out to him that if it is going to be a feeder for a provincially-owned railway, the Dominion Railway Commission cannot have anything to do with the freight rates upon it. My hon. friends show their want of bona fides by such a contention. If it were a provincial railway which was not owned and operated by the province as a government railway, through traffic would be controlled by the authority of this parliament. Let me read section 8 of the Dominion Railway Act:

> Every railway, steam or electric street railway or tramway, the construction or operation of which is authorized by special Act of the legislature of any province, and which connects with or crosses or may hereafter connect with or cross any railway within the legislative authority of the parliament of Canada, shall, although not declared by parliament to be a work for the general advantage of Canada, be subject to the provisions of this Act relating to:
>
> (a) the connection or crossing of one railway or tramway with or by another, so far as concerns the aforesaid connection or crossing;
>
> (b) the through traffic upon a railway or tramway and all matters appertaining thereto;
>
> (c) criminal matters, including offences and penalties; and,
>
> (d) navigable waters.
>
> Provided that in the case of railways owned by any provincial government the provisions of this Act with respect to through traffic, shall not apply without the consent of such government.

The provisions of this Act, as to through traffic, are not to apply to such a road as the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, and yet my hon. friend says that he is going to make this proposed road a feeder to the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway. Under our Railway Act, the minute we pass this Act for this purpose through traffic cannot be controlled by the Dominion authorities. Look at the chaos and the trouble that gets the people into. Here is a Dominion charter granting the right to construct what he says should be a feeder to a provincially-owned railway, and because it is a provincial government railway the Railway Commission will have no power whatever over the through traffic with which my hon. friend is going to feed the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway. Here we have these two little branches 25 miles in length beginning at a point on the government railway, and running within 25 miles of it in one direction and 25 miles of it in another, on a slant till they reach the line that they say they are going to build in order to get a Dominion charter. The amendment which I move is one which every hon. gentleman should support whether he is in favour of all railways being controlled by Dominion authority, as the Minister of Public Works indicates, or whether he is in favour of the provincial authorities controlling provincial railways, which they should do under the British North America Act. It is all very well for the minister to say that he believes in going as far as he can in putting all railways under the authority of the Dominion parliament, but when he says that he is willing to break the constitution because the constitution is that, when a railway is entirely within a province——

Mr. PUGSLEY. If it breaks the constitution we cannot do it.

Mr. LANCASTER. This government has broken the constitution.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes. This government has been breaking the constitution, if not every session, certainly every parliament, since I have had the honour of having a seat in this House. This government broke the constitution when it introduced the Naval Bill, because it failed to place the navy under the control of the King.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend realize that if that is done the legislation must be ultra vires, and that it would be out of the power of this parliament to legislate contrary to the constitution?

Mr. LANCASTER. Look at the position the minister puts himself in. He is quite willing to concede that he is breaking the constitution, and he will pass this Bill because it may be held to be ultra vires.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, no.

Mr. LANCASTER. Well one thing or the other; the Minister of Public Works would make a much more creditable argument, in my opinion, if he would undertake to show

that I am wrong in what I say about the British North America Act, but, the minister concedes that I am right, that the Bill is ultra vires and he argues that it should pass because the courts could declare it ultra vires. Is that the principle upon which we should pass legislation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not what I was speaking about.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman said that I was right in stating that the Bill would be ultra vires.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hate to take the precious time of the committee, but my hon. friend evidently intends to take up all there is to spare so that it does not make much difference. I was directing my remarks to what the hon. gentleman said with regard to previous legislation which had been promoted by this government. He said that this government, during every parliament, had broken the constitution. What I wish to say is that it is impossible for parliament to break the constitution. Parliament can legislate and if it is within its legislative authority it is all right; the constitution is not affected in any way.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it is not within its legislative authority under the constitution it is all wrong, and if it is within its legislative authority it is all right. I suppose the minister will have enough logic about him to admit that, although he does not always have very much logic in this House, and particularly on private Bills.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has a great deal.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman is very fond of stating one side of a question, and denying the converse of that statement, although it must of necessity follow from his own statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This Bill is entirely within the legislative authority of this parliament in its present form.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is provided that it is a bona fide application. If the minister looks at the route he will find that the railway provided for in clause (a) starts at the east side of Lake Abitibi, and makes a little curve in order to get into the province of Ontario, and then comes southerly down the east side of the lake. There is no place there where it can do business. The two other lines each 25 miles long are entirely within the province of Ontario. The provincial authorities allege that they have every reason to believe that this railway does not intend to do anything but construct the lines authorized under clauses (b) and (c), and for these lines they should certainly not receive a charter from this parliament. We would be doing no more than is right and just to the people of Ontario by adopting my amendment that there should be no construction of the railways provided for under clauses (b) and (c) until they have first constructed the line authorized by clause (a), which is the only excuse for their coming here. If they are going to construct the line authorized by clause (a) then they should be obliged to accept the amendment of which I gave notice on Friday, but they should not be allowed to get a Dominion charter to construct the other two lines until they have constructed that line.

Mr. SPROULE. If there were no other reason against this Bill than the fact that the provincial government sent its representative here to remonstrate with the federal government as to the unwisdom of passing this measure, that is a sufficiently strong reason why we should refuse to pass it. I do not think we should always endeavour to place ourselves in antagonism to the provincial governments. Those governments, I think, are properly believed to have prior rights in this country. They were in existence before the federal government was formed. They gave up a part of their rights to permit the federal government to be formed, but others they maintained for their own purposes, and one of these is the right to grant authority by incorporation of a company to build railways within their own boundaries. It was in pursuance of that right that the provincial government opposed this Bill, because the railway it proposes to charter is in reality only a provincial railway, and what is tacked on to it is tacked on simply to bring it within the jurisdiction of the federal parliament. I can see no other reason for it. Now, I think it is our duty to examine these proposals very carefully when they are submitted to us, and bring our judgment to bear on the question as to whether or not they are an interference with provincial railway, and what is tacked on to avoid such interference as far as possible; and when we have not only the circumstances surrounding this proposed railway to indicate that it is a provincial railway, but the fact that the provincial government sent its representative here to remonstrate against it, saying that it would be injurious to the province's system of railways and to its aim, we should be very slow to encroach on the domain of the province in that respect. Now, this railway has a main line and two branches. All railways are expected to build their main line first. The branches of this railway could never be successfully operated in connection with it, if they were ever intended to be operated with it, until the main line were built. The proposal of my hon. friend from Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) is that the company shall build the main line to the point where the branches branch off, and

then build the branches. If they build the main line, which is within federal jurisdiction, that would be an evidence that they had a bona fide purpose in coming here for the charter. But the proposed railway, I contend, is only a device to circumvent the rights of the province—to get the right under a federal charter to build a railway in the province which should be built under a provincial charter if it is built at all. I do not think we should support that device or play into their hands. It seems to me that we should have sufficient respect for the province to give it fair play in the situation. The province has inaugurated its own railway policy and system. Why was the Timiskaming and Northern railway carried away back into the wilds of that country? It was done for two or three purposes: First, to open up the country for settlement, and, secondly, to supply the needs of the country in connection with the opening up of new mines. Since the Cobalt mines were found in that country, the provincial government has exerted itself to its utmost to give the people railway facilities. It has now its railway in operation. It goes into a country where there is not a very good supply of railway traffic to support a railway, and unless it has feeders it must be a financial failure to the province. When a province undertakes to build its own railway system, it should not make the same fatal mistake and blunder that the federal government did, when it built the Intercolonial railway as a main trunk line and failed to provide feeders for it in the shape of branch lines. The province, desiring to profit by the mistakes of the federal government in this respect, when they mapped out their railway system in these northern wilds, made up their minds to throw out a branch line whenever a new mine was opened up or a new settlement took place. They are doing that at very great expense to the province, and some of these branches may not pay for a long time to come. But there is no locality in that country suffering badly for the need of a railway, and, therefore, there is no strong argument why another railway should come in and share with the provincially-owned railway in the traffic of that country. They want to have a paying railway at as early a date as possible, and, therefore, do not look with unconcern on any company or any other scheme that is calculated to take away the traffic that rightly belongs to that railway. What is here proposed? This railway has three lines. At first it starts from the Transcontinental railway at a point in the province of Quebec in order to bring it under the federal parliament. Then it goes across the boundary line into Ontario, and then starts its branch line from the Northern Ontario railway, a government-owned railway, to take away the freight that properly belongs to that road. The Ontario government are prepared to build a line into this locality just as soon as a railway is needed there. Why then grant a charter to any company for the purpose of building a branch line which will take away from the traffic of a provincial-owned railway? That is unjust to the province.

The hour for Private Bills having expired the committee rose and reported progress.

FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS

House again in committee on Bill (No. 85) respecting Forest Reserves and Parks —Mr. Oliver.

On section 16,

Mr. GOODEVE. When the House rose at six o'clock I was very glad to hear the Minister of the Interior agree with me regarding the great responsibility which will devolve upon him in this connection, and also with regard to the immense value of the natural resources of which this measure will give him the absolute control. He said that he agreed in every particular with the remarks I made, but gave as a reason for having this section in the Bill the fact that the administration of these resources has been carried on in a similar manner by this government before, and that there was great difficulty in making general regulations which would restrict and control the giving away of these various resources. It does not appeal to me as a sound reason that because this government allowed certain things to occur previously they should continue that policy. If that policy has been shown to be injurious to the public interest, and to have resulted in abuses, we ought to endeavour to change it, and prevent this abuse in the future. That is why I should like to see this particular clause cut out.

This clause refers, amongst other things, to mineral deposits. The hon. minister will remember that the Dominion Mining Institute has for years taken special exception to the administration by the Department of the Interior of mineral deposits in the lands under its control. So strongly do they feel on this point that there has not been a year, when it has not been brought up at their annual meeting. They have appealed to the Mines Department to bring in a Bill setting forth fixed regulations governing the disposal of minerals on Dominion government lands. We had that question up in the Mines Committee, of which the hon. member for Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) is chairman, but I regret that so far that committee has not brought in a Bill dealing with this matter. I remember one instance cited by the Dominion Mining Institute. Certain capitalists had

sent out prospectors into that northern country, and had them there two years at heavy expense. These inspectors found certain indications of value, and the parties made application to the Interior Department, but after considerable delay they were informed that they could not obtain the mining rights. They withdrew in disgust their prospectors, and said that under such conditions no man would undertake to prospect in that country. I give that simply as an illustration. The same thing has occurred with regard to the cutting of timber. I cannot see why this government should not have fixed general regulations for the disposal of timber in these park reserves. Let them regulate the manner of cutting so as to save the young trees, and let them throw open the cutting of the timber to public auction, and give every one a fair chance. Let them give the cutting of the timber to the men who comply with the regulations, and whose tenders are the highest. In that way the feeling that there is undue favouritism would be removed, the department would be relieved of much responsibility, and the public would have greater confidence in the administration of these reserves. Without going further into this argument, I think the minister will see the force of some regulation of that nature being imposed before we give him the absolute control of resources of such great value.

This Bill also deals with water-power sites and power transmission. A few years ago these things were considered of not much value, not only in Canada, but in most places; but to-day the use of electrical energy from water-power has made such advances that it is probably one of the most valuable of our resources. We can readily understand therefore how men will endeavour to get control of the water-powers which are on these reserves. The main argument made for this reserve on the eastern slope of the Rockies is that it controls the headwaters of the magnificent rivers and other water-powers we have there, so that any one will see that the clause we are now considering is dealing with resources of immense value. And one should not have to emphasize the necessity of our having a standard set of regulations governing them, so that applicants for water rights would know the exact conditions under which they could obtain them, the rates fixed, the length of time they could have the use of them, &c. It is not a sufficient answer for the minister to say that it is difficult to make such regulations. We are here to discharge our duties and responsibilities, no matter how difficult, and see that the public is protected. We know what our own commission appointed by this government has said regarding these water-powers, and the necessity of protecting them. I submit that we should not pass this clause as it stands, but that the minister should be prepared to give this parliament some idea of what regulations he proposes to adopt in the disposing of these various natural resources mentioned in this section.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that I can add anything to what I said before the House rose at six o'clock. I said then that the whole of the provisions of the subsection to which my hon. friend alludes are already in force under the same jurisdiction, and are applied to the whole of the territory that is under federal control. We are not asking for something in this Bill that is not already conferred upon and exercised by the same authority that is alluded to in the Bill. If my hon. friend thinks that what has been practicable during the last fifteen or twenty years in regard to the whole country is not applicable to this small section of it, then of course he may call for legislation in regard to that particular part. But as I said before, the fact that we are undertaking to work out a theory and a policy in regard to forest and water conservation, dealing with a matter which is as yet in embryo, and which must be worked out according to experience gained—I say under those circumstances his demand that there should be cast into legislative form all the various regulations that are required in the administration of the resources mentioned under this section, is scarcely a reasonable one, and is not one that he would consider reasonable if he were in my position. As to the water-power regulations, my hon. friend is surely aware that all water-powers under the control of the Dominion government are subject to well defined regulations, which are admitted by all who have studied them to have conserved the public interest on the one hand and the development of power on the other, and which are generally admitted to be more satisfactory than anything else that has been attempted in any country in the world. I do not think under these circumstances we are asking too much in asking that the same authority under which all these natural resources are administered throughout the Northwest Territories and the Yukon should be exercised on this reservation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. This is a more important provision than appears at first sight. The Bill covers an area of 16,000,000 acres of land, Dominion lands, grazing lands and mineral lands, and I have no doubt that the minister is given power under this section to dispose of timber, minerals and other resources representing a value of perhaps four or five hundred million dollars. So we are giving to the Governor in Council, which of course means the government, the absolute power to dis-

pose in such manner as they see fit of the assets of this country worth four or five hundred million dollars. Now it is an admitted principle that parliament should have control over its own assets, and that the most democratic form of government is that which submits to parliament the proposed disposition of the country's assets. Under the proposed section I conceive that the minister would have the right for instance to dispose of all the gold, silver, copper and other minerals, on these nine reserves in the province of British Columbia. In addition to that, the minister would have the right to make leases for any length of time he should deem proper of all the timber limits contained on this reserve, also of all grazing rights for cattle and other animals. In the province of Manitoba there are five reserves where there are valuable timber and grazing rights, and probably mineral rights; in Saskatchewan six reserves, and in Alberta four reserves, 24 reserves altogether, containing some 16,000,000 acres of land. Now that gives to the Governor in Council, and to the Minister of the Interior particularly, very large powers. I should think that the minister would like to protect himself against the encroachments of some of his whilom friends, and in order to do that, I should think he would desire some uniform standard regulations with regard to each proposed concession; just for instance, as we have a model clause when we are granting charters to railway companies, and a model clause when we are granting charters to telephone companies. There are model clauses to which every proposed company seeking incorporation has to submit. In the same way I think the minister could put a provision of that kind in the proposed section 16. If you do that, then, if you are going to offer a mineral lease, if you are going to offer a concession for sale, all you have to say to the purchaser is: Here are the rules and regulations we have made with respect to mineral rights or mineral leases for this reserve; we are going to put that up for sale by auction on a certain day, you will have the same right to tender as any one else. After being duly advertised for sale the inference is that the government will get a fair price for the concession. The same rule will apply to all other concessions put up by the minister, because the minister admits that this section gives him the power to make regulations, and it is admitted that he will make regulations. Now if he does that with regard to each concession, why not go a step further and say that the sale of this concession under this regulation shall be by public auction, so that the public may have a right to tender. I see no objection to that, and for that purpose I propose that the following amendment be inserted at the end of subsection (c):

Provided that prior to the exercise of any of the powers in this subsection contained, a uniform standard giving the conditions and terms of sale for each class of concession shall be imposed, and that the intention to dispose of such concession shall be duly advertised, and such concession shall be sold by public auction under such standard conditions and terms.

There is another section of the Act which says that the regulations which are to be made under this must be submitted to parliament. So in this way we will get the regulations submitted to parliament and approved, and then we will have standard written uniform regulations that he who runs may read. Every man who proposes to buy a concession will know the exact conditions of sale, and when you put a concession up by public auction, with all the conditions attached to it, it will be sold to the highest bidder. I do not think you can apply any more just or reasonable principle to the sale of the assets of the country, or one that will better assure to the public the highest price of the asset you intend to sell. I ask the minister in all earnestness to allow me to make this amendment. I would point out that the principle is adopted so far as the regulations are concerned. These regulations are to be submitted to parliament, and the minister should go one step further and adopt the principle of sale by public auction, and this amendment will carry out that provision.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), and my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), seem not to be exactly at one in their consideration of this section. My hon. friend from Kootenay states that there should be legislative provision covering the disposition of the rights to these several natural resources. My hon. friend from North Grey is willing that these should be disposed of by regulation, but the regulation must provide that they shall be disposed of by auction. My hon. friend from North Grey seems to be under the impression that we have not any regulation, that he who runs may read, under which our natural resources are disposed of.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The minister has misunderstood me. I have read the old Act, and I knew that there were regulations. But they are not specific as under this Act. You have no Act which says that the concession must be sold by public auction. But we have that principle in connection with our public works—where the amount involved is beyond a certain amount there must be public advertisement and tender. Why should the same principle not hold

when selling assets worth millions and millions of dollars?

Mr. OLIVER. That only shows how difficult it is to understand something that a man is not familiar with. There are certain natural resources, the rights to which it is perfectly feasible and proper to dispose of by public auction. But there are certain other natural resources, the rights to which should not be disposed of by public auction.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Can the minister give us an instance of each?

Mr. OLIVER. Of course, that is what I propose to do. We do dispose now of rights to timber by public auction—that is what our regulations provide for. So far as that is concerned the rights of the public, and also of the individual who undertakes to utilize these materials are conserved. That is considered to be in the public interest. But when it is a matter of disposing of mineral rights, I think the hon. gentleman will search the world in vain for a case in which mineral rights are disposed of by public auction.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why, the Ontario government sold a mineral right by public auction, and received a million and a quarter for it.

Mr. SPROULE. And it was given away by that government's predecessors.

Mr. OLIVER. I can only say that in my humble judgment the way to deal with mineral rights is the same as to deal with land rights, and that is to give them away. I think that is sound public policy.

Mr. LENNOX. That is the way they used to do in Ontario.

Mr. OLIVER. I am here to say, and to argue the point if necessary, that the best way in the public interest to dispose of mineral rights—speaking of rights to precious metals—is to give them away. And that is the way to dispose of public lands—to give the land away. I do not know that we need discuss the reasons for that. But, just as my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro), holds one view, I hold the other, and, judging by the lines of administration which prevail throughout the world, my view is favoured by the majority. Now, with regard to water-power rights, in my humble judgment it would not be wise in the public interest to dispose of them by auction sale. The advantage to the public in connection with water-power rights is in the abundance and cheapness of the power that can be produced.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But cannot the hon. gentleman attain that object by regulating rates? Put on a stringent regulation if you like and then offer the concession for sale.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO.

Mr. OLIVER. Under the regulations we have, provision is made for regulating rates at which power shall be sold, and there is also provision for regulating the rental that shall be paid by the lessee for the use of the power. It must be obvious that,if that right is sold by public auction and a sum of money is paid by the lessee for the right, the ultimate user of the right is the man who must pay that money. What I judge to be the great benefit of the utilization of power is the quantity that can be produced and the cheapness with which it can be supplied, and, just in proportion as you charge a price for the right to produce that power, you lay an additional tax upon the consumer. In my humble judgment, that is not sound public policy. I am quite aware that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Middlebro) has as good a right to his opinion as I have to mine. He represents one view, the national treasury, while I represent the other view, the public interest.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am representing the view of getting rid of political favouritism by putting these rights up to public competition.

Mr. OLIVER. So far as that is concerned, the hon. gentleman will find that, under the regulations of other countries than Ontario there is no room for political favouritism if the regulations are administered as they should be. And that there are regulations for the disposal of water-powers where there is equally no room for political favouritism. The question of political favouritism is not necessarily settled by an auction sale, nor does it necessarily appear when an auction sale does not take place. I am willing to accept the principle of auction sale when that principle is in the public interest, but, from my point of view, it is not wise to accept the principle of auction sale in the matter of mineral rights or water-power rights, or, for that matter grazing rights.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does not the hon. minister see that there is a great difference between a mine and a farm? Does not he see that it is in the public interest that the farm should be settled, because you thereby increase the productiveness of the land and add to your population? But to give away mineral rights, as the minister suggests, for nothing, though they may be worth two or three millions—surely he must see that it would be better, in the public interest, to secure the two or three milion for the benefit of the treasury rather than leave it in the hands of private individuals. For that is what it means when the minister says he would give away a mineral right rather than sell it. In other words, he would sooner give a couple of million dollars into the hands of—I will not say a friend, but a private individual—instead of securing it

for the public interest. I certainly differ from the minister on that point. There is a clear distinction between farming land and a mine. In the case of a water-power, in spite of what the hon. minister says, he can make regulations as stringent as he likes in the public interest, and then sell a concession to the highest bidder.

Mr. OLIVER. But the price he will give will have to come out of the consumer just the same.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But if you give it to the lessee for nothing, what is the advantage?

Mr. OLIVER. But it is on the principle of regulating the rates at which power may be sold, thus bringing the price down to the lowest possible point. And everybody knows that on cheap power the prosperity of industry in which machinery is used depends.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In one case you rely upon him to whom you give it to bring the price to the lowest possible point, but in the other case you make the regulations as severe as you choose in the interest of the public and sell it by public auction. You know then whether you are getting just what it is worth or not.

Mr. SPROULE. It struck me that the argument of the minister in justification of this clause was a very weak one. He says we have this principle in the Land Act, that we have been administering public rights under that law and we are only going a little further, but doing the same thing. Let him ask himself for a moment what has been our experience under what he is pleased to call the correct principle? Did it turn out good or bad? Look at the administration of the timber berths in the country. What has that been? We have had the greatest public scandals ever perpetrated in Canada, absolute piracy, dishonesty, thievery, fraud and what belonged to the whole people was converted to the use of a few individuals improperly and dishonestly, under the very law and the very principle that he is defending to-night. In my judgment our experience of the past is the strongest argument possible why we should devise some other means for dealing with these matters in future because that which has been pursued in the past has not been a success. It has been admittedly a failure, and that is known from one end of Canada to the other.

There is another reason why I think there is a good deal of force in the argument of my hon. friend from North Grey. What we are dealing with is not our own. It belongs to the people. What are the government? They are the trustees for the time being, handling the assets of the people, and like every other trustee who is dealing with something in the nature of a trust they are bound to make the very best possible use of the asset that they can in order to give the largest return to the owners. Are they doing that by this system? Are they doing it when they are acting in this way? The hon. gentleman says that he would give away a mine as well as he would give away land. Suppose that by an accident of Providence, or whatever you like to call it, there is great wealth stored away in small compass in the ground; it belongs to the Dominion of Canada and the Minister of the Interior is the party who is entrusted with the duty of seeing that it is administered in such a way as to bring to the owners the largest return. Yet he says that he would give it away. That is not getting the largest return from it. The party who works it is entitled to a reasonable profit out of his labour and out of the money invested in it, but the return to him is likely to be more than a dozen profits on his operations. Who is entitled to the return over and above what is a reasonable profit? Are not the owners entitled to that—the people of Canada? Therefore I say that when it is handled in trust it should be the duty of the trustees to handle it so as to get the largest returns for the owners, and when they are doing that, in my judgment they are doing what is good business, and they are following out a principle that is universally admitted to be the proper principle for every trustee to be guided by in administering a trust. The minister said something with reference to mines. He believed in giving them away. When I can get the attention of the minister with all the many attractions elsewhere, I will address myself to the subject. When a minister is in charge of a Bill and a member is endeavouring to criticise the measure, and is addressing himself to the subject, he is entitled to receive the attention of the minister.

Mr. OLIVER. I wish to apologize to the hon. gentleman by saying that I was asking my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) on my right—

An hon. MEMBER. You have no right to ask a question.

Mr. OLIVER. I was asking my hon. friend on my right a question to bring to my mind a point that my hon. friend was speaking on at the moment. It was not any lack of attention to what he was saying, but I was wishing to keep myself informed as to the thread of the hon. gentleman's discourse.

Mr. SPROULE. If that is the explanation I will exonerate the hon. gentleman from any desire to be discourteous, but I thought that I saw him trying to attract the attention of other hon. gentlemen around him.

Mr. NESBITT. I take the opportunity of endorsing what the hon. minister has said.

Mr. OLIVER. I am afraid my hon. friend is too suspicious.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not know that the endorsement comes with very good grace from the hon. gentleman. I was just trying to give an example of the two systems. The late Sir Oliver Mowat and his successor, Mr. Ross, seemed to have the same idea with regard to the administration of a trust that the Minister of the Interior has to-night, and in pursuance of that they took the mines of Ontario and absolutely gave them away to their own friends.

Mr. McLEAN (Huron). No, no.

Mr. SPROULE. I say yes; and the history of it is so plainly written on every page of the late government's record, that he who runs may read, if he were only half blind, and then he would not be any worse than the hon. member for Huron when it comes home to him. What was the result? They were borrowing money to carry on the affairs of the government of the province, they were squandering the assets of the province, and when the change of government was made it was found that they had given away four-fifths of the valuable mines in Ontario. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman has good order.

Mr. SPROULE. When I hear men talking in ordinary conversational style I hardly think it is good order. I was saying that they had given away nearly four-fifths of the valuable mines when the present government came in. What did they do? They took a small portion of a lake, they took remnants, they took mines here and there, endeavoured to find out the value of these mines, advertised them for sale and they got as high a value as they could for them. What did they bring back to the people of the province of Ontario between the time that the preceding government went out and they came into power—a period of about seven years? There has been derived from these mines between $5,000,000 and $6,000,000. That belongs to the province of Ontario, whereas, similar resources were being squandered by the predecessors of the present government. This result has been accomplished by virtue of a change in policy that recognized it to be the duty of trustees to use the trust confided to their care to bring back the largest return to the owners. What are they doing to-day? One of those mines alone is bringing over $70,000 a year that was not bringing $100 a year when the present government came into power. This revenue was being given away and the same principle obtained with regard to nearly all the valuable mines in Ontario. To-day the province is getting a large return from them and the result is that although the government are spending more in the interest of the people of the province they are still able to carry on the affairs of the province with great success, and they are doing it greatly to the benefit of the people. They are doing that by virtue of a different method of administering the trust confided to them than that proposed by the Minister of the Interior, and it should be a strong argument in favour of the wisdom of trying to handle that which is given to you in trust in such a way that it brings the largest returns to the owners for whom that trust is being administered.

By carrying it out in this way you are not likely to do that. Our experience in the past is the best evidence of this, and I know of no better criterion by which to judge the future than the experience of the past. What has been the experience of the past under the law the minister is defending to-night? It has been one of wasteful extravagance and dishonesty. I am free to admit that under regulations properly carried out in the spirit and letter we might get a much better return than we have got in the past under many regulations. Not only was the law bad because it was on a wrong principle, but the regulations were not properly enforced, and the result was great loss to the Dominion of Canada in the administration of timber limits, of mines and grazing leases. Yet, the minister can see no reason for a change now. To my mind the history of the past is the very strongest reason why we should endeavour to devise some other way whereby we could handle what belongs to the Dominion of Canada in a better way than it has been handled in the past, and to bring to the country a larger return for it.

Mr. DOHERTY. If the regulations referred to be the regulations made under the Land Act, and if the government are exercising the power of regulating the entire question of how rights are going to be acquired under the Lands Act, by a system of regulations made by the government over a period of thirty years past, it would seem to me that the government ought to be in a position to know what are proper regulations to make, and if the government are in that position I fail to see why they do not propose to this House to enact those regulations into law. I understood from the minister that the reason why it was considered necessary that the government should have conferred upon it power to control these matters, was that the whole thing was in embryo, quite a new thing, something which could not now be elaborated

and provided with a permanent system. I was struck with this position as going a great way to justify this departure from the sound principle that the control of the acquisition of these rights ought properly to be determined by this parliament, but if the government has been prescribing by regulations for a period of thirty years the manner of disposal and acquisition of similar rights I do not grasp how it could be said that the whole matter is in that embryonic condition in which it would be impossible to formulate and lay before the House just the regulations required for that purpose. There seems to me to be a contradiction between the two positions taken by the minister. Is it intended that existing regulations under the Lands Act shall govern the acquisition of the rights with which we are now dealing in this particular portion of the country that is to be set aside as a forest reserve?

Mr. OLIVER. It is intended that the regulations at present applicable to these rights in other sections of the country shall be made applicable to the same purposes within the proposed reserve, but with such changes as are considered necessary in order to carry out the special purpose of this reservation. It is the special purpose of this reservation that makes the new condition which is not thoroughly understood and which makes it impossible to apply the regulations as they are, and have been in use in the rest of the country. My hon. friend argues that we should have our regulations which apply to the country generally put in statutory form, but the underlying principle of these regulations, in regard to mineral rights particularly, was reversed in 1907 and 1908 so that the present regulations have only been in force since that time. They have not been thoroughly worked out, and the fact that they were reversed in 1907 and 1908 from the regulations prevailing before is evidence of what I have already said that in the formative condition it is desirable that there should be a freer means of meeting new conditions and new situations as they arise than is provided by definite legislation.

Mr. DOHERTY. As I understand, the regulations already made under the Lands Act must not only be submitted to parliament, but must be approved by parliament. These regulations approved by parliament have become law, and it does not seem to me desirable that what parliament has approved and made law should be susceptible to alteration not only in details, but in entire principle, as the minister says in 1907 these regulations were altered by the Governor in Council alone. I do not know how long these regulations had been in force before they were altered, but I fail to see any reason why the power should remain in the hands of the Governor in Council. There does not seem to me to be anything to indicate that there was such urgent need to make changes in the regulations that parliament had sanctioned that it was necessary to give that power to the Governor in Council. I have had occasion to look at some of the regulations made by order in council under the Lands Act which are before the House now.

It appears that a number of the regulations changed had been in force for a long period of years. If that is true, what is the necessity of placing the power to amend those regulations, which have become law by the action of parliament itself, in the hands of the Governor in Council? We have an annual session of parliament, and surely the few months that would elapse while the government would wait to submit to parliament any proposed alterations in those regulations, would not be a matter of vital importance. We are dealing here not with pure questions of administration. They may be questions of administration if you look at these lands as the property of the government; but you are going quite beyond that when you make a law to determine how rights in that property may be alienated and become the property of individuals; and the minister has, I think, conceded that when you are making a law for the purpose of determining how the public generally may acquire rights on certain property, the first essential is that that law should secure perfect equality of right between all citizens who are subjected to it. Now, we are asked, because it has been done in the past with regard to this immense tract of property, to surrender our legislative power to determine how one may acquire rights in or upon it, over to the Governor in Council; and I can see no reason for that except that between sessions of parliament there might arise a necessity for amending these laws. I have entire sympathy with the position taken by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve), that parliament ought to keep control over legislation that is to govern the transmission of this particular kind of property, just as fully as it should keep control over any other matter that is subject to its legislative competence. It seems to me that the continuance of the system under the Lands Act is difficult to justify in itself; but to go a step further, and to say that because it does exist under the Lands Act, we must continue it here, when there is no substantial reason advanced to establish the necessity of our doing so, seems to me to be very far from conclusive. In the perusal that I have had occasion to make of the regulations passed under the power conferred by the Lands Act, it has seemed to me that many of the matters there dealt with would have been more properly dealt

with by parliament itself; and it is a most undesirable system to create and maintain throughout a large section of country, under which not only the executive but the legislative power is exercised by one body, that body being properly speaking the executive branch of parliament, which we are taking out of its functions and delegating to it functions which properly speaking belong to us. That seems to me to be in principle a most undesirable state of affairs, and one which should call for some more serious reason than any that has been advanced to justify it. This is not the only instance we have had of legislation of this kind. We have had this session quite a number of Bills in which parliament has been called on to hand over its legislative powers to the executive government. All these instances, while they may be cited as precedents for our doing the same thing again, are instances of the growth of a very serious abuse. I do not profess to be familiar with the precise details of how the rights here in contemplation ought to be dealt with; but I do think that the government, which has been administering and dealing with this kind of property throughout all these territories for a long period of years, ought to be in a position to lay before us a statute that would determine how these properties ought to be disposed of. If that were done, I can realize that it might be a proper thing with regard to the details, to confide some power of making regulations to the government. Before I sit down, I would like to point out what seems to me to be a difference between these regulations and the regulations provided for in the Lands Act. While the latter regulations become law when made, they only continue in force if approved by parliament at its next session. But under section 18 of this Bill, the approval of parliament is not required. All that is required is that the regulations shall be laid before parliament at its next session. Of course, it is competent for any member to raise the question then whether these regulations should not be abrogated, but there is a substantial difference between the requirement that regulations shall be laid before parliament without parliament being required to take any action and the requirement that they must be submitted to parliament for approval. The minister has said that the position taken by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Sproule) differs materially from that taken by the hon. member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve). No doubt in moving an amendment my hon. friend from North Grey is accepting the principle of the section, but he moved that amendment on the assumption that the minister had closed the door to any possible consideration of the very conclusive reasoning made by my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) in support of the position he took, namely, that at all events before parliament should act the minister ought to submit the regulations which are to govern the disposal of these rights.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). I had hoped that the hon. minister would remove the anomaly that exists between the land regulations, which require parliamentary sanction, and the regulations under this Bill, which have the same force and effect as if enacted by this parliament, provided they are published in four consecutive issues of the 'Canada Gazette.' There is no more objectionable legislation than legislation by delegation or reference. that is by passing an Act giving the Governor in Council power to make regulations which will have the force of law and concerning which the approval of parliament need not be asked. That is what is being done here; and when we have regard to the scope and the intent of this measure, one can see at once how particularly objectionable is such legislation. Taking up the Bill as a whole, it has a very commendable object. that of setting apart forest reserves and parks. And it is certainly necessary that some immediate executive power should have the making of regulations for the proper governing of these reserves, such as the preservation of game, the prevention of fires, the prevention of unauthorized business and traffic, the removal and exclusion of undesirable persons and trespassers, &c. But when you come to subsection (b) of section 16, you find that it gives the Governor in Council power to alienate all the reserves. And he can do this without any authority from parliament, without any Act being passed. He has practically the power to sell and dispose of the whole park property at his discretion, without the intervention of parliament. The cutting and removing of timber, the working of mineral deposits and forests, the removal of sand, gravel, or any other material, the pasturage of cattle, the use of hay lands, the establishment of reservoirs, water-power sites, power transmission lines, telegraph and telephone lines and the granting of leases and permits therefor—all these things can be sold by the Governor in Council free from any interference by parliament, and without any authority from parliament. So that with the exception of alienating the fee simple of the land, we are asked to give the Governor in Council power to dispose of the entire park property.

Reference has been made to park reserves in Ontario, but in Ontario they are dealt with very differently. There, in the various Acts dealing with timber, or minerals in park reserves, you find provisions as to how these shall be disposed of, if

dealt with at all, and in the Acts there are schedules containing the regulations, so that all who run may read, and the public knows just what its rights are.

The minister justifies this general clause by saying that the same power was given to the Governor in Council with regard to the public lands in the three western provinces, and that what was good enough for the public lands of this Dominion, situated in these three provinces, ought to be good enough for these park reserves. But the way in which the public lands of the Dominion, in these western provinces, have been dealt with, has not been altogether satisfactory. Regulations were framed in such a way as to allow certain persons to obtain most valuable concessions at very trifling prices. The minister took office in his present position in April, 1905. It will be recollected that during the months of April, May, June, and July of that year some very large grazing leases were granted, aggregating 580,000 acres. It is true that in the course of that year the regulations were changed, and no further irrevocable leases, as we may call them, were granted. But during the early months of the minister's occupancy of his present office, these immense grants were made of grazing leases in that country. Much the same thing happened with regard to the timber leases. It will be recollected that a very large number of timber licenses were granted in 1903-04. Then they were changed. History may repeat itself here. In this case there should be the double safeguard. This property is set apart for posterity—for recreation, for health, for the reforestation of the country, for the preservation of the scenery and of game.

Therefore, it does seem that double safeguards should be cast about it. The minister has said that these regulations are in a formative condition. I think that a year or more ago a similar Act to this was passed setting apart a park reserve. The minister will know better than I, but I should think there must be regulations with regard to that park reserve. If there be these regulations, why not incorporate either in the Bill itself or in the schedule those that have been found workable and let them be adopted here? But to say that we shall give the Governor in Council complete power to deal with these matters by order in council is going very much further than this parliament should go. This is a matter of very great importance. The minister takes his own view, and no doubt he has a strong opinion on the matter. He may have full confidence in his own administration of the department and may feel that he has personal knowledge of the needs under these regulations. And he may be right. But he cannot be in his place forever, and these regulations, in future, may be enforced by some person in whom he would not have the same confidence as in himself. If he will take a broad view of this question I think he will see that it is desirable to have these regulations put in as part of the Bill, or delay the Bill until these regulations can go through their formative period or condition, and come to the stage of maturity where they can be dealt with by parliament.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I approve this Bill so far as it means the conservation of natural resources, but it requires but little thought to understand that the legislation is of a very serious nature. Until this Act is repealed, we divest ourselves of the power of governing a kingdom—over sixteen millions of acres—not only lands, but minerals, timber, and all the wealth contained in those lands. We have to look forward perhaps, to that kingdom becoming greater in another way. Cities and towns may grow up in it. And it is all to be governed by whom? By the Governor in Council—in name; by the minister, in name: but rather by some official appointed to carry out the work in this department, such as the gentleman who rules over the timber department. This Act is to be supplemented by regulations that are to have the same power as if they were contained in the body of the Act. The Act says the regulations are to be published in the 'Canada Gazette,' and are to be submitted to parliament. There is not even an averment in the Bill that regulations will be null and void until approved by parliament—they are to be submitted, that is all. This kingdom we are giving over to an official, a hired official, perhaps a political official, who would be appointed to take charge of it. We divest ourselves not only of the power we have at present for the direction and control of all its wealth, but we are giving to this official all the powers, for all this territory of municipal governments. He is to make rules and do everything that a municipal council could do in a very much smaller land. He is to arrange how even the fee simple is to be disposed of, and the mining rights, the timber rights, the removal of stone, gravel, or sand, the pasturage of cattle, the use of hay lands and the establishment of and use of reservoirs. There may be an agricultural community there, and I suppose that even grain growing would go with the pasturage rights in the land. I think if the minister would stay his hand and afterwards come to the House with something more definite so that we might know what sort of a government the country and the people were to have, we might assist him. But I think the House would be making a mistake in passing the Bill in its present shape.

Mr. GOODEVE. I want to reiterate and make very clear my position on this matter. I would like to take up the argument of the minister when he was trying to show that a difference in principle existed between the position of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) and my own. I think the minister did not well sustain his contention. Both the hon. member for North Grey and I contend for the one principle of absolute publicity and absolute equal rights in the disposal of these natural resources. I will take the minister's own argument. In dealing with my position, he referred to the mining law. That is the principle I have contended for. In every province of this Dominion we have statutory enactments, or mineral laws. Every prospector knows exactly the conditions under which he can stake out a mineral claim. It does not lie in the option of the minister or of the Governor in Council to say whether he shall or shall not receive that claim. The law has fixed all the conditions. That is exactly the principle I am contending for, so that when a man applies for a grazing lease he shall know the conditions under which he can obtain that lease. I think the minister scarcely realizes that he is asking in this Bill to be made a king over 25,000 square miles of territory, even a man above the king. Practically he is given power to say to one man, Go, and he goeth; and to another man, Come, and he cometh, because he will be given power to refuse that man a right or to give him a right. He will control everything except the fee simple to that land. He becomes an absolute czar of that great kingdom of 16,000,000 acres of land. I think even the Minister of the Interior should hesitate before he asks this parliament to grant him such absolute power. All I am contending for is that which has been so well advocated by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Macdonell), and the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart). We want the regulations brought down in a schedule and put in this Bill. We want to know what are the conditions under which the minister proposes to dispose of these valuable assets. We are not opposing this Bill, we are supporting the minister on the principle of this Bill, but we want to make it, if possible, of such a character that it will conserve the great natural resources of this country. I would ask the minister to allow that section to stand for further consideration, and give us some idea of the regulations he proposes to make.

Amendment (Mr. Middlebro) negatived: Yeas 17, nays 39.

On section 17: Dominion parks.

Mr. DOHERTY. Are we to understand that the word 'reserves' in the section means the reserves that are specified in the schedule as forest reserves, and are these parks to be taken exclusively out of the forest reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think it might possibly be made clearer because from the wording of the section it looks as if the minister were empowered to make such reserves as he liked into Dominion parks. The section says that he may 'designate' such reserves or areas within reserves as he sees fit.' I do not insist upon it, but it seems a little ambiguous, and it might suggest that he could make any reserves he liked.

Mr. OLIVER. Suppose we insert the word 'forest' before the word 'reserves'?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, I think that would make it perfectly clear.

Mr. OLIVER. I move that the word 'forest' be inserted in the second line of section 17 between the words 'within' and 'reserves'.

Section as amended agreed to.

On section 18: regulations to be published and laid before parliament,

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is it the intention of the minister that parliament shall have any legislative authority over these regulations when they are laid before parliament?

Mr. OLIVER. It is not the intention as expressed in the section.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is the use of laying them before parliament?

Mr. OLIVER. For the information of parliament.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Suppose they are not satisfactory to us, what remedy have we?

Mr. OLIVER. There will be an opportunity to express an opinion with regard to them, and I presume that if the opinion be well founded it would be for the government to try to meet the opinion so expressed and if the majority in parliament should disagree with the regulations it would be for the government to step down and out.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would not the minister adopt somewhat the same principle as that which he adopted in his Indian Act the other day when he gave the judge of the Exchequer Court power to do certain things, but he must lay his report on the table of the House, and it must receive the assent of this House before it becomes operative? Would it not be fair that these regulations should not become operative until assented to by parliament. Sure-

ly, when a minister is going to make regulations under which he has power to dispose of millions and millions of dollars worth of the assets of this country, we should have some say as to the manner in which they should be disposed of. Under the sections that we have passed already he will have absolute authority, and this parliament will have nothing whatever to do with the matter of disposing of these assets. Surely the minister will not prevent parliament from having some say, from giving consent to the manner in which these assets shall be disposed of. It is merely to give the House an erroneous impression to say that these regulations shall be laid before the House, but that we shall have no legislative authority to deal with them. The whole substance of the Act is that this parliament shall have the right to say how these assets shall be disposed of.

Mr. OLIVER. The larger part of the regulations would be of such a character and for such a special purpose that I do not think it would be for the dignity of parliament to require parliament's consideration of or assent to them. If my hon. friend will read sections 16 and 17 he will see that regulations are required for a very large number of what might be considered trivial matters, and I would hardly think that it would be necessary or desirable that these matters should be subject to the approval of parliament. I do not think it would add to the dignity or prestige of parliament that it should be so. With regard to the regulations for the disposal of natural resources, these are the important ones, and I have no doubt these are the ones that my hon. friend had specially in mind. With regard to regulations such as already exist, and which are applied to Dominion lands generally under the control of the Dominion government, these regulations are subject to the approval of parliament, as my hon. friend desires. The application of these regulations to the forest reserve area will only mean certain restrictions or modifications so as to bring them into line with the special purpose for which the reserve is set apart. The basic principle of the alienation of the public right in these resources will already have been approved by parliament as being embodied in the original regulations which are general in their application throughout the country, and therefore it would seem to me unnecessary that the adaptation of these regulations to the park reserves should, in the same degree, be submitted to parliament.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister does not say that the regulations regarding the forest reserves will be the same as those provided under the Dominion Lands Act with regard to other sections of the country. We have a Bill before the House now with regard to orders in council that have already been passed under the Dominion Lands Act. These regulations are all submitted to, and approved by parliament. The minister might put in force a certain regulation under the Dominion Lands Act which might have been approved by parliament, and then he might turn around and put in force an entirely different regulation under the Forests Reserves Act, with which he does not require to come before parliament at all. If he puts it in this Bill that these regulations are to be the same as those under the Dominion Lands Act, which are already approved by parliament, that is one thing, but to take to himself authority to make entirely different regulations without the approval of parliament is something with which we cannot agree.

Mr. OLIVER. It certainly is not the intention to make different regulations. I have already explained that it is the intention to adapt the regulations that are generally applicable to the special conditions which prevail in the parks and reserves. If these regulations have already been approved by parliament it does not seem to me necessary that the adaptation should also require the approval of parliament. It is true, as my hon. friend says, that the Act does not say the regulations shall be the same. The Act cannot say that the regulations shall be the same and yet may be different. I can assure the House there is no intention to exercise the power my hon. friend suggests may be exercised. Our idea is to have the regulations throughout the country, whether in or out of reserves, conform as closely as possible in their general principle, but we have to vary them, for instance, in the case of school lands, which are a trust, and in the case of park reserves.

Mr. PERLEY. I quite appreciate that there must be differences, and the minister personally is naturally bound by his statement that he intends to make the regulations under the Forest Reserves Act similar to those under the Dominion Lands Act, but a succeeding minister would not be bound by that statement as we all understand. In the Dominion Lands Act, 1908, section 77, there is a very wise provision, and I would ask the minister what objection there could be to inserting it in this Bill? That section reads:

> Every regulation made by the Governor in Council, in virtue of the provisions of this Act, and every order made by the Governor in Council authorizing the sale of any land or the granting of any interest therein, shall have force and effect only after it has been published for four consecutive weeks in the 'Canada Gazette,' and all such orders or regu-

lations shall be laid before both Houses of parliament within the first fifteen days of the session next after the date thereof, and such regulations shall remain in force until the day immediately succeeding the day of prorogation of that session of parliament, and no longer, unless during that session they are approved by resolution of both Houses of parliament.

That is a reasonable section, and I would ask the minister what objection he could have to inserting it here?

Mr. OLIVER. I have explained that many of the matters calling for regulations under this Act are not of sufficient importance to deserve the careful scrutiny given to a legislative enactment. The transactions covered by the Dominion Lands Act are of a much more important character than the regulation of the conduct of persons in a park for instance. While my successor might not be bound by what I say, if he should place before the House regulations in regard to parks not conforming in their basic principles to the regulations existing, he would lay himself open to strong criticism by the House.

Mr. PERLEY. Is there any difference between the powers given in this Act in regard to the alienation of public property and the powers given in the Dominion Lands Act, except that under the Forest Reserves Act the fee of the land cannot be sold or alienated?

Mr. OLIVER. That is a stupendous difference, and is one of the great reasons why we do not need to look at one in exactly the same light as the other.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). A license to cut timber or remove ore is as much an alienation as the issue of a patent. The timber is the land, so is the ore.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not like to become involved in a dispute with my hon. friend in regard to law, but in administration under the Lands Act we do not recognize that timber is land. Where a timber license is granted we retain the right of entry on the the land for mineral or other purposes, the licensee has only a right of access to the land for the timber, and for the beneficial use of that timber for his own purposes.

Mr. PERLEY. There are places where the timber is worth many times the value of the land on which it grows, and the real estate consists of the land with the timber on it. If there is $9 worth of timber for every dollar's worth of land, the minister could alienate and dispose of the $9 worth of timber under this Act without submitting it to parliament, whereas he cannot deal with a dollar's worth of the land itself. What objection can there be to his laying before parliament orders in council that may be made under the Forests Reserve Act at the same time that he brings down the regulations made under the Dominion Lands Act?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know that there is any objection to it, but I am arguing in defence of the Bill as drafted, that there is no reasonable necessity for doing so. What my hon. friend said about the alienation of the timber is not the question, the alienation of the timber does not have to be laid before parliament, it is the regulations under which that alienation takes place.

Mr. DOHERTY. If I followed the minister rightly, none of these regulations, either in the respect in which they would be identical with the regulations under the Lands Act nor in the respects in which they may differ from them, would be submitted to parliament for its approval.

Mr. OLIVER. Not as the Bill stands.

Mr. DOHERTY. As pointed out, the alienation of the right to cut timber or to extract minerals may be the alienation of a very much more valuable thing than the fee simple in the land itself, and if it was considered desirable under the Lands Act that we should make regulations to govern the alienation of land, if it was a proper thing that these regulations should only continue to have force after having had the approval of parliament, why is it not just as important to have that requirement with regard to regulations governing the alienation of rights which in a large number of cases are of much more value than the land itself? I admit that there is force in the statement that it might be beneath the dignity of parliament to be dealing with regulations on trivial matters; but that would not prevent a provision being made that would require regulations made under the powers conferred by subsection (b) of section 16 to be subject to the same requirement that is made with regard to the alienation of land under the Lands Act. Apparently every regulation made under the Lands Act requires the approval of parliament. Even if the minister, by a general regulation under this Act, should make the regulations made under the Lands Act applicable, and later on should proceed to alter those regulations under the Lands Act, the alterations would have to be submitted to the approval of parliament; but that would not necessarily apply to the provisions of this new Act. So that you would have a situation in the future where the minister, if he took the regulations under the Lands Act and made them the regulations under this Act, would have to submit them to parliament for approval, whenever he allowed them as regulations under that Act, whereas as regulations under this Act, they would not require the approval of parliament. Is there any reason for that distinction? Whereas you refuse to make a law that will last longer

than the next session of parliament of any regulation under the Lands Act, you give the minister absolute carte blanche to make regulations governing every matter coming under this Act, without coming to parliament at all. If parliament is going to dispossess itself of legislative power over these matters, it ought at least to do it in accordance with some consistent system, and upon some basis that will indicate that we are not doing it by pure haphazard. Apart from that mere argument of inconsistency, it does seem that the power to deal with these important rights is such a wide power that it would be only proper, if parliament should have nothing to say before the regulation is made and goes into force, it should at least be given the power to sanction or refuse sanction after it has been done, unless for some reason it is considered desirable that the government should be put in a position where in regard to these matters it shall be absolutely beyond the control of parliament, even though parliament is in session and is in a position to deal effectively with them. I would submit that it would be only a proper recognition of parliament that the regulations should at least, after they have come into force, be submitted to parliament for approval. Moreover, this would put us in the position of being consistent with previous legislation.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no serious objection, from my point of view, to adopting the suggestion made by the hon. member for St. Anne. To my mind it is not necessary either to maintain the dignity of parliament or to preserve the public rights in the matter; but there is no objection to it, and I would be quite willing to add to this section such a provision as my hon. friend has suggested. I still think that the Act would be just as well without that provision and the public interest just as well served, but I am quite willing to defer to my hon. friend's view.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I move in amendment:

Every regulation made by the Governor in Council in virtue of the provisions of subsection 'B,' section 16, shall have force and effect only after it has been published for four consecutive weeks in the 'Canada Gazette.'

Then add the terms of the Dominion Lands Act.

Mr. OLIVER. Perhaps it would be just as well to let this section stand, and I shall have a section drafted to be placed before the committee later on.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 19,

19. Any person violating any provision of this Act or any regulation made thereunder shall, in addition to any civil liability thereby incurred, be liable on summary conviction to a penalty of not more than one hundred dollars, and in default of immediate payment of such penalty and of the costs of prosecution such person may be imprisoned with or without hard labour for any term not exceeding six months.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to draw attention to a question regarding the boundary between Southern Alberta and British Columbia. I think it is generally conceded that it is not laid down correctly in the maps. A person convicted within the province of Alberta might be found later to have been in the province of British Columbia.

Mr. OLIVER. The boundary between Alberta and British Columbia is not well defined, and in process of time we shall no doubt get a better definition. Generally speaking, however, the best guide as to what constitutes the boundary is the flow of water. The map is wrong, but on the ground the flow of water would be the best direction to ascertain whether an individual was in British Columbia or Alberta.

On section 21.

Chapters 56 and 60 of the Revised Statutes, 1906, are repealed.

Mr. PERLEY. In the schedule there are two reserves left out, namely, the Donald forest reserve and the Lake Manitoba forest reserve. Why are these left out?

Mr. OLIVER. The reason why the Donald forest reserve was left out was because it has a very considerable quantity of land suitable for settlement, and the timber on it is not of much value; and instead of occupying an elevated wood area, which would be a source of water supply, the reserve is chiefly in the vallev of the Columbia river. In the case of Lake Manitoba forest reserve, the reason it was left out is because it does not occupy any watershed but is low land near the lake and has not much timber. It also has land desired by settlers, and a railway is being constructed close to it.

I desire to add to the schedule a reserve which has been asked for by the corporation of the city of Prince Albert. There is a tract of woodland immediately opposite the city. It is not suitable for settlement, and the city authorities have asked that it be declared a forest reserve, and given the name of the Nesbitt forest reserve in commemoration of the first missionary to establish a mission at Prince Albert. I would therefore, move to add to the schedule the Nesbitt forest reserve.

Motion agreed to.

Progress reported.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting supplementary estimates for the year ending March 31, 1912, which, on motion, were referred to the Committee of Supply.

CHINA AND JAPAN STEAMSHIP SUBSIDIES.

Bill (No. 103) relating to steamship subsidies—Sir Wilfrid Laurier—was read the second time and the House went into committee thereon.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Chairman, when this Bill was before the House some two months ago, I had occasion to state to some extent the character of the line which it proposed to subsidize.. The subsidy is an old one, a subsidy of twenty-years ago, which has been maintained by the joint efforts of the Canadian government and the Imperial government. A contract was made with the Canadian Pacific railway for a subsidy of £45,000, the Canadian government contributing £25,000 and the Imperial government £20,000. The service is altogether a mail service, not at all for carrying goods, though of course carrying goods is of some importance. But the principle object is to provide a direct service, not between Vancouver and the Orient, but from Liverpool across the Atlantic, across the continent, and across the Pacific to Hong Kong and Yokohama. I was asked the last time, when the subject was under discussion, if it was proposed to have cold storage on board these ships. That is not the intention; we do not see that there is much opportunity to have cold storage. I was asked also to state whether the trade had justified the expenditure, and if there had been any improvement in our trade with these oriental countries. I may say at once that it is not so much a question of trade, and if it were only a question of trade, I doubt if we would renew this contract. The object is rather to secure the carriage of the mails from Great Britain to the Orient, and to give Canada the advantage of direct communication. Trade has not grown perceptibly either with China or with Japan. The trade with China last year, 1910, was, imports, $802,198; exports, $1,450,000. The chief items of imports from China are silk, $125,000; rice, $67,992; hides, $124,967; tea, $265,648. The chief items of exports to China are manufactures of cotton, $265,000; manufactures of lead, $123,000; silver, $553,000. Our trade with Japan shows in imports, rice, $266,000; silks, $275,000; tea, $743,000. The exports to Japan were fish, $212,000; iron, $182,000, leather and manufactures of, $72,000. I may say to the committee that since the last discussion we had of this item, we have been notified by the Imperial authorities that it is not their intention to renew the subsidy after the present year. They agree to renew the present subsidy of £15,000, but only for one year, and then we will have to decide ourselves whether we shall continue the subsidy alone, which we intend to do if we can make terms with the Canadian Pacific railway. I will give a communication which we have received on the subject, in the shape of a letter from the general post office in London, to the Colonial Office, dated January 27:

With reference to your letter of the 30th of November last relative to the determination on the 6th of April next of the contract with the Canadian Pacific Railway Company for the conveyance of mails between Liverpool and Japan and China via Canada, I am directed to acquaint you for the information of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, that in view of the development of steamship services between this country and Canada and the probability of considerably improved facilities for the conveyance of the mails in the near future, the Postmaster General is of opinion that the period of any fresh contract for the service of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company via Vancouver should be limited to about a year. The first of May, 1912, would be a suitable date for its termination. In these circumstances, the Postmaster General suggests that an extension of the existing contract to cover the period in question would be the best arrangement; and if the company would be prepared to accept these terms, he would not press for any material modification of the present conditions.

The Postmaster General understands that the managers of the company are approaching the Canadian government on the subject of the renewal of the contract. As the Secretary of State is aware, the Canadian Post Office has raised the question of sharing with this office the receipts from foreign countries for the conveyance of mails by this service in proportion to the contribution by Canada and the United Kingdom to the subsidy, i.e., 5-9 4-9; and I am to acquaint you that the Lord Commissioners of the Treasury have now agreed to the Postmaster General's view that the claim of the Canadian Post Office should be conceded under the new contract now proposed. The amount which would be so payable to that office under existing circumstances would be about £15,000 a year. Perhaps the Secretary of State will think it well to acquaint the government of the Dominion with this decision.

The Postmaster General proposes to communicate with the Canadian Post Office on several points of detail relating to the proposed extension of the contract.

I have to observe that though the service has not given as much trade as we expected, still, I hope that every member of the House will agree that it would not be advisable to drop it, and that it should be continued, even if we have to maintain it alone, al-

though we have not lost hope that we shall yet prevail upon the British authorities to contribute in the future as they have done in the past.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand from the premier's reading that there is not a definite statement that they will not continue, they simply ask that the arrangement be made for one year, so that if further arrangements are not made, they will be in a position to drop it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes. I had an opportunity of discussing it with the Imperial authorities four years ago when I attended the conference. The present passage from Liverpool to Hong Kong in 25 days does not give a sufficiently rapid service for the requirements of the British people. I think the Peninsular and Oriental service is shorter, but our aim is to have a service via Canada in a shorter period than the Peninsular and Oriental can give us. We are not without hope that we shall be able to accomplish that, especially since we have not renewed our contract yet for the Atlantic service. But we have reason to believe that an offer will be made to us for a much faster service on the Atlantic than we have at the present time.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the Prime Minister if it is not a fact that by subsidizing these steamships they will bring eggs from China into the Canadian market to compete with our farmers, and if he thinks it is wise for us to subsidize steamships for that purpose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that I would risk the service. I think I would risk the eggs rather. I think that I would keep the service even if we had a few more eggs for ourselves.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will not this interfere with the proposed all-red route?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Quite the reverse. If we had the all-red route it would materially assist us in having a shorter service to the Orient. We would have a service of five days at most on the Atlantic and this would shorten the passage so much from Liverpool to China.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will it not at the same time assist the people of China to bring their products over and compete in our markets?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly. These subsidies are given in the hope of facilitating trade between country and country.

Mr. FOSTER. Do I understand that it is permanently arranged that on account of the mail service there will come to the Dominion treasury £15,000?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, about £15,000.

Mr. FOSTER. It would be that much to recoup our outlay on account of the subsidy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that run retrospectively?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems that there is good ground for demanding that payment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think so.

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, the corrollary from that is that there has been equally good ground for years past.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Well, yes, but it was not done; better late than never.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Miscellaneous—To meet expenses in connection with the International Conference for the suspension of pelagic sealing, $10,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have at the present time a treaty with the United States for the suspension during a term of years of pelagic sealing. My hon. friend (Mr. Foster) remembers that in 1894 Sir John Thompson attended a conference between Great Britain and the United States for the regulation of pelagic sealing. The origin of this discussion was that the United States had seized certain of our vessels engaged in sealing operations in the northern sea, pretending that the northern sea was a mare clausum and that the sealers were fishing in American waters. We contested that contention and succeeded. At the same time it was represented to us that pelagic sealing was destroying seal life in this that the females were liable to be killed on their way to the rookeries and that the life of the seals was very much in danger because for every female that is killed two lives are sacrificed. Whatever may be said of this contention, which seemed to me to be founded in fact, we agreed to two things, first, that pelagic sealing, which is sealing on the high seas and which has been engaged in principally by sealers from Victoria, should be restricted to certain seasons. I think it was from February up to a certain time in June, but I forget the months. At all events, there was to be a close season during which our sealers were prohibited from sealing. They were prohibited from using shot guns and were compelled to use only the harpoon. Then, they did not have the right to seal up to the three mile

limit around the Pribyloff Islands but they were restricted to a zone of seventy miles from the islands. This has gone on for some years. Now, a new class of sealers has come into existence carrying the Russian and Japanese flags and these Russian and Japanese sealers can seal at all times without observing any close season, they can use all sorts of weapons and they have the whole field to themselves without any restriction.

Mr. FOSTER. Not restricted to any zone?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have no zone to observe. They have been destroying seal life and there is a possible danger of the seal disappearing as the buffalo has disappeared. We are to have a conference which is to open on the 11th of this month at Washington between Great Britain, the United States, Russia and Japan and in the meantime we have made an arrangement with the United States by which it is provided that if the operation of killing seals on the Pribyloff Islands is carried on within fifteen years we shall have 20 per cent of the catch. If the Americans killed on their own territory 100,000 seals or 50,000 seals we would have 20 per cent of the catch and other considerations which will be found valuable but which I would not like to disclose at this moment. Mr. Bryce is to be the chief commissioner of Great Britain and we have appointed as our chief commissioner Mr. Joseph Pope who is quite familiar with the whole subject having accompanied Sir John Thompson and Sir Charles Tupper to Paris in 1894. He has already left for Washington and he has taken with him Mr. Found of the Department of Marine and Fisheries, Mr. Macoun, of the Geological Survey, who was at Paris in 1894 and who knows the subject thoroughly from the point of view of the naturalist. Capt. Byers represents the sealers of Victoria.

To provide expenses of the ministers attending the Imperial Conference and coronation, $6,000.

Mr. FOSTER. How many ministers are expected to go.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Two besides myself, Sir Frederick Borden and Hon. Mr. Brodeur.

Allowance for expenses of Senators and members of the House of Commons forming the parliamentary delegation to the coronation of His Majesty, 18 at $1,000 each, $18,000.

Mr. HUGHES. I understand that members of parliament who are invited to go are merely invited by a committee of members of parliament in England, and that they are to be entertained privately or in some semi-official way by members of the English House of Commons. Had this been brought before the House before the selection of members I certainly should have opposed any limited number of men going in this way. There will be more than 18 members of the House of Commons and Senate of Canada in England, and with all due regard to the gentlemen selected—and I may say a number of the names especially, of my good friend on my left (Mr. Foster), and the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart), and the gentleman who represents the west on our side are very good names and the maritime province representative—but I have no hesitation in stating that had this been understood at the time as it is now understood there would have been a different story to be told. I do not think, in the first place, that any number should have been selected, but that every man who goes over there should be on an equal footing, and if he pays his own expenses I think he should be as highly regarded in the old country as here. I am not speaking personally, I am going under other auspices, and possibly it is invidious for me to take this stand, but I am doing so on principle. I do not know what attention will be paid to these gentlemen over there. There are five members from the Conservative side and seven or eight from the government side who are to go over on this delegation. Those not on that delegation will have the privilege of paying for seats and watching the performance from a fence corner while others will be entitled to certain favours. More than that when this matter was discussed, it was distinctly understood on this side of the House that each man would go at his own cost. Now a number of gentlemen are quite disappointed. Had this $1,000 grant been known then I am satisfied a number of gentlemen would have consented to let their names go in for selection, who did not see their way clear to pay their expenses. Were the invitation official from the imperial government to this, for these members to go I would not hesitate. I do not see why the country should pay the expenses of gentlemen who are not invited officially. I do not think the item should be asked for.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As has been stated by my hon. friend the invitation that was sent to us was not official, it was simply an invitation of a committee of members of the House of Commons addressed to us. We would have preferred that they should have made their own selection and sent them their invitation, but the invitation had to come through some channel, and it came through the channel of the Canadian government. When we received the invitation we had to follow strictly the terms in which it was couched, and the request was to invite 18 members of our parliament.

Mr. HUGHES. Could we not have courteously told them that we respectfully regretted having to decline their invitation inasmuch as many more than 18 would be there and the government could not take it on themselves to make any invidious distinction?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think we could do that, they might have invited 18, or 20 or 45, but they invited 18 and I do not think we should have made any observations, we could not say we will not accept that unless you invite all our members. The invitation having been received and being meant to be courteous we accepted it as courteously, and we think that under all the circumstances it is better that the Canadian parliament should provide for their expenses. I do not agree with my hon. friend as I have sometimes the pleasure of agreeing with him.

Mr. HUGHES. At the time word was passed around it was stated there would be no cost to the country, that no members were to be paid.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It was rumoured; certainly it was not officially stated.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I was asked if I wished to go to the old country on that occasion or not, and I was led to understand I would have to pay my own expenses. I accepted and said I would go at my own expense.

Mr. PERLEY. I find myself in a rather awkward position about this vote, and would like to put it as right as I can. Last fall when it was first rumoured that some of the members of parliament would be asked specially to go to the coronation it was said that some allowance would be made by this parliament towards their expenses, in the same way that Australia and New Zealand were doing. Later in the session it was stated in the corridors that this idea was given up and that no vote would be asked towards the expenses of the members of the House of Commons and the Senate, who might go to the coronation. One day the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) sent for me and said that the Prime Minister had called at his office and told him that an invitation had been received from a committee of the House of Commons in England, asking that 18 members of the Canadian parliament should be named to whom this committee in England would simply show courtesy. This was not an official committee of the English parliament, but as I understood it a certain number of the members of the House of Commons who wished to show some attention to the members of parliament from overseas, had decided to ask them in this way, and it was proposed to give them trips into the historical portion of England, and I suppose some dinners and other entertainments. The Prime Minister then, as I understood, told the leader of the opposition that the selection of names had to be made within a day or two. The leader of the opposition asked me to try to find out what members from our side of the House intended to go to the coronation. He said there were no expenses to be paid by parliament, and no allowances to be made, and I took it that he got this understanding from the Prime Minister himself. Therefore, we went to the various members on our side of the House, and asked them if they intended to go to the coronation. I was asked by some members, as were other whips, why we were asking this question. We told them that the arrangement, as we understood it, was that no expenses were to be paid or allowances voted by this parliament, but that this private committee of the House of Commons of England were to have certain names of members given to them who would be more or less official and to whom these courtesies would be shown. After we got the names of those who on our side of the House intended to go to the coronation anyway, the leader of the opposition took the list and chose the ones from each section who had been the longest in the House. That was the way the selection was made. A few days afterwards it was rumoured that the government intended to ask for a grant for an allowance to these gentlemen, and I might say that it placed us all in a very awkward position, because, although the names given in by the leader of the opposition are representative and satisfactory names, at the same time I happen to know of one or two of our older members who would have liked to have gone to the coronation, and might have done so if they had known that there was going to be a grant by parliament for that purpose. They did not feel able to go at their own expense entirely. While I have no desire to make any objection to this vote, I want to say to the Prime Minister that I think the way this matter has been handled has not been a fair deal at all, because if it was the intention of the Prime Minister to ask for a vote from this House for this purpose, it should have been communicated to the leader of the opposition at the time that he asked him to give the names of five members on this side of the House for that purpose. I wish simply to make this explanation in order that I may put myself right in the matter.

Mr. LENNOX. I differ a little from a good many who have spoken. I am pretty well satisfied with this matter. I think it is a matter that we should leave altogether to the responsibility of the government. They propose to pay what would be equivalent to the expenses of these gentlemen if

they are not too extravagant, and I think we can leave that to them, to do as they like about it. I was asked if I would like to go, and when I was asked that I took for granted that the expenses would be paid. I said no. I did not want to go; so I am not at all disappointed. I did not want to go when I thought my expenses would be paid. I would not give any different reply if I were asked now. If we were at the beginning of this affair, I am not at all sure that I would be in favour of having the expenses paid; I rather think I would not. I am satisfied with the gentlemen who have been selected, for a very good reason, that I do not know exactly who they are, with the exception of two or three, and I have not gone to the trouble of finding out. But in this parliament I think we could hardly go wrong in making a selection of men who would be well qualified to represent us on this occasion.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would be very sorry if my hon. friend from Argenteuil thought that the manner in which this matter had been conducted had not been fair. Certainly nothing was more removed from my intention. I wanted to be absolutely fair to everybody. I cannot recall minutely what passed between the hon. leader of the opposition and myself. I communicated to him the parliamentary communication which had been received by us from the parliament of Great Britain. I have no recollection that at that time the matter of expenses was mentioned at all. Later on it was mentioned, and there were opinions expressed pro and con as to whether the expenses should be paid or not. There were divided opinions on both sides of the House. For my part I took the liberty of consulting a few personal friends both on this side and on the other side of the House, and having got the opinions of several members on which I thought I could rely, I submitted the matter to my colleagues, and here is the result. I think on the whole the action was well taken, and should receive the approval of everybody.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The item under consideration is not a very large item in itself. To my mind, however, it acquires an additional significance by reason of the fact that the beneficiaries are members of this House. The question before us has a double aspect: First of all, the aspect so far most commented on in the debate, namely, the manner in which the recipients of this grant were selected from among ourselves. That to my mind is not a very important feature of the case. It may be that unfairness has been the result of the method adopted. To my mind we should fight that out, if it has occurred, among ourselves, independently altogether of our relationship as members of parliament.

That is to say, it should not be a subject for discussion in the House. The feature, though, in which the country is and should be interested is this: Is it a proper principle to vote the money of the country for this purpose? That to my mind is all that is open for us to discuss here. Now, it seems that the invitation has arisen at the instance of certain citizens of the British Empire who are members of the British parliament. Those men got together, and determined that their hospitality as private individuals should be extended to certain members of the Canadian parliament. It is to be noted that they have no official position in extending that hospitality. They are merely private citizens who happen to be members of parliament. The British government does not come into the matter at all, or ask that this country be officially represented by members of this House. The Prime Minister states that although that is the case, they chose the channel of the Canadian government to carry the invitation to the members of this House, and he assumes that that puts a different aspect on the invitation, gives it a semi-official character, and justifies the government in voting the money of the people to pay the expense. I am at a loss to understand how they could have communicated the invitation in any other way. It was simply a method of communication. It did not change in any way the character of the communication. It did not lift it out of the category of a purely private extension of hospitality, and make it in any way official or semi-official.

That was the method they chose, but the invitation remained all the while just the private invitation of members of the Imperial House. That being the case, it became, to my mind, the duty of members of this House to decide whether or not they should respond, and not the duty of the government. The members of this House did respond. Surely at that point the matter should end. I do not see any justification for voting the people's money to pay the expenses in any degree whatever. It does not matter what the understanding was, the reason of the trip is of a personal and not a public character, and I do not see how this invitation differs from that which many citizens throughout Canada are accepting from their friends across the water. I cannot see the distinction. If a distinction can be pointed out, I am open to change my mind, but until it is, I must oppose the vote. It appears to me utterly indefensible. It is not pleasant to take exception to a vote of this kind. Nobody would take exception to the members who have been selected, and I hope no one will imagine that I had any expectation of going myself. I could not go no matter who paid the expenses, and further it would not

be a great object to me in any event. I take more pleasure meeting the common people in my constituency than those by whom perhaps I would be entertained over there. But I would like any member of this House to show me what there is in this invitation, and its acceptance that will justify this vote or place those who accept the invitation in a different position from other Canadians attending the coronation. The representatives of the government are in a different position, because they go as the official representatives of Canada, and it is only right that the Canadian people should pay their expenses, but this item is of an entirely different character, and I can see no defence whatever for the vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I wish to say a word with reference to this item. I think I have stood for some 25 or 30 years in this parliament as a fair defender of economy; and in this instance I have no hesitation at all in saying that under all the circumstances I should defend the vote. But I also feel it is my duty at present to move myself entirely from the category of those who will benefit by it, and I shall, therefore, tomorrow morning hand in my resignation as one of those selected by the hon. leader of the opposition. I shall support the vote. Nothing would have made me happier than to have had visited the old country under these circumstances, but I am not able to pay my own way and shall therefore forego that pleasure, and under the circumstances shall remove myself from the list of those who were deputed to attend.

Mr. FIELDING. I trust my hon. friend (Mr. Foster), will reconsider his decision.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. While I realize that this, like every other expenditure of public money, is a legitimate subject for public discussion, and consequently have no fault to find with the views of hon. gentlemen who oppose it, I do not believe there is a citizen of the Dominion who, on serious reflection, will object to the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), receiving this small allowance. He has been in the public life of Canada a long time. He is one of the oldest members of this House, and occupies a distinguished position in it, and I do not hesitate to say that it is right and proper he should go, and the government, as a government, are entirely prepared to assume the responsibility of this vote, to say it is a proper vote, and not hold any hon. gentleman opposite responsible for it at all. I hope, therefore, that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), will reconsider his judgment and consent to be one of the delegates.

Mr. HUGHES. The great objection, to my mind, in this matter, is this: Here are 18 members selected from this House of Commons, and these gentlemen, when they cross the water, will be the guests of the members of the House of Commons and the House of Lords in England. The invitation is a private one. I do not know what favours will be shown them, but I do protest, and shall continue to protest, against any member from this House or another citizen from this Dominion who crosses over the water, not having the favours shown him that these gentlemen will have. Here is my hon. friend from Algoma (Mr. Smyth) going across and paying his own expenses. He will stand among the crowd, and he is equally a representative of the people, and what I object to is that any member who goes across and pays his own expenses should not have the same recognition as any other member whose expenses are paid. That is the ground I take. I am not begrudging the money, I have never been a cheese parer, but I do not see why any member of parliament should be entitled to any special favour over there because he happened to be chosen as a delegate on the invitation of a number of gentlemen on the other side, and be given prominence over his brother members here who also attend the coronation and pay their own expenses. I am surprised that such a proposition should be made, knowing it would certainly bring hard feelings into the hearts of men who pay their own expenses and have to take pot luck, while these hon. gentlemen are given the favours. If the right hon. the Prime Minister will see that any favours that may be conferred on these 18 gentlemen will be extended to the others who pay their own expenses and are not costing the country a dollar, I shall make no opposition. With me it is a question of principle, a question of giving fair play to all, and that is the reason why I am opposing, not the vote, but the principle on which it is based.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is altogether under a misapprehension. The matter which he discusses has nothing to do with the payment or non-payment of the members chosen to represent parliament. Whether they be paid or not, they have been selected by the two sides as those who should accept the invitation from the committee of the Houses of Commons and Lords. With that I have nothing at all to do. I shall be in England as the official representative of the Canadian people, if I may say so, and every member of parliament, invited or not, is the same to me. Anything that I can do to have the favour shown to him to which he is entitled I shall be most happy to do, and I shall not make any distinction between those members and the other 18. It will be my pleasure to see that all are treated alike and on the same footing. But as to these 18 members, that is a

different matter. These 18 members were chosen, but they will not be there officially any more than the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. Smyth), who says he will go and pay his own expenses. These 18 members will be the guests, not of the whole parliament of Britain, but of a committee of members of the House of Commons. That is altogether a private affair. With regard to the other question, I hope that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will follow the advice given by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding), and that he will consider himself invited. I think it would be a pity if my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) was not there. Some time ago, speaking publicly, I expressed regret that Mr. Deakin, who was Prime Minister of Australia at the time of the last conference, had not been selected as one of the members to represent Australia. I hope he will be there, as I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Foster will be there.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). At his own expense, while the others are paid.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The eighteen members from Australia have their expenses paid by the Australian government, as the expenses of the eighteen members from Canada are to be paid by the Canadian government. I hope that my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) will be there to represent that portion of the Canadian people whom he represents so ably.

Mr. DOHERTY. I desire, in the first place, to join most earnestly in the observation of the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) and the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) so far as they urge upon the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) the desirability of reconsidering the decision he has made. I am sure there was no intention on the part of any hon. gentleman who spoke, whatever opinion he may have expressed, to convey any impression of objection, or that there could be objection, to the hon. member for North Toronto, as one of those who accepted this invitation.

Mr. LAKE. I did not even know who composed the delegation.

Mr. DOHERTY. Nor do I; and I trust that the hon. member for North Toronto will accept the suggestion already made to him by more authoritative voices than my own, and that he will see fit to withdraw the statement he has made with regard to his intention of not accepting the invitation. I have no desire whatever to make any objection to this vote. I would like, however, to offer a suggestion in regard to the terms in which it is set forth. I make the suggestion, in view of the statement of the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) with regard to the misunderstanding that seems to have occurred concerning the nature of this invitation, and which misunderstanding may possibly have had something to do with the method of determining who should be the gentlemen to accept the invitation of the committee of members of parliament on the other side. I notice that the vote is provided for the expenses of the 'parliamentary delegation.' I think, under the circumstances, that it is not absolutely correct to speak of these gentlemen as a 'parliamentary delegation.' I understood the First Minister to say a moment ago that these gentlemen will not be there in any more official capacity than any other member of the House who might be in England, and desire to attend the coronation. They are going, as I understand it, as accepting an invitation from certain members of parliament on the other side, not, properly speaking, as an official delegation from this parliament. I do not understand that this parliament, as a parliament, took any official step to delegate them. I would suggest that there might be found a modification of the wording of the vote which would make it clear that there is not sought to make any official distinction between gentlemen who may go, other than that these gentlemen who accept the invitation given. I am not prepared, perhaps to express it exactly as it ought to be expressed, but my idea would be met if, instead of saying we were voting money to pay the expenses of a parliamentary delegation, we should say that we were voting money to pay the expenses of members of the Senate and House of Commons attending the coronation, and accepting the invitation of the committee of members of parliament on the other side. I suggest that simply to make it quite clear what I think everybody understands, that there is no intention to make these gentlemen any more official representatives than any other member of parliament who may attend. I think that is no offence to the gentlemen—if I thought it was, I would not make the suggestion. I suggest this as putting on record exactly the facts and leaving no room for misunderstanding as to the relative positions of the members who have been fixed upon to accept this official invitation, and other hon. members who may attend the coronation.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I have the honour to be one of those nominated on this side of the House on this delegation, and, in case there should be any misapprehension about the matter, I wish to state that, so far as I know there was no information given to the delegates on our side of the House which was not given to the delegates on the other side. I did not know anything about whether there would be money provided to pay expenses or not, and the

first news I had of it was when I saw it in print in the estimates brought down yesterday. No pressure came from the delegation on this side, so far as I know, to have the vote put in the estimates. If I understand my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) the objection seems to be that it was not known on the other side that provision would be made to pay the expenses and that if it had been known they would have made a different selection from that which they did make.

Mr. HUGHES. May I correct the hon. member?

Mr. SINCLAIR. That is what it appeared——

Mr. HUGHES. Might I offer a remark? The statement was made to the members when the question was brought up, and each member was told: You will have to pay your own expenses. I think it went further than not being brought up, and that it was brought up in the way I state.

Mr. SINCLAIR. There seems to have been no authority on the part of anybody to make that statement. If there was any misunderstanding it must have grown up among hon. gentlemen opposite themselves. It should not be too late to rectify it. They ought to be able to agree on five gentlemen on that side to attend this delegation, and if there is any difficulty of that kind, I do not see why it could not be rectified yet, or why they could not make some selection that would suit them all. It is unfortunate if any hard feelings with regard to the selection on that side should exist. There are no such feelings on this side. I believe everybody is quite cordial, and I am glad to say that I was congratulated by nearly every friend around me when my name was given as one of those to go. I will vote against the motion when the vote is put.—I presume my hon. friends on the other side are not talking for the sake of talking, and that they intend to do something more than merely object. In that case, I will join my hon. friends and vote against it. I feel delicate about making any motion, for I do not know how it will affect the gentlemen who have accepted this invitation. I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes). If I understand this matter, the invitation comes from members of the imperial parliament, it is not a general invitation from the House of Commons of England, but from individual members, of whom Lord Rosebery is chairman. It would be natural to suppose that everybody who goes from Canada would receive attention. I suppose there will be thousands of people from Canada in London, and it would be impossible that these can all obtain seats in Westminster Abbey to witness the coronation. It would be impossible to grant the same privilege to everybody going from Canada. For my part, I would be inclined to move that the item be struck out.

Mr. MILLER. The hon. member has spoken about hard feeling among the members; I do not think there is any hard feeling upon the part of any one member against any other member on either side of the House. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) has spoken his mind as he had a right to do, honestly and frankly. But I do not think there are many members in this House, or many people in the country, who will agree with him. I do not think that the manner of the invitation from certain members of the House of Commons in England to the members here, and the fact that the representatives from Canada will be entertained by members in England, is a matter that is of any concern to us at all, or that we have a right to discuss. All we have a right to discuss is whether this parliament shall or shall not pay the expenses of eighteen members of this parliament to go to England. I think that had there been no invitation at all from the old country, it would have been proper for parliament to pay the expenses of a limited number of members of the House of Commons to go with the members of the cabinet who represent Canada in England. I do not think that all the ability that is in this House of Commons is contained in the cabinet. It would have been impossible for all the members of this House to go and for their expenses to be paid by the public; no one would have expected it. As a matter of course it did place those who had to make the choice in a delicate position. No doubt many members of the House who were not selected would have filled the positions equally well. But all could not go. The member for Algoma (Mr. Smythe) is one of the newer members of the House, and he and others will perhaps have an opportunity to attend a similar occasion at a later date. One of the reasons why I justify this vote is that some of the older members of the House of Commons are going. I quite agree with all those who have spoken, that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) and the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) are certainly two men who ought to be included in any list of those who go; I think we all agree in that. I do not think there will be any bad feeling either in the House or in the country, but that there will be good feeling all round. I think the people generally will be satisfied to see this vote carried.

Mr. PERLEY. I do not wish it to be understood that I object to this vote, I

think it is a right and proper vote, but I do not think it has been managed in the right and proper way. I should feel badly if the hon. member for North Toronto, on account of the discussion this evening, did not take his share of this vote.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think it possible to do so after the statement that the chief whip has made in the House to-night.

Mr. PERLEY. All I can say is that if the hon. gentleman feels hurt at any words I have uttered, it is because I have not the same power of expression that he has.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the hon. member knew what he was saying.

Mr. PERLEY. I certainly had no intention of hurting the feelings of anybody in this House. I simply wanted to put myself right in regard to this matter. I have no objection whatever to this vote, I think it is right and proper. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) said that we had no reason to think there would not be a vote. For myself I think that when the Prime Minister asked for the names of five members, and did not say anything about a vote, anybody would take it for granted that there would be no vote. That is why I felt justified in saying to the members by whom I was asked that the selection was to be made from those members who intended to go to the coronation any way. I simply rose to put myself right, and to say that a mistake was made by the Prime Minister weeks ago, or months ago, when he failed to say that he intended to bring in a vote for this purpose.

Mr. LAKE. I wish to say that in my opinion the attitude taken by the member for Portage la Prairie is a perfectly correct one, and I entirely agree with what he has said. I think that the official representatives of Canada in this parliament are the members of the government who are going to the conference and the coronation.

Mr. BEST. I was pleased a week ago last Friday when I heard the Prime Minister say that he had changed his mind, and that he was going to the coronation. I believe that the Dominion of Canada has a perfect right to pay his expenses. But it was distinctly understood, at least I so understood, that any other member who went would have to pay his own expenses. I think that any member of parliament who goes to England and has his expenses paid by the people of Canada, is not doing the right thing. If the government offered to pay the expenses of all the members of this House, I think they would all volunteer to go. I did not know who were the members, with the exception of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) who were selected to go until he stood up here and said that he was one of them. I was not aware who they were. I do not think this government has any right to pay the expenses of these men.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I regret very much that this discussion has taken a personal turn. Members on this side of the House hold George E. Foster, of North Toronto, in the highest personal regard. There is certainly no one that we would rather see go there to represent the Conservative party and the parliament of Canada than the hon. member for North Toronto. It is not in my mind a question of the personality of the members of parliament who will go. That is not the matter under discussion. It was somewhat unfairly stated by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) a few minutes ago, that the discussion arose from any dissension with regard to the selection of the individuals. I hope he will reconsider those words, because, speaking for myself, I did not know who were chosen on either side. I want to emphasize what the right hon. Prime Minister said that these hon. gentlemen are going entirely in their private capacity, and they are accepting a private invitation. They are not representing Canada in any way, they are simply going to the old country to take part in the coronation, accepting for a certain time an invitation tendered them by gentlemen who have been members of parliament. They are not representing Canada; then, why ask the people of Canada to pay their expenses? It is the principle to which I object most strongly, and if I have an opportunity I will vote against the proposal. If it carries I sincerely hope that my hon. friend from North Toronto will reconsider his determination.

Mr. EDWARDS. I do not know that I can agree in every particular with my hon. friend from Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), who has just taken his seat. Inasmuch as members have been selected from the respective parties and the Senate to go as the representatives of these two Houses to the old country, I cannot agree altogether with the view that they in no sense will represent Canada. As I understand an invitation has come to this country from the members of the parliament of Great Britain.

Mr. CAMPBELL. No, from private members.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am stating it as I understand it, and if I am wrong, somebody can correct me when I get through. As I understand it an invitation has been sent here from the members of the British House of Commons to a number of men to go from these two Houses and be their guests while in the old country. If that is correct, then they would to a certain extent be the repre-

sentatives of Canada. But whether that is true or not, I do not agree with the principle of making this grant. I have not one word to say against the personnel of the gentlemen selected from the two parties, because I doubt if you could get a better representation of the House of Commons and the Senate, but I do not think that the principle is a right one, and I wish simply to put on record my protest against the vote.

Mr. MADDIN. As I understand the situation, an invitation having come from the Imperial parliament to send 18 representatives from the parliament of Canada, a selection was made in the best judgment of the leader of the government and the leader of the opposition. They go to represent Canada whether they were invited to go or not, which is neither here nor there. They are directed by this parliament to go there for that purpose, they go with the permission of this parliament to represent this country, and if that is so why should their expenses not be borne by this country.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). How does this parliament direct them?

Mr. MADDIN. They are directed by this parliament when we pass this estimate. We directed them when the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition agreed upon the matter, and this being the case I cannot understand why hon. members in this House will permit votes to go through for such matters as the Newmarket canal, and then rise and protest against an expenditure of $18,000 to send a delegation from this parliament to appear at the coronation of our gracious Lord, the King. To say that this is a private invitation is not meeting the situation fairly. His Majesty is not issuing invitations personally. The authority is vested in certain members of the Imperial parliament. It may be as informal as you wish, but when that invitation arrives here, and when our representatives are selected with the best judgment of the leader of the opposition and the leader of the government, I cannot understand why the country should not assume the obligation of paying their expenses just as they pay the expenses of hon. members for serving here throughout the session. No one on this side of the House deplores more than I do the discussion that has taken place here to-night. In my judgment it would have been perhaps a proper subject for a caucus to have discussed, and I am quite certain that hon. members upon reflection will realize that this is not a matter to be dealt with in the manner in which it has been handled to-night. Some of us might like to have gone ourselves. There is nothing to debar any of us from going. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Smyth) deplores that he will be obliged to pay his own expenses.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I did not deplore that, because I had agreed to do it.

Mr. MADDIN. Then he deplores that he will have to stand behind the line and look through.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I deplore that I am not put on the same standing as some of my fellow members. I represent Canada just the same as they do.

Mr. MADDIN. Another hon. member wonders, if an invitation were offered, and if $1,000 were contributed to pay their expenses, how many of them would go? The same could be said of members of the bar on the opposite side of the House. If the question were put, how many of them would take a seat on the Supreme Court bench at a salary of $7,000 a year, I do not think there would be one member of the bar sitting on the other side of the House who would not hold up his hand for it. I think that if the House were asked how many members would go if the country offered them $1,000 to pay their expenses, probably every member who could afford the time would go. But that is not the course that has been pursued. When the leaders of both parties have exercised their best judgment in the selection of representatives of this parliament I think it is only fitting that the country should bear their expenses.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). Seeing that hon. members on both sides are taking a fling at myself, I think it due that I should say a word with regard to the matter. When I was approached and asked whether I would go to England it was emphasized very strongly that I would have to pay my own expenses. I said: Yes, I will go and when I was asked: Are you sure to go?—I said: Yes, I will go. I was under no misapprehension at all, I knew that I would have to pay my own expenses, and I was willing to pay my own expenses. I do not see why any one else should have his expenses paid when I was ready and willing to pay my own.

Salaries and expenses of the Paris agency—Further amount required, $5,500.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have appointed a new agent at Paris. My hon. friend knows that Mr. Fabre, the late agent, was paid by this parliament $6,500 and $2,000 additional which was contributed by the Quebec government. We have not thought it advisable to accept any contribution from the Quebec government, and we have made the salary of Mr. Roy, the new agent, $8,000. Mr. Fabre received no allowance whatever for contingencies; every-

thing came from the sum of $6,500. It is now proposed to provide $5,000 for office rent, and such contingencies as are necessary to carry on the work.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 12.41 a.m. Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

WEDNESDAY, May 10, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

PRIVILEGE—MR. LANCTOT, M.P.,

Mr. LANCTOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. I read in the Ottawa 'Free Press,' dated the 8th inst., the following:

It is stated, however, that there will be a revival of the charges against Mr. Adelard Lanctot, M.P. for Richelieu, who was exonerated the week before last. This time the charge is understood to be one of having obtained lumber and shingles from the government.

The same statements and insinuations have, in substance, been published in various newspapers in the province of Quebec, more especially in 'Le Devoir' and 'La Patrie.' With reference to the statements, or insinuations, contained in what I have just read, I wish to say that there is not one word of truth in them, or foundation in fact for them. There has never been, to my knowledge, or so far as I am aware, one five cent's worth of government shingles, timber, or lumber used in my building, or otherwise for my benefit.

BANK ACT AMENDMENTS.

Mr. LEWIS moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 297) respecting bank officials, employees and creditors. He said: It is obvious that at this date of the session it will be impossible for any one to put this Bill through the House without the consent of the government. But the purpose I desire to serve in introducing this Bill is to lay before the government and the people, in concrete form, certain remedies for certain grievances which have been found to exist in the Bank and other Acts, to be considered during the adjournment, and the feeling of the people respecting same ascertained. They are not contained in the old Bank Act of 1890, or in the proposed new Bank Act. I have conferred with the counsel who had charge of the criminal prosecutions in the province of Ontario in reference to the Sovereign Bank and the Farmers' Bank, and it is at their request that some of these clauses have been put in this Bill. The first clause is in reference to punishment for any person forcing or coercing a bank manager to give a fraudulent preference. There were two men charged with having aided and conspired, in the Farmers' Bank case, with the manager and other officials, to give a fraudulent preference, who were released because the Act at present does not render the creditors of any bank or any other person liable in such cases. The first clause reads:

Every one is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years who, being the president, vice-president, director, manager, cashier or other officer of a bank, wilfully gives or concurs in giving any creditor of such bank any fraudulent, undue or unfair preference over other creditors, or who, being a creditor, forces or assists in forcing, coerces or induces any president, vice-president, director, manager, cashier or other officer of a bank to give any creditor of such bank any fraudulent, undue or unfair preference over other creditors.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, that it goes further than the new Bank Act. It is a concrete statement. I think that a provision like the following has been asked for by the people of this country. There was a strong feeling in the province of Ontario, and particularly in the city of Toronto, when the president of one of the banks who was charged with an offence like this, was not found guilty simply because it was not proved that he knew the document he signed was untrue.

2. The president, vice-president, director, manager or other officer of a bank who makes or assists in making any false or deceptive statement in any account, return, report or other document respecting the affairs of such bank, is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years, whether or not he knew such account, return, report or other document to be false or deceptive.

3. Any official or director of a bank is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years who, by himself or through any other person, accepts a loan, discount or other accommodation from the bank of which he is an official or director.

I think it should be provided, as it is in the Independence of Parliament Act, in reference to accounts with the government, that any one who is connected with a bank, or who is an official in a fiduciary capacity, should have no power to accept accommodation from that bank. If he is a private person and desires accommodation, he has a right to go to other banks, so should a bank official. But his hands must be clean.

4. Any director, manager or other official of a bank or other corporation is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding two years who, by himself or

through others, assists in the creation of what is commonly known as watered stock for the bank or other corporation of which he is such director, manager or other official.

I have conferred with the law officers of the Crown in drawing that clause, and we discussed the question as to whether we should put in a definition of watered stock. I hope that the government will take charge of this Bill, or draft legislation in reference to it, and will then make the necessary definition as to what is watered stock, although we all know what it is.

5. Any director, manager or other official of a bank who makes a loan on the security either wholly or partly of a mine or mining company, or on the stock of such mine or mining company, which has not been listed, is guilty of an offence and liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding five years.

2. In case of a loan on security on listed stock, the value of such stock shall be taken at the listed value up to par.

I think that the clauses I have read are in the interest of the commercial integrity of the business people, and of the plain people of Canada, as well as the banks, and will be welcomed by bank managers. I have added another clause in this embryo Bill, and that is in reference to employees of a bank. Formerly, as was well known to the public, the young bank clerks were supposed to have what is known as an easy situation. They went to work at half past nine, and left their office by half past three or four o'clock. But to-day things have changed absolutely. The banks are making money much faster than formerly, and as, like other corporations, they have no soul, they have contracted miserly habits, and are reaching out after the dollar. To-day there are hundreds and hundreds of young men being worked to death in the banks at $300 or $400 a year, and are doing the work of men who usually draw $1,000 or $1,200; and they are being injured materially, mentally and physically. Almost every day we see in the daily papers that Mr. So-and so, the manager of the bank in the Northwest, or somewhere else—I have a number of such items in my possession—has committed suicide, but his accounts were all correct, &c. What has been the cause of it? What has been the cause of that? Why, overwork and worry, and long hours in close confinement. So much has this been the case that the banks have been unable to procure enough young men in this country, and they have had to go to the old country for them. Not long ago one of the chief banks brought fifty young men from the old country to take the places of our own young men, and I am credibly informed by a bank manager that these young men brought out from the old country receive $600 a year, while our young men get only $200 to $300 to start with, and the young men from the old country are not as capable as our own young men. I do not say anything against these young men, but, not having been brought up in this country, and not being familiar with the ways of the country, they cannot be as capable as our own young men at first. I have drawn a clause to this effect, and I think it will be welcomed by young bank managers and old bank managers too, except probably those in the head offices of the banks:

6. Any manager, agent or directing officer of any bank, or of any agency, of a bank, who causes any clerk or employee under him to work within any office or building longer than eight hours in any one day, such eight hours being divided by one hour, between the hours of noon and two in the afternoon, during which such clerk or employee may go outside of such office or building, is guilty of an offence and liable to a fine of not less than $200.

2. The provisions of subsection 1 of this section do not apply to tellers, nor on the day upon which the monthly return is made up.

While it may be hard enough for the labouring man to work eight or ten hours a day in the free open air, it is very much harder for a clerk in an office where a large number of these young men are assembled together. Go into any office in Toronto or Montreal, and you will find probably 200 young men from 16 to 20 years of age, white faced and anaemic, toiling over their ledgers. I was in the city of Toronto the other day and, passing the banks and similar institutions, I saw these young men, although it was not at the end of the month, grinding away at half past eight in the morning and the same hour in the evening. They have no intermission. Unlike the civil servants with their hour and a half in the middle of the day, these bank clerks are given fifteen minutes to go downstairs and get a cup of tea and a bite to eat. I am merely stating the facts, and I would ask the Minister of Finance, who has the Bank Bill in charge, why such things should be. The banks are granted their powers by this parliament, they are making money, and they should not interfere with the health and physical well-being of any persons in their employ.

Mr. SPROULE. My hon. friend from West Huron (Mr. Lewis) has been very industrious in introducing Bills into this House to remedy grievances, and no doubt many of them, if they became law, would be valuable. He has made several very good suggestions in these Bills with the object of providing remedies for certain evils which exist, but he has missed a

very important one, and I have been expecting a Bill from him on that subject for some time. I have noticed that for a great many years, under the system as carried out in this country, many bankers put an embargo upon marriage. I think this ought to be made a punishable offence, and that provision should be made for its punishment by an amendment to the Criminal Code. If a deserving young man in a bank desires to get married although he may be in a position, according to his own judgment, to settle down in life, he is not allowed to get married unless he has $1,000. This is a very improper, a very unwise and an almost criminal interference with the personal right and personal liberty of our young men, and it is a great injustice to many deserving young ladies as well. I think that when we amend the Bank Act we ought to take notice of this condition and provide a very severe penalty for any bank manager who interferes with the rights of young men in this way. I was surprised that my hon. friend from West Huron did not include this point in his Bill, because it is an important matter. The only objection I would have to including it in his Bill is that, according to his own statement, he never expects that these Bills will become law. It seems that he merely puts them out as kite fliers, and then buries them in potter's field or else they are still-born and we never hear any more of them. I would like to see an amendment to the Criminal Code in order to provide a remedy for this condition. In my judgment, and I have thought carefully over it many times, it is a great injustice, and it is something that should not be allowed to exist in any country. It is an interference with the personal liberty and personal rights of young men.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

ANNUAL DRILL.

*Mr. SPROULE:

1. How many officers, non-commissioned officers, men and horses were called out to perform their annual drill or training in the years 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910, and how many are intended to be called out for drill for the year 1911 with the number from each battalion, and where drill will be performed?

2. What length of time was spent in drill and rifle practice in each of these years, were all the officers and non-commissioned officers properly qualified to handle, instruct or drill the militia forces each year, and who were charged with these duties?

Mr. SPROULE.

3. Where, how rapidly and in what numbers could the force be mobilized and properly supplied with arms, uniforms and all necessary equipment for active service?

4. How many additional men could be equipped and put in the field for active service, say in three months?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I spoke to my hon. friend (Mr. Sproule) about this question the other day, and if he would drop the third and fourth questions, I would be very glad to give him the information privately, because it is not information of the kind to be published. I am getting the answer to the first two questions.

Mr. SPROULE. I would be glad to have the answers and allow numbers 3 and 4 to drop, as the minister suggests, if that would serve his purpose.

NAVAL SERVICE—TENDERS FOR CRUISERS.

* Mr. MONK:

1. What parties have tendered for the construction of cruisers to be built for the government?

2. When did the time for receiving such tenders expire?

3. What are the amounts of the said tenders respectively?

4. Do the tenders cover the construction of cruisers only, or of cruisers and destroyers as well?

5. What is the time fixed for the said construction?

6. Has any action been taken on said tenders? If so, what action?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1 and 3. It is not considered advisable to publish the names of the tenderers, or the amounts of the tenders at present.

2. May 1.

4. Both.

5. Six years.

6. Tenders are being examined.

LEASE OF WATER-POWER AT CARILLON.

* Mr. MONK:

1. Who is the lessee of the water-power on the Ottawa river at Carillon?

2. What is the date of the lease and its duration?

3. What is the rental payable by the lessee?

4. Has the lessee paid the rent regularly? If not, what arrears were due on the 31st March, 1911?

5. Has the lessee conformed to his lease as to expenditure for development?

6. What is the date of the order in council authorizing the said lease?

7. Has the original lease been transferred? If so, to whom and on what date?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited.

2. March 31, 1911, for 21 years renewable for two terms of 21 years each.

3. $100 for land; $2 per horse-power annually.

4. Yes; no arrears due.

5. Nothing has been done yet under this lease, as the lessee has 12 months from the date of the lease in which to commence operations.

6. March 14, 1911.

7. No.

FRUIT INSPECTION IN PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What is the date of the appointment of T. A. Peters as fruit inspector for Prince Edward Island?

2. Who recommended this appointment?

3. Has the government any evidence of the qualification of this man for the position? If so, what are his qualifications?

4. Has the government or any department thereof received any complaint or protest concerning this appointment? or the work done by this officer?

5. Has the government received a protest from the Prince Edward Island Fruit Growers' Association against this inspector's appointment, or complaint as to his qualifications?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Mr. T. A. Peters was appointed fruit inspector for Prince Edward Island, on September 1, 1910. He was previously employed by the Department of Agriculture in other capacities.

2. It was made on recommendations considered sufficient by the minister.

3. Yes. Mr. Peters has been known to the Minister of Agriculture and officers of department for many years. He is a capable, trustworthy and energetic officer. He has done excellent work in Prince Edward Island, and is exceedingly well qualified for the position of Dominion fruit inspector. He has had many years experience in connection with the fruit growing industry.

4 and 5. No.

EXPORT OF FARM PRODUCTS THROUGH WINDSOR.

Mr. WILCOX:

1. What quantities of hay, cereals, vegetables, poultry, eggs, fruit, general farm, garden and dairy produce, respectively, were exported through the port of Windsor to the United States of America during the fiscal years ending March 31, 1896-7-8, 1908-9-10?

2. What was the value of such exports, respectively, and what duty was paid thereon?

Mr. PATERSON. The quantity and value of the undermentioned articles exported from the port of Windsor, Ont. to the United States, during the undermentioned fiscal years, was as follows:

	Year.	Quantity.	Value.
Butter .. ..lbs.	1896	190	$ 31
	1897	100	14
	1898	207	27
	1908	1,309	303
	1909	1,953	433
	1910	7,387	1,240
Cheese .. ..lbs.	1896	10,489	1,092
	1897	32	4
	1898	175	25
	1908	4,360	735
	1909	4,926	746
	1910	6,716	1,246
Poultry.. .. ..lbs.	1896	.....	8,934
	1897	.....	8,628
	1898	.....	4,592
	1908	.....	13,528
	1909	.....	11,582
	1910	.....	19,262
Eggs.. .. ..doz.	1896	14,690	1,227
	1897	517	57
	1898	63	27
	1908	3,914	669
	1909	2,087	415
	1910	2,696	649
Honey.. .. ..lbs.	1896	125	16
	1897	200	20
	1898	732	83
	1908	319	49
	1909	835	81
	1910	680	70
Apples, green.. ..brls.	1896	528	814
	1897	5,204	4,387
	1898	64	113
	1908	13,265	27,223
	1909	563	991
	1910	4,490	13,130
Berries, all kinds.. ..$	1896	.....	4,349
	1897	.....	6,071
	1898	.....	5,157
	1908	.....	5,677
	1909	.....	5,019
	1910	.....	7,884
Fruits, n.o.p.. .. .. ..$	1896	.....	7,090
	1897	.....	6,224
	1898	.....	8,667
	1908	.....	12,544
	1909	.....	9,315
	1910	.....	8,485
Nuts, all kinds.. ..lbs.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	2,310	118
	1898	700	43
	1908	.....	.....
	1909	30,736	2,765
	1910	13,530	1,550
Seeds, clover.. .. ..bus.	1896	1,119	4,417
	1897	.....	.....
	1898	606	2,365
	1908	4,687	39,295
	1909	2,358	18,679
	1910	3,824	28,440
Seeds, grass .. ..bush.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	41	55
	1898	885	2,617
	1908	36,452	31,977
	1909	5,758	6,661
	1910	14,151	14,669
Seeds, n.o.p.. .. .. ..$	1896	.....	110
	1897	.....	.....
	1898	.....	24
	1908	.....	418
	1909	.....	1,311
	1910	.....	4,804

	Year.	Quantity.	Value.
Hay.. .. ..tons.	1896	647	6,799
	1897	180	1,252
	1898	6	47
	1908	140	1,623
	1909	25	165
	1910	28	300
Straw.. .. ..tons.	1896	192	904
	1897	30	146
	1898	.....	.....
	1908	5	28
	1909	.....	.....
	1910	.....	.....
Trees, shrubs & plants, $	1896	.....	.....
	1897	.....	17
	1898	.....	18
	1908	.....	154
	1909	.....	2,477
	1910	.....	2,890
Maple sugar .. .. ..lbs.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	76,615	5,729
	1898	450	27
	1908	250,654	19,933
	1909	413,271	30,312
	1910	397,475	26,981
Maple syrup .. ..galls.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	49	28
	1898	42	41
	1908	609	490
	1909	730	693
	1910	591	583
Potatoes.. .. .. ..bush.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	15	8
	1898	172	80
	1908	111	106
	1909	69,583	35,242
	1910	93,690	52,273
Turnips.. .. .. ..bush.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	14,059	1,127
	1898	27,044	3,401
	1908	99,219	14,888
	1909	126,549	23,034
	1910	125,992	16,726
Vegetables, n.o.p.. .. ..$	1896	.....	9,808
	1897	.....	5,372
	1898	.....	3,196
	1908	.....	46,789
	1909	.....	50,453
	1910	.....	70,118
Flour of wheat.. ..brls.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	.....	.....
	1898	269	1,406
	1908	3	13
	1909	1	5
	1910	4	14
Oatmeal.. .. .. ..brls.	1896	5	20
	1897	123	393
	1898	.....	.....
	1908	.....	.....
	1909	.....	.....
	1910	.....	.....
Barley .. ..bush.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	454	169
	1898	.....	.....
	1908	2,285	1,724
	1909	.....	.....
	1910	7	4
Beans.. .. ..bush.	1896	11,068	12,008
	1897	1,341	969
	1898	.....	.....
	1908	29,214	47,542
	1909	52,716	82,276
	1910	8,278	14,855
Buckwheat .. .. ..bush.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	.....	.....
	1898	.....	.....
	1908	.....	.....
	1909	7,164	4,011
	1910	4	3
Indian corn.. .. ..bush.	1896	515	157
	1897	258	45
	1898	.....	.....
	1908	1,226	968
	1909	2,482	2,306
	1910	1,313	1,469
Oats.. .. ..bush.	1896	160	45
	1897	1,190	242
	1898	3,735	885
	1908	16	9
	1909	7,669	3,641
	1910	3,043	1,231
Pease.. .. ..bush.	1896	421	337
	1897	509	254
	1898	78	39
	1908	1,995	3,352
	1909	1,581	3,522
	1910	2,700	4,485
Pease, split.. .. ..bush.	1910	1,886	2,247
Rye .. ..bush.	1898	630	272
Wheat.. .. ..bush.	1896	.....	.....
	1897	6	10
	1898	25	27
	1908	5	10
	1909	12	12
	1910	34	47

NOTE.—Fiscal years 1896, 1897 and 1898 ended June 30. Fiscal years 1908, 1909 and 1910 ended March 31.

CENSUS COMMISSIONER, YORK, NEW BRUNSWICK.

Mr. CROCKET:

Who is the census commissioner for the county of York, N.B., and when was the appointment made?

Mr. FISHER. Mr. W. S. Hooper was appointed Census Commissioner for the county of York, N.B., by order in council under date the 31st March, 1911, but he has since resigned, and no one has yet been appointed in his stead.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY — GUARANTEE OF BONDS.

Mr. GRAHAM moved that to-morrow the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Whereas, having regard to the growth of population and the rapid development of the production and trade of that portion of Canada lying west of the Great Lakes, and to the rapidly expanding trade and commerce of the Dominion generally it is in the interest of Canada as a whole that another line of railway designed to assist in the direct and economic interchange of traffic between the eastern and western portions of the Dominion, to open up and develop portions of Canada as yet without railway facilities, to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada, to develop commerce through Canadian ports,

and to afford the government system of railways in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, and interchange of through traffic, should be constructed from the Pacific Ocean to the city of Montreal: and whereas the projected line of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company extending from Port Arthur to the city of Montreal will provide the uncompleted portion of the said through line lying east of the Great Lakes.

It is, therefore, resolved that it is expedient to provide as follows:—

1. That His Majesty, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada, hereinafter called the government, may aid and assist the construction and completion by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company (hereinafter called the company) of a line of railway extending from the city of Montreal in the province of Quebec to the city of Port Arthur in the province of Ontario, including the mileage of the line (lying between the said points) already in part constructed by the company and by the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company, extending from a point in the province of Quebec opposite the town of Hawkesbury to Rideau Junction, west of Ottawa, in the province of Ontario, by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities, hereinafter called the guaranteed securities, of the company, to the extent of $35,000 per mile of the said line of railway so aided; interest on the guaranteed securities to be at the rate of 3½ per cent per annum, payable half yearly; the principal to be payable in fifty years hereafter. The government may, subject to the provisions of an Act to be passed for such purpose enter into a contract with the company fixing the terms and conditions upon which the guarantee is given and of the security to be taken therefor.

2. That the guarantee securities shall be secured by deed of trust by way of mortgage or charge to a trustee or trustees approved by the Governor in Council, granting a first mortgage or charge upon a line of railway extending from Montreal to Port Arthur, excepting the portion, above described, between a point on the Canadian Northern Quebec railway opposite Hawkesbury and Rideau Junction, about sixty-two and a half miles in length, and about ten and six-tenths miles of the company's Hutton branch, south of Sellwood Junction, and the right-of-way, station grounds, and other real estate, and interests therein, buildings and other structures and improvements, rolling stock and equipment (subject only to equipment bonds), plant, machinery, tools, supplies, materials, and other personal properties, present and future, acquired and to be acquired for the purposes of the said line, and in connection with the operating, repairing and maintaining thereof, and the tolls, incomes and revenues of the company arising and to arise therefrom, and the rights, privileges, franchises and powers of the company now or hereafter held with respect to and in connection with the said line, and the operation, maintenance and repair thereof, such deed of trust shall also grant a mortgage or charge upon the said ten miles of the company's Hutton branch, and upon the properties of the company thereto appertaining, ranking after the mortgages and charges created by two trust deeds made by the company to the British Empire Trust Company, Limited, and National Trust Company, Limited, dated July 12, 1906, and June 24, 1908, respectively, and after the thirty years 3½ per cent debenture stock issued under such trust deeds, in so far as such debenture stock may from time to time be unexchanged and outstanding, and such deed of trust shall also grant a first mortgage or charge upon the bonds or debenture stock deposited under the next following paragraph.

3. That the company shall deposit with the trustee or trustees of the said deed of trust, bonds or debenture stock issued under the trust deed dated June 28, 1909, made between the company and the British Empire Trust Company, Limited, and National Trust Company, Limited, to an amount equal to $35,000 per mile of the said line between a point on the Canadian Northern Quebec railway opposite Hawkesbury and Rideau Junction, and to $35,000 per mile of the said ten and six-tenths miles of the Hutton branch (being approximately $2,558,500 of such bonds or debenture stock); and the bonds or debenture stock so deposited shall form part of the mortgaged premises under the deed of trust, securing the guaranteed securities; and there may be included in the last mentioned deed of trust provisions respecting the interest on the bonds or debenture stock so deposited, and respecting the return to the Company (upon and after the discharge of the said trust deeds dated July 12, 1906, and June 24, 1908), of the bonds or debenture stock deposited in respect of the said ten and six-tenths miles of the Hutton branch freed and discharged from the mortgage or charge under the trust deed securing the said guaranteed securities.

4. That in the said deed of trust there shall also be included a general charge, ranking after and subject to the mortgage or general charge created by the said trust deed dated June 28, 1909, (and subject to the powers of further issue therein reserved or contained) upon the line of railway of the company extending from the town of Hawkesbury to a point on the Niagara river, and upon the properties of the company thereunto appertaining.

5. That the kind of securities to be guaranteed hereunder, and the forms thereof, and the form and terms of the deed of trust securing them, and the times and manner of the issue of the guaranteed securities, and the disposition of the moneys to be raised thereon by sale, pledge, or otherwise, pending the expenditure of such moneys for the purposes of the line of railway so aided, and the forms and manner of guarantee or guarantees shall be such as the Governor in Council approves, and such terms, provisions and conditions may be included in said deed of trust as the Governor in Council deems expedient or necessary.

6. That upon the said guarantee or guarantees being signed by the Minister of Finance or other designated officer, the government shall become liable as guarantor for the payment of the principal and interest of the securities so guaranteed according to the tenor thereof, and such payments shall form a charge upon the Consolidated Revenue Fund;

and the said guarantee or guarantees so signed shall be conclusive evidence that the requirements of the Act respecting the guaranteed securities and the deed of trust and all matters relating thereto have been complied with.

7. That the line hereby aided shall be constructed and completed according to the following specifications:—Bridges over rivers and large streams are to be of concrete and steel construction and to be built to the classification of the Heavy Standard Specification of the Department of Railways and Canals, dated 1908. Bridges of pile or frame trestle may be constructed over small streams which can be taken care of by culverts, such culverts to be constructed within a reasonable time after the line is put in operation, of which time the Governor in Council shall be the sole judge. The line of railway shall be laid with steel rails, not less than 80 lbs. to the lineal yard—with standard fastenings. The maximum curvature shall not be of less radius than 716 feet, and the grades against eastbound traffic shall not exceed five-tenths of one per cent, or 26·40 feet per mile, or six-tenths of one per cent, or 31·68 feet per mile, against the westbound traffic, provided that under exceptional conditions, with the consent of the Governor in Council, less radius of curvature and heavier grades may be allowed, on the recommendation of the Minister of Railways and Canals and approved by the chief engineer, but in no case shall the curvature exceed 573 feet radius or gradients of 52·80 feet to the mile.

8. That the decision of the Governor in Council as to the length of the above mentioned lines shall be final.

9. That subject as herein provided, any moneys paid by the government under any guarantee given in pursuance of any Act founded upon these resolutions shall be held to be paid of discharge of the liability of the government and not in discharge of the liability of the company under the guaranteed securities or under the Deed of Trust securing them, and the moneys so paid shall be held to be still secured by the guaranteed securities and Deed of Trust, and the government shall be subrogated in and to all the rights of the holders of the guaranteed securities, the interest upon or the principal of which has been paid by the government, and the government shall, with respect to all moneys so paid, be in all respects in the position of security holders with respect to whose securities default has been made in payment to the extent of the moneys paid by the government.

10. The government may, at the request of the company, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, pay all or any portion of the first four half-yearly payments of interest on the guaranteed securities falling due after the opening for traffic of the whole of the line so aided, but in such case the government shall not enforce the repayment thereof against the company under the said Trust Deed, or against the Canadian Northern Railway Company under its guarantee as provided for in paragraph 12 hereof until the maturity of the principal of the guaranteed securities pursuant to the terms thereof. The company shall, however, pending the repayment of the interest so paid by the government, pay to the government half-yearly interest on such interest at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum; and such interest, upon interest, until so paid, shall form a charge upon the mortgaged premises under the said Trust Deed.

11. That the books of the company shall at all times be open to inspection for and on behalf of the government by any person named in that behalf by the Governor in Council, or by the Minister of Finance.

12. That the Canadian Northern Railway Company shall, by covenants included in the Deed of Trust, referred to in paragraph 2 hereof, or in some other instrument agreed to between the Governor in Council or the Minister of Finance and the Canadian Northern Railway Company, in such form as the Governor in Council approves, guarantee to the government the due payment, by the company of the principal and interest of all securities issued and guaranteed by the government, under the provisions hereof, according to the tenor and effect of such guaranteed securities respectively, and in accordance with the terms and provisions hereof; and shall also guarantee to the government the due payment by the company of the deferred interest, and of the interest upon interest, if any, which may be payable by the company under paragraph 10 hereof; and shall further guarantee to the government the due payment by the company of all loss or costs which the government may sustain or be put to in enforcing, after default, the provisions of the said Deed of Trust against the line of railway and premises thereby mortgaged and charged.

13. That it is hereby declared that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government for the express purpose of encouraging the transportation of goods through Canadian channels. Before such aid is granted the Governor in Council shall require the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company to enter into an agreement undertaking that all freight originating on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company or its branches, or on the line of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined to points in Canada, be carried over the Canadian Northern railway, or the Canadian Northern Ontario railway, or the connections of either, or over any railway within Canadian territory; and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that all such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to Canadian ocean ports; and that the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company shall not in any matter within their powers directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use their utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely, the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

14. That the company shall enter into an agreement with the government to secure

or establish or cause to be secured or established, suitable terminals for the company within the city of Montreal and agreeing on the request of the government to enter into arrangements with the Intercolonial railway for the interchange of traffic between the company and the Intercolonial railway at Montreal, for such period as the Governor in Council may determine and upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the parties, and should the parties fail to agree, terms shall be fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

He said: I may add that His Excellency the Governor General has been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution, has given his assent thereto, and commends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—ADJOURNMENT FOR CORONATION.

On the orders of the day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I would crave the indulgence of the House for a few minutes to discuss what should be the course of the House and its business in consequence of the fact that I, as Prime Minister, have to absent myself from the country in order to attend the Imperial Conference which is to be opened in London on the 23rd of this month, and afterwards, the coronation ceremonies.

Some days ago, my hon. friend (Mr. R. L. Borden), alluded to this fact, and to certain rumours which had been circulated in the press, and he suggested that one of three courses might be followed. The first was that the House might continue to sit in my absence, which he said, was more for the convenience of the Prime Minister and his colleagues than for the members of the House generally; the second was that the House might be prorogued, and the third was that the House might adjourn, sufficient supplies being previously voted to carry on the business of the country in the interim. As to prorogation, I think the House will agree that, to say the least, it would be inconvenient without parliament having carried through any important part of its business. As to the first suggestion, that the House might sit in the absence of the Prime Minister, there are I think three precedents to my personal knowledge. There is the precedent in 1894, when Sir John Thompson attended the negotiations in Paris between the United States and Great Britain on the question of pelagic sealing. Then, the first year this government was in office, in 1897, I absented myself from the House to attend the jubilee of her late Majesty, Queen Victoria; and in the third case, in 1907, I left the House in session to attend the Imperial Conference of that year. In these instances, the business of the House was practically at an end; no contentious matter was left over, and practically the end of the session was at hand. In the present instance I must say that I felt somewhat loath to leave such a heavy burden upon my colleagues in my absence, because practically very little of the work of the session has been done, and very much remains to do. There are some important matters as to which there is contention between the two parties; there are other important matters on which the parties can agree with more readiness. My colleagues kindly undertook to relieve me of the burden of attendance, each one of them expressing his willingness to do my share of the work, and after full consideration I saw no objection to my being absent, leaving the House to go on with the business. But while it would be well to carry on the business of the House to a conclusion, if it could be done, there was another feature which was lacking altogether in the three precedents I have cited, and that is, this being coronation year, there is, I believe, a unanimous opinion in the House that there should be an adjournment so that the Canadian parliament may be represented at the coronation. Action has been taken in that respect already, but apart from that representation, many other members of the House are anxious to attend such an historic event. We will, I believe, be meeting the views of all the members of the House if we resolve that parliament shall adjourn a sufficient length of time to permit its representation at the coronation. The question, therefore, arises as to what the adjournment should be so as to give members of the House opportunity to leave in time to see the festivities, and to come back. I have thought, after conference with some friends on both sides of the House, that we should sit until the end of May and adjourn in the first days of June, but it has been represented to me that in the last days of May there are two holidays on which the House does not generally sit, namely, the 24th of May, Victoria Day, and the 25th of May, Ascension Day. It will, therefore, be inconvenient to have members come here on the first of the week and be idle during the two holidays, and on the whole, after conference with my friend's opposite, we thought it well that the House should adjourn not later than the 23rd of May. Then, on considering when we should resume our sittings, I came to the conclusion that it would be practically impossible to meet before the 18th of July. I, therefore, give notice to the House that that is the programme we intend to carry out, namely to adjourn about the 23rd of May, to resume about the 18th of July. In the meantime, until the 23rd of May, the House

will continue in session advancing the business as far as possible, and, I believe there may be a good deal of practical and useful work done in the meantime. Then, there remains the question of supplies to be voted. We have had supplies voted to the first of June, and after consultation with friends on both sides of the House, we think that supplies ought to be advanced until the first of September. There are, however, some items of supply which must be voted in full, independent of such agreements. There is the vote for the military and Northwest Mounted Police contingents, which are to attend the coronation, and with respect to them a partial vote would not be sufficient. There is also in this category the vote for the Festival of Empire, which although a private enterprise, has been contributed to by all the daughter nations, and our contribution, therefore, must be paid immediately. Then, the Minister of the Interior has some Indian annuities, which have to be paid to the Indians regularly and expeditions to pay them have to be started in advance. Such expenses must be voted in their entirety.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). They are treaty obligations, I suppose.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are treaty obligations. There may be some other items which it will be necessary to vote in full, and at once, but there are others as to which it will not be inconvenient to vote in instalments. These are the views which I have to submit to the House for the carrying on of business consequent upon the present conditions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Prime Minister has already mentioned to me, privately, many of the matters he has spoken of. As to the date of adjournment, I have already told him, as I tell him now, that in view of what I have already said across the floor, I consider it a matter which should be left pretty much to his own judgment. I am, therefore, perfectly willing to concur in the dates he has mentioned. It may perhaps be suggested that it would be hardly worth while to come back over Saturday and Sunday, and meet for two days of the following week, namely, the 22nd or 23rd, but I merely throw out that suggestion, and I leave it entirely to his own judgment. As to the date on which the House should resume, I am willing that the Prime Minister should have his views carried out in that respect as well. With respect to the Supply that is required for the military and Northwest Mounted Police coronation contingent, the Festival of Empire, and the Indian annuities, which, as I understand, are treaty obligations, there will be no objection whatever to voting them in full. It is perfectly proper and right that they should be voted in full under the circumstances. In conclusion I can only say that I am very happy indeed that the Prime Minister will be able to attend, both the Imperial Conference and the coronation.

Mr. GOODEVE. I have no desire to offer any criticism to the suggested programme outlined by the First Minister. I would like to emphasize the suggestion offered by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) that as the 23rd of May will be a Tuesday, by adjourning on the previous Friday, the 19th of May, there would not be a great deal of time lost, none that could not be made up by sitting a little later at night. A large portion of the time of the western members will be taken up in going to and coming from our several homes, six days each way, and to some extent the same thing applies to the eastern members. We have already had two adjournments in this long session, at Christmas and Easter, and with this third adjournment each western member will have lost 36 days in travelling during these recesses.

The date fixed for the reassembling of parliament is in the middle of the very hottest season in Ottawa. We have had a strenuous session owing to illness during the hard and unusual winter, and I know that our western members rather enjoy our own mild climate and consider it quite a hardship to have to come back here in the intense heat. For that reason I would again suggest that instead of Tuesday, July 18, the Prime Minister should make the date two weeks later, Tuesday, August 1.

Mr. HUGHES. As I may not be present when the items to which the Prime Minister has referred are under discussion I take this opportunity of saying that I have recently been through portions of the Northwest territories, and if ever men earned a trip to the coronation, the Mounted police during the past winter have earned it. From scores of sources I learned that every new homesteader in the Canadian Northwest, so far as could possibly be ascertained, and they were well looked up, was visited once or twice every month during the stern winter endured in the Northwest and they were asked if they were in want of food or fuel. I take this opportunity of mentioning to the First Minister that this was very highly appreciated all through the Northwest.

Mr. RHODES. Coming from the extreme east, I would endorse the remarks made by my hon. friend from Kootenay, who speaks for the extreme west. A large number of the members of the House live comparatively near Ottawa and can return home almost any time by a few hours' rail journey and one day is the same to them as another; but to those who live

more than a thousand miles away every day counts, and if the House would adjourn on Friday, May 19, many of us could spend Sunday at home and gain practically 5 days with a loss of only 2 to the service of the House. As has been suggested we could sit later on the last two days to make up for the time. With respect to coming back on the 1st of August instead of the 18th of July, if the government could see its way clear to meet that suggestion, I am sure it would be approved of by hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House, who have to come extreme distances.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Coming from a point close to Ottawa I certainly have no reason to complain at the House sitting until May 23 and resuming on July 18, but I think there is another reason why we should try if possible to adjourn on Friday, and that is the 24th of May is a public holiday. There is not a constituency I believe in Canada in which there will not be a celebration of some kind on that day, and I think every member would like to be present if possible at these celebrations. Personally I am willing to do everything to hurry the work through so as to adjourn on Friday. As to resuming on July 18, the Prime Minister will agree that July is generally the holiday month of the year. Every person endeavours to go for a holiday in that month, and the very fact of having to come back on the 18th of July will interfere not only with the members but with their families. We could also perhaps help to rush the work through after we came back on the 1st of August if we adjourned until that date. So far as I am concerned I really think that if the right hon. the Prime Minister can possibly see his way clear to adjourn until the 1st of August it would be much better. It would certainly be of great assistance to members by enabling them to give their families the usual benefit of the summer vacations. I hope the Prime Minister will see his way to an adjournment to the 1st of August.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer). In case an endorsement from this side should add force to the suggestion from my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, I should like to add my very frank approval of it. There is no need for me to add anything to what has been said by hon. gentlemen opposite on the point. It is apparent that those of us who come from very great distances in the west have great advantage to gain by getting away from here on Friday night instead of having to remain until the following Tuesday. There is very much force also in what my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) has said as to the desirability of our being at home for the various functions to be held to celebrate one of the most important holidays not only in this country but in the empire.

Mr. FOSTER. I think that my right hon. friend the Prime Minister is convinced as to the desirability of an earlier adjournment in May; but looking at him intently, I cannot come to the conclusion that he is convinced of the desirability of our reassembling later than July 18. But there is one argument which I would like to adduce what might have some weight with him. The Prime Minister has on previous occasions been over on functions something similar to the one now facing him. He knows the difficulties, the troubles, the menaces, gastronomic and otherwise, which he will have to face; and though his robust constitution may enable him to live through it all and resume work on the 18th of July with his usual vigour, his less robust colleagues, who are to accompany him, will probably not find themselves in as good condition in a sanitary sense. I submit therefore as an unanswerable argument, that, after these functions on the other side are through, he should provide them with a fortnight's rest at some good cure where they can renew their vigour, and so be ready for work.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am sure that I speak the sentiments of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) when I say that those of us who live among the Thousand Islands do not want to be dragged away from them on the 18th of July. I am satisfied further that the Minister of Railways requires some rest as he has been under the weather lately. For myself if the Prime Minister wants to bring us back in the dog days I can stand it, but I would much prefer that we should meet on the 1st of August.

Mr. SPROULE. There is just one other argument that might be advanced. I noticed a cartoon in one of the papers the other day which depicted the Prime Minister as being troubled concerning the nurse he was leaving in charge of an infant called reciprocity, which was bawling with mouth open from ear to ear. The only way to keep it asleep during his absence from parliament was for the nurse to dose it with chloroform and paregoric; but if the House adjourned on the Friday instead of the Monday following, there would be three days less time during which that infant would be required to be kept asleep.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think the infant is vigorous and kicking, and in no need of paregoric. I have listened carefully to everything that has been said. I am only the servant of the House, and want to consult the views of the House as much as possible. We are here, however, to do certain work, and that work must be

done. My hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) suggests that we should adjourn on the Friday preceding the 23rd of May. I shall not be here at that time, and if any modifications are to be made to the programme I have suggested, there is nothing to prevent their being made if the House will sit late and begin business early. Perhaps it would be well that we should begin morning sittings immediately, say next Monday, and in that way get through the work quicker. But there is certain work to be done as to which we cannot agree. For instance, if we were to discuss reciprocity at present, my hon. friends opposite would not be disposed to facilitate the business of the House. There is, however, other business as to which we can agree, and which can be disposed of. If it be found that the legislation on the programme is advanced sufficiently, the House might agree to advance the adjournment from the 23rd to the 19th. With regard to the other suggestion, that we should not meet again until the 1st of August, that is a matter largely in the hands of the House. If the House will agree to vote sufficient Supply to carry us on a decent time, we might meet later, but if we have Supply voted only to the 1st of September, we shall have to resume business on the 18th of July.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT—AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act and the Acts in amendment thereof, and to provide as follows:

1. As section 39, subsection 2. That a person who has served over three years as a clerk in the outside service of the Customs may be appointed to the rank of senior clerk, subject to such examination on the duties of office and other qualifications as is prescribed by the deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department. The salary of such senior clerk shall be from $1,200 to $1,600 per annum.

2. That the part of Schedule 'B' of the Civil Service Act which relates to Customs be repealed and the following substituted therefor:

SCHEDULE 'B,' CUSTOMS.

					Increase.
Higher Classes.					
Collectors	Salary per annum, from	$ 300	to	$4,500	Nil.
Chief inspector	" "	3,200	"	4,000	Nil.
Inspector of ports	" "	2,100	"	3,200	700
Assistant inspectors	" "	1,600	"	2,000	200
Chief clerks	" "	1,200	"	2,100	100
Surveyors	" "	1,200	"	2,800	400
Assistant surveyors (comprising tide surveyors, chief landing waiters and chief lockers)	" "	1,200	"	1,600	400
Technical Officers.					
Dominion appraisers	Salary per annum, from	$2,100	to	$2,600	500
Appraisers	" "	1,200	"	2,400	400
Assistant appraisers	" "	900	"	1,600	100
Gaugers	" "	900	"	1,600	400
Other Classes.					
Senior clerks	Salary per annum, from	$1,200	to	$1,600	400
Clerks and landing waiters	" "	400	"	1,200	Nil.
Examining officers (including preventive officers whose duties are not chiefly clerical, and lockers)	" "	100	"	1,000	Nil.
Packers and messengers	" "	400	"	800	200

Hon. WM. PATERSON (Minister of Customs). $1,200 is now the maximum of those clerks who come under the 1st resolution. There are many in the service who have been there many years, and have attained to their maximum, and to whom we cannot grant any increased salary. Considering their position and responsibilities, it is thought desirable that those who have been in the service some time, and have proved themselves qualified under examination, might be promoted to a new class, to be called the rank of senior clerk, with a maximum of $1,600.

Mr. SPROULE. The trouble is that this includes those who had been employed in this capacity for only three years. It seems to me this might result in bringing into the service men of limited experience and equally limited knowledge. It might be used as a scheme to transfer men from one position in the service to another, giving them a much larger salary than their

qualifications would entitle them to. I could understand this applying to men who have been for a considerable length of time in the outside service, but three years is only a limited time.

Mr. PATERSON. Many of these have been in the service for far longer than three years. This will apply to those who, besides having had the length of service provided for, have the necessary qualification, to be ascertained by an examination. Without this amendment we could not advance these clerks though some of them have been for years at $1,200.

Mr. SPROULE. But the limit should be made greater than three years.

Mr. PATERSON. I would rather the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would not take exception to that. For it might exclude some who should not be excluded, and three years is a fair test.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the system of examination?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Blain) will see that it is to be an examination on the duties of office, and that there are to be other qualifications as prescribed by the deputy head in a report to be concurred in by the head of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the deputy head be the exclusive examiner?

Mr. PATERSON. He would set the papers. I think it is his intention that the papers be examined by the commission. But it will be an examination peculiar to the position.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the minister give us an idea of the number in the outside service who might take advantage of this, and who have been there only three years, together with the salaries they are receiving at the present time?

Mr. PATERSON. I could give it with reference to the salaries. They are at the maximum, and that is the reason for introducing this clause.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the maximum?

Mr. PATERSON. It is $1,200. But I could not give the exact number of clerks who would come under this provision. It would apply pretty generally to those who have been there for the length of time stated. They would not get the whole advance at once; $1,600 would be the maximum, and they would reach it by degrees. Many, especialy in Montreal and Toronto, have remained at $1,200 for some years, and we could not do anything for them though we felt they deserved higher remuneration.

Mr. SPROULE. I recognize the justice of doing something for these men, and am not raising the slightest objection to this provision as it applies to them. But, if the service has been loaded up with a number of young men who were started at a much higher figure than their predecessors in the service, and who have obtained the $1,200 in a short time, and if this provision gives them a raise at once without their having had more experience—and probably with no more than common qualifications—it seems to me there is danger that either you are doing less than justice to your older employees, or more than justice to the new ones. If it would apply only to a few it would not be so bad; but if it applies to many, it might be an abuse which we should not favour. That is why I asked the minister as to the number who could take advantage of this arrangement.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, some of those to whom this would apply have not been so long in the service as others have been. But look at it in this way. Would the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) consider that $1,200 was as much as a man engaged in clerical work is entitled to after years of service and experience? If their services are worth more than $1,200, no abuse could arise even if, after examination, they were given by degrees advances to $1,600. Would the hon. gentleman think that $1,200 is all that a clerk is worth, especially in large places where the work requires quickness, correctness and other important qualities?

Mr. BLAIN. How many years would it take for an officer having $1,200 to reach the maximum of $1,600?

Mr. PATERSON. The rule that applies to the inside service of increases of $50 or $100 according to classification does not apply to the outside service. It is left to the department to recommend by order in council the advances to these officers. Their fitness is ascertained by reports of collectors and inspectors, and by the work of the clerks as it comes before the department. I am asking this year two or three hundred thousand extra, but when this is divided among 2,000 of all ranks from the Atlantic to the Pacific it means that we are able to give only about $50, or, in some cases $100, and to some of the higher officers may be $200. You will observe that in this new classification we are raising the maximum of the examining and preventive officers whose duties are not chiefly clerical. The deputy thinks that men doing the work they do should reach a larger maximum, and that a thousand dollars should be the maximum. If there were any very deserving officers capable of going higher, we would ask them to

pass an examination, in which they might pass out of that class into the class of clerks where they might go to $1,200.

Mr. LALOR. Does this affect the ordinary collector of customs, or the examiners of ports of entries such as Fort Erie?

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, it would affect them all. The collectors used to run from $300 to $4,000, a very wide range; now they will go from $300 to $4,500. A year or two ago an Act was passed by which we were permitted to raise the maximum of collectors to $4,500, to meet the case of two or three collectors at the largest ports, such as Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg. The collector at Fort Erie gets, I think, about $1,800. We might find it necessary to give him a little increase. In the hon. gentleman's town the revenue has increased, and I said to the deputy that I thought we were hardly compensating the collector there for his work. Cases of that kind have been taken into consideration. We are asking for $300,000 or $400,000 more, but when it is scattered over so large a number we cannot give a large increase.

Mr. LALOR. I appreciate very much the remarks of the Minister of Customs with regard to the increase in the salary of the collector in my own town—I was going to mention him particularly. He is an old and efficient officer, and the collections at that port have increased to such an enormous extent that his salary is not at all in proportion to the revenue. I hope the minister will take his case into consideration. He is a careful officer, and has not been properly paid at all. I think his salary now is about $850 a year. He has to keep a family, and when we consider the increased cost of living, that salary is not nearly enough. Fort Erie is not in my constituency, but I want to say the same with reference to the subordinates at Fort Erie, some of whom I understand, are getting a salary of $700 a year. On this salary they are expected to keep up a family. and to maintain a certain respectability. As a member of this House, I would be glad to see such officers as I speak of receive an increase in salary. They are just as deserving, and in many cases more so, than the higher officers and collectors of ports. I would like to see the minister take into consideration such officers as I have mentioned, in view of the increased cost of living. Their salary has not been increased in the same proportion as the salaries of officers in almost every other capacity.

Mr. FOSTER. I would have been much better pleased if the minister had come to a decision to place these outside men under the Civil Service Act, and under stable conditions. The minister has left himself a three years' limit. Now for four or five years, if I understand his procedure aright, he has been appointing men at better salaries than usual; properly so, because the cost of living has increased, and he has recognized the necessity, in order to get good men, of giving them at least something to live upon, and probably also he has felt the reasonableness of it. But we have in the outside service, as the minister knows well, a large number of old servants, who were appointed a great many years ago, who have not had increases, but who have to maintain their families, and carry on the expenses of a home. Now, it is harder on such a man than it would be on a young man. A young man is more hopeful, and his resiliency is greater, he is better able to come back again after feeling depressed. But an old servant who has reached a more advanced period of life, who is still at a small salary, with no hope of promotion—that is the class of men to whom I want to call the minister's attention particularly. Whilst I would rather see the three year limit maintained, because I think that enables the minister to make those provisions for all the younger men who were lately appointed at large salaries, we must remember that the minister is a party man, and is at the call of the party to a large extent, and he is bound to listen to patronage claims. I think he has human nature enough in him to listen to them. But there will be great injustice done if, when parliament grants these possible increases, the minister does not set himself to work to ameliorate the condition of these old servants at small salaries. I want to make a plea to the minister for that class of men. If I talked for an hour I could not make the plea any stronger than I am making it.

Mr. PATERSON. Even under this three year limit, before they can get into this other class, in all the branches of the service that the hon. gentleman alluded to we have the power now either to grant an increase or not, according to circumstances. Length of service is one of the circumstances that should not be overlooked, and efficiency is another, and a good deal depends upon corresponding salaries in other ports. Collectors examine closely what changes are made, and what is paid collectors working beside them at other ports. Consequently we have to establish a kind of rough rule, which, however, cannot be a rule, because one collector might have just as much work to do, though his revenue might not show so large as that of

another. Perhaps there may be a large amount of shipping, and much work in entering and clearing vessels at a certain port. But we are trying to advance them all. As I said before, parliament has been very kind to us. I think in the last three or four years parliament has given us over half a million dollars, some of which has gone to establish new ports, but most of it has gone in salaries. When you consider that we have to provide for a numerous staff from the Atlantic to the Pacific, we have to ask for large sums, which sometimes have appeared to me a little startling. But the House recognizes the fact that the salaries ought to be higher than they were a few years ago, and I think I can say honestly that I have done something in that direction. I suppose I have the feelings that actuate others and that reasons may be shown, perhaps, other than those of sufficiency, or efficiency, or duties, but I do try, as far as I can, and I think my officers try as far as they can, in the distribution of these moneys, to act fairly. I think I can honestly say that the fact as to what the political complexion of an officer may have been in days gone by does not count against him, and it ought not to.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it should not.

Mr. PATERSON. If a vacancy occurs and a suitable persons to fill it is recommended to me, if that person happened to be of the Liberal faith, he would not be rejected therefor. I am speaking with reference to new appointments. But men who have been in the service, no matter when they came in or what they may have been before, if they are doing their duty faithfully and well and it is possible to give a general increase, there will be full consideration given to their cases on their merits. That is the way we try to do. Of course, we cannot satisfy everybody. Some officers think that they are worth more, perhaps, than my chief officers or inspectors report, and we are not able to satisfy them. But, I think, as a rule, the service is pretty well satisfied that they have been fairly dealt with. Their only complaint would be that those in the service are not paid as they should be, and really, if you take the whole customs service and divide it up, putting the low and high salaries together, you will find that the average salary is considerably under a thousand dollars. I think it is only about $800, and that will not be considered extravagant payment for them.

Mr. FOSTER. That is the outside service?

Mr. PATERSON. That is the outside service.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask the minister if there is any general increase to be granted to the clerks and landing waiters? These are officers who are receiving what I would consider to be small pay—about $700 or $800 a year. Are they to get an increase in their pay this year?

Mr. PATERSON. My deputy has a memorandum prepared of some hundreds of increases taking the Dominion altogether. I have not that under my hand at the present time, and I do not know that it would be advisable to read it publicly in the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. You do not know the amount of increase that each will receive?

Mr. PATERSON. No, but if the salaries of these officers are $800 or thereabouts, I do not know whether there would be much of an increase to them. It may seem that this is small enough to pay men, but the highest they can go up to in the service is $1,000. There are a great many who are receiving $700 and $800. If they were getting an increase it would probably be about $50. An increase can only be given as the money is appropriated; there is no automatic increase as in the inside service. A great many men have been in the service for years and years, and perhaps, until within the last two years, have not received any increase at all. I have in my mind one efficient officer who is now holding a high position, but who was for eighteen years precisely at the same salary of $1,000. He is receiving a higher salary now. But the increases are not rapid. I sometimes wonder at the pressure there is from capable men to enter the Civil Service, and young men at that, because it does seem to me that there are far better opportunities for men with their abilities in other walks of life than in the Civil Service. There are so few prizes in the Civil Service. It has this advantage, that it is permanent, it is a respectable position, the hours are not very long, and that has its attraction for certain people, but to the energetic young man my personal advice would be to try and see if he cannot do better somewhere else. One of the great difficulties in advancing the salaries of these officers is that if a vacancy takes place in one of the offices drawing a salary of $700 or $800 you will get over a dozen applicants for it all eager to get the position. You know that in your own business, things are kind of regulated by the law of supply and demand, and in a public office, as a trustee of the people, you have to be guided somewhat by the same principle. It is the very multiplicity of the applications to get into the public service that makes it difficult. When they get in it is not an unusual thing for them to ask for an advance.

Mr. HENDERSON. About the first thing, is it not?

Mr. PATERSON. I will not say that in every case, but it is so.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before this carries I would like to observe that I appreciate very much some of the considerations that the minister has brought forward, but I would like to say to him that there has been a good deal of complaint, and I might almost add scandal, in connection with the treatment of some of the men in the Halifax custom office. These men, who are men of very great capacity and of very long service, have been overlooked. According to statements in the press, for which I do not vouch, but which the minister can put right if they are not correct, these men have been overlooked for a great many years, while men who have entered the service within the past ten or twelve years have received salaries that are much more adequate in relation to the amount of work done than the salaries of the men to whom I allude. I can give the minister some illustrations of this, as I have them here right under my hand. I can give him the case of men who entered the service within seven or eight years, and who have salaries as high as men who have been thirty years in the service, and I venture to say that he could not get a report from the collector of customs at Halifax which would indicate that there is any good reason for that discrimination. It has been stated in the public press of Halifax that three of these men, who have been a long time in the service, were recommended for an increase by the collector of customs of Halifax, Mr. Mitchell, a very capable man, who was appointed by this government, and that the recommendation of Mr. Mitchell in that regard was entirely overlooked. This is said to be due to the fact that the gentleman who represented the county between 1904 and 1908 put in a very strong objection and protest to the increases being granted. I do not know whether that statement is correct or not, but I do say that, if the minister permitted the recommendation of the collector of customs at Halifax to that end to be overlooked upon such a protest or objection, I do not think he was doing his duty. I know Mr. Mitchell very well; he was a strong Liberal before he was appointed to the position which he now holds, a very strong and a very active Liberal, and I do not think that any one in Halifax objected to his appointment. I congratulated him myself upon his appointment, and I think he has discharged the duties of the office there with a great deal of efficiency. If these recommendations were made for increases of salary they ought not to have been passed over for any such reason as has been stated in the public press.

Mr. PATERSON. If that was the reason.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, if that was the reason. I am not asserting that it was the reason.

Mr. PATERSON. Of course, our officers do not feel bound to take the recommendations of collectors in all cases, but they are bound to give them due consideration. You can understand that the collectors quite naturally would like to see all the officers advanced, and, therefore, we are not able to meet their views in all cases. But if there is any case overlooked without good reason, I would be pleased if the hon. gentleman would give the name.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will give the names at once. The first one is Mr. W. A. Garrison. I had no communication from Mr. Garrison, directly or indirectly, and all I know about his case I gather from the public press. He is surveyor of the port of Halifax; he has been acting collector during the illness of Mr. Harrington, the predecessor of Mr. Mitchell; he is a man of ability, and of long experience, and I have not heard that there ever has been any complaint against him; he entered the service forty-one years ago as tidewaiter, became clerk in the long room, and was promoted to the vacant surveyorship about twenty years ago. When this newspaper article was written two years ago, his salary was $1,500, and I think it remains at that still.

Mr. PATERSON. I see it was that a year ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The man who fills the same position in Quebec gets $2,000; in St. John, $1,700; in Ottawa, $1,650, and in Vancouver, $2,000, while Mr. Garrison, with forty-one years service, and with the ability to act as collector, receives only $1,500. Another officer mentioned in the Halifax 'Herald' of 21st June, 1909, is Mr. J. O'Brien. I have had no communication from him, and I know nothing of his case except what is to be found in this newspaper article. He has had forty years service, he has been chief clerk for twenty years, his present salary is $1,200, and he has had no increase since 1893. In an interview I had with the minister, at which was present the Commissioner of Customs and two other officers of the department, I mentioned the case of Mr. John R. Power, and I would remind the minister that the salary of Mr. Power, after thirty years service, is only $950, although there are several men performing similar duties, having not more than six or seven years' service, who receive higher salaries. I am not complaining of the salaries given these men of recent appointment; I do not say that any one of them is receiving more than he should; I would not be surprised to learn that some of them are receiving less

than what might properly be paid to them; but I do say that the apparent discrimination between these gentlemen and Mr. Power ought not to continue, and that some recognition should be given to long and faithful service.

Mr. PATERSON. Your comparisons are between officers in other ports, and not the officers in Halifax.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax.) In the other cases, but not in this case. I am saying that these men have been overlooked in salary increases for a great many years; I am calling the attention of the minister to the statement that these men have been recommended over and over again, for an increase of salary by the present collector, Mr. Mitchell, and that in no case has an increase been granted to any one of them. I hope the minister will take these individual cases into consideration.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not say anything against Mr. Garrison, but he is an aged man now, and there does exist this discrepancy between the same officers at different ports, and St. John and Halifax watch each other very closely when comparisons are made. We have found, in order to get good men, that it is necessary to start them at a higher salary than was the case in years gone by. In the earlier years of my administering the department, as a rule we started a new officer at a lower rate than had been attained after years of service by the officers he was replacing, but lately we have had to give higher salaries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think the minister's explanation is borne out by the facts, because I can give him the names of men who have been appointed six or seven years ago at salaries of $600, and who are now receiving as high as $1,100.

Mr. PATERSON. That would be an exceptional case.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are quite a list of them.

Mr. PATERSON. Will the hon. gentleman give the names?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not wish to mention the names of these gentlemen in public, because I am taking no exception at all to the salaries paid them, but I will send the minister a private memorandum.

Mr. PATERSON. I will look into the matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does not conduce to a good feeling in the service if it is considered that these advances are made for reasons that cannot properly be described as in the public interest. There ought to be some explanation of these apparent discriminations when they are brought to the attention of the minister.

Mr. LAKE. While the Civil Service Act was under discussion, the members of the government expressed the hope that in the near future it would be possible to bring the officials in the Customs and Post Office outside service under the Act. Has the minister gone into this question, and when does he think he will be able to submit a proposal of this kind to the House.

Mr. PATERSON. I have discussed that question with the officers of the department frequently, and we desire if possible to bring about such an arrangement, particularly in larger cities. There are, however, difficulties in working out a scheme owing to the nature of the work and the classifications now existing in the inside service. I do not believe it would apply to small places at all because a man who passed the examination, say in Ottawa, would not care to be appointed to a position in some small and remote port. In the large ports it would be a great benefit to the department. Men would be sent to us by the Civil Service Commission because they had taken the highest examinations. Whether we can accomplish this next year I do not know, but we would like to have something of the kind. It would be a great relief. The appointment of clerks in the inside service by the Civil Service Commission has been a marvellous relief in the work of the department.

Mr. BLAIN. How are such officers appointed to the outside service?

Mr. PATERSON. We try to find out as well as we can how they are fitted for the positions.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If this is such a marvellous relief for the inside service what objection would the minister have to having appointments made by the Civil Service Commission to the outside service?

Mr. PATERSON. There is no objection except the difficulty of working out a scheme which we are trying to overcome.

Mr. JAMESON. How many clerks will be affected under this arrangement, and how will it money out?

Mr. PATERSON. My deputy is in Montreal to-day, and so I have not with me any calculation of this kind. Of course we could not tell how much money would be involved as we could not say how many would pass the examination. The increases would be made in the regular yearly instalments of $50 or $100. The increases will not be very great in the aggregate and individually they seem very small.

Mr. JAMESON. When was the last increase given to the officials in the outports?

Mr. PATERSON. I think there was a very general increase last year, where the salaries were low. In certain ports in the maritime provinces, the department gave only $300 to $350. That seems a very small sum, but there is very little work. In the outports from $300 to $500 is the usual payment. In Manitoba and the other provinces the salaries are higher. Last year we tried to bring all the low paid officials to about as high a salary as we intended to carry them.

Mr. JAMESON. The minister will not suppose that I wish to oppose increases to any one in the service of the department, because I entertain no such idea. I think that in many instances they are underpaid. I thought that it would have been well for us to know just how many persons would be affected by this legislation. If a large business house were proposing anything of this kind, a memorandum would be submitted to the directors or shareholders showing just what burden would be involved. I understood from the minister that an increase was provided for the outport officers last year. I find by referring to the Auditor General's Report for the year ending March 31, 1910, that a number of officers of customs in the outports are paid very small salaries. Take the county of Digby in which I am more particularly interested.

Mr. PATERSON. Is that the port of Digby?

Mr. JAMESON. The outports of the port of Digby, and the port of Weymouth. Some of the officers are paid as low as $200 per year, and some $300. These officers have to be always ready to discharge the duties devolving upon them. These duties keep them at home to a certain extent as they must be on hand when required, and they discharge their duties very faithfully. The trifling salary of $200 is absolutely insufficient for any man supposed to discharge the important duties which devolve upon a customs officer. I should be very glad to know that an increase had been given them, but on referring to the last Auditor General's Report I see that their salaries remain the same. Many of these officers have been in the employ of the government for years. I am not speaking of any one county or province, because the salaries in general of these men are insufficient. If substantial increases, as proposed by these resolutions, are to be given, to clerks who may have been in the service only three years, something should be done for these other officials who have faithfully discharged their duties during five, ten or fifteen years, and who have had no increase, although the cost of living has increased in these outports in the same ratio as in the cities and towns. When the minister brings forward a resolution of this character, he should be prepared to give information as to the number of officers who will participate in the increase, and the exact sum to which these increases will amount in the way of an additional burden on the country.

Mr. PATERSON. As regards the class to which my hon. friend has referred, I could not give them any expectation of any increase. The view we take is that they are at their maximum.

Mr. JAMESON. From him who hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath, and to him who hath shall be given.

Mr. PATERSON. No, but there must be some regard for the work done. At many of these outports, the salary of $350——

Mr. JAMESON. Some have only $200.

Mr. PATERSON. Perhaps if these men were given the revenue they collect instead of a salary, they would prefer to take the salary. What is the department to do in a case of that kind? The revenue is not large, but pressure has been brought time and again to have officers at certain places to enter and clear vessels. Perhaps in some of these places there are not over ten or twelve entries and clearances in a year, and the revenue is not as large as the salaries paid. These men were simply appointed for the convenience of some shipper, and they have scarcely any work to do. In some cases, the customs officer will be a farmer. When a vessel is loaded with timber, its master goes to this officer and gets a clearance from him, and it may not take half an hour to give it. These ports are simply for the convenience of very few people, but once you establish an outport, you cannot close it without arousing great feeling. Of course these outports are a great facility to some shipper. Instead of having to sail ten or twelve miles to a port where we are able to pay a collector a proper salary, the shipmaster can get his papers on the spot, and that is why he wants a man there. These men do not live on what we pay them. They are engaged in other duties, and their duties as customs officer probably do not take up an hour of their time. In the Dominion we have more ports of entry, not relatively, but absolutely, than the whole 90,000,000 people in the United States have. We are beset on all hand to open up new ports; and when my hon. friend talks about the $300 man, and the $200 man, and what a

hardship that low salary is, there are plenty of men in these places only too glad to take the job at the same money if the present incumbents would resign. What is a business man to do under these circumstances? There are men who would be only too glad, if they would send in their resignation, to take their job at the same money. What is a business man to do? You must conduct things on business principles.

Mr. JAMESON. That is exactly what I suggested—the minister should do things in a business way, and let the committee know what the effect of this will be in dollars and cents, and number of officers affected.

Mr. PATERSON. It will not affect these men.

Mr. JAMESON. But it will affect the people who have to put their hands in their pockets and pay the bills. The minister speaks of there being such a large number of ports in Canada compared with the United States. Of course there are more; we have more coast line on the Atlantic alone than the United States have on both Atlantic and Pacific. The minister knows that. But the minister does not go further and make a comparison of salaries paid. In the seaports of the maritime provinces, where we do a large amount of shipping, it is necessary to have customs ports and to have fairly capable officers in charge of them, men who are capable of discharging their duties, who will be on hand—and, so far as my information goes these officers are on hand when required. It may be that they engage in some other occupation; but they must confine themselves to occupations which will not take them so far away from their offices that they cannot discharge their duties with reasonable dispatch. And, when all the rest of the service are receiving increases of salaries, I draw the attention of the minister to the fact that, as I believe these men are receiving the same salaries as they have received for years. It is only right that their case should be taken under advisement, and if it is fair—as I believe it to be—that they should be given an increase, then, that increase should be provided for. And I do not think the people of this country will be in any way disposed to criticise it.

Mr. PATERSON. I am afraid I cannot promise that with reference to that class of officers.

Mr. CROSBY. I understood the Minister of Customs, when answering a question put by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) with regard to Mr. Garrison, to intimate that there was some reason for Mr. Garrison's salary not being increased. Mr. Garrison is a very competent and able man. He went into the customs house as a very young man, and to-day when the minister calls his collector of customs from Halifax, Mr. Garrison must take his place and take charge of the port. Halifax, I think, is the fourth in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. PATERSON. You are an important port, but not the fourth.

Mr CROSBY. Perhaps the minister will tell us what position Halifax takes?

Mr. PATERSON. A very good position.

Mr. CROSBY. It would be a good position whatever position we took. I said we were the fourth port in the Dominion, and unless the minister shows I am wrong——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister means that Halifax is in the third position.

Mr. CROSBY. We are certainly well up on the list. But we are not well up so far as the payment of our men is concerned. Mr. Garrison has been receiving $1,500, I think, for fifteen or twenty years. I believe that Halifax occupies a higher place than two of the ports whose surveyors receive higher salaries. Not only is that the case, but last year we had more business than in any previous year, and next year we expect to have a great deal more. In fact, the day is not far distant when every passenger steamer that crosses the Atlantic between the mother land and America will be compelled by the condition of things to come to Halifax. Now, Mr. Garrison is also a comparatively young man. It is only a few months ago, when in the city of Halifax, I saw my gallant friend in his military uniform—in fact, he looked like Colonel Hughes. Therefore, there can be no question so far as his physical condition is concerned. And I know he stands in high reputation with the citizens of Halifax. It would be a sufficient recommendation for him if he stood high with the collector of customs. Our collector of customs, Mr. Mitchell, has been spoken of by the leader of the opposition. He is an excellent man and I have no hesitation in saying that the port of Halifax is fortunate in its collector. The only thing wrong in his case is that we are not paying him enough. He is getting the same salary, I think, that the collector of customs of Halifax got at confederation or very shortly after. Before his appointment he was at the head of a very large and remunerative business. I think it was only with great persuasion on the part of his friends that he agreed to take the position, and the citizens of Halifax were delighted when he was appointed. We claim that he should have a salary of $4,000. We do not ask for $4,500, because there are one or two other places that do a little more business than Halifax, and we leave the $4,500 to them. But the next man to the collector is the surveyor, and he only gets

$1,500. I see that the minister (Mr. Paterson) can hardly credit that because he is looking up to see what Mr. Garrison receives.

Mr. PATERSON. The minimum was $1,200, and he is only getting $300 over the minimum.

Mr. CROSBY. He has been getting that a long time. I am sure that when the minister has visited Halifax he has found Mr. Garrison a man thoroughly competent for his position. It is only fair that he should receive a better salary. Other men have been referred to. I could quote a dozen appointments within the last six years of men who are receiving larger salaries than Mr. Power who has been in the custom house a long time. He went into the custom house a very young man—he seems to be a young man to-day. Living in Halifax keeps him young. And there is Mr. O'Brien whom I know well, and who is a very competent man. The Minister of Customs referred to the number of ports in the maritime provinces at which he has collectors and he also referred to the United States. Well, I may say that in the United States, even a foreign vessel coming from a foreign country, before she reaches her destination, can call at half a dozen ports, and if there is no collector she is not called upon to enter. In the maritime provinces a vessel cannot call at a port and remain even twenty minutes without going to the customs officer and making an entry. Consequently, when a vessel goes from one port three or four miles into another port, the captain is bound to go to the collector and report and get a clearance. Our customs laws are different in that regard from those of the United States, and if we make stringent laws in that respect we must provide some way by which these men may be accommodated. The master of a vessel entering a port is always averse to going to the customs, although he knows he has to do it. As the minister knows, it is always an inconvenience to the captain. In the United States a vessel goes into a port where there is no collector of customs and does not have to report; and even if they go into a port where there is a collector, unless they stay there over 24 hours, they are not called upon to make entry. So that in the United States the ship has greater convenience than it has in our ports. Even if a little fishing vessel goes to one of our fishing ports and spends a few hours, she has to report to the customs officer and get a clearance, and she cannot go fishing again unless she has a clearance. If the master of a vessel violates that law, she can be seized and fined up to $400. So that when the Minister of Customs complains of the number of ports, he must remember that his department and his government are responsible therefor. I think it would be better to have fewer ports, and thereby give the ship some relief. The collector of customs gets twenty-five to fifty cents, as the case may be, for writing out an entry; consequently he will take good care that the ship master comes to his office, and if he does not, he can be fined. Now, the minister said that no man should be expected to confine himself wholly to customs work unless he was getting a salary of $1,000.

Mr. PATERSON. I say that is forbidden if he has $1,000 or over.

Mr. CROSBY. That is the position I have always taken with regard to our large cities, that we should have no man working in the customs with less than $1,000 salary. There should be no man working in any of our large cities where the trade is heavy, at a less salary than $1,000 a year. I hope the time will soon come when the Minister of Customs will see his way clear to make such a rule in all the cities. As a matter of fact, no man who is working in that department could attempt to do any business outside of his office; if he did, the minister would be in hot water all the time with complaints coming to him about that man. Now, with regard to the service, I can see no reason why the outside service, in the cities at least, should not be brought under the Civil Service Act and run the same as the inside service. If the Postmaster General and some of the other departments would do that, it would save them a great deal of trouble. All the cities can be fairly well taken in under the Civil Service Act, and it would always be possible to get efficient men for the department, after passing an examination to qualify for whatever positions might become vacant. I hope the Minister of Customs will turn his attention to that matter. He has a large department, and it is difficult for him to please everybody with regard to appointments. I have no objection to the minister taking the recommendation of his friends in a particular district, when he wants to make an appointment in the Customs Department, and I do not object to his appointing a friend of his who is well qualified in all other respects. But it is the meanest kind of a thing, it is the most contemptible thing, for any minister to hamper and harass a man who has been appointed by some other government. I think when a man enters the Civil Service he should be protected by every member of this House in his rights. He has a perfect right to vote as he pleases; as long as he does not make himself obnoxious in any way he has a right to proper treatment as

regards his salary, irrespective of his politics.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask the minister why he does not introduce the policy of promotion in his department. For example, I have in my mind a customs office which became vacant the other day by the death of the occupant. My hon. friend has, in the province of Ontario, many officers who have had considerable experience and who would like very much to be promoted to that important place, with a very much higher salary. But the hon. gentleman instead of adopting the policy of promotion, takes an outside man who has no experience whatever, and very little qualification, puts him into this important office, and by doing that he gives no inspiration to those who are engaged in the service. They have no opportunity or expectation of promotion. Why does my hon. friend not adopt the policy of promotion? Would it not be in the interest of the public instead of taking, shall I say, a politician, and putting him into that office, without any qualification, and over the heads of men who have devoted the best of their lives to the service of the government.

Mr. PATERSON. Does the hon. gentleman mean to take an officer who has been in the service in some other port or in the same port?

Mr. BLAIN. In some other port, if necessary—some worthy officer.

Mr. PATERSON. I have not been able to carry it out under the present circumstances. If we were adopting the system of competition and they were proving themselves by examination and all that—

Mr. BLAIN. Would not that be a good policy?

Mr. PATERSON. Well, there is the question; it would have its good points. I perhaps, need not say that it would probably have some opponents. The old system has been going on so long that I suppose it would be objected to, but perhaps, with respect to efficiency, if it could be worked, it would produce the effect that the hon. gentleman says. I think I will have to leave it to be worked out by my hon. friend some day.

Mr. LALOR. It would be a little bit hard on defeated candidates.

On paragraph 2: Schedule 'B' Customs,

Mr. SPROULE. Does that cover all the outside service or are there others in the outside service who will not receive consideration?

Mr. PATERSON. This is simply increasing the maximum as fixed by the old table that has been in existence for, I do not know how many, years. But, I would like it distinctly understood that if officers get the idea that because there is an increase of $400 proposed in one class they are going to get $400 as soon as this Act passes they are all wrong; they may not get a dollar, or they may get $50 or they may get $100.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is very misleading then.

Mr. PATERSON. They will not get it all at once, but this is to give power to the department to give an increase to a deserving officer, who is at the old maximum. He may get an advance, not of the full amount, but of $100 or of $50.

Mr. SPROULE. Take the first class mentioned in the schedule:

Collectors—Salaries per annum from $300 to $4,500.

No increase. What do you mean by that? Suppose an officer is geting a salary of $600; is he not likely to get an increase? Why do you say from $300 to $4,500. If you do not propose to deal with all those between those limits?

Mr. PATERSON. This does not deal with the increase; this simply gives the power.

Mr. SPROULE. But you have the power already.

Mr. PATERSON. We have the power to increase the salary of a man who gets $600 now, but because we have the power to increase his salary, it does not necessarily mean that it will be increased.

Mr. SPROULE. What is the sense of taking the power to do what you have already power to do, if you desire to exercise that power?

Mr. PATERSON. There is only one reason for it; when we were changing the table with reference to senior clerks we thought it was well that the whole table, which has been in existence for a long time, should be changed and therefore we propose to deal with all classes. The great bulk of the officers who are in the service now would not require to have this table altered for their sake at all because there is plenty of latitude to give them an increase under the old table. But, in changing this item we thought it well to change the whole table so that it would not have to be changed again. I want to make that point clear, because I do not want to have the officers disappointed. It must not be imagined that because the maximum is increased so many hundreds of dollars that they are to get the full amount. It only means that the department may be at

liberty by degrees, and as the officers on their part deserve, to grant them increases in order that they may ultimately reach that point.

Mr. SPROULE. You want to be at liberty to do what you already have liberty to do. Are we to understand that you only intend to increase those who are at the maximum?

Mr. PATERSON. This relates to those who are at the maximum.

Mr. SPROULE. Are those officers who are to-day receiving a salary below the maximum entitled to understand that there is a probability of their salaries being increased or, on the other hand can none expect to get an increase who are not already at the maximum?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand it the minister is not pledging himself under this proposition to increase any salary, but he is taking power to grant increases. The first class mentioned is that of collector at salaries from $300 to $4,500. Then the salaries of inspectors at ports were, minimum, $2,100 and maximum $2,500. He is now increasing that maximum to $3,200.

Mr. PATERSON. Yes, there will now be two inspectors who are at the maximum and under this we can raise them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am speaking of the minimum and maximum. Assistant inspectors $1,500 to $1,800; the minister now makes the maximum $2,000; chief clerks, $1,200 to $2,000. He now makes the maximum $2,100, and so on all through.

Mr. SPROULE. What about the first item?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the first item there is no change at all. He has left that as it was, the second he has left as it was, and the two near the bottom of the page are left as they were before. In the others he makes some increase in the maximum salary which can be granted to these officers.

Mr. PATERSON. That is it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask the minister if he does not consider that a man who has been for from three to five years at the head of his class and drawing probably the maximum salary of that class should get the maximum if that maximum has been raised by $200 or $400. I believe that would be a fair way to treat these officers. They should hold the same position in their class after the maximum has been increased. A man who has been at the top of his class should, under the new regulations, be placed at the maximum again. That is the only fair way to do it.

Mr. PATERSON. It took him some years to get to the maximum.

Mr. RUSSELL. As the Irishman said when he complained of the landlady's cooking: 'There's raisins in everything,' and the reason given for the increase to the inside service was the high cost of living, and that is just as good a reason for increasing the pay of the outside service. These officers are entitled to a substantial increase right away. If a man is at the head of his class for say eight years as it happens in some cases, I do not think they should now be compelled to work up to the maximum when they have been kept for so many years on starvation wages. At $50 a year increase, it would take them eight years to go to the maximum.

Mr. PATERSON. That is the idea.

Mr. RUSSELL. And it is a very bad idea. I do not think the minister should take advantage of the fact that he has more applications for positions than he can take care of, to keep down salaries to the starvation point. The minister should pay an official what would be considered a living wage on which to maintain himself and his family decently. Hope is a very cheap commodity, and while men are not satisfied with the pay they get when they enter the service still they hope that in the future they will get a decent salary.

Mr. PATERSON. I do not see myself how some of these men can live decently, and support their families on the pay they get, and we are trying to bring them up to about the same recompense they would get in other similar occupations in life. A minister cannot allow his feelings to sway him in such a matter. The hon. member (Mr. Russell) is a large employer of labour, and he pays his men well, and I have no doubt that his experience is the same as mine, and that he can get other men to work for a lower wage than he is paying his employees, but, because I thought I was paying more than I could get another man for, I would not allow the old employee to go. At the same time, if a business man found that when he was filling a vacancy there were fifty applications for it, and that they all were willing to work for less than he had been paying the former employee, would not that fact influence him in determining the wages that would be given? It is said that a minister should conduct the public business as he does his private business, and would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Russell) feel that he was doing justice to himself if he paid higher wages than dozens of equally competent appli-

cants were willing to take the position at? I know that if an employee of his were getting higher wages than he was absolutely certain he could get a man to do the same work for, he still would keep on the old hand, and usually business men are just and generous, and they follow that principle. But, if a vacancy occurred, the hon. gentleman would not feel it incumbent upon him to pay more wages than he was asked to pay. I think I am right in saying that there are many applications in for every vacancy as soon as the news can get out, and one cannot be insensible to that fact.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think the government should set a good example in a case like this.

Mr. PATERSON. I think so too.

Mr. CROTHERS. The minimum salary of a collector is $300, and the maximum $4,500; what determines whether a man shall be paid $1,000 or $4,000?

Mr. PATERSON. The maximum amount mentioned by the hon. member is paid only at Montreal, and while we may advance the Toronto collector to $4,500 yet, the collections are larger at Montreal, and the collector there has been a greater number of years in the service. The collector at Toronto may be entitled to $4,500, but I thought I would not give it to him for a year or two at any rate, because I think a distinction should be made on account of Mr. White's longer service, and the larger port at which he is collector. The port of Winnipeg, and I think the port of Vancouver will by-and-by have to be considered. Ports like Hamilton and London and Halifax and St. John, and Quebec, perhaps, are pretty nearly all on the same range. Take, St. Thomas and Chatham and Guelph and Galt, and towns of that size, and the salaries range from $1,200 to $1,600, while at Brantford and Niagara Falls it goes up to $1,800. The revenue guides us in a measure at the inland ports, but in some maritime ports we may have no revenue at all, and yet the officer has a lot of work to do in entering and clearing vessels. There are outports established for preventing smuggling and so on. We may possibly, by and by, be able to get the salaries in ports such as the hon. gentleman has in his county up to about $2,000, but there is no maximum fixed. The department try to do justice between one port and another and are guided by the revenue, &c.

Mr. CROTHERS. There is no fixed principle on which salaries are determined?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. CROTHERS. The collector in my city, St. Thomas, receives a salary of $1,600. The revenue there is now $300,000, and there are a number of outports. I think a man with the responsibility of handling that amount ought to get a larger salary than $1,600.

Mr. PATERSON. If this is allowed to pass, these questions, which are quite proper, can be answered when my estimates are up, and my deputy is here.

Mr. DOHERTY. I was slightly disappointed with these figures. Last year I made some observations with regard to the salary of the collector at the port of Montreal, and I quite acknowledge that there was an increase of $500, although I do not pretend that this was in consequence of my remarks. The minister, by this resolution, is tying himself up so that for a long time to come he cannot increase that salary above the present figure. I understood last year that the minister felt that the increase he was making in the salary of the collector at Montreal hardly adequately met the case. I do not wish to repeat what I said last year about the importance of Montreal and its immense business and revenue. It must be remembered that previous to this increase the salary had stood at $4,000 for a long period of years during which all the expenses of living had increased in a very great degree. I think I am not being importunate in urging upon the minister that the increase of $500 hardly met the requirements of the case. The increased cost of living is not felt more keenly in any place than in Montreal, and the officer having the responsibility of handling the immense business at that port should be in receipt of a salary that would not be so utterly, and absolutely disproportionate to the salaries received by men in charge of large businesses, which would still be small when compared with the business to be supervised and controlled by the collector of customs. I need say nothing of the qualifications of the present incumbent, they are well known, and fully recognized, and I must add that what I am now saying, I say absolutely without any communication from him. I urge on the minister that the present salary of the collector at Montreal is utterly inadequate even to-day, and as this resolution will bind the department probably until a longer period of time than the lifetime of the present incumbent, I beg to respectfully urge on the minister the desirability of reconsidering this maximum amount which a collector may receive. I am sure that in this request I would be endorsed by the business community of Montreal generally without party distinction, and by hon. members of this House representing divisions in Montreal, or that neighbourhood. I understood the minister last year to say that the increase then given

was the best that could be done for the moment, but that he did not take the position that that settled as a finality the proper remuneration of the office of collector of customs at Montreal. This is a glaring case of remuneration quite inadequate to the service rendered and out of all proportion to the office, and to its grave responsibilities. I certainly would be glad if the minister could see his way, if not to an immediate increase, at least to reconsider his decision to tie himself up so as to make it impossible for a long time to increase this very inadequate salary.

Mr. GERVAIS. I think I am in duty bound to endorse the remarks of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), as to the salary which is proposed to be paid to the collector of customs at Montreal. The importance of that port cannot be compared with any other port, and the efficiency of the services of the present incumbent is too well known for me to venture to add anything to what has been said of the character of the work which has been performed for years past by the present incumbent. On account of the importance of the port of Montreal, on account of the efficiency of the service which has been done, and which is being done by Mr. White, the present incumbent, and on account of the cost of living in Montreal, I think that a salary of $6,000 should be considered the least which should be paid to the present collector. It is all very well to propose general rules and general schedules of salaries for all over the country, but I think that the case of the port of Montreal is a very exceptional one, and the general schedule should not be made applicable to that port. There should be a proviso added to the resolution under which by way of order in council, the government could, after due consideration, in some way increase the remuneration of the present collector of customs at Montreal to at least $6,000. This view is held by all the people of Montreal, especially by the large importers. It is well known that the imports entered at the port of Montreal exceed $16,000,000 per year, which certainly warrants our paying a salary to the collector of that port of at least $6,000.

On that question, I would ask the Minister of Customs if he intends this session introducing legislation for the purpose of creating the office of deputy or assistant-collector. The creation of such an office has been asked for by quite a number of the large importers of Montreal, and it would go a long way to expedite the business of the port, and meet the convenience of the city. I think that a petition was sent to the Department of Customs asking the minister to create such an office, and I would like to know if he proposes doing so this session. I would again urge on the hon. minister to add another resolution to those proposed which would enable the government by order in council to grant to the collector of customs in the port of Montreal a salary somewhat adequate to the important position he holds, the efficient service he is rendering, and the increased cost of living. Such increase, I am sure, would prove to be fair and popular.

Mr. PATERSON. As regards an assistant-collector, I am not disposed to regard with favour the proposal to establish such an office, and do not intend doing anything in that respect this year. As regards the collectorship the difficulty is this. I have nothing but words of commendation for Mr. White, the collector of customs at Montreal, and I heartily endorse everything that has been said in his favour. His record stands well with the department. In his conduct of the public business, the geniality with which he meets customers, and his ability in other respects make him a very efficient officer indeed. I think he has some of the most valuable traits a customs officer should have, and personally I would have no objection to making his salary larger. But there is one objection which seems to me insuperable. The commissioner of customs, who has to do with all the ports of the Dominion, Montreal included, gets $5,000, and I cannot see my way clear to put one whose work has to be supervised by the commissioner on an equal plane with the deputy head of the department. If the deputy head of the department were receiving a higher salary, that difficulty would largely vanish. It may not strike my hon. friend as important, but it does me. I do not feel that I could recommend the placing of any individual officer of any one port, however important—and Montreal is a very important port—on a par, so far as remuneration goes, with the commissioner who is responsible for the administration of the Customs Department throughout the Dominion.

Mr. DOHERTY. That only goes to show that the salary of the commissioner ought to be increased.

Mr. PATERSON. But I cannot do that.

Mr. DOHERTY. If we are to assume that the commissioner of customs is to be paid more than any collector—and the minister apparently admits that the collector of customs at Montreal ought to have a great deal more than he is now getting——

Mr. PATERSON. I do not admit that now.

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, the minister says that the one insurmountable obstacle is the fact that the commissioner is only getting

$5,000. We must conclude that if that obstacle were out of the way, the collector of customs at Montreal would be given a larger salary. If the minister's reason be well founded, that the commissioner of customs necessarily should be paid more than any collector——

Mr. PATERSON. Do you not think he should?

Mr. DOHERTY. That is a reasonable proposition, but it only follows that we ought to begin by increasing the commissioner's salary. It is not logical to say that you cannot raise the salary of the collector of customs at Montreal simply because you must keep it under what the commissioner gets. The reasonable way to remedy the situation would be to give the commissioner of customs what he ought to get.

Mr. PATERSON. But I have not the power to put that in here.

Mr. DOHERTY. Possibly, but there are other ways in which that can be done. We are getting supplementaries every day or two.

Mr. PATERSON. In the different departments there are more deputy ministers than one.

Mr. DOHERTY. In some departments there are deputies who get more than $5,000 per year.

Mr. PATERSON. Only technical officers.

Mr. DOHERTY. At all events the position taken by the minister does not appeal to me. It seems to me an extraordinary position to take that because you do not pay a gentleman occupying a higher position more, you cannot do what is just to another officer, and you must keep him at a salary below what he is entitled to. I must confess that I had hoped for better things. I recollect last year that the same objection was made, but I thought that after some reasonable period of time the situation with regard to the commissioner would be rectified so that he should no longer stand as an insuperable obstacle to our doing what is merely justice to the important officer whose case we are considering. After all I think that the public interest demands proper remuneration for services of this kind. Dropping for a moment the consideration of any particular occupant of the office, I do not think it is becoming the dignity of this country that officers should occupy such positions at salaries which put them, having regard to the positions they fill, on a footing of inferiority towards the bulk of the people with whom they are carrying on their daily business. That is a most unfair and undignified position for this country to take towards gentlemen who have given years of faithful service, and by that very fact have placed themselves in a position where they have no longer any liberty of choice, but must remain where they are instead of seeking other positions which might give them better remuneration.

I do not wish to use language that might be supposed to be stronger than the occasion requires; but I must confess that I think that to lay down the absolute principle that, because the commissioner does not happen to have a larger salary and because it is not convenient to attend to the question of whether he ought to have a larger salary, therefore, other claims must not be even considered, involves actual injustice—I do not think the expression is at all too strong—and furthermore, puts this country in a position that is not creditable to it, and puts the officer, occupying this highly responsible office, as I said, in a position of inferiority in relation to the bulk of the people with whom he does business. To justify this by saying that at the moment it is not convenient to increase the salary of another officer seems a very inadequate justification for persistence in maintaining the salary at the rate now provided. But I would like to point out to the minister that we have now a resolution passed with a view to making an enactment which the minister says he desires to make permanent or to provide for a long period. May I point out that it is not desirable that by this enactment which is to remain effective over the long period, he should tie his hands so that he will not be able to make this increase even if the insurmountable obstacle should disappear. After all, I am only urging the minister at the moment to take a larger power than he wants to take. Surely, he cannot say that any harm could be done by that. Surely the minister may trust himself. If he had the power, and realized that he had the power, might be able to appeal to him more effectively.

Mr. GERVAIS. I desire to call the attention of the Minister of Customs to the low salary proposed to be paid to the appraisers. The increase of salaries to the appraisers is proposed to be made $400 per year. I think the appraisers for the port of Montreal should have a salary of at least $3,500. If I had time to quote from the statistics of American ports, I should be able to show that ports of less importance in the United States of no greater importance than Montreal have collectors who receive salaries as high as $10,000 a year, and some of these American ports have appraisers whose salaries are as high as $6,000 per year. I repeat, then, that the salaries of the appraisers of the port of Montreal should be made at least $3,500.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. What I desired to ascertain was how far this measure was bringing the outside service under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. PATERSON. Not at all.

Mr. SPROULE. But it does. We have here introduced the schedule system to regulate salaries, then there would be increases following that system, and the clerks would be entitled to superannuation. Under part of the schedules we provide for an increase from the minimum to the maximum, the same as under the Civil Service Act. Then you provide that a person who has served over three years as clerk in the outside service may be brought into the inside service after passing the departmental examination, and then he must be entirely under the Civil Service Act. Will it affect their superannuation, or will it provide them a graded increase of salary?

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman will remember that there is the old Civil Service Act, and there was an amendment to that. This is an amendment to the old Civil Service Act, it is not an amendment to the amendment of the Civil Service Act, under which outsiders were brought in. This does not change their position in the least, except as regards the schedule which was in the old Act. That we are amending, and we are increasing the maximum in the table that was in section 39 of the old Act. That is the only change.

Mr. SPROULE. Under the old Act they could come in without passing a qualifying examination.

Mr. PATERSON. This is no step at all in the direction of bringing them into the inside service.

Mr. SPROULE. When they come in under this Act, is there any annual increase to which they are entitled?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. PATERSON moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 208) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

INSPECTION AND SALE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 153) to amend the Inspection and Sale Act as regards the weight of a bushel and a bag of certain articles.—Mr. Fisher.

Mr. FISHER. When this Bill was before the committee the other day, I was asked who recommended these weights. I find they were recommended by two organizations in the province of Quebec, and in the province of Ontario, which are composed of vegetable growers. The weights have been examined by the officers of the experimental farm, and have been reported upon as the correct weights for the articles mentioned in the Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The only change is in regard to potatoes.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, 80 lbs. was the weight in the province of Quebec, and this makes it general throughout the Dominion. In Ontario the practice has been 90 lbs., but there has been no law fixing it at 90 lbs.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What means will the minister take to acquaint the people of Ontario of the change?

Mr. FISHER. I will see that it is published in the agricultural papers generally.

Mr. BLAIN. Has there been any general request from the province of Ontario for this rather drastic change? The minister says that it has been asked for by certain organizations. I may point out that this will make a great change, and I cannot see what advantage it will bring either to the buyer or the seller. For many years it has been the custom in Ontario to buy and sell a bag of potatoes at 90 pounds. Perhaps the minister will say that it is desirable there should be uniformity. I am not so sure that they would support so drastic a change. I am not sure that if it were submitted to the agricultural societies the minister would receive their sanction generally.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think the farmers would object to selling 80 pounds for a bag of potatoes instead of 90 pounds.

Mr. BLAIN. I think they would. Men have grown up to do business in potatoes with 90 pounds to the bushel. That is the general custom, and when the hon. gentleman introduces a measure to change that to 80 pounds, it will create a good deal of confusion. In the first place, almost all the bags used by the farmers in every part of the province are made to hold 90 pounds. In future they will have to take a 90-pound bag and put 80 pounds of potatoes into it. It is a very great disadvantage to the farmer and no advantage to any class of people that I know of. I am quite confident that if the minister will consult his friends and the people of Ontario they will not endorse a proposition of this kind. I would like to

enter a protest, mild as it may be, against the very drastic change that will be introduced by the passage of this measure into the potato market in Ontario. I do not think that the suggestion that because it is 80 pounds in Quebec it should, therefore, be 80 pounds in Ontario, will be sufficient for the farmers in the latter province. It will make a very unsatisfactory condition of things if after a custom has grown up extending over half a dozen generations it is suddenly changed without any very strong demand for it. There may be some reason for changing it other than the reasons that are mentioned, but I do not think my hon. friend will find any class of farmers or those interested in the potato business in Ontario who would consent to so great a change that will cause the greatest inconvenience to the people of that province.

Mr. SPROULE. I think it is distinctly a mistake to change it to 80 pounds, because all over the country a bag of potatoes is a bushel and a half, and a bushel of potatoes is 60 pounds. A bushel of potatoes here is stated to be 60 pounds. What is understood by Dominion standard pounds?

Mr. FISHER. I think there is a Dominion standard pound in the Weights and Measures Act.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox and Addington). I quite agree with the minister that the weight of a bag of potatoes should be the same in every province, but I remember that when the change was made to 80 pounds in the province of Quebec, it was to accommodate certain dealers and farmers around the city of Montreal. I see no reason why the weight should now be changed all over Canada to 80 pounds. I do not know how you will fix the number of pounds to the bushel. A bag of potatoes in our province has always been understood to be a bushel and a half—that is 90 pounds—and while the minister is anxious to make the weight of a bag of potatoes the same throughout the whole country, I think he should adopt the standard as 90 pounds.

Mr. FISHER. This Bill has been prepared by the Department of Trade and Commerce, and I shall be glad to allow the committee to rise in order that I may consult my colleague, and see if he approves of that suggestion.

Mr. LALOR. I had an opportunity of going with the deputation that was here in connection with this matter, representing the vegetable growers and fruit growers, not only of Quebec, but of Ontario as well, and I listened to their arguments before the minister. There was a representative of the association from my own county. Their argument was that in the city of Toronto, for instance, potatoes were sold by people who put them into smaller bags, and disposed of practically 70 pounds of potatoes as a bag. Thus they were able to undersell the legitimate dealers in potatoes who were selling 80 or 90 pounds to the bag. They suggested to the minister that he should make it uniform with the province of Quebec in order that the public would not be deceived, and that there would be a standard weight for a bag of potatoes, so that the consumer would know, in buying a bag of potatoes, that he was entitled to get 80 pounds.

Mr. KIDD. I quite agree with my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), that it would be a great inconvenience to change the weight of a bag of potatoes from 90 pounds to 80 pounds. Sixty pounds to the bushel has been a standard measure, I suppose, ever since we commenced to handle potatoes in Canada. I think it would be very much better if in the province of Quebec the standard were made 60 pounds to the bushel or 90 pounds to the bag, or even to provide that potatoes shall be handled by the hundred pounds. I think that to adopt a standard of 80 pounds to the bag would cause inconvenience. If it were made 80 pounds to the bag, there being 60 pounds to the bushel, how could you be sure that you were putting the specified weight into the bag, because you would have to get it down to the proper number of pounds?

Mr. SPROULE. It would be a bushel and a third.

Mr. KIDD. Yes, a bushel and a third. I think it would be better to change the standard in Quebec to 90 pounds, and make it equal all over the country. It would be a great convenience to have a standard bag of potatoes all over the Dominion as it would also be to have a standard bag of oats. It would be better to have it 34 or 32 pounds to the bushel throughout the whole country.

Mr. FISHER. There is no standard weight in Ontario, or anywhere else except in Quebec. A man might sell a bag of potatoes, and sell any quantity he chose.

Mr. KIDD. What does the minister mean by saying there is no standard in Ontario?

Mr. FISHER. There is no standard in Ontario, or anywhere else except Quebec.

Mr. KIDD. If you sell a bag of potatoes containing 80 pounds in Ottawa you will find that there is a standard before you get away. You would find the market inspector after you, and he would take the potatoes and you along with them.

Mr. FISHER. That is the practice. I do not know what the law courts would say, but there is no standard.

Mr. BLAIN. My understanding is that originally 90 pounds was the standard whether by law or practice or custom. Certain representations were made to the government some years ago and a change was made for the province of Quebec. I have nothing to say about that; possibly it was a good thing then. The complaint comes now, not from Quebec alone, but from Ontario, that there is no uniform bag. There is now an interchange of products between Quebec and Ontario. Quebec potatoes find a market in Toronto, for example, and I can understood that it is not in the best interests of either the buyer or seller that potatoes coming from Quebec should be a bag of 80 pounds and coming from Ontario a bag of 90 pounds. But I do say that the original practice was to sell 90 pounds to the bag of potatoes and if a change was made reducing it to 80 pounds for one province it does not occur to me that it would be very much in the interest of the people, particularly the province of Ontario, that 80 pounds should be adopted for the rest of the country. I repeat——

Mr. FISHER. I do not seem to be able to give my hon. friend to understand that there was no standard weight in Ontario. A bag of potatoes in Quebec was 80 pounds by law, and there was no law with regard to a bag of potatoes in any other part of Canada.

Mr. BLAIN. When was it made 80 pounds by law?

Mr. FISHER. It was made 80 pounds by law in Quebec by Edward VII, chapter 26, section 1. That would be in 1901, I think.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there must be something wrong about that, because my impression is that the provincial authorities have the right to make a law, and that such a law has been in existence for a long time. Why, I say that is because I remember very well many years ago I was in Toronto with a neighbour who was selling potatoes. They were weighed and sold by the bag. The total weight was divided by 90 to get the number of bags. At the same time there were potatoes sold by the bag that were not weighed at the time, but afterwards they were found to contain less than 90 pounds. My recollection is that he threatened to lodge a complaint before the police magistrate, and the party was obliged to settle up. If there was no law I do not see how he could prosecute. Whether it was law or custom it was the common practice for the municipal authorities to make market regulations.

Mr. NESBITT. All are agreed that the weight of the bag should be uniform, but all are not agreed that it should be eighty lbs. I have dealt in potatoes a great deal in my time, and there was no law that I know of governing the weight of a bag of potatoes, although in buying large quantities of potatoes by the bag we always specified that they should be taken at 90 lbs. to the bag. That was the custom when I was in the business, and the reason we did that was that we bought from various provinces. I do not see that any harm can be done by making the weight of a bag of potatoes 80 lbs. because the people will soon get accustomed to it. As a matter of fact, we do not as a rule weigh potatoes.

Mr. SPROULE. In my part of the country everybody weighs the potatoes.

Mr. NESBITT. In taking them into stores in Ontario they weigh them and estimate them at 90 lbs., but a great many potatoes are delivered direct by the farmers to the houses of the people, and not once in a thousand times are they weighed.

Mr. BLAIN. Each bag contains a bushel and a half.

Mr. NESBITT. It is supposed to, but they are mighty short for a bushel and a half. Sometimes if you make the weight 80 pounds uniformly, the people will soon get accustomed to it, and there will be no trouble.

Mr. BLAIN. What reasons would the hon. gentleman give in the interests of the people of Ontario that such a change should be made?

Mr. NESBITT. None, except the advantage of uniformity.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not make it uniform the other way?

Mr. NESBITT. I have been buying seed potatoes this year by the hundred weight, so that it is not absolutely the custom to buy potatoes by the bag in Ontario.

Mr. SPROULE. The reason for making the standard 90 lbs. is simply that two one-half bushels of ordinary potatoes will weigh 60 lbs., and, as the ordinary two-bushel grain bag will hold a bushel and a half of potatoes, that made 90 lbs., and it became the standard. It is not the part of wisdom to change the custom of half a century unless there is strong reason for it. There is no more reason why Ontario should be made to conform to the Quebec custom than that we should ask Quebec to conform to the Ontario custom.

Mr. LALOR. I do not know that the vegetable growers are insistent on the weight being 80 lbs., but what they want is a uniform weight. I would point out that a bushel of measured potatoes at this time of the year will not weigh as much

as a bushel of the same potatoes would last fall. The proper course is to make a uniform standard weight throughout the country whether it be 80 lbs. or 90 lbs. In listening to the argument of the vegetable growers before the Minister of Trade and Commerce, I thought their demand was reasonable for a uniform weight for a bag of potatoes, and not so much in their own interest as in the interest of the public, because notwithstanding what the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) says they stated that in Toronto and other places potatoes were sold by the bag at less than 80 lbs. I do not believe there is any law governing it.

Mr. SPROULE. I should doubt that very much.

Mr. TALBOT. The fewer changes we make the better, because changes always lead to confusion. At one time in the province of Quebec, we had a bushel measure, and at another time we had a barrel which was supposed to be three bushels. That was the barrel measure that we interfered with. The barrels have since been made straighter and contain less. Now this bag proposition is made to us. We have no such a thing as a one-third bushel measure, we either have a bushel or a quarter or a half, and that is understood by everybody. We use a bag that is supposed to hold 90 lbs., whether it will hold 90 lbs. or not, that is the kind of bag that will be used. I think, therefore, that on all accounts it is better to leave the present system alone. At present a bag is supposed to hold a bushel and a half and to weigh 90 lbs.; leave it as it is.

Mr. EDWARDS. The minister has spoken positively with regard to there being no law in the province of Ontario fixing a standard weight for a bag of potatoes. I do know, however, that in the city of Kingston potatoes are marketed by the bag, and a bag is supposed to contain a bushel and a half, and to weigh 90 pounds. The market clerk has the right, and has exercised the right, of seizing from the farmers any bags which are supposed to be short of weight, weighing them, confiscating them, and bringing the farmer before the magistrate and having him fined. Now, if there is no law in the province of Ontario fixing the standard weight at 90 pounds, it seems strange that the market clerk should exercise that authority. It may be possible that the general statute gives to municipal corporations the right to pass by-laws governing the weight of potatoes sold in their respective markets. I have always understood that the weight is governed by a general provincial law; the minister says that is not the case.

Mr. FISHER. What I said was that there was no standard fixed by federal law. I think what the hon. gentleman says there is perfectly correct; it may be that municipalities have the power to pass regulations for their own markets, and, therefore, to fix a weight. I said there was no federal law, and under the Inspection and Sale Act there is no standard of weight for a bag of potatoes except in the province of Ontario.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am under the impression that there is a law in the province of Ontario fixing the weight of a bag of potatoes at 90 pounds. I can see that it would be a nice thing to have a uniform standard for the whole Dominion. But I think if the weight is changed from 90 to 80 pounds it will cause a great deal of confusion and inconvenience in the province of Ontario. There is another thing that strikes me. Suppose you fix the weight at 80 pounds. People have been accustomed to look upon a bag of potatoes as containing a bushel and a half, and in a bushel and a half there are six pecks. Now six pecks divides readily in 90 pounds, giving 15 pounds to a peck, and merchants who frequently sell potatoes by the peck would be put to inconvenience if the weight was changed to 80 pounds to the bag.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Now that the minister has fixed a standard weight for all the articles mentioned in the Bill, and in section 2 has fixed a standard for potatoes sold by the bag, I would suggest that he amend section 2 to read as follows:

Any article mentioned in this subsection, if sold by the bag, shall contain one and a half bushels of the standard weight of the article.

Then people will know what they are doing.

Mr. FISHER. That is a reasonable proposition, but I would not like to accept it without consulting with the officers of the department. I move that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

SUPPLY.

House again in Committee of Supply.

Civil Government—Privy Council office—to provide for one clerkship, second division, subdivision A, $1,600.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The explanation for this addition to the number of clerks in the Privy Council is found in a letter from Mr. Parmelee, the King's Printer, to Mr. Boudreau, Clerk of the Privy Council. It is dated March 22, 1911:

Dear Mr. Boudreau,—The experts who were called upon to investigate conditions at the

Bureau have laid great emphasis upon the abuses prevalent in connection with the translating of copy for the printers. They point out that the Bureau has for many years gone beyond the scope of its duties in employing its own proof readers to do translating and to make corrections in connection with translated copy, and for this work the proof readers receive extra pay in addition to their regular salaries.

Speaking of the difficulties created for the Bureau by differences of opinion as to correct translation the experts state as follows:—'Whole sentences are recast after the matter has been put into type for no better reason than that in the opinion of the changer, they are more suitable translations than were given in the original manuscript. It is safe to say that the composition of the publications translated into French cost twice as much at it would were it properly translated and legible copy furnished.'

A full report of the conditions in this connection, by the experts, will be found in the report submitted to His Excellency the Governor General in Council, by the Hon. Mr. Murphy, page 27 and appendices C and D following, and I shall be grateful if you will do me the favour of reading these sections of the report in order that you may be fully impressed as to the abuses therein indicated.

Upon this Mr. Boudreau sent the following memo:

Memo. for the president of the Privy Council.

The King's Printer, in a letter dated the 22nd of March inst. with reference to the translation of orders in council published in the official 'Gazette' says that he is 'directed to state that in the light of the report of experts, his department will no longer assume responsibility for errors in translated copy, and that hereafter no translating of any kind will be done at the Bureau.'

Every week an average of about 15 columns of the 'Official Gazette' will have to be translated by the Privy Council office, which would require the services of a well qualified translator.

The Clerk of the Privy Council could not undertake to do the work himself as he is often absent on official business. There is no other clerk in the office who could do the work. Consequently it would be advisable to create a position in class A of the second division.

Respectfully submitted,
RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

Ottawa, 24th March, 1911.

Upon the following recommendation made by myself to the Privy Council, an order was passed:

The undersigned has the honour to recommend that the of the Privy Council office as fixed by order in council of the 25th January, 1909, be further amended to add an additional clerkship to subdivision A of the second division, provision to be made by parliament at this present session.

This recommendation was approved and this was the reason for this item.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. SPROULE. This is for the whole year, of course?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. This is one of the items the right hon. gentleman mentioned this afternoon as requiring to be voted for the whole year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, that is not one.

Royal Northwest Mounted Police—Coronation contingent—required to meet the transportation and other expenses of the R. N. W. M. Police, $30,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is to provide for a contingent of 75 men and horses at $400 per head.

Steam service between Annapolis and London or Hull, England, or both, $5,000.

Mr. LENNOX. I understood from a statement which I heard the leader of the opposition make at six o'clock that the understanding between the right hon. gentleman and him was that only such items as were mentioned this afternoon would be submitted to the committee to-night. On account of a ball at Government House there is a very slim attendance here, and the impression this afternoon was that we would only sit until about nine o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. That was my understanding. The right hon. gentleman mentioned certain items which required to be granted in toto, and said that only a proportionate amount of the others would be voted.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I said this afternoon that I had an understanding with my hon. friend on the opposite side that the estimates should be advanced. The question was how much. It was understood that certain items would be voted in full and that the others would be voted to at least one-third of their amount. We have received already two-twelfths. My impression was that if, on the 23rd the estimates had not been passed, of what remained, we should get three-twelfths to carry us to the 1st of September. Whether we take the whole or three-twelfths does not matter much to me. But I said that, in any event, some estimates would have to be passed entirely or we could not carry on the business of the country. For instance, the payment of the treaty Indians. We have to start parties north very soon and the Indians must be paid the whole of their indemnity. The coronation contingent must be paid the whole of their indemnity. The full amount for the Festival of Empire must be paid. Whether my understanding of the arrangement is correct or not is of little moment to me at the present time. The Minister of Trade and Com-

merce is not in this House, and he has entrusted me with carrying his estimates. This is the only time I can give to explanation for the committee so as to have these passed.

Mr. LENNOX. The First Minister has gone far beyond what I mentioned. With a great deal of what he has said I can entirely concur. I mentioned that I had overheard, as I passed, my leader make a statement from which I understood that, so far as to-night is concerned, the Prime Minister would not wish to take up any items except those mentioned that would have to be passed in toto. I called attention to this as we were asked to take up the estimates of the Department of Trade and Commerce. As to the broader question what we should do between this and the 23rd, I was not at all referring to. But I may say that if I thought we were going through the estimates generally to-night I would probably have brought up the matter we were speaking of yesterday. But I understood the Prime Minister wanted to go on with some things before going away and I did not wish to block him. But I do not need to deal with that matter, as my leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax) is here and he will know what to do.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the Prime Minister is right in his understanding of what the general programme is to be. We are to give one-fourth, or three months' supply to September 1. But between now and the day of adjournment we are to go on with Supply, and with the business of the House as usual. I quite agree with that understanding. So far as the business to-night is concerned, there may be a little misapprehension—not between the Prime Minister and myself, but between myself and my hon. friends on this side—who thought that other items were to be taken up. I do not think that the hon. member from North Toronto (Mr. Foster), expected that the items of trade and commerce would be taken up to-night. However, we might do something at it, for a while anyway.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have been wanting for two or three days to take up the trade and commerce estimates, because I have been charged with it by my colleague, the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I would not take the House by surprise, and if there were objections I would not press the matter. But if I might, I would like to reserve any points for further consideration later on.

Steam service between Annapolis and London or Hull, England, or both, $5,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This and succeeding items, down to and including 231, involve nothing new except in one or possibly two cases. The others are as they have been for some years past. Therefore, I do not think they are contentious matters at all. In the item:

Steam service between Bonaventure river, Quebec, Petit Rocher and Bathurst, N.B., triweekly, during the season of 1911, $5,000.

There has been an increase of $2,000. The reason is that we have not been able to keep the service alive for the former subsidy of $3,000. The next is:

Steam service between Canada and Australia on the Pacific ocean, $180,509.

The most important item of change is here. I move that, instead of reading as it does now, it should read:

Steam service between Canada and New Zealand or Australia or both.

The reason is that we are not able to make any agreement yet with Australia in regard to this subsidy. We have made a contract with New Zealand, that Dominion contributing an amount in proportion to our own. We expect that Australia will come in later. As I said, I do not think any of these items are contentious.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The first item is for steam service between Annapolis and English ports. That, I understand, is the continuation of an existing service; how frequent in the service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The contractor for this service is the Acadia Steamship Company, Annapolis Royal. The steamships are: 'The Atlantis,' 704 tons net, 1,170 tons gross, ten knots; 'The Katinka,' 702 tons net, 1,162 gross, ten knots; 'The Katie,' 634 tons net, 1,099 gross, twelve knots; 'The Ada,' 639 tons net, 1,100 gross, ten knots. The contract calls for five voyages, $1,000 for each voyage.

Mr. CROSBY. Who receives this subsidy?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Acadia Steamship Company. The boats I have just mentioned—'The Atlantis,' 'The Katinka,' 'The Katie,' and the 'Ada.'

Mr. CROSBY. Are they British boats?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any control over the rates for freight?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Under all these subsidy contracts we have control of rates

Mr. CROSBY. Who are the directors of this company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure I do not know. I have not that information at hand.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I suppose these boats are not fitted up with cold storage accommodation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They have cooled air ventilation and fruit decks.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the service been satisfactory?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand it has been fairly so. It has not been as frequent as it might have been.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have there been any complaints of the conditions of cargo landed on the other side?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, occasionally.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have they been investigated?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Always.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). With what results?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Sometimes it has been found that the fault was with the company, and sometimes with the shippers themselves—the fruit not very good when shipped. But the service has been fairly well performed.

Mr. CROSBY. It seems to me strange that we should grant a subsidy to a company of which we do not know even the president, or the directors. It also seems to me strange to grant a subsidy to a steamship company to go to Annapolis and load apples when we have at the same time a company running from Halifax to the same port to which we grant a subsidy. I can see no reason for granting a further subsidy. I am not conversant with the boats just mentioned, but I think we ought to have time to see whether these boats are British or Norwegian boats. We know that subsidies are being paid to foreign boats running from Canadian ports to the West Indies. Therefore, I say we should be careful, before we grant subsidies, to know something about the company, and something about the boats. The boats referred to as having a subsidy from the city of Halifax particularly for this trade, are boats of the Furness Line, but the boats of that line are all British boats. That subsidy is granted to assist this particular trade, and amounts to $25,000 a year. I think that boats can be had to carry apples from Annapolis to the other side without any subsidy at all. I think a subsidy granted to a line running from St. John to the West Indies which I do not think was very successful, and that subsidy was largely given to a Norwegian boat.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I dissent altogether from the statement that we have given a subsidy to Norwegian boats. We do not pay any subsidies except to British boats, no subsidy is given to any boats except they are on the British register. With regard to the directors of the company, I have the contract in the office, and it is easy to get the information the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby) asks for. But the question is not who the directors are, but whether the service is well performed, and if it is well performed, it is of no consequence who the directors of the company are. This subsidy is not a large one, the boats only make five trips in the autumn, and the object is to ship the apple crop of the Annapolis valley. I think that object is one which commends itself to the judgment of parliament.

Mr. BLACK. The shipping of apples from the port of Annapolis is one of great moment to the people of the whole of that valley. Halifax is situated quite a distance from the fruit belt, and the haul to Halifax is a long one for Nova Scotia. Annapolis is right in the fruit belt, and the difference in freight means a good deal to the apple raisers. There is about 125 miles of a haul from Annapolis to Halifax, while the quantity of fruit produced near Annapolis, with a very short haul, will load a steamer. It is of great moment to the fruit growers that their apples should be shipped direct from the port of Annapolis rather than from Halifax, after making a long haul.

Mr. EDWARDS. The First Minister stated in regard to this line that the government had control of the rates. Am I right in assuming that that control applies to all lines to which subsidies are granted?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does that control of rates apply only to goods going from Canada, or does it also apply to goods coming in?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is chiefly on the export traffic.

Mr. CROSBY. The First Minister stated that it did not make much difference who the companies were.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Who the directors were.

Mr. CROSBY. The only way to get at a company is to know the directors. The only way to indentify a company is through their board of management. I should think

it very essential for parliament to know to whom we are granting this money. We want to know what the character of the company is, and whether this company has a line of boats or not. My own idea is that you are handling this money over to some so-called company, and that that so-called company charter a boat to go to Annapolis and load a cargo of fruit. They charter that boat whenever they have a cargo of fruit ready for it. The right hon. Prime Minister shakes his head; if he can give me some information on that point I will be very glad.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The names of the vessels that are to carry the fruit are mentioned in the contract. This contract has been made with the Acadia Steamship Company of Annapolis Royal. I do not know the board of directors, but I have a statement in my hand that in the contract the company bind themselves to carry out its terms, and to ship these fruits by the steamships 'Atlantis,' 'Katinka,' 'Katie,' and 'Ada.' The boats are not merely hired for this purpose; the names of the boats are mentioned in the contract itself.

Mr. CROSBY. I do not know anything of the Acadia Steamship Company of Annapolis. I have sent for Lloyd's Register, and we will be able to ascertain in a short time whether they have any such boats or not. But, in the meantime, I will undertake to say, from my knowledge of shipping, that the Acadia Steamship Company of Annapolis do not own any such boats, and I do not know any company which does own any boat which can be used for the transportation of apples from Annapolis to the old country. Therefore, the company must charter boats to go and make a trip at certain seasons of the year when boats are available for that work. This money can only be handed over to a company, calling themselves by what name they may, and if we hand it over to them we ought to know to whom we are handing it over even if we do not follow the money any further. The hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden), who is right beside the First Minister, must know the Acadian Steamship Company of Annapolis. I have some men in my mind. For instance there is Mr. Chase who is a large exporter of apples and potatoes from that country. If you could say that Mr. Chase is at the head of any such company I would say it was all right because I know Mr. Chase as everybody does. But not knowing the names of any of the men associated with this company, we are simply voting money when we do not know exactly for what purpose it is going to be used. It may be done with all good intentions.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We do not pay the money in a lump sum, but we pay $1,000 a trip. The money is paid only when the conditions of the contract have been fulfilled. It is only paid when it is earned, each trip.

Mr. CROSBY. If the First Minister would grant me $5,000 or $1,000 a trip I would be very glad to supply steamers to carry these products to the old country.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will do that.

Mr. CROSBY. Then we had better arrange so that I can get that $5,000. I do not know that I am particularly anxious to have it. But, we should know who is going to get this money. To whom did you pay it last year? There must be some man who received this money, and gave a receipt for it. If you give us the name of somebody who got it last year we will have somebody to talk to.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The principal thing we should be anxious about is as to whether this service is a deserving one, whether the people who are performing it are earning the money and whether it is in the public interest. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crosby) has referred to me. I know there is such a company. I think that one of the men interested in it is Mr. Whitman of Annapolis, and the company is duly chartered. Mr. Whitman is one of the most respectable business men in Nova Scotia, if he is interested, and I think he is. The people in the western part of the Annapolis valley are very much interested in this service. It is beneficial to them. I cannot understand why my hon. friend is so strongly opposed to the people of western Nova Scotia getting some benefit from it.

Mr. CROSBY. I am not opposing this; I am asking for information, and I think I have a right to ask for it. If we are going to give $5,000 to somebody, certainly we ought to know who is going to get it.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then he is supporting the vote, not opposing it?

Mr. CROSBY. I do not think that my hon. friend should be permitted to say that I am opposing it. I certainly did make inquiry with regard to it. But, it is not necessary——

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I do not know why I should be interrupted. I never interrupted the hon. gentleman.

Mr. CROSBY. All right, Sir, you may have the floor, but I will be after you in a moment.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I believe this service is in the interest of the people

of the Annapolis valley. I believe that the money paid is earned, and I wish to say that not a dollar of it is paid until it is earned. A contract has been made, that contract is open to tender and it is open to other companies, if they wish to perform this service, to put in tenders. I cannot quite understand why this item should be opposed.

Mr. CROSBY. I am neither supporting nor opposing it. I believe in subsidies if they are in the right direction, and if the results are such as to benefit the trade of the country. I see the hon. member for Annapolis (Mr. Pickup) here; he certainly must know who is behind this steamship company. I hold in my hand Lloyd's Register of shipping which has all the ship owners of the world in it. I will hand it over to my hon. friend, and see if he can find this company registered or if he can find them registered as owning any steamers. As a matter of fact I know they do not own any steamers, and I am saying that in the presence of the Minister of Militia, and the representative of the county of Annapolis, and I say without fear of contradiction that this company do not own a single steamer. If that be so is it not fair that we should ask to whom we are paying this money, and to whom this company are going to pay the money. In making reference to the conditions in Halifax I have no desire that anything shall be done detrimental to any other part of the Dominion. I am desirous that everything shall be done to facilitate trade in every part of the Dominion. I referred to the Furness line of steamers which runs from Halifax. I have no doubt that that company could send a steamer to Annapolis to accommodate the apple trade of Nova Scotia, and the western part of Nova Scotia particularly. I know Mr. Whitman to be a very decent and respectable man, and I have not a word to say about him. The Dominion government have bonused more than one man to form a company, but it is not a fair thing to us to vote $5,000 to a so called company. The First Minister tells me that he does not know anything about it although this subsidy has been given for a year or two past. Still, we cannot tell anything about the company.

Mr. PICKUP. Perhaps it is well I should explain that this company is composed of farmers, with Mr. Whitman as their secretary, and they charter boats during the season and have done so for the last ten years, on which to ship their apples to Europe. Only a proportion of the subsidy is drawn each year, there being $1,000 allowed for every boat that comes in under charter, and in consequence of this subsidy the farmers in western Nova Scotia, including the counties of Kings and Annapolis are enabled to obtain a cheaper rate for the apples they ship from that part of the country. As low as forty and fifty cents a barrel have been paid as freight, when the rate from Annapolis and Kings county by rail via Halifax to English market was 85 to 90 cents per bbl., thus saving the farmers who avail themselves of the opportunity 30 to 40 cents per bbl. on each cargo of 10,000 barrels which, I think, would justify granting this subsidy. This subsidy is for the purpose of assisting the farmers of that part of the Dominion to get a cheap rate to the old country, They have chartered one or two vessels during the season,—I think four boats is the greatest number they have used in any one year,—and they draw $1,000 for each boat they charter—to the old country. Under this system they have shipped as many as 8,000 or 10,000 barrels on each boat, so that it only has cost the government ten cents a barrel to grant this very valuable assistance. I do not think any objection can be made to this vote at all. It is as justifiable a subsidy as is granted by this government to any service whether it be from Halifax or St. John or anywhere else.

Mr. CROSBY. That confirms my statement that this is not a company owning boats.

Mr. PICKUP. What does it matter whether the company owns a boat or whether it charters a boat to carry on the business they undertake so long as it affords the people a satisfactory and cheap service to get their products to the market?

Mr. SINCLAIR. It is the commonest thing in the world for steamship lines to charter boats, and my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby) knows that very well. The Furness line charter tramp boats from Halifax that they do not own at all. The contract with them is that they shall send a boat out at certain periods of the year to carry the freight, and it makes not the slightest difference to the farmers or the community generally whether the company owns the boat or not so long as their freight is carried.

Mr. CROSBY. The hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) knows as well as I do that there is no steamship company in the world that does not own some boat. While the Canadian Pacific railway and other big lines charter boats at times, they have some boats to start with and they have something to offer when they ask for a subsidy. But here we have a company asking for a subsidy that has no boat at all, and that does not propose to own a boat, not to speak of having her registered in the Dominion. I know Mr. Whitman very well. Something has taken place

within the last year that will alter the whole conditions of trade with Annapolis. I am as anxious to see facilities for trade provided at Annapolis as at Halifax or anywhere else. The Canadian Pacific railway have recently bought the Western Counties railway, and they will no doubt make a strong bid for the apple trade from the Annapolis district. They will, I believe, give every advantage to the people of Annapolis and Western Nova Scotia to get their fruit to the old country not only at a low freight rate, but in such an excellent condition that tramp steamers cannot compete with them.

Mr. PICKUP. These are not tramp steamers; they are freight boats that come from Spain and southern European ports, with fruit to the United States, and on their way back they call at Annapolis and carry the fruit and land it on the other side in good condition.

Mr. CROSBY. I think I will be able to show that these ships come from Spain and Norway.

Mr. PICKUP. They are English and Norwegian.

Mr. CROSBY. I know what I am talking about, and I am satisfied that I will be able to show that they are more Norwegian than English. I am quite sure that one of the main objects of the Canadian Pacific railway in acquiring that railway was to capture the apple trade of Western Nova Scotia, and in doing that they will not only give cheap transportation but the very best facilities. The subsidy is not large, it is true, but large or small we should not grant a subsidy without knowing why we are doing it. The Canadian Pacific railway will run their boats to Annapolis if they find it convenient, or they will take the apples to Halifax or St. John and send them to England from one of these ports. I do not mean to accuse the First Minister of naming boats that are not such, but I doubt very much that these are British boats, and the time has come when whatever subventions we give should be given to British boats only.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is a doubting Thomas, but I will try and convince him that his suspicions are without foundation. We have the information from the hon. member for Annapolis that the company is composed of farmers, and that they charter boats for the purpose of shipping their own fruit, and an inquiry made by the Auditor General brought out a reply which is to be found in the report of the Trade and Commerce Department for 1909-10, which will give the history of the service. The hon. gentleman will find the correspondence in the Auditor General's Report for the year 1909-10. The correspondence is as follows:

Audit Office, Ottawa, December 21, 1909.

Sir,—In the contract with the Acadia Steamship Company for steamship service between Annapolis Royal, Nova Scotia, and London or Hull, England, the payment of the subsidy of $1,000 for each voyage is made dependent on evidence being submitted to the department, sufficient to show that the 'fruit or other perishable produce shipped on such voyage was carried and delivered at the port of destination in good and satisfactory condition in so far as proper storage and ventilation thereof were concerned.' Have you received the necessary evidence in the way of certificate or otherwise that the fruit carried on the voyages for which you ask payment in your application of the 16th instant reached its destination in good and satisfactory condition?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. A. FRASER, A.G.

The Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Trade and Commerce Department,
Ottawa, December 23, 1909.

Sir,—In reply to your letter of December 21, I beg to send you herewith evidence submitted by the Acadia Steamship Company showing that the fruit and other perishable produce carried on the above service was delivered at port of destination in good and satisfactory condition in so far as proper storage and ventilation thereof were concerned.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
F. C. T. O'HARA, D.M.

The Auditor General.

Audit Office, Ottawa, December 28, 1909.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23rd instant inclosing temperature charts of the steamers 'Atlantis' and 'Katinka' which performed the voyages between Annapolis, Nova Scotia, and London, England, during the apple season, 1909, the subsidy for which you have asked payment in your application of 16th instant.

Were the fruit cargoes of these steamers examined in the interests of the department at the port of destination, by any person in a position to certify that the fruit was in good condition at the end of the voyage?

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
J. A. FRASER, A.G.

The Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce.

Trade and Commerce Department,
Ottawa, December 29, 1909.

Sir,—Referring to your letter of December 28, I beg to state that the fruit cargoes on the steamers referred to were examined at the port of destination, and this department was advised that the receivers in Hull had wired the company in Annapolis that the 'Cargoes 'Atlantis.' 'Katinka,' with regard to proper stowage, ventilation, delivered in good condition.'

I am, sir, your obedient servant,
F. C. T. O'HARA, D.M.

The Auditor General.

That ought to satisfy my hon. friend.

Mr. CROSBY. The First Minister must think I am very easy to satisfy if he thinks

that will satisfy me. I could not hear one word to indicate that they are British boats.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is a stipulation of the contract that they must be British boats. If they were not it would be a fraud on the government and they would get no subsidy.

Mr. CROSBY. That may be. I have not had time to look the boats up, but I think we should have that. Would the member for Annapolis state what Mr. Whitman has to do with this?

Mr. PICKUP. He assembles the fruit.

Mr. CROSBY. What I want is information as to the company. A steamship company or any other company cannot have less than three members.

Mr. PICKUP. The Acadia Steamship Company, I suppose, has 100 shareholders.

Mr. CROSBY. Could the hon. member name some of them?

Mr. PICKUP. Mr. Whitman, Mr. Spur and Mr. G. R. Jones.

Mr. CROSBY. It strikes me that whatever reason there may have been for giving the subsidy in the past there is no reason for giving it to-day. We are subsidizing a line to go to Annapolis and one to Halifax, two lines for the one character of trade. Then the Canadian Pacific railway has acquired this road, and I am satisfied that they will give as good a rate on fruit from Halifax, St. John or Annapolis as will be given by any steamship company or tramp steamer, and in addition to that they will give accommodation and storage for that fruit such as has not before been furnished.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Then no one will ship by this line, and no subsidy will be paid.

Mr. CROSBY. If my hon. friend will grant a subsidy of $5,000 he will find some one to take it off his hands.

Mr. PICKUP. It is only $1,000 a trip, and she carries 10,000 barrels, so that the farmers are saving $4,000 on each trip.

Mr. CROSBY. If the Prime Minister will let this stand over until to-morrow, I will be able to prove that there is nothing in the statement of rates, that the rates offered by other companies to take the freight of Halifax will be equal to the freight from Annapolis. Of course if it goes through I have nothing further to say.

Steam service between Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona, $5,825.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What boat performs this service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The contract is with the Victoria Steamship Company of Baddeck, and the steamer is the 'Blue Hill.'

Mr. CROSBY. Can you give any information about the directors of this company?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I do not know.

Mr. KYTE. One of the directors and the manager is Mr. A. H. Sutherland, of Baddeck, another is Mr. J. E. Hamilton, retired merchant of Baddeck.

Mr. CROSBY. Can you assure me that Mr. Young, of Sydney, is not one?

Mr. KYTE. Mr. Young has nothing to do with it whatever.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it a weekly service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No; two full round trips are run daily during the season of navigation.

Steam service between Bonaventure river, Quebec, Petit Rocher and Bathurst, N.B., triweekly, during the season of 1911, $5,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No service was run under a contract on this route during the last year, but a contract was entered into on January 9, with Angus McLean for a service to be performed from the opening of navigation, 1911, to March 31, 1916, by a steamer of not less than 1,000 tons register, with accommodation for 100 passengers. Mails are to be carried, and the annual subsidy is $5,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the reason of the increase?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No company would take it for the subsidy, and there was no service last year.

Steamship service between Canada and Australia on the Pacific Ocean—Five-sixths of $180,509.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This service was performed for a number of years by the Union Steamship Company of New Zealand. There are six steamers in all with speed varying from 14 to 16½ knots per hour. They make four-weekly trips from Sydney and return, calling at Brisbane, Fiji, Honolulu, and the outer wharf of Victoria. The subsidy is £37,090 15s. 2d. per annum. A new contract is being prepared with the same company for service between Canada and New Zealand for five years, calling at Honolulu and Fiji, beginning August 1, 1911. The contractors are permitted to extend the voyage to Australia. The contract is based on the present Canadian-Australian service.

Mr. DANIEL. Is the tonnage gross or net?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have given the gross only.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How long is the contract for?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Five years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In what position is the All Red Route system at present?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That depends very much on whether the imperial government are ready to contribute or not. New Zealand has always been ready to contribute handsomely; Australia has not been so ready. Unless we have the good will of Australia, I have no hope that we shall have an All Red Route. The matter no doubt will be taken up at the next conference. If we can prevail on the British government to give us a subsidy also on the Atlantic ocean, whether they contribute to the Pacific ocean service or not, that would mean a good deal. A good deal of the success of the All Red Route depends on what service we would obtain on the Atlantic. If we could obtain a fast service on the Atlantic for a reasonable sum, no doubt we could have a service which would go far to make the All Red Route an accomplished fact.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It is entirely left with the British government and the government of Australia to do their part towards the maintenance of such a service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We would expect that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. But in passing this vote, will we not be interfering in some way with the carrying out of that proposition? We are entering into an arrangement for five years.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The All Red Route is not in such a position of certainty that we should neglect the opportunity of having a good service on the Pacific ocean. Moreover, to organize the All Red Route service and secure the proper steamers would take nearly five years.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. We are about to expend £37,000 on the inauguration of this system, and enter into a contract for five years right in the teeth of the fact that the Prime Minister is going to a Colonial Conference which will take up this very subject, and bring it probably to some satisfactory conclusion. Would it not be wise to let this matter stand until after the conference? £37,000 would be a considerable amount to give toward the subsidy Canada would be likely to grant for an All Red Route.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that I do not see such an immediate prospect of realizing an All Red route as would warrant us with not keeping the service we have in hand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would it not be possible to enter into a contract for the present year only?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that any steamship company such as this one—a respectable, strong company—would undertake a service of this kind for one year only.

Mr. DANIEL. Is it not a fact that at the last Imperial Conference the Prime Minister of Australia said it would be impossible to do a freight service by the All Red Route over Canada on account of the transhipment of goods, and that they could send freight just as quickly, and cheaper by way of the Suez canal?

Mr. EDWARDS. On a previous item the right hon. gentleman said that this government regulated the freight rates of these companies to which subsidies were granted chiefly on the goods exported from Canada. I would take that to mean that to a certain extent the government also regulated the freight rate on the goods coming in by these lines.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand that we cannot regulate these rates absolutely. We run up against what is known as the North Atlantic Conference. As to the goods that are shipped out of the country, we control the rates absolutely, but as to the goods coming in we do not.

Mr. EDWARDS. The main object of these subsidies, I should think, would be to facilitate the outgo of Canadian products. But when we consider the figures in the report of the Department of Trade and Commerce as showing the amount of our produce sent to Australia and New Zealand, we cannot but have some doubts as to the advisability of granting $300,500 a year—that is what this item and the next, covering the trade between the Canada and Australia and New Zealand, both on the Atlantic and Pacific amount to—to facilitate that trade. Another point that suggests itself is that all the time we have been granting these subsidies and so endeavouring to facilitate the outgo of Canadian products to Australia and New Zealand, these countries have maintained pretty high tariffs against the goods from this country. But it is quite possible that if the agreement now pending before the House is ratified we shall be paying these hundreds of thousands of dollars of subsidy to bring goods into Canada to compete with our own products. For instance, take the item of mutton from Australia. There is a very remarkable growth of the amount of that product brought into this country in recent years. It grew from 60,000 pounds in 1905 to over 1,000,000 pounds in 1908, and in 1910 it was 1,377,270 pounds. I do not know what it was in the fiscal

year just closed, but the indications in the answer given to questions were that not only the amount of mutton, but the amount of other products, coming from these countries to Canada is increasing, notwithstanding the duty they have to pay at the present time. At the same time, our exports to Australia and New Zealand have grown comparatively little. In 1908 our exports amounted to $992,442. That is the sum total of the goods shipped from this country, both home and foreign, for Australia and New Zealand. In 1909 it was only $996,901, and in 1910 it dropped to $890,549. There does not seem to be any very great growth in the outgo of our products to New Zealand—it seems rather declining. This makes me doubt the advisability of the subsidy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No doubt my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) is right; we have received very small returns indeed for the large outlay we have made in providing steamship accommodation between Canada, Australia and New Zealand. Trade has not grown correspondingly. New Zealand has given us a preference, as we have given her, but Australia has not, up to the present time, gives us a preference. But we have a promising trade in Australia, chiefly in agricultural implements. Notwithstanding the very high tariff against it, this trade has grown and is still growing. The subsidy for which as we are now asking the approval of the House is not confined to Canada alone, but is correspondingly maintained by New Zealand. The question simply is: Are we to have communication with the sister colony, New Zealand, or not? These steamers are chiefly mail and passenger steamers. We expect, in the course of time, if we cannot get the whole of the freight trade of New Zealand and Australia, we ought to have a very large and increasing proportion of the passenger trade. Would my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) advise us, in the face of the fact that we have on this continent a British Dominion, and that there are on the other side of the world two British Dominions, that it is not worth while to pay to have steam communication between them? The matter is not only one of business. There is a question of sentiment, and more, one of high policy that we should keep steamship, telegraphic and any other communication possible with our fellow subjects on the other side of the world. That is partly the reason we have the subsidy. And if we pay these subsidies, we must expect that the steamers will carry goods into Canada also. We sell some of our goods to the British subjects in Australia and New Zealand, and we must expect that they will send in return what goods they can sell us. I think the policy a wise one. It is not a new one, and I have never heard it seriously challenged up to the present time.

Mr. PORTER. Are these steamships subsidized by New Zealand and Australia as well as by Canada?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are subsidized by New Zealand. Formerly they were subsidized by Australia also, but Australia refused to go into the last contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is their reason for refusing?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is more than I can say.

Mr. EDWARDS. Of course, if the granting of these subsidies is to be considered on sentimental as well as economic lines, it opens up a very different field. I may be wrong in my recollection, but I think I have heard somebody say, or have read somewhere that some person said, in this House, that very little consideration ought to be given to sentiment in the matter of trade relations. However, I have no wish to sever the connection between Canada and other parts of the empire. If the link can be made stronger by subsidizing steamship lines all right. But it occurred to me that as a business proposition, it would be quite right to consider the possibility of goods coming in on these subsidizing vessels as well as going out on them. And, in view of the growth of the importation from Australia and New Zealand into Canada, and notwithstanding the present rate of duties, it would seem to me that if the agreement which has come up for consideration in this House for some time is ratified, there would be still greater importations of their products into this country to compete with the farm products of Canada; and so the subsidy we grant will not be so much to facilitate the outgoing of Canadian products as the incoming of the products with which Canadian products will have to compete.

I would not for a moment advocate that these subsidies be discontinued. They have been granted for many years, and I would feel like subordinating my own view to the views of men of greater experience in such matters. I would like to know the character of our export trade to Australia and New Zealand. I know that a great part of it consists of agricultural implements, and I have no hesitation in saying that I do not feel like facilitating the exportation of agricultural implements. I feel that the agricultural implement people have had the big end of the stick in this country for a long while, and if we are granting subsidies to take so many hundred thousand dollars of Canadian produce, chiefly agricultural implements, to Australia and New Zealand, the return cargoes being the produce of

these countries coming into direct competition with what our farmers produce, then it seem to open up another field of consideration as to the advisability of continuing to grant extensive subsidies for that purpose.

Mr. REID (Grenville). To whom are these subsidies paid?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is paid to the Union Steamship Company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have we any communication with Australia by the Canadian Pacific railway?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On the Atlantic, but not on the Pacific.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is the only communication with Australia?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it the intention of the Prime Minister at the coming conference to urge the importance of carrying out the All Red Route proposition? Has any effort been made to secure control of telegraph lines across the country to assist in carrying out that project or to build telegraph lines?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know that we have attempted to have our own lines on the continent. One of the objects of the conference will be to discuss cable service across the Atlantic. On this subject the government has already had a very voluminous correspondence with the imperial government.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I asked whether the Prime Minister intended to urge upon the conference the importance of this All Red Route system?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly, and I am very glad to have the assistance of my hon. friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In reference to the cable system the Prime Minister is well aware that unless we do our part in carrying messages across our own country, we can hardly expect in the near future to have a cable system carried to any successful conclusion, and if the Prime Minister or his government have not taken any action in the matter I would be very much surprised.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We have had numerous conferences with the Canadian Pacific railway with regard to the improvement of the service on the continent, and I am glad to say it has been improved, and I have had no complaint of late upon that subject. We now have the Pacific Cable which is owned by the four governments, Great Britain, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. We have communication by the Canadian Pacific railway wire across the continent. Now the one question which is of greater moment is communication between Canada and Great Britain, and this is one of the subjects to be taken up at the conference.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The rates of the Canadian Pacific railway are under consideration as well, are they not?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. BLAIN. The question of steamship subsidies does not receive much attention in this House. The right hon. gentleman to-night suggests that a very large number of items might pass without much discussion because they have passed the House for many years. In my opinion these matters should be gone into very closely. Every one of these subsidies should be carefully investigated, taking into consideration the development of trade between Canada and these other countries, the changed conditions of the carrying trade and commerce generally. I believe a special commission should be appointed to secure better and fuller information upon this matter, so that it might be placed on a better and more substantial and more Canadian basis. The goods brought in by many of these lines come into competition with our own goods. It is very important, as the right hon. gentleman points out, that we should have communication with all parts of the British Empire, but I do think that these matters pass the House without much consideration and I venture to say do not receive proper consideration by the government; there is a tendency to take it for granted that, having passed, they should pass again. When we ask what the results have been we are generally told by the ministers that the increase in trade has been disappointing. We hear that year after year. I think the appointment of a commission in order that this whole matter should be revised would be in the best interests of Canada.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Has the government control of the rates on goods exported from Canada on subsidized steamers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes; they are subject to the approval of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and if the rates are not approved, the subsidies can be cancelled.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. It seems strange that this arrangement should be entered into without the assistance of Australia. Australia receives the greatest benefit from this subsidy, yet this country and New Zealand are practically bearing the whole cost of the subsidy. The Prime Minister seems to be unable to give any explanation why Australia is not assisting in this subsidy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As far as I can understand the reason, it is this: The

steamship service is perfcrmed by the same company with Australia and New Zealand. If we had a service direct to Australia I think Australia would contribute, but the fact that the steamers going from Vancouver to Australia call at New Zealand, lengthens the journey, and therefore the service is not as speedy as it might otherwise be. That is my own surmise. We shall know more when I come back from the conference. If my hon. friend will then question me I will perhaps be able to give him a better answer than I can at the present time, because this is certain to be one of the subjects that will be discussed at the conference. At the present time I have no information except that Australia has refused to participate. We have wired, telegraphed and written and at last the matter could not be delayed any longer, and we concluded to make an arrangement with New Zealand in the hope that Australia will come in. Since it has been done, I understand that Australia may perhaps come in.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That seems an additional reason why this vote should stand over until the Prime Minister returns. It certainly seems a reasonable question to ask, because Australia is one of the colonies that is going to receive the greatest benefit from this very same source, and at the same time we assist them to bring goods into our country to compete with our own. If the reciprocity deal should ever happen to pass this House their goods will be coming in here in direct competition with our farmers' products and do an immense amount of injury to our people. That we should grant this subsidy in order to assist them to do it seems rather unfair.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is all wrong. This subsidy is for a service between Canada and New Zealand, and not between Canada and Australia.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Yes, but Australia benefits by it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The steamers may call at Australia; that is they have permission to go there. I may say to my hon. friend that Australia was ready to contribute if we were willing to ignore New Zealand, but we would not do that, and Australia retired.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. These same boats call at Australia, and collect the products that will come to our country and compete in such large quantities.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The boats leave Vancouver and go direct to New Zealand. Then, the company have the privilege of extending their trip to Australia.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to add one word as to why the item attracted my attention. I could not help but compare it with item No. 174, for a service between Canada and Great Britain, costing us $600,000. When one considers that we are granting a subsidy of $600,000 to facilitate the exportation of our products to our best customer, and granting half that amount for an exceedingly small trade, in so far as anything we have to sell is concerned, with Australia and New Zealand, it did strike me that one subsidy was entirely out of proportion with the other.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Does my hon. friend compare the subsidy for the New Zealand service with the subsidy to the Allan line for the service to London? The things are not comparable.

Mr. EDWARDS. I was comparing them purely from the standpoint of the trade figures. The amount that we sell to Australia and New Zealand is exceedingly small. For instance, to New Zealand, we sold in 1910, of home products, $887,058. I understand that New Zealand reciprocates in this matter of the subsidy, but that Australia does not. We sold to Australia $3,561,075 of home products, and we admitted from Australia $403,484 and $774,166 worth in 1910. It is true that the balance of trade is in our favour, but the amount of the subsidy for the amount of the trade seems to me to be large.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have nothing to say of the result in so far as trade is concerned. We have not obtained what we had reason to believe we should obtain from this service. The question is whether we should maintain it or drop it. I have stated the reasons why I think the steamship service ought to be maintained even if it does not give us as much trade as we should receive.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the position of the Prime Minister not be stronger at the colonial conference when he was arguing with Australia in order to induce them to enter into this arrangement if the item was not passed?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, I think not. I think the item must go through, because we must have a service on the Pacific ocean with that colony.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to ask the right hon. First Minister if there is any subsidy granted for a steamship service between Canada and the Argentine republic?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None whatever.

Steam service between Canadian Atlantic ports and Australia and New Zealand, $120,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is for an Atlantic service, and the subsidy is voted to the New Zealand Shipping Company. The following steamships are engaged in this service:

Name.	Tonnage. Net.	Gross.	Speed. Knots.
Rakaia..	3,660	5,628	11
Whakatane..	3,786	5,902	11
Wakanui..	3,751	5,824	11
Waimate..	3,629	5,610	11
Turkistan..	2,899	4,505	11
Tokomaru..	4,072	6,238	11½
Kumara..	3,907	6,034	12

These boats sail on or about the 15th of each month. The summer service is between Montreal and Auckland, Wellington, Lyttleton and Dunedin, in New Zealand, and the ports of Melbourne and Sydney in Australia, while the winter service is from St. John and Halifax, to the ports mentioned in New Zealand and Australia.

Mr. EDWARDS. I would like to know if the right hon. gentleman has the figures indicating what proportion of our trade between Canada, Australia and New Zealand is carried through Atlantic ports and what through Pacific ports?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No I have not. This was a new service which was inaugurated a little more than a year ago, at the instance of the merchants, chiefly of Toronto and Montreal, on the representation that unless we had a steamship service from the Atlantic all the trade we have with Australia would go by New York. We have inaugurated this service to keep in British channels the trade of the St. Lawrence. We have yet no statistics to enable us to distinguish between the trade done by the Pacific service and the Atlantic service.

Steam service between Canada and Great Britain, $600,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is the well known service of the Allan Line. The steamships are the 'Victorian', 10,629 tons gross, speed 18 knots; 'Virginian' 10,764 tons, speed 18 knots; 'Corsican', 11,436 tons, speed 15 knots; 'Grampian, 9,603 tons, speed 15 knots; 'Hesperian, 9,599 tons, speed 15 knots; 'Tunisian', 10,576 tons, speed 15½ knots. By an agreement between the Allan Line, and the Canadian Pacific Railway Line the service is performed also by: 'Empress of Britain', 14,189 gross tons, speed, 18½ knots; 'Empress of Ireland', 14,191 tons, speed 18½ knots. There are ten complete round voyages per annum by each steamer. The winter service is Halifax, St. John, and Liverpool, and the summer service, Montreal, Quebec and Liverpool. This contract is about to expire and we have not renewed it. We think that at the present time the service on the St. Lawrence can be performed without any special subsidy. This is chiefly for the carriage of the mails—and that the mails can be carried on the poundage system as far as the summer service is concerned, although it may be different in the case of the winter service. We have reason to expect that the time has come when we should look forward to a far better and speedier service than we have had. We believe we should have a service of at least twenty-one knots as compared with 18½ knots now, and we have expectation that we may receive offers for such a service.

Mr. SPROULE. Why are you voting a subsidy if you have not renewed the contract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The contract is for five years, and we do not propose to renew it, although we may have to continue it for one or two years. This vote will carry us over one year, and meantime we are expecting offers for a better service.

Mr. SPROULE. Do those who use the cold storage on these ships for their dairy products, &c., get better terms on account of this subsidy? Some years ago when the cold storage arrangement was entered into, we provided that those who use it should get a better rate than the ordinary rate, but I think of late years that arrangement has not been adhered to.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All the rates are under the control of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. The contract reads:

It is further understood and agreed that the tolls to be charged in the way of either freight or passenger rates between ports on both east and westbound trips shall always under substantially similar circumstances and conditions, be charged equally to all persons, and at the same rate, whether by weight or otherwise, in respect of all traffic of the same description and receiving in carriage the like accommodation; and further, that no toll shall be charged which discriminates against Canadian merchants or shippers or against emigrants to Canada.

Mr. SPROULE. That is all right so far as it goes, but originally there was a provision that the cold storage rates on these subsidized steamers would be less than on unsubsidized steamers. I think that that arrangement was dropped some time ago. As the First Minister says, this service ought to be self-supporting without a subsidy, but when we give a subvention ostensibly for the mail service it ought to help to stimulate the exportation of these perishable products and secure a larger return for the farmers of the country by enabling them to ship at lower rates.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. All these are valuable considerations for the next contract.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am glad to know that the Prime Minister has not renewed this contract. Might I suggest to him a point worthy of consideration, that, while the rate from Liverpool to Halifax is, I think, seventeen shillings, the rate from Liverpool to New York is only nine or ten shillings, and, steamers receiving this large subsidy should be practically forced to compete in freight rates with the port of New York. If that were done, it would help our land transportation systems.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. SPROULE. I agree with the First Minister that we ought to have a much faster Atlantic service. We have for years past engaged in a childish effort to negotiate with these people who are providing boats for the service which are away behind the age, if not in comfort, certainly in speed. It is time we should have a faster Atlantic service than we have had.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Steam service between Canada and Cuba, $25,000.

Mr. DANIEL. What are the details of this service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The contractors are Wm. Thomson & Co., Limited. The date of the contract is December 1, 1909, and it expired on the 7th of January, 1911.

The steamships are the following:

Name.	Net. Tons.	Gross. Tons.	Capacity. Tons.
'Trongate'	1,619	2,552	2,700
'Ottringham'	1,698	2,679	5,100
'Gogovale'	2,038	3,097	5,250
'Leuctra'	1,950	3,207	5,032
'Benedick'	1,581	2,440	.....
'Bencliff'	1,385	2,210	.....

In addition to the above steamers, the 'Felix,' 'Snestad' and 'Haakon' were also employed.

They are all ten knot steamers, and no cold storage provided. It is a monthly service from St. John to Havana, and the subsidy is $25,000 per annum.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that a direct service both ways or are the vessels allowed to call at American ports?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is a direct service down, but on the return journey when the contractors show that they cannot get sufficient cargo they are allowed to proceed to American ports to complete.

Mr. DANIEL. In calling for tenders was it not stipulated that it should be a direct service both ways?

Mr. SPROULE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes, this change has been made by the minister since the contract was let.

Mr. DANIEL. Are all the vessels named, British vessels?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Some of these which were used at first are not. We now pay no subsidy except to British boats.

Mr. PORTER. Is the trade with Cuba growing satisfactorily?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. EDWARDS. I cannot understand on what basis the amounts of these subsidies are fixed. Comparing the trade with Mexico and Cuba for the past four years, I find that our imports from these countries were:

Year.	Mexico.	Cuba.
1906..	$297,516	$445,100
1907..	492,299	475,319
1908..	919,826	515,163
1909..	315,334	496,485
1910..	559,122	841,209

Our imports from Cuba into Canada have almost doubled since 1906. Our exports to the two countries were:

Year.	Exports to Mexico.	Exports to Cuba.
1906..	$259,372	$1,221,766
1910..	904,957	1,737,385

It will be seen that our trade with Mexico is very much smaller than our trade with Cuba, and yet the subsidy granted to the steamship lines running between Canada and Cuba, is $25,000 while the subsidy for the steamship service between Canada and Mexico on the Atlantic is $50,000, and on the Pacific $75,000. That is, our subsidy for the steamship service between Mexico and Canada on the Atlantic is twice as large as our subsidy for the steamship service to Cuba, yet our trade with Cuba is very much larger than our trade with Mexico. I do not understand on what basis the subsidies are granted. If they are granted to facilitate trade one would naturally expect that there would be some proportion between the subsidies granted and the amount of trade. The subsidies seem to be in inverse ratio to the trade.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Perhaps that is the reason we pay the larger subsidy to Mexico, because the trade is in its infancy and has to be encouraged more than the trade with Cuba. Another reason is that the service with Cuba is from St. John to Havana, whereas the trade with Mexico is from Montreal to Mexico, a much longer voyage. The trade with Mexico is of very recent growth, it did not exist ten years ago, while the trade between the maritime provinces and the West Indies is very old, in fact has been carried on as long as these

countries have existed. It, therefore. does not require such a large subsidy to carry that trade on as to carry on the trade with Mexico, where the business has to be created.

Mr. CROSBY. The trade with the West Indies has been carried on for many years but only in the last few years have the government undertaken to give a subsidy. When the subsidy was granted the trade was being carried on successfully from Halifax, and there was no necessity for the subsidy. I cannot see any reason for giving it, it is simply subsidizing one port in Canada to compete with some other port. This subsidy is largely for the carrying of potatoes from New Brunswick, and the first year the subsidy was granted, I think in 1908, it did not help the farmers in New Brunswick, in fact it caused disaster. It would be better for them if there were no subsidy. I am confident that it does not help the exporters of potatoes, it only helps those who are interested in chartering the boats. This is another case where boats are chartered as in the case of the Annapolis subsidy. Thompson & Company charter boats during the time that trade is active in the fall. They frequently carry our lumber. Sailing vessels carry freight from the port of St. John, and all along the coast of New Brunswick. We have a fine class of vessels there able to handle this trade. Of course there is no difficulty in getting a steamer to load in the autumn at St. John, Halifax, or Annapolis for Cuba, but these steamers do not bring any cargo back, because there is none to bring. This is a subvention which is not in the interest of trade and commerce generally or of trade with Cuba at all.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the Prime Minister any figures to show the amount of freight carried under this contract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In 1910 there were 5,888 tons of general merchandise, chiefly potatoes and fish.

Mr. PERLEY. It seems to me that the argument used by my hon. friend from Halifax must be a good one in view of these figures. In 1910 5,888 tons of freight went out and none came in. That shows conclusively that the change which the government made in this contract was not a good one because the outer trip is the direct trip to Cuba, the steamers could not stop anywhere else; but on the inward trip they stop at other ports which get the freight while Canada pays the subsidy. There were no passengers carried either in or out. The Prime Minister says that the estimates are the same as last year, and he thinks that is a good reason why we should pass them. But because a subsidy has been granted several years is no reason why it should be continued. That company was started in 1908, and in 1910 it took out less than 6,000 tons and brought none in. If this freight can be shipped by steamers from St. John, Halifax, and Annapolis that have no subsidy, there is no reason why we should grant a subsidy to this particular line.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This subsidy was first asked for by the merchants of St. Johns, who were convinced that a valuable trade could be developed between the two countries, and the government acceded to their representations. Tenders were advertised for, and it was only after ample publicity that a subsidy was given. I do not know that any protest was ever made by any one or that there was any rival steamship company plying between those two points. When the hon. member for Halifax made the complaint that there was no necessity for the service, that it would compete with other companies, I remember distinctly that this point was challenged by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) who insisted that this service would be of very great benefit to the farmers and fishermen.

Mr. DANIEL. I think that this service was inaugurated for the purpose of transporting farm products, and working up a trade with Cuba in those goods. As a matter of fact these steamers have been carrying large quantities of potatoes, especially in clearing from New Brunswick and the adjoining state of Maine as well, because the prices of potatoes in the United States are lower than in New Brunswick. But the trouble has been that there is very little return freight from Cuba to Canada, and there is preferential treatment between Cuba and the United States, so that the shippers from Cuba can do better in the United States.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many companies tendered for this contract?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have not got that information.

Mr. CROSBY. It seems that the Prime Minister has the idea that this was brought about by the government advertising for tenders. If he will inquire he will find that this was brought about early in 1909 by the hon. member for Carleton, N.B. (Mr. Carvell) and the Minister of Public Works making a strong demand for a subsidy of $20,000. In the session of 1908-9 we discussed this matter, and it was shown beyond the shadow of a doubt that the subsidy was due to the demand of the hon. member for Carleton and the Minister of Public Works, who had been asked by some people more particularly interested in getting a subsidy and putting on the steamers. And it was proved conclusively that the steamships the

Thompson people put on were practically all Norwegian boats. The first year, I think, one was a British steamer. And the fact remains that we were doing as much business before as we are doing to-day with this subsidy. The only import business we had with Cuba at that time was in molasses and sugar. In the changed condition of affairs, that trade goes in another direction; we seldom import sugar from Cuba to be manufactured in Canada. We have a regular service of boats running via New York to Cuba. In the fall during the season of the potato crop and when exports of potatoes take place to Cuba and other markets, there is no difficulty in chartering all the vessels that there are cargoes for. In the city of Halifax, any one looking over the returns will see that a great trade is done with Cuba during the autumn, yet quite without a subsidy. In the city of St. John, they can get all the steamers they want without the subsidy. When they have a cargo, all they have to do is to put a demand on the market and they get a steamer at once. A great portion of the export to Cuba is in lumber, and this is carried from our ports to Cuba by sailing vessels quite as satisfactorily as it can be carried by steamers. The voyage by sailing vessel from Halifax or St. John to Cuba is 12 to 16 days, and the voyage of a steamer is 7 or 8 days. With a cargo of lumber the difference in time is of little importance. So, the effect of this subsidy is to interfere with the carrying of our own products in our own Dominion bottoms, to the injury of our own seamen and ship owners. I, therefore, protest, as I have done on former occasions, against subsidies of this kind. I do this not with the desire to interfere with the trade of any port, but because I can see no good reason for this subsidy. I do not want to see a subsidy granted that will interfere with the business of our own Canadian sailing ships as well as with steamers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall the item pass? Carried.

Mr. CROSBY. I would like to have some reason given for granting the subsidy, and we have not heard any reason for it yet. The Prime Minister has told us that advertisements were sent out and that sort of thing, but the fact is that this subsidy was first granted on the demand of the hon. member for Carleton, N.B., and the Minister of Public Works in 1909. The government granted it by minute of council, and the vote was brought in in the session of 1909. Therefore, in the start, there was the demand, not of any farmers of New Brunswick or of the vicinity of St. John, but a demand by some hon. gentlemen in this House. I understand that Mr. Thompson and some other gentlemen are connected with it, and they desired to get $25,000 to charter some boats which would take trade, that, as I have said, was already done by sailing ships or unsubsidized steamers.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no doubt that the initiation of this subsidy was as stated by my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby). It was brought to the attention of the government, no doubt, by the minister who represents New Brunswick, and the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) who is a supporter of the government. It was brought in not for their own benefit, for they had nothing to do with it, but for the purpose of finding markets for the products of the farmers and fishermen of New Brunswick. As stated by my hon. friend, confirming what I have already said, there has been, as far back as memory goes, a great trade between the maritime provinces and the West Indies. But that trade was largely confined, so far as Canada was concerned, to the export of fish and the import of sugar and molasses. That trade received a very severe blow after the Spanish war when the United States got a special tariff arrangement with Cuba after Cuba had secured its independence. Efforts have been made ever since to recover our trade. It was thought that if a line of steamers were established to carry not only the only article which was then a matter of export to Cuba —fish—but also to carry agricultural products, it would be possible to develop trade. I have no doubt the project was well conceived. But, as stated by my hon. friend from St. John (Mr. Daniel) there has been no corresponding cargo from Cuba, and for that obvious reason the United States have a large advantage over us. That is the reason why we have opened that service. The success has been moderate, it may be that we are not getting sufficient advantage from it, but I do not think we should abandon it yet.

Mr. CROSBY. There is no reason why the subsidy should ever have been granted. Last year Cuba took all the potatoes and fish that we could send her. In the very first year this subsidy was granted it had the effect of bringing about a bad condition for the exporters who shipped their potatoes to Cuba, and they were induced to do so by those who were interested in getting the farmers to ship in order to fill up the steamers. It was a disastrous thing for the farmers in the province of New Brunswick. But there is another consideration that occurs to me. The government pretend that under their reciprocity agreement, if it carries, we are going to send out apples, our potatoes and our fish to the United States; then why are we arranging for this line of steamships to carry our stuff to Cuba? If the United States takes all our stuff what is the use of granting subsidies to steamers to carry it

to Cuba or to Great Britain? The hon. gentlemen opposite claim that under reciprocity the maritime provinces will double their exports of apples, fish and potatoes to the United States, and at the same time they are arranging for subsidies to carry them to Cuba and to Britain. I claim that there is no necessity for this subvention to carry these goods to Cuba; we have all the facilities we require now without it.

Mr. DANIEL. I think the object of the subsidy in the first place was all right, and that it was a good thing, because it was given for direct voyages to Cuba and back to Canada. I think that is the way the contract should be continued, because it was for that purpose the contract was given, not to create trade between Cuba and New York, but between Cuba and Canada. These vessels find it much easier to get a good return cargo from Havana to New York. I think the idea of the subsidy is correct, but it should be carried out in the way of a direct voyage both ways.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. How many trips did these steamers make last year to Cuba?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Twelve.

Steam service between Canada and Mexico upon the Atlantic ocean, $50,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This service is performed by the Elder-Dempster Company. The trade has been steadily increasing from its inception. It consists of general merchandise and manufactured products chiefly.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the extent of the trade to Mexico, on the east and on the west, for which we are expending $125,000?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I cannot give that information. The customs returns do not separate between the service on the Pacific and the service on the Atlantic.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What did they both amount to, the whole trade?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This trade was begun in 1906 when it amounted to $259,000. During the nine months of the following year it amounted to $317,000; in 1908, $477,000; in 1909, $817,000, and in 1910, $904,000.

Mr. EDWARDS. Does the Mexican government pay any subsidy for this Atlantic service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The government of Mexico pays $50,000 for the Atlantic service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And a subsidy on the Pacific also?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No, on the Pacific they pay no subsidy.

Mr. PERLEY. The Prime Minister stated that the trade is increasing satisfactorily. I do not find that the figures given in the Trade and Commerce report are very satisfactory. In 1908 the total tons carried by this line were 14,855; in 1909, 16,337, and in 1910, 13,642. There was less freight carried in 1910 than in 1908. Further than that I see that in 1907 the number of tons carried was 45,811, whereas it has fallen in 1910 to 13,642. I would like to know whether the Prime Minister thinks that is a healthy condition?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend only takes the tons carried. But, there are the tons weight and the tons measurement which are very important considerations. The figures are as follows:

	Tons Weight.	Tons Meas't.
1908, In..	4,360	41,870
Out..	10,495	21,975
Total.	14,855	63,845
1909, In..	2,110	26,751
Out..	14,277	15,239
Total..	16,337	41,990

In 1910 there is a corresponding increase in respect of the traffic, and especially the ton measurement showing that the trade in lumber especially seems to have increased.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister is making a poor argument. The figures for the tons measurement show that the quantity carried in 1910 was less than half as much as that carried in 1908.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Possibly. I understand that one of the reasons why the tons weight has decreased is because they cannot get any more sisal in Mexico.

Mr. CROSBY. This is a subsidy in the right direction. It is a subsidy that is beginning to build up a trade that could not be built up by any other method. I think the merchants of Canada feel that they have benefited by this service, and that they hope some day to have a large trade. This is not like some of the other subventions in regard to which the traffic could be handled without a subsidy. This is a trade that we would get if we did not grant this steamship subsidy.

Mr. EDWARDS. Can the right hon. gentleman inform me as to the amount of duty collected on imports from Mexico in 1908 and 1910?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not at this moment. I can find out the particulars later.

Steamship service between Canada and Mexico upon the Pacific Ocean, $75,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a subsidy that was inaugurated over five years ago. The contractor is Mr. Thomas Herbert Worsnop, of Vancouver. The steamships engaged are the 'Lonsdale,' net tonnage, 2,043, speed, 11·25 knots, and the 'Georgia,' net tonnage 1,778, gross 2,797, and speed 11 knots. It is a monthly service of 12 complete trips during each year, from Vancouver and Victoria to Salina Cruz, Mexico, calling on both north and south bound voyages at Mazatlan, Manzanillo and Acapulco in Mexico. The first contract, made September 17, 1906, allowed a period of six months to place ships on the route, and was to continue for two years from first sailing from Vancouver, which was May 1, 1907. This contract expired May 1, 1909. The new contract is for three years from May 1, 1909, and expires May 1, 1912. The amount paid is $75,000 per annum.

Steam service or services between Canada and Newfoundland, $18.000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a well known subsidy. The service is performed by the Reid Newfoundland Company, by three steamers, the 'Bruce,' which was recently destroyed, the 'Glencoe,' and the 'Invermore.' It is a daily service except Sunday, between North Sydney and Port au Basque.

Mr. DANIEL. Do these steamers run to Sydney in the winter?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. May I ask the Prime Minister what progress has been made towards bringing Newfoundland into the confederation, and what effort has been put forth towards bringing about that happy state of affairs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. None whatever, since the offer of Newfoundland was not accepted in 1894. We have made no effort on our part to bring Newfoundland into confederation. Not that our view upon the subject has changed, but we understand that the people of Newfoundland are not at all favourable to confederation, and no effort that we could make would induce them to come in at the present time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was not there a report in the newspapers the other day that they were ready to come in?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. So many things are said in the newspapers.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I cannot help but feel that it might be wise on the part of the government to at least investigate the matter, and see if it is not possible to communicate with the people of Newfoundland with regard to the question.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. FIELDING. I really think it would be a mistake on the part of the government of Canada to take any action in the matter. I am sure it would be misunderstood in Newfoundland. Newfoundland public men are well aware that it is the disposition among public men in this Dominion irrespective of party to have Newfoundland join the Dominion, and that whenever they are prepared to make the approach in the matter they will be welcomed. But, I am satisfied that any movement on the part of the Canadian government would be resented, and so long as our friends in Newfoundland know that everybody in Canada is well disposed towards them I do not think that at the present stage we could with advantage do any thing more.

Mr. PERLEY. Does the government of Newfoundland contribute any subsidy for this service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They contribute a like subsidy.

Steam service—Canada and South Africa, $146,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This service is performed by the Elder-Dempster Company; the speed of the vessels is ten and eleven knots; the service is monthly from Montreal, calling at Quebec in summer, and from St. John, calling at Halifax in winter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have we a trade representative in South Africa?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Is our trade with South Africa developing?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not very much. This service was inaugurated about 1903. Since then the trade has fluctuated between $1,700,000 and $2,354,000 last year.

Mr. EDWARDS. What is the general character of the imports and exports in our trade with South Africa?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no information at hand to enable me to answer that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the colony contribute towards this service?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Have they been asked?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This service was inaugurated shortly after the war, and the South African colonies were so disjointed that it was hardly possible to expect them to contribute. Now that a union has been formed it may be possible to have joint action, but no steps have yet been taken towards that end.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the Prime Minister take up the question at the Colonial Conference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We will see if it may be possible to have any trade with them.

Mr. EDWARDS. In granting subsidies to steamship lines between Canada and other countries the most serious consideration should be given to the character of the products interchanged. If the products coming from these countries to Canada are such as would come into direct competition with the products of our own people, the question of the cost of production in these other countries, the rate of wages paid, &c., should be most carefully looked into.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The chief object of these subsidies is to push Canadian exports in the markets of other countries, and up to the present no one has questioned the advisability of that. If we do that we must be prepared to take what other countries send us. We have little to expect from South Africa in that respect, because the chief products are fruits and wines. Last year we imported from South Africa 24,000,000 pounds of raw sugar.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. There are a number of steamship subsidies, each for a small amount, between local points in the eastern provinces, which in the aggregate amount to a large sum. The only subsidy of such a kind on the inland waters is between Pelee island and the mainland, which of course is an absolute necessity. There are many ports on the lakes which have not communication with each other. and would the Prime Minister be willing to grant local subsidies the same as is done in the eastern provinces?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly, if the conditions are similar. For instance, if there is any place in Lambton county where the people are isolated and without railways, and where they can only communicate with the rest of the world by steamers, we would do it right away.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have in mind places along the Great Lakes which I believe are similarly situated to those places in the eastern provinces, and which would be materially assisted by such a subsidy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the people have no communication with the outside, they ought to have it by all means.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1911, between Gaspé basin and Dalhousie or Campbellton, $15,000.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is a case of the kind I mentioned just now. The county of Gaspé is at the end of the peninsula between the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Baie de Chaleur. It has been without railway communication, although this year a railway is to be opened up to Gaspé basin. The place has been absolutely isolated, and this was the only means of communication they had all the year round.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I quite understand that, but I have in mind places in my own riding such as Grand Bend, a village 14 miles from a railway, or Bayfield, 15 miles from one, and many others along the Great Lakes. On the Atlantic coast they are well supplied with steamboat communication, but in the inland waters there is little assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. Take Little Current or Manitowaning on the island, they have no communication at all.

Steam service from the opening to the closing of navigation in 1911, between Port Mulgrave, St. Peter's, Irish Cove and Marble Mountain and other ports on the Bras d'Or lakes, $6,000.

Mr. PERLEY. What system is there for looking over these different services each year, and seeing whether they are required? Sometimes in looking at the estimates it has appeared to me that once you had an item of this kind in the estimates, it was there for ever.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think that these services could be dispensed with. All these places are isolated, they have no means of railway accommodation or communication with the outside world except through the steamships. The population is not large and unless they are assisted in some way they will have less frequent communication or none at all.

Mr. SPROULE. In many of these places, the population grows, the industries increase sufficiently to warrant boats calling there at regular times, and getting trade. That is the case on the upper lakes. One would expect that in some of these places on the coast there would be the same development as in the inland portions of the country, and that there would come a time when this service might be carried on without the assistance of a subsidy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend is aware that the population of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia has not increased within the last 20 years, and the government has not been sufficiently long in office to get it increased.

Mr. PERLEY. The right hon. gentleman says that these are isolated communities which need this service. I am not objecting to the service, but what I want to know is whether the department has any system of looking into these different services so

as to ascertain whether these subsidies are still required. What the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) has said with reference to the inland waters might be very true with regard to some of these services, and the subsidy alone be sufficient to sustain them. Because we give a subsidy for two or three years, should not mean that we should give it for ever.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope they will not go on for ever. The port of Mulgrave is on the strait of Canso and has very little population. St. Peters in Cape Breton is a small fishing village, and Irish Cove is in the same position. There has been no increase of population such as would warrant dispensing with the service.

Mr. PERLEY. I was not referring to this particular item but to the general policy.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The department has to take each case by itself, and up to the present has not come to a conclusion that it can dispense with this assistance.

Mr. SPROULE. The information given us to-night does not correspond with that given us from time to time when we are asked to vote money to improve these harbours. Then we are always told that they are important places, rapidly growing, and on that account it is absolutely necessary to spend a lot of money there. But if they be growing, one would naturally expect that the time would come when it would not be necessary to give these subsidies, and the trade would be self-sustaining.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When a place is growing we ask for a wharf, and when it is not growing we ask for assistance.

Mr. PERLEY. Take the items 197 to 200. They all seem to be for service between Mulgrave and other ports.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mulgrave is the point of distribution, and is the point of connection between the mainland and Cape Breton.

Steam service between Prince Rupert, B.C., and Queen Charlotte island, five-sixths of $7,600.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This has the merit of novelty. The contractor is the Grand Trunk Pacific. In the months of November, December, January, February and March there are not less than two round trips each month from Prince Rupert, British Columbia, calling at Port Simpson, Naas Bay, Stewart and various other places and back to Prince Rupert; and during the remaining seven months in the year not less than four round trips each month upon the same route.

Mr. PERLEY.

Steamship service between Prince Edward Island and Great Britain, five-sixths of $7,500.

Mr. PERLEY. How long has this been in operation?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. For more than 10 years. It was stopped the last two or three years as we could not get any company to take it at the price. The contractors are the Manchester liners. The steamers are the 'Manchester Shipper' and 'Manchester Trader' and 'Manchester Spinner.'

Mr. PERLEY. Are there any arrangements for cold storage?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are ventilating fans in all the vessels and cold storage on the 'Manchester Trader.'

Mr. SPROULE. How many trips do the steamers make in the year?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Three trips, sailing September 22, October 25 and November 26.

Steam service during the year 1911, between Quebec and Blanc Sablon, calling at ports and places along the northern shores of the River St. Lawrence between such terminals, $20,000.

Mr. SPROULE. How many trips are made?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There are four ships, the 'King Edward,' 'the 'Restigouche,' the 'Aranmore' and the 'Savoy.' This is the subsidy I was mentioning a moment ago. The people served under this subsidy have absolutely no communication with the outside world except by this line. They are strung along the north shore of the St. Lawrence below Tadousac and as far as Blanc Sablon on the shore of Labrador.

Mr. REID. Is this Holliday Bros.?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. It is now twelve o'clock, and I think we have done a good day's work and might ask for an adjournment.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Might we not finish these this evening?

Mr. SPROULE. We are not much more than half through them yet. I think we have done a good day's work.

Some resolutions reported.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. What business to-morrow?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My colleague the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) will take up railway resolutions.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, May 11, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

COMPANIES ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. MILLER moved:

That Bill (No. 7) An Act to amend the Companys' Act, be placed amongst government orders on the orders of the day in the name of the Hon. the Secretary of State for consideration in Committee of the Whole in accordance with the recommendation contained in the tenth report of the Select Standing Committee on Banking and Commerce.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Has the Secretary of State been communicated with upon this matter?

Mr. MILLER. The Under Secretary of State, Mr. Mulvey, was in charge of the Bill, and it is at his request that this motion is made.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Has the Secretary of State recommended it?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Motion agreed to.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the recommendation of the Honourable the Speaker of the House of Commons, laid on the table on Tuesday, the 9th instant, that the vacancy in the Library of Parliament be filled by the transfer of Mr. Oswald Soulière from the Department of Marine and Fisheries to that of the Library of Parliament be concurred in, and that a message be sent to the Senate acquainting their honours therewith.

He said: The report is to be found in the Votes and Proceedings of May 9, page 909.

Motion agreed to.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

NICOLET POST OFFICE.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What amount was paid to the guardian of the Nicolet post office, what is the nature of his duties, and is he supposed to be a night watchman?
2. What amount has the government collected from the registrar of Nicolet for the rental of an office in the post office for the past three years?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) $43,33 per month; (b) the ordinary duties of a caretaker; (c) no.
2. A misunderstanding arose as to the rental to be paid, but the matter is now approaching settlement.

EXPORTS OF MILK AND CREAM.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What was the quantity and value of cream and milk exported from Canada to the United States during the months of March and April, 1911?
2. What was the quantity and value of casein exported from Canada to the United States during each month of 1910 and for the months of January and February, March and April, 1911?

Mr. PATERSON. The quantity and value of cream and milk exported from Canada to the United States during the months of March and April, 1911, was as follows:

MARCH.

	Gallons.	Value.
Cream	17,244	$14,594
Milk	18,327	1,115

APRIL.

	Gallons.	Value.
Cream	18,084	$14,828
Milk	418	49

2. The quantity and value of casein exported from Canada to the United States during the undermentioned months, was as follows:

	Pounds.	Value.
April, 1910	16,150	$ 760
May "	102,970	1,213
June "	55,462	1,509
July "	125,306	3,157
Aug. "	151,722	3,075
Sept. "	174,766	3,224
Oct. "	310,851	7,793
Nov. "	230,532	6,507
Dec. "	179,792	4,896
Jan., 1911	97,283	2,085
Feb. "	44,336	1,952
March "	26,002	838
April "	37,777	1,091

NOTE.—Casein not separately enumerated in classification of exports previous to month of April, 1910.

ANNUITIES TO JUDGES IN YUKON TERRITORY.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH moved that at the next sitting the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to provide that His Majesty may by letters patent under the Great Seal, grant to each of two of the judges of the Territorial Court of the Yukon Territory, now holding office, an annuity equal to the salary of the office now held by him, to begin immediately after his resignation, and to continue thenceforth during his natural life.

He said: I have to state that, His Excellency the Governor General, having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution, commends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Mr. SPROULE. How long have these judges held their offices?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is only a notice of motion.

Motion agreed to.

NEWSPAPER STATEMENTS AFFECTING HON. MR. OLIVER.

On the orders of the day being called:

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That the special committee to inquire into statements in regard to the Hon. Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, mentioned in the resolution of this House, passed on the 3rd day of May inst., do consist of Messrs. Clarke (Essex), Carvell, Geoffrion, Meighen and Crothers.

Motion agreed to.

BARRINGTON PASSAGE BAIT FREEZER.

Mr. JAMESON. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask when we may expect a return with reference to a bait freezing establishment at Barrington Passage ordered on 28th of February last. The minister some time ago said it would be brought down shortly, but it is not here yet, and I am anxious to get it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I shall have the matter looked into at once.

NIAGARA FALLS WATER-POWER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to bring to the attention of the government a notice which I observed in the press of the United States respecting a fight being made by the American Civic Association against a threatened depredation and despoliation of Niagara Falls. The statement issued by that association is in part as follows, according to this press report:

The situation is peculiar. The waterways treaty with Canada, signed January 11, 1909, while apparently limiting the amount of water which might be taken from the falls, has, on the contrary, increased this diversion. The power development companies have taken advantage of the outside limitations of the treaty and to-day are demanding what will come to 68 per cent more water than is now being drawn into the tunnels for the purpose of turning the giant turbine engines.

Next Wednesday, the 10th instant, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations will have before it joint resolution No. 3, offered by Senator Burton, of Ohio. This resolution has been prepared in order to save Niagara from the interests which are attempting to wrest additional free power for their private use.

It is estimated that the failure of the Burton resolution will mean an increased income of approximately $5,000,000 annually for the companies back of the opposition. The method by which the amount of water necessary to yield this enormous return can be taken under cover of the law is simple. The treaty has established what is known as a maximum limit of diversion of 56,000 cubic feet per second; that is to say, 25 per cent of the average flow of 222,400 cubic feet per second, and 30 per cent of other ordinary low water flow of 180,000 cubic feet. These amounts were allowed for diversions for specific purpose of power production. But the treaty places no limit on the amount of water that may be taken for sanitary and domestic purposes, thus leaving the way open for still greater diversions. The new enterprises ready to start up work on this basis, together with the increasing diversion sought by the existing plants, fully warrant the general alarm least the national ownership of Niagara shall whether wholly or in part pass into untrustworthy and irreverent private hands.

I observe also that in the same statement issued by this association it is alleged that $40,000,000 worth of capital is now invested by those who desire to consummate the purposes alluded to in this statement. I think this matter worthy of being brought to the attention of the government for the reasons contained in the latter part of the statement, namely, that although the treaty restricts the maximum limit of diversion to 56,000 cubic feet per second, there is an attempt to take advantage of that provision in the treaty, which permits diversion for sanitary and domestic purposes. It is clearly, therefore, the duty of this government to make some inquiry as to whether any such attempt is about to be carried out; and if so it is desirable that this government should make a strong protest against it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been giving some attention to this matter and have some papers bearing on the subject which I have not with me at present. I shall be glad if my hon. friend will send me the newspaper clipping he has read, and to-morrow I shall be able to make a statement with regard to the subject.

ENGLISH MAIL SERVICE TO THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

Mr. EMMERSON. I would like to bring to the attention of the Postmaster General a subject that is of deep importance to the people of New Brunswick and the other eastern provinces. I refer to the deliveries of the English mails in the east. Last week a business man in Moncton wrote me, that:

The 'Virginian' arrived at Rimouski at 6.25 Saturday morning, four passengers and mails for the east. She left Rimouski at 15.12 in the afternoon on a local train for Camp-

bellton; detention nine hours at Rimouski. Arrived at Campbellton at 20.35; transferred from local to freight train and left Campbellton on freight train at 22.15 Saturday night; difference in time makes detention there one hour and twenty minutes.

Arrived at Moncton at 6.40 Sunday morning; carried Moncton mails along with them to St. John—(we received Moncton mails at 11 o'clock Monday morning). Transferred at Moncton to another freight train on Sunday morning for Halifax. I do not know whether they have arrived there or not.

Considerable delay always occurs, but this seems to have been quite unusual. The further statement of my correspondent is to the effect, that he had letters and papers mailed to him in London on the 28th April via the Canadian route, and that they only arrived in Moncton on Monday, or about 13 days later.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). They ought to engage an ox team.

Mr. EMMERSON. My correspondent goes on to say that papers and letters mailed April 28th to him from London via New York reached him Saturday afternoon, whereas those mailed him on the 26th April by the Canadian route only arrived on Monday, 8th May and took 13 days to get to Moncton, as compared with seven and a half days via New York. He adds that he has given orders to have his mail matter sent in future by the New York route. There must certainly be something wrong on the part of the Postmaster General's Department or some other department with respect to the disribution of the English mails in the maritime provinces. The mails from Moncton and the east which arrived at Rimouski on Saturday morning last were received at Moncton and Halifax and Campbellton many hours after the mails, which had arrived at Rimouski for Manitoba and the west had reached Winnipeg. This is a matter which demands the attention of the Postmaster General. This complaint is not a new one, but one of long standing, and it seems to me that the time has come when a remedy should be applied.

Mr. CROSBY. Strong protests have been sent from the Halifax Board of Trade to the Postmaster General, and probably to the Minister of Railways, complaining of the present mail service to Nova Scotia and the east. When the steamship arrives at Rimouski there is great anxiety to transfer the mails for the west in the quickest time, and properly so, but in the rush, the east appears to be overlooked, and on many occasions our letters have been delayed for three or four days. The Board of Trade have addressed me on the subject, but having a high opinion of the executive ability of the Postmaster General, I thought the evil would be remedied without my urging him very strongly. In that I am sorry to say I am mistaken. I hope the Postmaster General will have the matter attended to at once, and that we will get our mails in Halifax via the Canadian route at least as speedily as via New York.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I have with me a return which was asked for earlier in the session by the leader of the opposition, and which deals with the whole question of the mail service for the east. When the mail steamer arrives at Rimouski, she is met by a special tender manned by our own crew and the bags and the baskets are at once transferred to the wharf at Rimouski. I may say that this mail matter has increased six or seven hundred per cent in the last few years. There is a large quantity of mail for the east, but of course there is a far greater quantity for the west. Sometimes the steamer is delayed and, the train for Rimouski leaves for the east on time, and the mails have to be placed on the next train which causes delay. At the demand of the steamship companies, we have decided that in future the mails for the west will be landed at Quebec, taken by the Canadian Pacific railway to Montreal, and there distributed for western points. The mails for the east will be delivered at Rimouski and put on the first available train. The delay is due to the Intercolonial railway at times, and to the steamer at other times, but so far as the post office is concerned, it does all it can to expedite the mails. The return which I have here gives all information.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is diligence up to a certain point, but in the end the question comes down to, what is the next available train? It may not come along for half a day.

Mr. EMMERSON. Nine hours in this instance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems unfortunate that one million people in the maritime provinces must have important mail communications delayed in this way. I did not know that this matter was to be brought up, and I have not before me the very strong representations which have been made to me, and which I have passed on to the Postmaster General. I would be glad if the Postmaster General would make a motion so that the document he has brought down may be put on the records of the House as I purpose bringing this matter up again for discussion.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will make the motion, but perhaps I could include it in 'Hansard'.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That will answer my purpose better. Perhaps it may be included in 'Hansard' without objection.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Let it go as part of the answer of the minister.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The memorandum is as follows:

Ottawa, Feb. 2, 1911.

With further reference to the question of employing a special train via the Intercolonial railway from Rimouski to Halifax for the conveyance of incoming British mails during the season of navigation on the St. Lawrence route, the Postmaster General is informed that during last season, that is from 29th April to 11th November, inclusive, twenty-nine steamers landed mails for the maritime provinces at Rimouski via Allan and Canadian Pacific railway line steamers.

A form showing the number of letter bags, newspaper bags and parcel post receptacles with their respective approximate weight, and approximate total weight, time of arrival at Rimouski and Halifax, also the detention at Rimouski, is attached. (The Controller regrets that he has no typewriter large enough for this work). Also attached is a return showing the gain in time that might have been made for each mail if a special train had been employed.

The cost of a special train would be as follows: 494.06 miles at $1.50 per mile, $741.09 per trip; for 29 trips a total cost of $21,491.61 for the whole season.

It is possible that the railway might claim double mileage between St. Flavie and Rimouski on the plea that it was necessary to make up the special train at a divisional point, in which case the cost would be $27.02 more per trip, or a total of $22,277.19 per season.

The average total weight of mail per trip last season was 10,678.27 pounds.

With reference to the return showing the gain in hours effected by using a special train, it might be observed that mails would not be assorted on the special train and consequently matter for the northern portion of the maritime provinces would not reach destination in some cases as quickly as under the present system. The column showing gain in hours merely indicates the acceleration of mails for Halifax city on the basis of 16 hours running time for the special train from Rimouski to Halifax, Regular train, 200, covers the distance in 16 hours 39 minutes.

Where the gain shown is over 24 hours it will be observed that there has been unusual detention at Rimouski due to the steamer arriving shortly after the maritime train had passed Rimouski, and also the difference in the running time of a special and a regular train.

B. M. ARMSTRONG.
Controller.

If special trains had been employed no mails would be assorted in route, and allowing 16 hours for running time between Rimouski and Halifax, the mails would have arrived at Halifax as follows:

April	29,	10.35	p.m.	instead of	7.00	p.m.	April	30,	Gain	20	hours,	25 minutes.
May	6,	9.30	"	"	5.40	"	May	7,	"	20	"	10 "
"	12,	7.00	"	"	5.40	"	"	13,	"	22	"	40 "
"	20,	3.30	"	"	6.30	"	"	20,	"	3	"	
"	27,	4.50	"	"	5.45	"	"	28,	"	23	"	55 "
June	4,	6.07	a.m.	"	6.05	"	June	4,	"	12	"	2 "
"	9,	4.48	p.m.	"	6.05	"	"	10,	"	25	"	17 "
"	17,	11.12	a.m.	"	5.55	"	"	17,	"	6	"	43 "
"	24,	6.10	"	"	2.00	"	"	24,	"	7	"	50 "
July	1,	12.00	noon	"	4.25	"	July	1,	"	4	"	25 "
"	8,	5.00	a.m.	"	3.26	"	"	8,	"	10	"	26 "
"	15,	8.50	"	"	3.24	"	"	15,	"	6	"	34 "
"	22,	1.45	"	"	3.25	"	"	22,	"	13	"	40 "
"	29,	1.20	p.m.	"	3.00	"	"	29,	"	1	"	40 "
Aug.	5,	12.20	a.m.	"	2.15	"	Aug.	5,	"	13	"	55 "
"	12,	8.30	"	"	3.45	"	"	12,	"	7	"	45 "
"	18,	9.25	p.m.	"	12.00	"	"	18,	"	2	"	35 "
"	26,	3.30	"	"	3.50	"	"	26,	"	0	"	20 "
Sept.	1,	11.08	"	"	3.15	"	Sept.	2,	"	16	"	7 "
"	9,	9.25	"	"	10.44	"	"	9,	"	1	"	15 "
"	15,	11.00	"	.	2.25	a.m.	"	16,	"	3	"	25 "
"	23,	5.45	"	"	11.00	p.m.	"	23,	"	5	"	15 "
"	29,	12.00	"	"	3.35	"	"	30,	"	15	"	35 "
Oct.	8,	8.20	a.m.	"	2.00	"	Oct.	8,	"	5	"	40 "
"	14,	4.25	"	"	2.45	"	"	14,	"	10	"	20 "
"	20,	No gain.										
"	29,	3.40	a.m.	"	6.00	.	"	29,	"	14	"	20 "
Nov.	3,	5.40	p.m.	"	7.20	"	Nov.	4,	"	25	"	40 "
"	11,	7.40	a.m.	"	7.15	"	"	11,	"	11	"	25 "

January 27, 1911.

The Controller begs to inclose herewith a return showing the number of letter bags, newspaper bags and parcel post baskets received at Rimouski for the maritime provinces during the summer, and approximate weights, hour of arrival of this mail at Rimouski station from the dock, hour of departure from Rimouski, time of detention at Rimouski and hour of arrival at Halifax, also a return in regard to the winter service showing the number of letter bags, newspaper bags and parcel post baskets arriving at Halifax for the maritime provinces, with

approximate weights, also the hour of arrival of the Halifax mail at that post office.

Mail for Halifax city during winter season is sent to that office as soon as received from the steamer, and mail for Nova Scotia is despatched by first outgoing train if connection is made. If connection is not made, this matter is sorted at North street station and despatched by first available trains. Mail for St. John city and New Brunswick is also despatched by first available trains, and the latter sorted on these trains. It might be noted that during the summer season the average detention at Rimouski of mails for the maritime provinces, owing to special trains not being used, is about 7 hours and 51 minutes, and the Controller would also add that from the 19th of June to the 23rd of October, two trains per day are operated from Montreal to Halifax, and from the opening of navigation to the 19th of June, and from the 23rd of October to the close of navigation, only one train is operated between Montreal and Halifax.

Under the summer time-table on the Intercolonial railway, trains for Halifax pass Rimouski at 5.21 a.m. and 8.06 p.m., and when one through train only is operated, such train is due to pass Rimouski going east at 11.45 p.m.

BRITISH MAILS FOR MARITIME PROVINCES LANDED AT RIMOUSKI—SUMMER SEASON 1910.

Steamer.	Date of Arrival.	Number of Letter Bags.	Approximate Weight.	Number of News Bags.	Approximate Weight.	Number of P. P. Baskets.	Approximate Weight.	Total Number of Articles.	Approximate Total Weight.	Hour of Arrival at Rimouski Station.	Hour of Departure from Rimouski Station.	Hours Detention at Rimouski.	Hour of Arrival at Halifax.	Note.
			Lbs.		Lbs.		Lbs.					H. M.		
Empress of Britain	April 29	26	1,170	95	7,125	28	2,660	149	10,955	6.35 a.m.	11.45 p.m.	17 10	7.00 p.m., 30th	
Virginian	May 6	23	1,035	121	9,075	28	2,660	172	12,770	5.30 a.m.	11.45 p.m.	18 15	5.40 p.m., 7th	
Empress of Ireland	May 12	17	765	80	6,000	29	2,755	126	9,520	3.00 a.m.	11.45 p.m.	20 45	5.40 p.m., 13th	
Victorian	May 19	25	1,125	117	8,775	28	2,660	170	12,560	11.30 p.m.	11.45 p.m.	10	6.30 p.m., 20th	
Empress of Britain	May 26	24	1,080	98	7,350	24	2,280	146	10,710	1.50 a.m.	11.45 p.m.	21 55	5.45 p.m., 28th	
Virginian	June 3	25	1,125	144	10,800	23	2,185	192	14,110	2.07 p.m.	11.45 p.m.	9 38	6.05 p.m., 4th	
Empress of Ireland	June 9	20	900	82	6,150	26	2,470	128	9,520	12.48 a.m.	11.45 p.m.	10 57	6.05 p.m., 10th	
Victorian	June 16	29	1,305	96	7,200	27	2,565	152	11,070	7.12 p.m.	11.45 p.m.	4 33	5.55 p.m., 17th	
Empress of Britain	June 23	28	1,260	107	8,025	23	2,185	158	11,470	2.10 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	5 56	2.00 p.m., 24th	
Virginian	June 30	24	1,080	98	7,350	18	1,710	140	10,140	8.00 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	06	4.25 p.m., July 1	
Empress of Ireland	July 7	23	1,035	82	6,150	22	2,090	127	9,275	1.00 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	7 06	3.26 p.m., 8th	
Victorian	July 14	27	1,215	98	7,350	19	1,805	144	10,370	4.50 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	3 16	3.24 p.m., 15th	
Empress of Britain	July 21	23	1,035	102	7,650	24	2,280	149	10,965	9.45 a.m.	8.06 p.m.	10 21	3.25 p.m., 22nd	
Virginian	July 28	23	1,035	86	6,450	22	2,090	131	9,575	9.20 p.m.	9.20 p.m.	none.	3.00 p.m., 29th	*
Empress of Ireland	Aug. 4	20	900	99	7,425	21	1,995	140	10,320	8.20 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	11 46	2.15 p.m., 5th	
Victorian	Aug. 11	27	1,215	88	6,600	13	1,235	128	9,050	4.30 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	3 36	3.45 p.m., 12th	
Empress of Britain	Aug. 18	23	1,035	177	5,775	19	1,805	119	8,615	5.25 a.m.	5.15 a.m.	.....	12.00 p.m., 18th	*
Virginian	Aug. 25	27	1,215	99	7,425	19	1,805	145	10,445	11.30 p.m.	11.30 p.m.	.....	3.50 p.m., 26th	*
Empress of Ireland	Sept. 1	20	900	24	6,300	15	1,425	119	8,625	7.48 a.m.	8.06 p.m.	12 18	3.15 p.m., 2nd	
Victorian	Sept. 9	26	1,170	86	6,450	23	2,185	135	9,805	5.25 a.m.	5.25 a.m.	....	10.40 p.m., 9th	*
Empress of Britain	Sept. 15	24	1,080	90	6,750	21	1,995	135	9,825	7.00 a.m.	7.00 a.m.	.....	2.25 a.m., 16th	*
Virginian	Sept. 22	24	1,080	103	7,725	34	3,230	161	12,035	1.45 a.m.	5.21 a.m.	3 36	11.00 p.m., 23rd	
Empress of Ireland	Sept. 29	21	945	76	5,700	22	2,090	119	8,735	8.00 a.m.	8.06 p.m.	12 06	3.35 p.m., 30th	
Victorian	Oct. 7	25	1,125	115	8,625	21	1,995	161	11,745	4.20 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	3 46	2.00 p.m., 8th	
Empress of Britain	Oct. 13	24	1,080	97	7,275	29	2,755	150	11,110	12.25 p.m.	8.06 p.m.	7 41	2.45 p.m., 14th	
Virginian	Oct. 20	27	1,215	103	7,725	26	2,470	156	11,410	11.10 p.m.	11.10 p.m.	.....	2.65 p.m., 21st	*
Empress of Ireland	Oct. 28	19	855	91	6,825	26	2,470	136	10,150	11.20 a.m.	11.45 p.m.	12 25	6.00 p.m., 29th	
Victorian	Nov. 3	26	1,170	123	9,225	29	2,755	178	13,150	1 40 a.m.	11.45 p.m.	22 05	7.20 p.m., 4th	
Empress of Britain	Nov. 10	27	1,215	101	7,575	30	2,850	158	11,640	3.40 p.m.	11.45 p.m.	8 05	7.15 p.m., 11th	

* Trains held for connection.

THE BANK ACT.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (Simcoe). Now that we have come to a definite understanding as to when the House will adjourn, I desire to ask two questions, one of which is: Does the Minister of Finance intend to deal with the Bank Act before we adjourn? I assume it will be impossible for the minister to do so, but I shall be glad to hear from him on that point. My second question is: Can the Minister of Finance assure the House now that when we resume after adjournment the Act relating to banks and banking will be disposed of during the balance of the session? The minister pointed out before that press of business prevented it, but I would anticipate that when we reassemble in July there will be an opportunity. I trust the minister will be able to assure the House that the matter will then be taken up and disposed of.

Mr. FIELDING. I doubt if there will be the opportunity my hon. friend suggests when we reassemble in July. I would like to keep an open mind on that, but for the present I do not anticipate that we will be able to proceed this session, either during the present part of it or when we resume, with a general revision of the Bank Act. I have given notice of another Bill respecting the Bank Act, the purpose of which is to continue the bank charters for a period of one year. The charters will expire at an early date and it is most desirable from all points of view that whatever we may do hereafter these charters should be continued for that period. This Bill will be brought forward before the recess, but as to what may happen at the later stage of the session I do not wish to speak too definitely; my impression is that the House will have its hands very full at that time, and will not have time to proceed with a general revision of the Bank Act.

CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF BONDS.

Mr. GRAHAM moved that the House go into committee to consider certain proposed resolutions respecting aid to be granted to the Canadian Northern Railway Company for the construction of lines of railway therein mentioned. He said: Mr. Speaker, in rising to move that you do leave the chair, in order to proceed in committee with the resolutions standing in my name, I feel that these resolutions not only are of great interest to the people of Canada, but include a bargain which when consummated, will be of the utmost advantage to the entire Dominion. Those who have not visited Canada from one end to the other will perhaps not be so thoroughly seized with enthusiasm as those who have, as to the present prospects and future greatness of the country in which we live. I feel confident that the fathers of confederation scarcely dreamed of the fabric that was to be erected on the foundations which they laid. Not only are Canadians enthusiastic over our country, but those who come to us from all parts of the world are deeply enthusiastic, and I think the most loud in their proclamations of the natural wealth and advantages of Canada are those who have come to us from across the border, from the south.

When I became Minister of Railways and Canals, I set about trying to inform myself as to what were the necessities of Canada from a transportation standpoint. I was thoroughly convinced, and I have been more than confirmed in that view, that one of the most interesting problems we had to solve and one which was of the deepest import to our people was that of how to get their goods to and from market quickly and at a fair rate. The people who have quick and cheap transportation in any country, if the country be any good. are the people who are prosperous, and every farthing we can cut from the price of the carrying of a product to market adds something to the value of the labour that brings forth that product.

In travelling through the west during the past season, I endeavoured to secure and assimilate all the information I could get in reference to this great problem. I found that we had several United States lines running into the west and giving certain accommodation. I found that the pioneer road, the Canadian Pacific railway, had stretched its branches in many directions, and was giving a good service over two main lines, the main line proper and that by way of Crowsnest Pass, and that the people it reached, while sometimes complaining of what they thought were exorbitant freight rates were nevertheless pretty well served. I found too that the Grand Trunk Pacific had a magnificent line from Winnipeg to Edmonton. I think it is not exaggerating to say that it is the best line of new construction ever built on the continent of America. I might go further, but I think that is sufficiently strong. That line at present is not only stretching on to Prince Albert, but is also reaching out with its branches. This year the Grand Trunk Pacific is building as its programme in the west something like 700 miles, the Canadian Pacific railway about the same, and the Canadian Northern railway approximately the same. That is a large mileage for construction in one year, considering the population, but not a great mileage, considering the vast expanse of territory. In addition to these two I found in the Canadian west to the north that the Canadian Northern railway had a system including no less than

4,000 miles of railway. That in itself is a great system, serving largely the territory to the north; it runs through what to my mind will eventually become a centre of mixed farming and dairying for the Dominion of Canada. The Canadian Pacific railway stretches through to Vancouver. From Prince Rupert the Grand Trunk Pacific stretches out eastward, to meet the main line at Wolfe's Creek, and by an arrangement with the British Columbia government, the Canadian Northern railway is now constructing a line which will reach from the Yellowhead Pass through the province of British Columbia down to the city of Vancouver. When this is completed, the west will be pretty well served as to main lines. That great country west of the Great Lakes will be connected by two main lines, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Canadian Pacific railway, with the Canadian ports in the east. Travelling through the western country and over the systems of railway there, one could not but be struck with the fact that while the Canadian Northern railway is serving a large territory, and a large number of people in gathering the products of the west, it had no way of sending these products to the east.

And I was impressed—and I believe the people of Canada will be impressed on making the same examination—with the necessity of having that system of 4,000 miles west of the great lakes connected as soon as possible with Canadian ports on the east. The Canadian Northern, in addition to its lines west of Winnipeg—the main line runing to Edmonton, and miles west —has a line stretching from Winnipeg to Port Arthur. From Port Arthur to Sudbury, or a few miles north and west of Sudbury, it has no connection. The present resolution which I am asking hon. gentlemen to consider will, among other things, provide for the furnishing of that link. At the present time, the Canadian Northern has, under the name of the Canadian Northern Ontario, a line running from Toronto to Sudbury, and from Sudbury to Sellwood, but it has no line connection further west. The connecting of the lines from Port Arthur eastward will give the city of Toronto, and all the province of Ontario another through route to the great west. Coming east from Sellwood it is proposed that the line shall run eastward touching North Bay. Before it reaches North Bay and in that vicinity it will traverse the southern portion of what is known as the clay belt of Ontario. Now, Mr. Speaker, with all due deference to hon. gentlemen coming from other parts of Canada, let me say that there is as much good land in Ontario that has never been cultivated as there is in that province now under cultivation, and in all the discussion of opening up new territory we from this province have a deep interest in seeing that this uncultivated part of our province is brought under the plough. There is in that territory, according to surveys, from 16,000,000 to 20,000,000 acres of good clay soil. The Grand Trunk Pacific runs through the northern portion of it. The Canadian Northern will run more towards the southern border of this belt. The Canadian Pacific railway practically does not touch it at all. Coming eastward from Port Arthur, except, for a few miles, the Canadian Northern will serve an absolutely new country from that now served by either the Canadian Pacific railway or the Grand Trunk Pacific. Except in one or two instances, if I remember the figures correctly, this new line will not come nearer than twenty miles to any of the existing roads, and in many places it will be from 50 to 60 miles from the Grand Trunk Pacific and from 20 to 40 miles from the Canadian Pacific railway. Coming eastward and passing North Bay, the road will proceed down through the province of Ontario, opening up a new country until it strikes the county of Renfrew. And in my native county of Renfrew, it will give railway communication to places which have never had it all these years. There are parts of the county through which I was carried on horseback, and later rode on horseback, through which I hope, before long, to ride on a first class train.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Does it go to Pembroke?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. Coming eastward from Pembroke it crosses to the Quebec side at Portage du Fort, and then at Chats Falls crosses again into the province of Ontario, and comes on down to Rideau Junction, five miles outside of the city of Ottawa, where it joins the Niagara and Montreal line. Proceeding eastward from Ottawa it will go to Hawkesbury, the distance from the junction to Hawkesbury, if I remember well, being something like 56 miles. It will then cross the interprovincial bridge, about 1.1 miles in length into the province of Quebec. This bridge is not now of proper standard for the line and will have to be brought up to standard. Then, from a point on the Quebec side opposite Hawkesbury, it will proceed to the city of Montreal. The total mileage of this line will be approximately 1,000 miles, perhaps a little more, but I think not any less.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is the route stated in so indefinite a manner in the resolution?

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be stated more definitely, probably, in the Bill. The route has not been altogether approved by the Railway Department, but most of it has

been. The company will create terminals in the city of Montreal.

Now, as to the provisions of the resolution: In the first place, it is a 3½ per cent, fifty-years bond that is guaranteed by the government. The road is to have 80 pound rails, and be a good standard road with modern bridges. The bonds are to be guaranteed by the government, but the Canadian Northern Company adds its guarantee, and stands between the government and any possible loss.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Does the government guarantee principal as well as interest?

Mr. GRAHAM. It guarantees principal as well as interest, and the Canadian Northern guarantees the government against any loss. It is really the Canadian Northern Ontario and a portion of the Canadian Northern Quebec. That portion built under the Canadian Northern Quebec charter is the 1·1 miles between Hawkesbury and Carillon.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the Canadian Northern guarantee include all its road with rolling stock?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the rolling stock is built under an equipment bond. After that, we will get the security, second to an equipment bond.

Mr. CROCKET. Is it equal to the standard of the National Transcontinental?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the standard is an 80 pound rail with the bridges up to the standard required by the Railway Department, and with a grade of ·95 going east and ·06 going west.

Mr. LENNOX. Subject to a qualification as to that?

Mr. GRAHAM. Such a qualification as you must have in the case of any line. If it becomes a physical or practical impossibility to get that grade, you have to put in a pusher grade, but only with the consent of the department before that can be done.

Mr. CROCKET. Then, the standard is not that for the St. John Valley Railway Company in New Brunswick?

Mr. GRAHAM. It might be. In New Brunswick, there is a pusher grade—at least one, I think, of one per cent and over—on the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider what would be the benefits of this measure to the country. It is said: We are spending a lot of money on deepening waterways and harbours, we have large projects before us in canals; why then, should more obligations be taken on in reference to railways? I think it will be conceded by any person who has given the matter any attention that when you find traffic increasing by water you will find it also increasing by rail, and vice versa. There seems to be a law that where you have facilities for traffic and transportation by rail and by water, those facilities draw trade from other routes, where the double advantage does not exist; the water traffic in no way interferes with the rail transportation. Now, beginning at the west, the company gives a first mortgage on all this line, with two or three exceptions.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the minister comes to that, I would like him to say what he would care to say upon the question of the necessity of this line, and also give us his views as to the necessity of a guarantee. What I mean is, that I think these two subjects ought to be considered by parliament in dealing with this matter. In the first place, what public necessity of this country will be benefited by the construction of this road; and in the second place, what necessity is there for a subsidy, assuming that the road is not only desirable but necessary?

Mr. GRAHAM. In regard to the first point, I think the conditions in Canada, with our rapid growth, and the fact that this company now has 4,000 miles of railway in the west, is increasing it rapidly, and is gathering up traffic, makes it absolutely necessary that there should be another line for the carriage of the products from the west to the east, as well as feeding that line from the east to the west. I believe there is a day of prosperity near at hand that will extend clear through to the maritime provinces, a prosperity which I do not think will be secondary even to that of the west, although we have not so much unoccupied territory. My own conviction is that we cannot get these lines constructed too rapidly to meet the absolute necessity that will then exist for the carrying trade of our own products, to say nothing of the carrying trade we might do for any other country. As to the necessity of a guarantee, this company might in years work this line through. They have done a great deal, but they have been aided by subsidies and aided by guarantees. But in order that we may have this line constructed, and constructed without undue delay, in a way that we shall have something to say about its construction, and in order that the company may be able to finance such an undertaking in the best possible method so that the freight rates may be based on the least possible cost of construction, I believe it is in the interest of the people who have to ship goods that the government should enable the company to borrow their money at the best possible rates in the Old Country. I do not believe,

Mr. Speaker, and I do not think any other member believes, that this guarantee will ever cost the Dominion of Canada a dollar; and if we can ensure the rapid construction of this road at the cheapest possible rate, merely by lending the name of the Dominion of Canada to the company to secure its money, I believe it is in the interest of transportation, and in the interest of cheap rates as well to lend it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the estimated cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. A standard road, $50,000 to $55,000 a mile.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Does that include rolling stock?

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not include rolling stock.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is there any clause in the contract which gives the government control of rates over this line?

Mr. GRAHAM. The control of rates will be absolutely in the hands of the Board of Railway Commissioners, as it is on all other railways in Canada at the present time.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Not the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Canadian Pacific railway is under their control by consent, though I think the company does not admit liability as a matter of law. I have expressed my opinion in the House before, and though I am not a lawyer, I believe they are legally under the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When the Manitoba government guaranteed the bonds of the Canadian Northern railway in that country there was a clause in the guarantee enabling the government to control the rates. It seems to me it is very desirable that there should be a clause in this contract, notwithstanding the Railway Commission, giving the government control of the rates.

Mr. GRAHAM. That might be a necessity in a province where they have nobody specially appointed for controlling the rates. But we have a board which, by statute, is given power to investigate the rates of all these companies.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It would apply to that company just the same.

Mr. GRAHAM. The control of the Board of Railway Commissioners does not apply to a provincial road. A company which gets its charter from the government of Manitoba would be under the control of Manitoba, if of anybody.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. The control of the traffic.

Mr. GRAHAM. That question has been in the courts. The Manitoba government put in a clause like this which has been effective in regulating the rates.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. This is an exceedingly important matter to the west. We have two railways now running north of Lake Superior which, in all probability, will meet the necessities of traffic for some years to come. Now in view of the trouble we have in the west, the objection I would make to guaranteeing these bonds would be the fact that so far we have not been treated right in respect to freight rates. I do not care so much about passenger rates, I refer particularly to freight; and it is high time that this government, or the Railway Commission, took some steps to regulate freight rates in the western country. It does not make any difference if there are a dozen roads, unless you have competition; we want these roads to be competing lines. We have seen these roads making an agreement by which they all charge the same freight rates, and so far we have not received much advantage from the new line. The freight rates are too high, and it is time that this government, through its commission or some other means, should take steps to regulate the freight rates in that country.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course the government of the Dominion has given a good deal of consideration to the question of dealing with the tariff of rates on railways. However, to be sure that there should be no discrimination as against Canadian ports, you will find a clause in this agreement that at no time must the rates via this line exceed the rates via lines to an American port. Now, coming to that ten-mile section, what is called the Hutton Branch, in the vicinity of Sudbury and Sellwood, I may point out that there is already on that ten-mile branch, it being a portion of the line from Toronto, certain securities for which a mortgage has been given. But in order to secure the government on that ten miles, the company is depositing with the government other securities on their Canadian Northern and Quebec line to the extent of $35,000 a mile for this 10·6 miles. Now from Hawkesbury we have a second mortgage. The security on that runs out in twenty years, and then ours becomes the first mortgage. In the meantime the first mortgage bonds on another portion of the line to the extent of $35,000 a mile, are deposited with the government. On the line from Hawkesbury to Rideau Junction, about 61·4 miles, the same thing occurs. That is a portion of the line chartered from Niagara to Montreal. Certain securities have been issued on the line, including this piece from Rideau Junction to Hawkesbury, and

the company deposits with the Minister of Finance these securities that have already been issued but not sold, to the extent of $35,000 a mile. Although the mortgage is not a first mortgage on this portion of the road, under the guarantee, these bonds that the government will hold are first mortgage bonds, and the government's security, in addition to holding these, comes second on this line. The same thing applies to the 1.1 miles of the bridge. I may say that the security held by the government is, with this exception, a first mortgage from Montreal to Port Arthur, and that it ranks as a second mortgage on the entire system from Niagara to Montreal.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What are they allowed to issue on the line from Niagara to Montreal? We require this information to understand our security, which ranks after it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the amount is $30,000 a mile, if I remember rightly. I am speaking from memory, but I can give that information in a little while.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is any part of the line built?

Mr. GRAHAM. The part from Hawkesbury to Ottawa, 56 miles, is constructed. The bridge is constructed across from Hawkesbury, but it will not answer the purpose without improvement or reconstruction. In addition to this, it is provided that the government may, after two years of operation, pay the interest on these bonds, and if they do this interest is added to the principal and becomes part of the guarantee for which the government has security and must be repaid by the company to the government.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Is it 'may' or 'must'?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it is 'may.'

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). We 'may' only pay?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. My own opinion is that we will pay it if you ask me for my interpretation of it. It generally turns out that way.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We will pay for some time to come.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not for long, but for two years. Suppose that what my hon. friend says actually came to pass, what would be the result? In the first place, it has been said that holding the securities of the line from Niagara to Montreal in part, in order to secure ourselves, we would have to step in and buy the line or satisfy the holders of the first mortgage on that line. Supposing that were the case, we would then have what many people in Ontario think we ought to have—a line directly connecting with the Intercolonial railway, running through the province of Ontario to the city of Toronto, and we would have it cheaper than any line was ever built for. Suppose that there was a default in the interest on the main line from Montreal to Port Arthur, what would occur? The government would have the road then, too. We would have Halifax, St. John and Sydney hooked up with the Intercolonial railway, and this line clear through to Port Arthur, we would have a through line belonging to the Dominion of Canada, and that is what a lot of people in this country would like. Looking at it in every way, I come back to the point again that Canada cannot lose a farthing, because under this proposition the worst that might happen would be that the company would default, and if they defaulted it would in the opinion of some people be the best thing that could happen to the Dominion of Canada.

Then, we get to the city of Montreal, where the company engage to provide terminals. The city of Montreal is the great commercial metropolis of Canada. It must remain the gateway to a very great extent of the commerce both inward and outward for our country. It is a striking fact, Mr. Speaker, and one for congratulation as well, that the increase in the value of property in the city of Montreal has been as rapid during the last ten years as the increase in almost any city in the whole of Canada, including the western cities. It is due largely to the fact that Montreal is the commercial metropolis, and that the prosperity of Canada as a whole is reflected in the growth of that city. The Canadian Northern engages to provide terminal facilities in Montreal.

Then we come to this other proposition, and it is of some import, I think, Mr. Speaker. At the present moment the Intercolonial railway runs from Sydney, Halifax and St. John, and through intermediate points to the city of Montreal. For forty miles east of Montreal, to what is known as Ste. Rosalie, it runs over the Grand Trunk railway. We have a running arrangement with them and also an arrangement for the interchange of traffic. We pay the Grand Trunk Railway Company $140,000 a year in connection with this arrangement. Last year the Intercolonial railway made, as its share of the traffic received from and given to the Grand Trunk railway, $1,600,000. The arrangement is a good thing for the Intercolonial railway, for, without being fed with some traffic gathered up somewhere the receipts of the state-owned railway would be materially lessened. In a few years the Grand Trunk railway will undoubtedly be urging that that arrangement be abrogated. They will have the Grand Trunk Pacific, with a branch into Montreal, built by somebody, and they will have the Grand Trunk Pacific crossing at Quebec to Lévis and running eastward. They will

urge strongly with some degree of reason that they ought to be allowed, as the Grand Trunk Railway Company have a deep interest in the Grand Trunk Pacific, to make connections for traffic with the Grand Trunk Pacific. That traffic arrangement is so drawn that this government, or whatever government is in power, can cancel it, but the company cannot.

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, I wanted to assure my hon. friends first that there would be something left for them to do when they got in. We are not called upon now to consider the abrogation of this arrangement with the Grand Trunk, but we can see that in the future it will be urged very strongly. But even if it is not, the Canadian Northern must have an Atlantic seaboard outlet. It has none unless it builds one. We have one to offer. If it be necessary in years to come to abrogate that arrangement, then we have a clause in this contract by which we will be free to ask the Canadian Northern, and it will be compelled to give us, an arrangement for an interchange of traffic at the city of Montreal. No person in the east and no person in the west will question for a moment the advisability of having the state-owned railway in close connection with some railway that has a line through from ocean to ocean. It will help traffic east and west, and it will help Canadian ports as well. I come back to my other proposition, to reiterate, and I say it with all sincerity, that I believe the time is at hand when the eastern part of Canada is going to enter upon an era of prosperity such as it has not known for years. I hope before the House rises to lay before hon. members another small project for gathering under the wing of the state-owned railway certain lines that will bring traffic to that road and will assist under this arrangement in feeding the line, that will give traffic to and take traffic from us in the years to come.

I did not intend to speak at such length. I commend this proposition to the House in every way; I believe it is in the interest of the people of Canada; I believe it is in the interest of the people of the west, but not more so than in the interest of the people of the east. I might just say in this connection that the company is also to build a line, although it is not in this contract, from the Georgian Bay to connect with their main line so that during the summer season they will have a through lake and rail route, as the other roads have. This is a big project, but Canada is accustomed to large things. I believe it is an undertaking in the interests of the people. It will not cost Canada to my mind anything except the fact of her liability in guaranteeing these bonds, which the financial world will, I think, understand as the Canadian

Northern people have not yet defaulted on bonds, and I think they will not in the future. I have every confidence that this line will be a good and paying line, and that when it is completed we in Canada will find that the government did a wise thing, and did not do it any too quickly in order to provide for the growing interests of the carrying trade of this great Dominion.

Mr. CARVELL. When will it be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not for over four years.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there any proposal in connection with this scheme for the extension of the Canadian Northern east of Montreal by the construction of a new line to St. John or to Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not in connection with this scheme.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the estimated amount of the security that will be held by the government over the amount of their guarantee?

Mr. GRAHAM. We have a first mortgage on the line from Montreal to Port Arthur with such exceptions as I have mentioned. We hold first mortgage bonds to cover this. We hold a second mortgage on the balance of the company's line in the province of Ontario from Niagara to Montreal, and we hold behind that the guarantee of the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister surely made an estimate of the value of these securities.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is very hard to estimate the value of the security of the Canadian Northern backing to a note. My own opinion is that it is absolutely unassailable. Then we have the security of the line from Niagara to Montreal, a second mortgage on that which will be at least worth say $10,000 or $15,000 to $20,000 a mile. Then we will have a first mortgage on the line from Montreal to Port Arthur, as I have mentioned, which, to my mind, will represent from $50,000 to $55,000 a mile.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is it not a fact that there is not a foot of the road built from Niagara to Toronto; is it not all in the air?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a line under construction now from Niagara to Montreal, and there is quite a portion between Toronto and Montreal now constructed, and it is being rushed as rapidly as possible. The right of way between Niagara and Toronto has been purchased.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). In the construction of the road from Niagara to Montreal, is it the intention to utilize some old roads that have been purchased by the company? Are these given as security also?

Mr. GRAHAM. Just what old roads?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The Rathbun road from Sydenham to Deseronto. Is that given as security?

Mr. GRAHAM. Bonds have been issued on that line and we would only hold a second mortgage on it anyway. I would like time to look into that particular thing my hon. friend speaks of, as I do not quite agree with him on it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the House goes into committee, I would like to express my regret that a measure which the minister regards as so important to the welfare and progress of the country and to the interests of transportation in Canada should have been delayed until we have been six months in session. Every one agrees that transportation is, perhaps, the very most important problem that is before the Canadian people to-day, and that very fact would seem to be a reason why this proposal should have been brought down earlier in the session, when parliament would have been able to give it very much closer consideration and attention than seems to be possible on the eve of an adjournment.

I asked the minister in the first place as to the necessity or the advisability of the road, which would appear to be a condition precedent, and the minister has not seen fit to answer me except in the most general terms. I will give him an idea of what I had in mind. We have between the east and west of Canada a certain stretch of country that has no appreciable population at present, and that is not likely to have, for a good many years. We have one line of railway, the Canadian Pacific railway, already in operation across that territory for some twenty-five years past. We have in process of construction across that uninhabited territory the Grand Trunk Pacific running farther north, and I hope it will be found that it runs through a country which may be able to sustain population. I entirely agree in the suggestion that was made by an hon. gentleman on this side during the remarks of the minister, that building two lines of railway where one is sufficient to carry the traffic is an economic waste, and never does reduce cost of carriage. I think that is an unanswerable statement. It is well known that where you have two lines of railway where one is enough to do the work, there is an economic waste, and you are not doing any good to the man who produces the commodities which are shipped over these railways. As I understand the present situation, that portion of the Canadian Pacific railway lines which extends between the populated east and the populated west of Canada is capable of carrying five times the present traffic which passes over it. In other words, before it would be necessary to double-track that road, its traffic could be increased five-fold. It does not seem to me to be possible that under these circumstances, the construction of a third road is likely to lead to any diminution in the freight charges, because the Railway Commission, or a committee of the government for that matter, in considering freight charges, must have regard to the fixed charges upon the road, and must always make the freight charges sufficient to meet the operating expenses and the interest upon the bonds, as otherwise the road would be placed in bankruptcy, or would have to be taken over by the bond creditors. I had expected that the minister would have given us some reasons why, over that stretch of four or five hundred miles of territory, a third road is considered necessary at the present time. I know it is not worth while to review what might have been done in the past, but I believe it would have been good business for the Dominion of Canada in the first instance to have brought the east and the west together by undertaking the management, and even the expense, of operating a road between the populated east of Canada and the populated west of Canada. In other words it would have been good policy to bridge over that uninhabited district which divides the east from the west and thus to bring together, so far as transportation is concerned, the east and the west in a way in which they are not now brought together. But there is nothing in that direction in the proposal before us. The proposal of the government is one which provides for the building of a third railway through this uninhabited country, where one of the existing railways is able to carry five times the traffic which passes over it at present. A condition of that kind is one which should have been adverted to by the hon. minister, and he should have presented reasons that would convince the House, in the face of these circumstances, of the necessity for building this road. I am certainly in favour of providing out of the finances of the country or putting upon the credit of the country any burden necessary to make our transportation facilities all they ought to be to meet the rapid growth and development of the country; but I believe in doing that along well considered business lines, and I do not believe in entering into a proposal of this kind or any similar proposal until it has been thoroughly worked out and considered upon economic lines. Subject to that condition, I am always ready to support the government in any proposal that will attain the end we all consider so desirable.

My hon. friend the Minister of Railways says that when this line is completed the west will be pretty well served. Six or seven years ago I said in this House that the Canadian Northern railway had even

then the status of a transcontinental railway. I know that we all marvelled at the wonderful enterprise of the men at the head of that undertaking, and I for one will be disposed to go as far as any man in aiding any undertaking brought to the attention of the House, which would make their work in providing transportation facilities for the people of Canada more effective than it is to-day. But when the Minister of Railways tells us that the needs of the west will be well taken care of when this road shall have been completed, I would like to tell him that I can hardly agree with that, because the west will require, probably in the not distant future, a road through the northern part of that country, along the very line through which it was originally proposed to build the National Transcontinental, but from which it was afterwards diverted. No one who heard or read the utterances of the right hon. the Prime Minister, and of his colleague at the time, when that proposal was first under consideration, can fail to remember that the road, as originally projected, was not to be a road between the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Pacific railway, where the transcontinental runs to-day, but a road through the northern part of that great western country which would open up an entirely new territory.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Does the hon. gentleman say that the time may come when four transcontinental railways will be required?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Five, six or seven.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I say that the northern part of that country for the developement of which it was intended to provide by the National Transcontinental railway, and which could have been thus provided for, has not been provided for, and as that great country increases and develops, I have no doubt whatever, that another transcontinental will be necessary. But I do not say that such a proposal necessarily involves the construction of a road across five or six hundred miles of territory where there is a road to-day capable of carrying five times the traffic that passes over it. This question is one which should be considered from a sound business and economic standpoint, and the money not wasted in providing for a third line where one is capable of doing all the work.

There are just one or two other considerations, because most of the matters to which I desire to allude can be minutely noticed when we come to deal with the separate sections. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) says that the increasing traffic will make this road necessary. He will remember that about two years ago, or perhaps last year, his views as to traffic on the Intercolonial railway, after the National Transcontinental was completed, were of a somewhat gloomy character. He did not look forward with such optimism to the prospects of traffic over the Intercolonial railway, when that traffic would in part have been diverted by the National Transcontinental as far as Moncton. And I think, to use his own graphic expression, he seems to consider it as essential that the Intercolonial railway should be hooked up to some other great railway for the purpose of securing traffic. I do not know whether he is building this road for the purpose of hooking up the Intercolonial railway to it. If that be his object I think that the House is reasonably entitled to some information as to the conditions under which that hooking up is to be effected, and as to whether the Intercolonial railway is to be controlled by this proposed road or occupy a responsible position with regard to it.

My hon. friend was reminded of the necessity of control of the rates. It is true we have a Railway Commission, and I am not sure that the control of the rates afforded by that commission can be improved upon. I do not think much of the minister's idea of the control of rates by competition, if that was in his mind when he spoke; but so far as the provisions of the contract with respect to rates are concerned, in my opinion they are utterly ineffective. I do not believe that the concluding paragraphs of these proposals, paragraphs 13 and 14, will have any effective operation at all. I have examined, as well as a layman could, the effective agreements between railway companies, as to the routing of traffic, and so far as I have been able to read in books and gather in conversation from men familiar with the subject, such agreements in the end do not usually prove effective, and the traffic in the end will go just where the conditions call for it to go. I am of the opinion that it will go pretty much, if not altogether, irrespective of such agreement as is contained in these proposals. I do not want to deal with matter foreign to these proposals, but I might point to a statement made by the hon. minister himself, and certainly by his predecessor, as to arrangements made between the Intercolonial railway and the Grand Trunk railway which amply prove the truth of the statement I have just made. We find that the Grand Trunk railway—which after all is the same practically, though not technically, as the Grand Trunk Pacific—is at present enlarging its terminals in the United States, and acquiring other terminals there, and is basing its action in that regard and its arguments before the legis-

lative bodies in the United States upon the grounds that these terminals are to be provided for the purpose of handling the traffic gathered up in Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan.

It is perfectly obvious to any hon. gentleman who knows the provisions of those agreements that the government are helpless in that matter. They may be helpless in that matter for a reason which cannot be urged under this agreement because I observe here that the provisions as to routing traffic are to be embodied in a stipulation to which not only the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company is to be a party, but the Canadian Northern railway itself is to be a party. If that is necessary in this agreement surely it was ten times more necessary in the agreement which was made between the government of Canada and the Grand Trunk Pacific, and yet my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals, although he was not in the House at the time, will remember that we urged on the government the absolute futility of any such stipulation as was embodied in the agreement between the government and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, unless the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself was made a party to that stipulation, and became bound thereby. That we were right on that occasion is demonstrated by the action of the government at the present time, if the agreement is of any value at all, which I greatly doubt. But so far as control of rates and routing of freight are concerned, I hope I may be wrong in the opinion I entertain, but I do most thoroughly and sincerely entertain the opinion that in the end these provisions will be found absolutely ineffective, and that the routing of traffic will proceed according to conditions and influences altogether outside of any such stipulation.

The Minister of Railways made one other suggestion which indicates that this agreement is of a very remarkable character; he says that it is a good agreement for the country if the company does not default, and it is even better for the country if the company does default.

Mr. GRAHAM. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is an even better agreement for the country if the company does default, and fails to carry out the stipulations which the government thinks it worth while to insert in this contract, that seems to me to be a sound and strong argument why some policy other than that now suggested should have been embarked upon by the government. If the default of the company is to be a good thing for the country, what is the reason for entering upon these stipulations, a non-enforcement of which will be a good thing for the country? I venture to say to the minister himself that in making that statement he has made a very strong argument against his own proposals this afternoon. However, when we come to consider this clause by clause and paragraph by paragraph I shall perhaps have something more to say upon that particular point. In the meantime, I can only express my regret that upon some matters which I regard as of very exceeding importance, in this connection the Minister of Railways and Canals has been so reticent and silent this afternoon.

Hon. JOHN HAGGART (South Lanark). Mr. Speaker, with the former part of the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), in which he describes the magnificent country which this railway is going to serve, I perfectly agree. We take pride in the Northwest, and its development. Of that country the Conservative party have reason to be proud because it was first opened by them, and the railway development of the great Northwest is due entirely to their policy.

As to the necessity of this railway, we have had very little reason given by the Minister of Railways. When we come to look at the route of the road to be built from Montreal up to Port Arthur, we find that as far as Sudbury it is not at any point more than 7 or 8 miles from the Canadian Pacific railway, and for most of the distance it is within two or three miles of that road. Did the minister have any conversation or any communication with the Canadian Pacific railway or with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway after inducing the parties to subscribe capital for the purpose of building the road, before he agreed virtually to build a road for a rival corporation to destroy or injuriously affect the property built by these subscribers, to a certain extent with their own money?

Why does the minister ask for the building of this particular road? If the country required the transportation we would be perfectly willing to grant it. Transportation is the problem which confronts this new country at the present day. Is it a necessity to double the road from Port Arthur down to Montreal almost along the line of the Canadian Pacific railway for the purpose of developing that country? It is true that the Canadian Northern railway are a very energetic and enterprising company, that they have built with assistance or out of their own money, I do not know which, and acquired, nearly 4,000 miles of railway in the Canadian Northwest, that they have made arrangements with the British Columbia government for making connections with the seaboard on the Pacific and that they have a railway from Winnipeg down to Lake Superior, and

intend to have a connection, I think the minister said, from Victoria harbour down to Montreal, utilizing the same route as the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway intend to utilize. It may be in the interests of the country, there may be a reason, but none has been advanced by the Minister of Railways for the necessity of this new line of road. It may be that even in a country where there are no present requirements for a railway, a well managed and enterprising line can create a business which will justify the building of the road, but if there is no necessity for anything of the kind why should we injure capital which has already been invested in other roads and interfere with those who have put their money into these undertakings? The minister says that the Canadian Pacific railway passes to the south of the magnificent clay belt of northern Ontario, that this road goes through the middle of it, and that the Grand Trunk Pacific railway goes to the north of it. The proposed route of the Canadian Northern road from Pembroke up to Sudbury passes at the clay belt within six or seven miles of the Canadian Pacific railway, not more than that.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is altogether wrong in his distances between the Canadian Pacific railway and this road.

Mr. HAGGART (South Lanark). Then the map placed upon the table by the minister is wrong. According to the map it is within a mile of the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. For 50 or 60 miles it is fairly close.

Mr. HAGGART. At no point is it more than ten miles away.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are points on the two lines that are 50 miles apart.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Then, the minister should lay before the House a correct map. It is impossible that they can be 40 or 50 miles apart. It may be 40 or 50 miles from the Grand Trunk Pacific, but if you are going from Pembroke up to Sudbury, you cannot be further from another line than 15 or 20 miles. And the map the minister has furnished shows that it is only 15 miles. If you want to develop the country, run your road through parts of the country that are not served already. I consider the present location of this road an injustice to existing railways. For the whole distance from Montreal to Port Arthur it is virtually a paralleling of the Canadian Pacific railway. It is a direct injury to that company and an attack upon capital which this country solicited to be invested in their undertaking. I would not care about that company, or the injury to capital if it could be shown that this scheme was necessary for the development of the country. But nothing of that kind can be shown. There might be some sort of excuse for it if there were any control of rates. The minister tells us that the Railway Commission control rates. They do to a certain extent, but far more efficient control would be gained by a direct bargain with the company giving the government the right to reduce rates without appeal to the Railway Commission, such a bargain as was made in British Columbia and in Manitoba.

There is another point. There is to be a road from Montreal to Toronto. A part of this line is built from Montreal to Hawkesbury bridge and from Hawkesbury bridge to Ottawa. You exchange securities. They give bonds of $30,000 or $35,000 a mile on a road already completed for the purpose of securing a guarantee on the part to be completed. We have had no statement as to what the cost of the road is to be. In a general way it will cost about $50,000 a mile. But you notice the absence of anything about terminals in this arrangement. Are we to have security on terminals?

Mr. GRAHAM. At Montreal?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not include the terminals at Montreal?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It does not include the terminals in any city—Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto or Hamilton. What is the good of the security on a road when your security does not include certain parts of the road, and also does not include the terminals? The minister says it would be a good thing if this road to Port Arthur were made an extension of the Intercolonial, and run as a government enterprise. It has long been the ambition of the east to get a connection of that kind. And it may be a good thing; but I have had something to do with the Intercolonial, and I think my hon. friend (Mr. Graham's) experience with a government managed road, before the commission was appointed, must convince him that such a thing would be a bad investment for the government. We are not only to have this magnificent line of communication with the northwest, but we are to have a new line in New Brunswick, a shortening of the road to St. John. I think that in the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, provision of this kind should have been made, because that line is the shortest line from Edmonton to St. John. It was folly, in my opinion, to build a road to Moncton and from Moncton to St. John merely to please certain people in New Brunswick. But that

is not all. The statement of the Minister of Railways threatens us with the introduction of resolutions taking over two or three more railways in the eastern provinces. I would like to know what railways they are, and what is the occasion of the step thus indicated. I think the real occasion is the prospect of an election in the fall. If the hon. minister can tell me of two or three railways in the maritime provinces that are in a financial position to justify the taking of them over by the people of this country and making them part of the Intercolonial, he will do something which I hardly expect, with all his capabilities, he is able to do.

We are a prosperous country, thanks to the development of the northwest, and thanks for that largely to the magnificent showing of the Canadian Pacific railway and its development. But why should hon. gentlemen opposite encourage that road? Their policy is not to take traffic from the west to the east over our own lines, but the doctrine they preach to the farmers of the northwest is the opening up of the markets to the south of us.

Mr. STANFIELD. They will drop that.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). They dare not drop it; they have to go on with it. These are the transportation developments they promise the people of this country. I long ago stated that the principal improvement in our transportation facilities that is now needed is water communication with the northwest to a certain extent, the building of the Georgian Bay canal. The building of that route would do far more for the country than the loaning of large sums of money as this government is doing. And what is it all for? It is to make friends of certain railway contractors at a time when their friendship may be most needed. This and other indications remind us of the desperate state to which hon. gentlemen opposite have been reduced. They propose the building of new lines of railway in a magnificent scheme of communication with the northwest, they indicate their intention of taking over a lot of railways in the maritime provinces, and they have promised an enormous expenditure for public works in many parts of the Dominion. These things show the desperate condition of the occupants of the Treasury Benches, and the impossibility of their developing a policy which will in a fair, honest and upright way appeal to the people of Canada.

As to the gentlemen who are making the application, I feel sympathetically inclined towards them. I recognize that the Mackenzie & Mann interests have done a great deal for Canada, and the energy they have displayed, and the success they have achieved is greatly to be commended. I do not think, however, that is a reason for us going into this undertaking at the present time, when we are so near a long adjournment, and going into it in this hasty way. I regret that the minister did not see fit to bring forward this proposition at a time when it could be carefully considered and discussed. It is impossible that this matter should get fair consideration now, not only by reason of the state of the session, but because the minister has been so reticent in what he has said this afternoon. He has given no information to enable us to decide upon the merits of this scheme. One would think that in a matter of this kind where securities are offered to us, one of the first things the minister would tell us would be the probable cost of the road.

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave that to the House. I was asked by the hon. member for Lambton (Mr. Armstrong), what would be the cost of the road, and I answered that a certain standard of road, as laid down in this contract, will cost at least $50,000 a mile, and perhaps $55,000.

Mr. LENNOX. The minister has not told us how that amount is arrived at, what surveys have been made. We have had a lot of experience in matters of this kind. In 1903, when the Transcontinental was proposed, we were assured that the government knew all about it then, and we are told now by the minister that it is estimated this will cost about $55,000 a mile. Is there any good basis upon which to believe that is correct? We were told that the Transcontinental was expected to cost from $25,000 to $28,000 a mile, and the expensive portion of it was in Quebec. So that from Quebec to Winnipeg it was expected to cost $25,000 a mile, and we were told that this estimate was based on ample surveys and investigation. But it turned out that that was not the case at all; it has turned out that that road, without counting a cent for interest, will cost over $100,000 a mile. Now, if it turns out that this road will cost, instead of $55,000, $100,000 a mile, where will we be at?

Mr. GRAHAM. The security will be better.

Mr. LENNOX. If it turns out that this road will cost $100,000 a mile, these gentlemen, just the same as the Grand Trunk Pacific, will come again, and when our money is invested in it we can't refuse. The minister has given us absolutely no reliable data upon which to form an opinion as to whether this is a good scheme in the sense of the security. Then the minister has made it evident, in his answer to the question of the leader of the opposition, that he has no idea as to what traffic is going to feed this road. He has pretended

to tell the House that there will be such a large volume of traffic as will necessitate the building of another transcontinental line. We already have the Canadian Pacific railway, which could handle vastly more traffic than they are getting, and we will shortly have the National Transcontinental railway, which will require to handle an enormous amount of traffic to pay any reasonable dividends, or else the people will have to pay enormous rates for transportation. We will have the Hudson Bay railway opened up, which will divert traffic to Hudson Bay. We have the Georgian Bay canal scheme before us, and a promise by the government that they are going on with that, paralleling this enterprise right along. We have the Welland canal scheme, and gentlemen in that country are depending upon the government to advance that scheme and make a great additional highway for the commerce of the west. Then we have the Jim Hill roads, all with their noses upon the international boundary, waiting for this reciprocity scheme to get through, when they will come in and absorb a very large quantity of our traffic. With this divided traffic, with more roads by far than are needed if all these communications are opened up, we will have these various lines impoverished to a considerable degree, and the result will be that the farmers of the west will be paying very large additional sums for transportation. Now, I feel that the government is not to be commended in bringing this scheme in at the present time and forcing it on the House. There is no one on this side of the House, I believe, that wants for a moment to oppose any scheme that will aid in the development of Canada but every member of the House has a right to ask the government to give us a reasonable opportunity to examine this scheme. If the minister proposes to put this through before we adjourn in a week or two hence, he is not giving parliament the opportunity we should have to investigate this matter.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). In view of the fact that a section of this line traverses a portion of my constituency, I feel it my duty to make a few observations. I agree entirely with what the minister has said regarding at least that portion of the line which traverses the territory with which I am acquainted. So far as the county of Renfrew is concerned, the section through which the proposed line will be built is a very fertile section, a largely populated section, and a section which, up to the present time, has been without railway communication. I feel, therefore, that I would not be serving the interests of my constituency if I were to offer any opposition to this scheme. I quite realize that one of the great problems of this country is that of transportation. We all know what the Canadian Pacific railway has done for this country. I believe that the Canadian Pacific railway, the building of which, I may say, was opposed very strenuously by our hon. friends opposite, had more to do with the development of this country than any other scheme that was ever projected. I do not wish to support any project that is going to be in any way detrimental to the interests of the Canadian Pacific railway, but I feel that, while this road may traverse the country in close proximity for a certain distance to the Canadian Pacific railway, yet I believe that with the great prospects which we have ahead of us, and in view of the fact that a large portion of the country through which the road passes is pretty well settled to-day, there will be room for both lines. I entirely agree with the remarks of my hon. friend from South Lanark (Mr. Haggart) as to the great importance of the water carriage routes in this country. When the Supplementary Estimates came down the other day I was very much disappointed to find that there was no appropriation for the commencement of the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. While the Supplementary Estimates amounted to some $17,000,000 and included in that amount there was some $2,000,000 for the Hudson Bay railway, however, there was not one dollar for the commencement of this great work which, to my mind, is one of the most important projects which has ever been contemplated by this country. I trust that the government will see its way clear, before the end of the present session, to bring down a further supplementary with a substantial amount for the construction of this great waterway which, in my view, would tend very materially towards the cheap transportation of the grain products from the west to the east. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I merely wish to state that I am in accord with this proposition which is now before the House.

Mr. GEORGE GORDON (Nipissing). Mr. Speaker, I would not be doing justice to the constituency which I represent did I not also say a few words in regard to this railway project. The hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) has said something with regard to that portion of the country through which this road will run —Renfrew and practically as far as North Bay. I submit that from North Bay to Port Arthur, the Canadian Pacific railway, as it now runs, does not fulfil the requirements for the development of that country. The country through which this new line is to pass from North Bay to Port Arthur cannot be served by the Canadian Pacific railway as now located. A great many members of this House, I am sorry to say, are not informed with regard to the

great extent of that country. They forget that although the distance on the map looks very short between the Canadian Pacific railway and where this line will go, it is not as short as it is represented to be. The Canadian Pacific railway from Sudbury to Port Arthur runs through a very rocky country, as those of you who have gone through that country are aware, and the location is too far south altogether of the great clay belt through which this new road will go to be of any service to it After passing North Bay, I understand the new line will go direct to the Sturgeon river, then up the Sturgeon river passing over to Lake Wahnapitae and from Wahnapitae into Hutton. In all that country from North Bay to Hutton there is good fertile farming land which cannot be successfully worked without railway facilities, and in addition to that there are immense quantities of standing timber. Looking upon the whole matter as I do, I cannot do otherwise than feel that it is a good thing for the country that this road is going to be built. With regard to the guarantee which the government has agreed to give to this company I have nothing to say other than this, that if the road cannot be got through that country for a less consideration, then I would have to endorse this proposition.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolutions.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was very anxious to have a first mortgage on the line between here and Montreal, as I thought it would, perhaps, be one of the most valuable stretches.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is a good deal in the suggestion of the minister that he wants such security that if default should be made and foreclosure had, he will have a continuous line from Port Arthur to Montreal, particularly as he is stipulating for bonds of a previous mortgage issue to the extent of $35,000 per mile upon the complete portion of the line between Ottawa and Montreal.

Mr. GRAHAM. From here to Hawkesbury.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the very consideration which the minister mentioned emphasize the importance that the mortgage should include the terminals? The minister puts it in this way. He will guarantee bonds upon the portion of the line already completed for the reason that we want a charge upon the whole line, because a charge upon a part of the line might be less valuable if we had to foreclose. My hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, Lanark) points out that if you have no mortgage upon the terminals and you have to foreclose, your line will be incomplete until new terminals are provided. Is not that exactly the point the minister makes?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is in a way. But, the terminals to be provided in Montreal will be very, very expensive, and to my mind the company could not finance these terminals if there was a first mortgage preceding the bonds they would have to issue. I would not be surprised if the terminals in Montreal city would cost sixty per cent of our entire guarantee on the line, and I do not think that is an extravagant estimate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Twenty-one millions.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not be surprised if the terminals in Montreal before they get through with them will cost that amount of money. I discussed the terminal situation with the company very thoroughly, and they argued that they could not finance terminals of that kind if they had a first mortgage standing against them, and that looks reasonable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It looks exceedingly reasonable from their standpoint, but the standpoint of the country has to be considered. If you do not have a charge upon the terminals you at least should provide some means by purchase or power of expropriation to get them in case you should have to take over the road. So far as I understand it, the road would be of little use to you without the terminals.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the road became our property.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When taking security of this kind, the only business way of looking at it is to consider the possibility of being obliged to foreclose. The minister has given a reason that appeals to me why it would not be practicable to include the terminals in this mortgage, but he has not given any reason for not providing means to acquire these terminals in case it becomes necessary to buy in the road.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not sure that there is not something in the agreement by which that can be worked out, but I have made a note of the matter and I will look into it.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Do you know the amount of prior securities issued on the road from Ottawa to Niagara, or the amount they have the right to issue?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it is $30,000 a mile.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). And you likewise do not take security on the terminals there?

Mr. GRAHAM. We take security on all their line which is included in this $30,000 a mile. I imagine that the terminal situation in Toronto will be similar to the terminal situation in Montreal. At present they have no terminals in Toronto and they

use the connection with the Grand Trunk, but I am told they are to provide other terminals that are not now in existence, and will not form part of this contract.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The first mortgage on that portion will be only $30,000 per mile.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think so.

Mr. LALOR. In addition to this, do they get land grants or subsidies from the provincial government?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they have a grant from the Ontario government in reference to some land in the clay belt. The portion of the line from here to Montreal got a regular subsidy, but we are extending the guarantee over all the line from Ottawa to Montreal, because we want to get first mortgage security on the entire line from Port Arthur to Montreal, as it would not be a continuous line without that.

Mr. LALOR. There is no cash subsidy from the Dominion?

Mr. GRAHAM Not other than I have stated.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I would remind the minister that the Canadian Northern railway have considerable terminals in the east end of Toronto at the present time.

Mr. GRAHAM. I should not have said they had no terminals in Toronto, but what I had in mind was the larger terminals which are contemplated.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). I would like to know how much the guarantee amounts to?

Mr. GRAHAM. Approximately 1,000 miles at $35,000 a mile.

Mr. SPROULE. That is a guarantee practically forever.

Mr. GRAHAM. The principal falls due in 50 years.

Mr. SPROULE. If the principal be not paid at the end of 50 years, we would be responsible for its payment?

Mr. GRAHAM. We guarantee the Canadian Northern Ontario railway, and we are guaranteed behind that by the Canadian Northern railway parent company itself. We have two guarantees. Suppose there were a default, then the Canadian Northern railway guarantee that the Canadian government will not lose. Suppose the Canadian Northern railway then defaulted, which I think is practically impossible, the worst that could happen would be that this line would become the property of the Dominion, and we would have a line which cost more than $50,000 per mile to build, at $35,000 per mile. We have the first mortgage.

Mr. GRAHAM.

Mr. BLAIN. I suppose there was some promise given as to when the railway would be constructed between Niagara Falls and Toronto, more particularly as the guarantee is to cover that part of the road, it being a second mortgage. When does the minister expect the work will be completed?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no information as to the building of the line between Niagara and Toronto. There are certain complications, but the line between Toronto and Ottawa is under construction, and the Canadian Northern railway will have a line from Toronto to Quebec.

Mr. BLAIN. The other part is very important for that section of the country. We did suppose that when the government was coming to the assistance of a company, it would see that this section of country was served by the construction of the road. My hon. friend will understand that a second mortgage upon a railway not yet constructed is not worth much. I would suggest that the minister should see that the company is urged to construct that part of its line. He says there are difficulties surrounding it. I suppose there are, but the company is occupying a place for the construction of a railway and doing nothing practically upon it.

Mr. GRAHAM. If I remember correctly, only a few weeks ago we got certain complications straightened out as to the entrance from the west in Toronto, and by common consent a route was approved into the city from the west.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Have you, independent of those securities, the guarantee of the company on its whole undertaking?

Mr. GRAHAM. In addition to this security of the Canadian Northern Ontario Company, we have the guarantee of the Canadian Northern railway. Where there are several securities on lines, the direct guarantee of the Canadian Northern railway is as valuable as if we had another mortgage on the top of the ones now existing on the western lines.

Mr. SPROULE. So far as I can judge public opinion, the sentiment is rapidly growing that we have reached the time when it is not the part of wisdom to grant more subsidies to railways, especially through portions of country already well served. This is presumed to be a valuable piece of road to carry the trade between the east and west, but at present we are struggling with reciprocity negotiations which are calculated, if they go through, to take a large portion of that trade to the south, and probably take it all. It seems to me, therefore, that while the government are providing on the one hand to secure the

trade from the west to the east, they are providing on the other to take it away. Has the Minister of Railways made any estimate of what is likely to be the traffic between the east and the west over these three roads when built? We have the Canadian Pacific railway and the National Transcontinental railway through that country, and now it is proposed to build another, and we are proposing to build this third line at the very moment when we are asked to pass a treaty which is likely to divert the traffic across the southern boundary. I am inclined to think that the people will regard this scheme of guaranteeing the bonds of a railway, to run through a section of country where it is not needed as rather profligate and an abuse of the power of parliament. If this road were to pass entirely through a new country which had no railway facilities, something could be said in its favour, but that is not the case. If I understood the remarks of the minister correctly, the intention is to run this line between the National Transcontinental railway and the Canadian Pacific railway away round north of Lake Superior. These roads are not built far apart, and the section of country is one not likely to afford much traffic, so that the road will have to depend on the traffic from eastern provinces to the west, and vice versa. Is the traffic in that new country likely to support three railways, and enable them to earn a fair return on the money invested? If it is not, we stand to lose by this guarantee. The minister should have submitted some approximate calculations showing what traffic is expected to go over this line, especially in view of the fact that the present railway running through that district is able to handle five times as much traffic as it is now getting. And he is doing this at a time, when if reciprocity be adopted, from 25 per cent to 40 per cent of that traffic will cross the boundary line, and not go over this railway at all. I do not think they are. We have it brought up in various ways in the country, and we frequently hear an expression of the opinion of the people regarding it. This is a large guarantee, and it is for a long time. It is not the sum total of what we will be forced to give because we will have to give many other railways subsidies in the future. They all tend to create an obligation on the country, and if anything should happen to the railway the country would have to make good its guarantee. I think the minister should have submitted to the House the clearest evidence that there is an urgent demand for this railway before the country would be satisfied that we were doing our full duty in supporting this proposed guarantee.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course the data as to the future necessities of the carrying trade of Canada will be large or small according to the faith we have in the development of the country both east and west. In introducing this resolution this afternoon, I explained the situation of this railway, that it has a system of 4,000 miles of railway in western Canada, with no independent outlet to its other system in eastern Canada, and that I was satisfied that it was absolutely necessary in the interests of both the west and the east that it should have this connecting link.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister seems to base his argument on faith. He must have gone to Sunday school as a boy, and must have remembered the passage: 'If ye have faith as a grain of mustard seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove and nothing shall be impossible unto you.'

Mr. GRAHAM. It is not a bad thing to remember.

Mr. SPROULE. He might have faith that he could bring the moon down here, but not many would believe his faith could accomplish it. When passing through that country did the minister take the trouble to look into the situation at Duluth, Superior, and Minneapolis, to ascertain what expenditures this company propose making there in view of the proposed reciprocity pact? I am told they are preparing for very heavy expenditures to receive the freight crossing the line there. That would of necessity reduce the amount of traffic for their main line. I presume the minister paid no attention to that, however, because it was not under way when he was in the west. It seems to me that the data upon which the minister is asking us to commit the country to an undertaking such as this, are very limited. Is there any agreement or undertaking with regard to any reduction of rates or anything of that kind?

Mr. GRAHAM. The rates on this road as on all roads in Canada under federal jurisdiction, are controlled by the Board of Railway Commissioners. We have a clause in the resolution which says that the rates from a Canadian point of shipment to another Canadian point, must not in any case exceed the rate to a corresponding American point. The hon. gentleman will remember that the Canadian Northern has no eastern terminals in the United States. The Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk railway have, but the Canadian Northern have not.

Mr. SPROULE. When Manitoba agreed to guarantee this company's bonds they secured a substantial reduction in the rates for the carriage of wheat. If the company were willing to do that for Manitoba I would assume that they would be willing

to do it for this government. If we were able to get the same proportionate reduction in the rates eastward from Port Arthur as this company granted on their rates in Manitoba, it would be a very great advantage to the people of both the east and the west.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that there is a great difference. In the case of Manitoba there is a short line to begin with, to get to a lake port. In the second place, Manitoba has no machinery for making or revising rates such as the Canadian parliament has devised for the control of rates through the Railway Commission.

Now, the Canadian parliament, as I have stated, has established a Board of Railway Commissioners to regulate rates and has provided them with all the necessary machinery for that purpose. No rate can be put in force until it has been approved by the board, and before a rate is made everybody can be heard. There is a clause in the Bill which I now have before the House—I hope I can get it through this session—which changes the time of notice from ten days to thirty days. So, in the case of any new traffic arrangement anybody concerned will have a month's notice and an opportunity to state his case within that time. The point I make is that there are so many conditions as to rates over the whole Dominion, that unless you have some body with expert assistance and all the machinery of investigation, and with full power in the matter, any attempted protection will be comparatively futile. In Manitoba, there were certain well established rates for a certain number of miles between certain parts—

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). About three times the other rates.

Mr. GRAHAM. Pretty stiff rates;—and the Manitoba government simply made terms concerning those rates. But there are no varying conditions as there are all over Canada. You cannot make a set of rates for the Dominion which will continue to be applicable. And this parliament or the Governor in Council has not the necessary machinery to deal with these matters. So, we have established a body which has all the machinery, and I think we cannot do better than leave it in their hands.

Mr. SPROULE. We know what the Canadian Pacific railway rates are from Port Arthur to Montreal. If we got the Canadian Northern to give a reduction of 2 cents a bushel in consideration of the guarantee, it would force a similar reduction on the part of the others. We have subsidized the other roads, and if they were forced to do this, there would be no great injustice done them, provided they could do it and still earn a reasonable rate on the money invested. And it would be a very substantial advantage to the people of the west as well as to the people of the east.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The question raised by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) in regard to freight rates is one of which the minister must, sooner or later, take cognizance. For instance, I think that the fifth class, commodity rate from Montreal to Winnipeg is 70 cents a hundred, and of that, the proportion from Port Arthur to Winnipeg is 40 cents a hundred. So that the getting of a special rate by the province of Manitoba on that guarantee is now working against the interest of the shippers now that we have the Railway Commission. If the commission has complete jurisdiction over this part of the route, I am satisfied that rate would be equalized a little down. The time is coming —I know it is heresy for me to say so here —when we shall give no more of these guarantees. There is no reason why this company should not get a guarantee as well as any other, because they have always acted in good faith with the country, they have built a very large mileage and have opened up a vast extent of new territory. To my mind, the most essential thing in connection with railway building in this country in the future, is the building of branch lines into territory now destitute of railway accommodation. The day of building or subsidizing competitive through lines of railway will soon come to an end. We shall then act as the older countries do, as France does, for instance, which country, years ago, took the view that the building of competitive railways was an injury to the country, a waste of capital, and that it was better to control the traffic and rates. It is plain that one road carrying all the business of three roads can carry more cheaply, and make more money than three roads, because there is only one set of fixed charges on which interest has to be earned. Some day we shall have to consider that in Canada, and then I think we shall assist in building up branch roads rather than subsidize long competitive lines across the country. The question of exchange of traffic will then come up. I did not hear the minister say that he was putting a clause in this Bill which would compel the exchange of commodity traffic. If that were in the railway law, every shipper knows, there would be no necessity for competitive railway lines. The question is not understood by the great majority of people, because they do not come in direct contact with the question. There are two rates on railways, the local rate and the commodity rate. The commodity rate is a low rate for car lots which extends over the line of that railway only, and the moment the traffic goes to another line

that other line will charge local rates. So, you cannot ship over two lines without paying an excessive rate. The day will come, no doubt, when that will have to be considered. In this connection, the commission has not met the expectations of a great many people. The west to-day is clamouring for reciprocity. Why? because they say to the east: When you come to ship stuff to the west you give a preference largely to the United States lines, and send in over those roads instead of the Canadian roads. There are roads that have not connected up with the Northwest as it is proposed now to connect up the Canadian Northern, as for instance the Grand Trunk. If you ask the Grand Trunk to put a car on their siding to ship stuff to the Northwest over the Canadian Pacific railway right, they refuse to do it. They will allow their cars to go to the west except by the American route. I think that is a question that should be considered by the minister, and, if he has jurisdiction, some slight exercise of the strong arm might help, or he might use a little persuasion with the commission to get them to change their ruling on that point. This action on the part of the Grand Trunk railway is a hardship to shippers. And the people in the Northwest, when they see cars coming from the other side of the line, consider that we in the east, especially the manufacturers are very unpatriotic, because they presume that it is done because it is cheaper to send by the United States rather by the north shore of Lake Superior, when, as a matter of fact, the freight rate is exactly the same. But the Grand Trunk railway has taken that position. The question has been brought before the Railway Commission and they have ruled that the Grand Trunk railway must have their way.

With reference to these terminals at Duluth I think the hon. member for East Grey has asked a question which should be considered. The Canadian roads are quite capable of holding their own with the Canadian government, and the American government or with any other government or corporation in the whole world. That may be a pretty broad statement. But the largest and strongest corporation in the world to-day, so far as I know, is the Canadian Pacific railway. When there was talk that our traffic was liable to go to the south, the Canadian railways took time by the forelock, and the Canadian Pacific railway and Canadian Northern railway are building terminals in Duluth—spending large sums of money there. By the way, does this guarantee cover the branch line they are building to Duluth?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I did not know whether the minister's charity extended that far.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not farther than Port Arthur.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). It is well to consider these questions very carefully. Having in view the fact that from now on, it will be better for us to confine the railway business largely to the extension of branch lines into unoccupied territory.

It is far better for them to have a number of branch lines built out there, than that there should be another transcontinental line, at least for a number of years, in view of the increased earnings which these branch lines will give the main line. If you have a number of branch lines you get a large quantity of freight from them, you have more freight to carry over the main line, and in the long haul the commission will give lower rates, and the products of the country will go cheaper over one line than over two or three. There is another question affecting the northwest. A few years ago Railway Commissions were established in some of the western states; I will take the state of Minnesota as an example. The state established a Railway and Warehouse Commission, which commission under their law, was to have jurisdiction over all the freight arising from one point in the state to another point in the state. The state commission claimed they had a perfect right to that control; whereas the federal commission only had jurisdiction over freight arising in one state and going into another state. That was unfortunate to some extent. The state legislature appointed men on that commission with largely socialistic views, and they proceeded to cut all the rates in the state of Minnesota one-half or one-third of what they were previously, establishing cheaper freight rates than were known anywhere else in the west. That tariff of rates has been published, and can be obtained by the Minister of Railways on applying to the secretary of the commission in St. Paul. A large number of these tariff schedules of the state of Minnesota have been sent broadcast all over the Canadian west, and that is the secret of a good deal of the discontent up there in regard to freight rates. For instance, the tariff establishing the freight rate in Minnesota is about one-half what it is in Canada for the same distance. Now, the other side of the story is that an appeal was taken against the Minnesota Railway Commission, the matter was fought out in the United States courts, and recently a judgment was given declaring that the schedules and freight rates of the state commission were of no value, that they were confiscatory in their nature, and con-

trary to a clause in the American constitution which says that private rights shall be conserved. The only thing I wish to say in conclusion is that I hope the minister will take up the question of exchange of traffic. I know he has put in several good amendments in the Bill, and I hope he will consider that some time, perhaps next session.

Mr. SPROULE. Has any agreement been made whereby the traffic by this route is to be handed over to the Intercolonial. I could see an advantage in doing that, if it became a feeder of the Intercolonial.

Mr. GRAHAM. At the present time we have an arrangement with the Grand Trunk for an interchange of traffic at Montreal; the government can terminate that arrangement at any time, but the Grand Trunk cannot. As I pointed out a short time ago, it will not be long before the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific will both be urging us for some modification by which they can handle each other's traffic. We are putting a clause in this agreement which says that when the government sees fit it can demand of the Canadian Northern railway, and they must consent, to make an agreement with the government to give and receive the traffic of the Intercolonial.

Mr. SPROULE. Why don't you do it now?

Mr. GRAHAM. We could not do it without breaking the traffic arrangements we have by which the Intercolonial, last year earned $1,600,000.

Mr. SPROULE. Has the government ever considered whether it would be advisable to extend the Intercolonial to the Great Lakes?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a big question. When we got to the great lakes we would probably have to get a line of steamers and go beyond the Great Lakes.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). In the Montreal 'Gazette' of yesterday I find this item with regard to the Canadian Northern railway route:

> Leaving Ottawa the line crosses the Ottawa river at Chats Falls into Quebec, passes through Norway Bay and crosses back into Ontario at Portage du Fort. It follows the Ottawa river to Pembroke, making a short line from Pembroke to Ottawa. At Pembroke the lines to Toronto and Port Arthur will diverge.

I see the map does not put it in that way, the map shows that it diverges at Ottawa.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think the reporter has got the point wrong. As a matter of fact the dividing line will be at Rideau Junction near Ottawa, and the Toronto line will go straight up as shown on the map.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

On resolution 10,

Mr. FOSTER. Are these bonds guaranteed before the whole line is complete?

Mr. FIELDING. The usual method is that the guarantee is prepared and delivered to a trust company, and after the sale of any portion of the bonds the proceeds are paid out from time to time as construction proceeds. The guarantee is actually prepared and placed in the hands of the trust company before the completion of the road.

Mr. FOSTER. And these guaranteed bonds are really to be disposed of in order to build the road?

Mr. FIELDING. Quite so.

Mr. FOSTER. How is the interest met until the time of the opening of the road for traffic?

Mr. GRAHAM. Further down my hon. friend will find that during the construction the company is to take care of the interest.

Mr. FOSTER. This really means, then, that outside of and beyond the $35,000,000 that is guaranteed the government meets the first two years' payments, making about $2,500,000, and the interest thereon, so long as it is not paid by the company itself; that is, it is an addition to the original subsidy?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. But not contemplated as a gift?

Mr. GRAHAM. Not contemplated as a gift. It becomes a part of the mortgage, and the repayment is secured by the mortgage to the government, and they pay interest on this interest for the two years.

Mr. FOSTER. These they are to pay at maturity?

Mr. GRAHAM. We relieve them of the interest for the time being for the first two years.

Mr. BLAIN. Will they be bound to purchase their equipment in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, yes, we will certainly put that in the agreement.

Mr. CROTHERS. What subsidies have already been granted by public bodies to any portion of these lines, and on what terms have these subsidies been granted?

Mr. GRAHAM. For the line east of Ottawa the usual subsidy without conditions, has been granted by this parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. For how many miles?

Mr. GRAHAM. The subsidy has been paid from Ottawa to Hawkesbury, which is about 56 miles.

Mr. SPROULE. At $3,200 per mile?

Mr. GRAHAM. They received a double subsidy, or nearly so. I think the Ontario government granted aid from Toronto to Sellwood.

Mr. CROTHERS. Oh, they granted a subsidy for 200 miles west of Sudbury.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not a cash subsidy. A land grant was given by the Ontario government some years ago, but just what position that is in at present I cannot say.

Mr. CROTHERS. The provincial government may have made that land grant on conditions which may have given them a previous claim upon the road.

Mr. GRAHAM. Oh, no.

Mr. CROTHERS. We surely ought to have information as to that.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will have a first mortgage; we will see there is no previous lien on the line in any way.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to get at the whole amount of subsidies, aids of any kind, that are paid, or to be paid, for any and all portions of this road that is now being bonded for $35,000 a mile. I want the amount of money the Dominion government has paid and what it is to pay, what amount has been given by the provincial governments and what by municipalities, if any, what amount in money, and what amount in lands. The minister must remember that a guarantee of $35,000 a mile for one thousand miles of railway situated as this is, is a very substantial contribution to the total cost of the road. Has the minister any estimate as to what the road will cost?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have the standard of the road here, and am told it will cost at least $50,000 a mile.

Mr. FOSTER. Is that without equipment?

Mr. GRAHAM. Without equipment.

Mr. FOSTER. We give $35,000 for each mile in the shape of a guarantee and beside that we are making two and a half millions of an advance to say the least, which will bring the total amount per mile considerably more than $35,000. We ought to know before this passes just exactly what aid this company is getting of any, and all kinds, what has been already paid on these portions built and what will be earned when the road is built.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will get all that information to-morrow.

On clause 12,

Mr. FOSTER. Does that include the whole Canadian Northern system?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, the parent company gives its guarantee.

Mr. FOSTER. It will be a company's covenant?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

On clause 3,

Mr. FOSTER. At what time was this clause drawn.

Mr. GRAHAM. This clause was drawn and redrawn. I would not like to say when it was finally completed.

Mr. FOSTER. When was it broached?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am afraid my hon. friend has something in his mind. This was finally drawn about two weeks ago.

Mr. FOSTER. When was it first broached?

Mr. GRAHAM. The first moment I discussed it with the Canadian Northern people, which must have been three or four months ago.

Mr. FOSTER. If the minister had to do it just now, I suppose that would be the first idea in his mind.

Mr. GRAHAM. No matter what else was in my mind, that would be in it.

Mr. FOSTER. Was this an after effect of conscience? It does seem odd to some of us that after doing all you possibly could do to draw traffic away from Canadian channels, in order to save your face you make a thirty-five million dollar grant to show the people how much you desire that all this transit should take place through Canadian channels. I think this clause is a pricking of conscience.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is one of the original ideas.

On section 14,

14. That the company shall enter into an agreement with the government to secure or establish or cause to be secured or established, suitable terminals for the company within the city of Montreal and agreeing on the request of the government to enter into arrangements with the Intercolonial railway for the interchange of traffic between the company and Intercolonial railway at Montreal, for such period as the Governor in Council may determine and upon such terms as may be agreed upon between the parties, and should

the parties fail to agree, terms shall be fixed by the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Any penalty attached to this?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it is difficult to work out a penalty.

Mr. DANIEL. I think it is generally understood that a large railway like this can really get freight over it routed in any direction it pleases. Some time ago Mr. Loud, of the Grand Trunk railway, gave testimony to that effect before some court which was trying to find out the reason why the Grand Trunk railway did not carry out an agreement made with the Intercolonial railway. Mr. Loud said that the Grand Trunk railway or any other railway could get almost the whole of its freight routed in any way it pleased. The provision here, therefore, is not a very strong safeguard. We have not had an opportunity of testing it with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific because the road is not built, but it would look as if this provision were really not much of a safeguard. I should think that if the government decidedly wished to insist on the freight going through Canadian channels this clause might be made stricter and more of a compelling clause.

Mr. McCOLL. I quite agree with my hon. friend who has just spoken (Mr. Daniel), that a railway company can have its freight routed as it likes.

There are six lines of railway running right along our southern border, namely, the New York Central, the Delaware and Hudson, the Rutland system, the Boston and Maine, and the Maine Central, connecting with the Quebec Central. They all terminate in Montreal. During the winter I have had an opportunity of becoming familiar with the conditions that prevail over in Vermont. In the struggle before the legislature to prevent the Central Vermont getting into Providence, Rhode Island, a great deal of stress was laid on the fact that a new trade would be gathered on the northern boundary to be carried to the seacoast, and that trade would be largely the result of the reciprocity treaty now under discussion.

We ought to have some much stronger clause to prevent Canadian traffic being diverted into American channels. I will venture the statement, without consulting any of my colleagues on this side, that the remedy for all this is a close running arrangement between the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Northern railway. My own opinion is that if we were to lease the Intercolonial railway to the Canadian Northern railway, or have it worked by that company on a joint working contract which would insure economy in its operation, the Intercolonial railway would become a valuable asset producing annual surpluses. That would settle the future of the Intercolonial railway for all time to come. I am aware that the people of the maritime provinces in particular believe in its being a government owned road because it was built in consummation of the union between these provinces and upper and lower Canada. While I agree that it is a really national road, would it not be prudent to deal with it now for all time to come by leasing it to the Canadian Northern railway, or making an arrangement with that company for joint operation, the ownership still to remain with Canada. That would insure to the Intercolonial railway all the traffic which the Canadian Northern railroad can produce and relieve this country from a very great burden. It would relieve also the Minister of Railways from a very arduous undertaking, and we can all sympathize with him because he has not only the ordinary duties of his department to attend to, but also the duty of managing a large railway or of organizing others to manage it. If we could make such an arrangement as I suggest, it would go a long way to reconcile the people of Canada to this additional burden laid on them by the guarantee of this very large amount of bonds to the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I think that this clause of the agreement should go back to the conveyancer. There is no penalty provided, but even if there were I doubt if that would help it. It looks very formidable, but if you had to enforce it, it would be very difficult to prove a breach; and when you did prove a breach, it would be more difficult to assess the damage.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It seems to me that it is the only provision which can possibly be made, and the effect would be this, that if the company violated its agreement parliament would be free to take any action it might think proper.

Mr. FOSTER. What action would you suggest parliament could take?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend could easily think what might be done. Parliament might take away certain privileges which the company might be enjoying.

Mr. FOSTER. What privilege for instance?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There might be many privileges. It would be easier to take action after the event than to anticipate now what action ought to be taken. If information came to parliament that this company was violating its bargain, parliament might legislate so as to impose penalties and to provide for a measure of damages, for a mandatory injunction or any other remedy which might be deemed proper under the circumstances.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why should not parliament deal with it now?

Mr. PUGSLEY. How?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If I were over there and were seeking to put this legislation through parliament, and had not any better reason than the Minister of Public Works has given, I think I would resign. It would be remarkable legislation to pass this Bill without any provision for penalty, or for a mandatory injunction or any of these other awful things the minister is speaking of, and then, after they had committed a breach of this innocuous paragraph, to come in afterwards and provide a penalty. No one ever heard of such legislation, at least I never did. If there are any penalties to be enforced, and mandatory injunctions to be asked for in the future on account of a breach of this provision, they should be set forth; any such provisions that might be made in the future by parliament, should be made now. I agree with the Minister of Public Works that it is difficult to devise a scheme to make this particular kind of a paragraph effective. We pointed out in 1903 and 1904 that a similar agreement made with the Grand Trunk Pacific would probably be wholly ineffective. In the first place it could be evaded and even if the company were proceeded against for a breach of it, I cannot see that the government could recover more than normal damages. Any railway company making an agreement of that kind need have little fear of any proceedings for a breach of it. I think it is generally understood between railway companies when they enter into arrangements of this kind, that they can be either evaded without any risk of an action, or, if any proceeding is taken, the company committing the breach has little to fear from any action in the courts. That is the testimony of people familiar with railway affairs, they are really of little use, and I think this agreement would have to be construed from the standpoint of the country very much as if this paragraph were not here.

Mr. DANIEL. The minister asked for suggestions for the improvement of this clause. I would suggest that he strike out the words 'not specially routed otherwise by the shipper' where they occur.

Mr. GRAHAM. That would take away from the shipper his inherent right to route his business wherever he likes.

Mr. DANIEL. What are we giving the $30,000,000 for.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not to curtail the rights of the shipper.

Mr. DANIEL. To provide transportation facilities for the shipper which otherwise he would not have.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is true, but if we do that and take away the right of the shipper to say how the goods shall be routed, we might as well throw the money in the river.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I cited a case this afternoon, where the Grand Trunk would not allow a shipper to route as he pleased. That is the ruling of the Railway Commission. What is the use of such sophistry as that?

Mr. DANIEL. When the late Mr. Blair was minister he would not allow freight to be routed over the Intercolonial railway, to go through St. John by the Canadian Pacific railway, he compelled it to go all the way by Intercolonial, he did not give the shipper freedom of choice as to how he should route his freight.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is my hon. friend quite sure about that?

Mr. DANIEL. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am satisfied he is entirely wrong. I have no doubt Mr. Blair made a rate over the Intercolonial railway as compared with the rate by way of St. John, so low that it was an inducement to the shipper to ship by the Intercolonial railway all the way to Montreal. I am sure my hon. friend is mistaken when he says that Mr. Blair refused to allow a shipper to route his goods whichever way he chose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not think my hon. friend from St. John is wrong, because I remember the matter being brought up in this House and instances being given where goods had been consigned via St. John, and the Canadian Pacific railway to a point in Ontario. They did not arrive, and a couple of weeks afterwards they were discovered somewhere on the Intercolonial railway between Moncton and Quebec, they had been sent by the other route, and it transpired, unless my memory fails me, that that was shown to have been the result of instructions by which the directions of the shipper as to the route had been entirely disregarded.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not a business man, but I know a little about some goods which have been shipped, and I know that in bringing goods to St. John from Toronto sometimes, the shipper will say: Send by such a line to Montreal, Canadian Pacific railway to Montreal, or by steamer to Montreal and thence via the Canadian Pacific railway to St. John, or by the Intercolonial railway to St. John and those instructions, I have understood, are always carried out.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have never had any trouble in any business I have had, and I

have bought a good deal of goods by car lots and less, in having the man who sold the goods send them by the line I asked him to.

Mr. CROSBY. What line was that?

Mr. GRAHAM. As many and more than my hon. friend has in Halifax.

Mr. CROSBY. And as long as my hon. friend is in office we will not have any more.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am sorry he thinks so. It does not seem to be the impression of the people. I hope my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby), will help us to get more railways for Halifax. My hon. friend raises the question as between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial, but if he had carried that out to its conclusion, he would have discovered that the arbitrators decided that in our favour, and compelled the Grand Trunk to give us the traffic that was to be ours under the agreement.

Mr. FOSTER. When was that done?

Mr. GRAHAM. A couple or three years ago. And ever since we have been getting traffic that we should not otherwise have got.

Mr. FOSTER. With what result?

Mr. GRAHAM. An increase of the income of the Intercolonial. Our exchange in traffic at Montreal last year gave us, I think, $1,600,000.

Mr. FOSTER. What happened in reference to the preceding years when they had practically denied the agreement and failed to carry it out. Has the minister received anything on that account?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have not that in memory. I cannot state the facts at the moment. The situation of the Canadian Northern under this bargain is a little different from that of the Grand Trunk Pacific under its contract. I think the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) referred to that. The Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk are different entities, although identical interests. But the Grand Trunk is not a party to the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific, so far as the routeing of traffic is concerned. The Grand Trunk Pacific has no American connection, although the Grand Trunk has. In this situation neither the Canadian Northern nor the Canadian Northern Ontario, nor the Canadian Northern Quebec has any American Atlantic seaport.

Mr. SPROULE. But they may have in the future.

Mr. GRAHAM. That may possibly be. But the agreement that may be entered into, based upon this resolution, provides for the Canadian Northern and the Canadian Northern Ontario, and it also covers the business to be done by the branch lines and connections. So, every interest identified with the Canadian Northern is bound up in the agreement that will be made on this resolution. I agree largely with the leader of the opposition, having had some experience with railroads. If they start out not to keep an agreement, I do not think all the penalties you can put on these pages would prevent them from evading to some extent—I mean as to traffic.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Routing?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. We come to an outline in the agreement of what they agree to do, and I think that under the condition that would probably arise under this contract they will be glad to keep these agreements, and there will be a force to help them keep it, that, perhaps, does not exist in other agreements.

Now, I come to the point raised by my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall). The question he raises, that of leasing the Intercolonial, I am not prepared to consider I may be wrong, but at the present moment, I would not like to consider leasing or selling the Intercolonial railway. That is my personal feeling about it. But in the resolution before us there is a provision that on demand of the government the Canadian Northern railway shall enter into an agreement for the interchange of traffic at Montreal with the Intercolonial. That is a feature of this agreement which strikes me is of great benefit to the state-owned railway. It was asked to-day why that agreement was not placed in the resolution and proceeded with at once. I will explain the situation again, as I did this afternoon. There is at present an agreement for interchange of traffic at Montreal between the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial for the term of ninety-nine years. That agreement may be terminated on notice being given by the government, but the company has no power on its side to terminate the agreement. It may be that, in a short time, the Grand Trunk will suggest—in fact, I can go further and say that the Grand Trunk is now suggesting it, and will, no doubt, continue to suggest more strongly when the Grand Trunk Pacific is completed—that, in the interests of the through traffic and the road, we ought to release them from a portion at least of that arrangement. I do not think for a moment the government will agree to do that, it will not at present at least. But, before this road is constructed, or at that time, conditions may arise under which it would be in the interest of the Intercolonial, and of the people, so far as transportation is concerned, that a propos-

ition of that kind might be entertained. There is a clause in this resolution under which the government, if they desire, can call for the Canadian Northern to make an agreement for full interchange of traffic at the city of Montreal, and thus the Intercolonial might become the eastern connection of this great new transcontinental road. I agree with my hon. friend that, if that condition were arrived at, and if such an agreement were made, it would be stronger than any legislation you could make in order to direct traffic to Canadian Atlantic ports.

Mr. FOSTER. What are the reasons which impelled the Grand Trunk to endeavour to modify that agreement so that it might be allowed to free a portion, or all of its traffic from conditions of interchange with the Intercolonial?

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason urged—urged very mildly at present, but as I see it, to be urged more strongly in future—is that the Grand Trunk Pacific controlled by the same people, ought to have at least a portion if not all the traffic that the Grand Trunk gathers up in Ontario for distribution in the maritime provinces.

Mr. FOSTER. It is that the diversion is not to outside roads but to roads through Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the argument placed before me.

Mr. FOSTER. They wish to give a larger portion to themselves in reality?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. But no part of it contemplates a diversion of any of the traffic towards other than Canadian routes?

Mr. GRAHAM. There has been no such suggestion.

Mr. SPROULE. I desire to say just a word with reference to the observations of my hon. friend from Norfolk (Mr. McCall) for fear they might be taken as expressing the sentiment of the country, and showing that we were desirous of having some company take over the Intercolonial under leasing or other arrangements. So far as I can judge, the sentiment of the country in my part at any rate, is the very reverse of that. The country, I think, desires to hold on to the Intercolonial, believing that, properly managed, on the same principle as company railways are managed, it would be a good asset of Canada. But there is another reason that would induce us to hold on to it, and what induced me to believe, many years ago, that it would be a very desirable thing to bring the road up the Georgian bay. In the first place, I think, that, as a government owned railway, its earning powers might be materially increased if, in making this contract, we had arranged that the Canadian Northern would direct its freight over the Intercolonial and allow interchange of freight. I think it would be better for the country if the Intercolonial were extended up to the Georgian bay. Here is one of the reasons which make me believe that we would be unwise to part with it. Some years ago that railway was hauling freight to an extent which gives an idea of the benefit the people receive from the Intercolonial. I am now quoting from the 'Hansard' of 1904, vol. 1, page 335. The question was asked by Mr. Kemp:

Mr. KEMP asked:

1. How many bushels of grain have been hauled by the Intercolonial railway during the six months preceding March 1, 1904, for delivery at Halifax for export?
2. What was the proportion delivered in each month?
3. What lake ports was it shipped from?
4. What was the rate per bushel from such lake ports to Halifax?
5. What was the mileage of each railway over which it was hauled?
6. What was the earnings per bushel of each railway?
7. What was the estimated cost per bushel for the service the Intercolonial railway performed?

Hon. JAMES SUTHERLAND (Minister of Public Works):

1. The number of bushels of grain hauled by the Intercolonial railway during the six months preceding March, 1904, for delivery at Halifax for export was: Wheat, 87,826½ bushels; corn, 59,611 bushels.
2. Proportion delivered each month was:

	Bushels.
November, wheat	47,836
December, wheat	23,990½
January, wheat	16,000
February, corn	59,611

3. All of it was shipped from Depot Harbour.
4. The rates from Depot Harbour to Halifax were:

	Per bush. Cents.
16,000 bushels wheat	5·15
21,836 " "	4·90
39,990½ " "	5·40
25,718½ bushels corn	4·94
33,892½ " "	5·00

5. The mileage of each railway over which it was hauled was:

	Miles.
Canada Atlantic railway	346
Grand Trunk railway	34
Intercolonial railway	828

6. The earnings per bushels of each railway was:

	Cents.
C.A.R. on 16,000 bushels wheat	2·27½
G.T.R. on 16,000 "	·60
I.C.R. on 16,000 "	2·27½

The question was asked: Was that a paying rate, and the answer was that, having regard to the return cargo, it was considered a paying rate. I have always

thought that if we had the Intercolonial railway extended to the Georgian bay it might become a great lever to keep down the freight rates upon other roads. What would happen to the shippers if we parted with the Intercolonial? Any other railway, even the Canadian Northern railway, would seek to raise the rates up to the level of other roads, and the people would pay practically double freight rates if the Intercolonial railway went into the hands of the Canadian Northern railway. That is to my mind an important consideration. There are two reasons why we ought to keep that road. One is that it is a very desirable lever that we can use to regulate the freight rates on other roads through the same section of country; the other is that while that road is carrying this freight at those low rates the people get the additional advantage. I have thought this matter over many times, and I think that the Intercolonial railway should be pushed as rapidly as possible, especially to the Georgian bay, where it could share in the freight coming from the west down the lakes, and so become a paying concern, which it is not to-day. I think it would be a very unwise move for the government to attempt to dispose of that road either by sale or by lease.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). The Minister of Public Works asks us for a suggestion with reference to this clause 13. They do not often ask this side of the House for suggestions. I think if they acted upon our suggestions a little oftener it would be better for the country. Now I will offer a suggestion for what it is worth. We are creating a tribunal in this clause 13 to try questions that are likely to come up. You have created a tribunal, and you have made the finding of that tribunal final with reference to other matters. Now as to the length of the road, the decision of the Governor General, it is said, shall be final. There are only two parties to the agreement, and when they do not agree let one be the sole judge, then they are both bound by his decision, even supposing the sole judge is one of the parties to the agreement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am inclined to think that the Railway Act now provides for that. If any railway company fails to do what it has bound itself to do, the party injured may apply to the board for an order compelling a company to carry out its obligation.

Mr. FOSTER. Does that hold with reference to agreements between railways or between a railway and a shipper?

Mr. PUGSLEY. To agreements between railways, I think.

Mr. SPROULE.

Mr. FOSTER. If one railway made a bargain with another railway, the commission could step in and compel them to fulfil it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think so, I think that is in the law. What I think will be the most effective remedy is this: All railway companies are greatly influenced by public opinion. At the present time, and I presume it will be so for many years to come, the Transcontinental railroads will be constantly coming to parliament for favours of different kinds, coming for steamship subsidies, for railway subsidies in connection with their branches which are to be feeders. Now if a company like the Canadian Northern railway, having with the authority of parliament, entered into a solemn obligation to transport the freight going over their road through Canadian channels to Canadian ports at the same rate to the seaboard as is given to the United States ports, and if we found them to be wilfully violating that solemn agreement, I think that parliament would very soon deal with them.

Mr. FOSTER. That would all depend upon the influence the company had with the government.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A company cannot influence public opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. I think the Minister of Public Works is better at making theories than he is in carrying them out. We had a good instance of that in the case of the Grand Trunk railway. The Grand Trunk is as amenable to public opinion as any other railway company. It made a solemn agreement with the Intercolonial railway to interchange freight at Montreal at certain rates, and on certain conditions, but the pen was not put to the agreement before the Grand Trunk proceeded simply not to carry it out, and they did not carry it out, but violated it straight. Now, I would like to know just what was the question that the Railway Commission decided as to that interchange of traffic. I would like the minister to give us the basis of the question that was submitted, and the decision that was made upon it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think I laid on the table two weeks ago the synopsis of the agreement with reference to the arbitration. It was not the railway commission that gave the decision, but the board of arbitrators—I used the word commission. The question was whether they would give us the traffic at Montreal or carry it down to certain points on their own line and then hand it to us. We contended that the substance of the agreement was that Montreal was the junction point and that the

traffic should be handed to us there, and the board of arbitration upheld our contention.

Mr. FOSTER. That makes my point still stronger, that public opinion has no effect on the Grand Trunk. From 1898, when the agreement was made, down to the present time they have violated that agreement.

Mr. GRAHAM. They are not violating it now. It is fair to the Grand Trunk to say that eminent counsel on their behalf construed the agreement as they did, and advised them to that effect. Our counsel had other views, and the views of our counsel prevailed before the arbitrators.

Mr. FOSTER. Then we have nothing to hope for from the railway commission in this matter. The Canadian Northern can violate that agreement if it pleases, and the railway commission will have no authority to compel it to carry it out.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is a question of law on which I am not prepared to give an opinion.

Mr. FOSTER. So far we have no action or precedent as to what that commission would do or would not do, because they have not ruled on a question of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. The railway commission has no power to deal with the Intercolonial railway. It might have power to deal with a company, and still not have power to deal with an arrangement between a company and the Intercolonial railway.

Mr. FOSTER. Then it is still more powerless with reference to this.

Mr. SPROULE. What power would they have to punish?

Mr. GRAHAM. As the leader of the opposition pointed out, and I agree with him, no penalty that you could apply could help out. These companies make agreements, and the board of railway commissioners can enforce the agreements they make; but I am not going so far as to say that they could enforce an agreement in this case that they shall route their freight by Canadian ports. That is a question of law on which I am not prepared to give an opinion. There is something that will compel them to do that which to my mind is stronger than any penalty you could impose. In the first place, they could not take their traffic to an American port at an advantage to themselves. They must always give the Canadian port as good a rate as the American port. Then, they will get the long haul to Montreal, and it is to their advantage to take the traffic to Montreal. A corollary to that is that if the agreement is made with the Intercolonial railway, it will be to their interest to give us the traffic, and it will be to our interest to get it, because we will hand over to that road the westbound traffic that comes through Canadian ports. I do not think, if you covered the statute with pages of penalties, they would help you out in enforcing a routeing arrangement.

Mr. PORTER. I did not very clearly gather the manner in which the Canadian Northern might possibly benefit by routeing the traffic originating on its line by way of an American port. As I understand the situation, it is this. The Canadian Northern railway undertake by this agreement that all freight originating upon its line will be routed to a Canadian port; that is, they will not use any endeavour to divert it, but they will use every endeavour to take it to a Canadian port, and in doing that they will not charge a greater rate for delivering it at that port than the rate at which the same freight could be delivered at an American port. Taking these two things as granted, I do not see clearly how the Canadian Northern or any other railway under such an arrangement could make it an object to divert the traffic. Perhaps the minister will enlighten me as to some way in which a railway operating under such an agreement as this could evade the provisions of that agreement, and get some extra freight rate out of the freight that originated on their line and was diverted to an American port.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the law of rebates on both sides of the line, there would be no object at all in the Canadian Northern or any of its connections sending the traffic to an American port. It could not make any greater profit.

Mr. FOSTER. Why, then, does the Grand Trunk do it?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Grand Trunk has interests in other lines.

Mr. FOSTER. Could not this company have interests in other lines?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has no interest at the present time.

Mr. BARKER. The other company could give the interest by a division of the rates.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is contrary to the law both in the United States and in Canada for a company to give an undue division of rates, and the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States and the Railway Commission of Canada have power to make the division of rates between the two companies.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose there is the same rate, let us say, from Regina to Halifax or St. John that there is to Boston or Portland; is there anything to

prevent the Canadian Northern getting a larger share out of that total rate if the freight goes to Boston or Portland than if it goes to Halifax?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes. It is against the law of both countries. There is a basis on which that division is made where the traffic passes over more than one line, and the Interstate Commerce Commission of the United States and the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada would say what proportion of the rate should go to each company for the mileage haul.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any law of the United States or of Canada which says that a company hauling freight 200 miles shall get just as much as a company hauling it 800 miles?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is exactly what I am pointing out. Take Regina to Boston and Regina to Halifax via Montreal, the Intercolonial railway will have to haul 840 miles to Halifax, and some other railway with which the Canadian Northern may have connection, would have to haul it six hundred miles less; I do not believe there is any law in the United States or in Canada which says that a company hauling traffic 240 miles shall get as much as the Intercolonial hauling it 840 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. I see the point.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does it not follow that the Canadian Northern railway could make a better bargain with a road that has only the 240 mile haul, and, therefore, if it was its interest to send traffic to Boston it would be sent there?

Mr. GRAHAM. It could not make that arrangement if it had a traffic agreement with the Intercolonial railway to give the Intercolonial railway the traffic.

Mr. CROSBY. Could that agreement be made now?

Mr. GRAHAM. It could not possibly be made now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Boston road would have its agents out in the Northwest getting people to route their freight to Boston, and the Canadian Northern railway, while not directly connected with any such effort, would look on with a great deal of approval, because it would be getting a great deal more money out of it if the traffic went to Boston or Portland rather than Halifax or St. John. We discussed at all that in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific agreement. In the Grand Trunk case it was perfectly plain, because the Grand Trunk had terminals at Portland, and it would be a far shorter haul than to Halifax and St. John, and its interest was perfectly obvious in that case. Exactly the same conditions could be created here provided the Canadian Northern railway made some arrangement with a road having terminals at Boston or at Portland. I have not the slightest doubt but that Portland and Boston and, perhaps, some other United States ports are at the Canadian Northern railway to-day with a view to having this traffic routed in their direction, because the American roads and the American ports are very keen about such matters and they look a long way ahead.

Mr. PORTER. The minister practically admits that such an arrangement is possible between railway companies, and that being so could not this agreement be so drafted as to prevent such a condition arising? If the Canadian Northern railway were prohibited from entering into an arrangement with any other company by which it would secure a greater share of the freight rate than it would by carrying it to a Canadian port, would not that bring about the object that this section has in view? Is it not possible to do that?

Mr. GRAHAM. It may be possible on paper, but it would have no practical result.

Mr. PORTER. It would have no less practical result than this clause has.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think it would have any more. The question of routeing is so intricate that it is difficult to make a law that can control it absolutely. I look more to the fact that in the future we will probably have a running arrangement or an interchange of traffic arrangement in which it will be the business of the government to see that they get a large share of this traffic. If the Canadian Northern were going to divert in any direction it will in all probability take the long haul to the city of Quebec on its own line. I have a great deal more fear of not getting all the traffic we ought at Montreal because of the Canadian Northern using its own line for the long haul to Quebec or Lévis, than I have of it going to an American road either at Boston or elsewhere. Then, the Canadian Northern is putting on a line of steamships between Canadian ports, and it will be to its interest in every respect to carry traffic to and from its own steamships. I have studied the different phases of it, and after full consideration, and three or four months' discussion, I have come to the conclusion that to put a clause of this kind in as stringent as we can, would accomplish everything that anything else could. The interests of the Canadian Northern railway are bound up in the Canadian route by steamers, and having their line through to Quebec direct, the chances are all in favour of us getting a big share, if not all, of the traffic through Canadian ports.

Mr. PORTER. When the minister states that the railway will take advantage of the long haul rather than diverting the traffic over the short haul, is he not ignoring the fact that the freight rates to the two ports of delivery are the same? If the railway gets the same amount of money for the short haul as for the long haul, they would be saving operating expenses and it would be an inducement for them to divert the traffic.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a very intricate question.

Mr. BARKER. Surely the minister knows that it frequently pays a company, and that it is an everyday occurrence and a common sense proposition, to hand traffic over to even a rival company at a particular point rather than that the originating company should carry by the long haul. Does he not know that in the end this practice may pay both of them? The minister knows well that to talk about these agreements having any effect upon a railway company in routeing traffic is an absolute absurdity. Any gentleman sitting behind the minister who is in the habit of shipping goods will tell him that when he goes to the station agent, if it is in the interests of the company that it should go by Portland, there will be a car for Portland and there will not be a car for Halifax. We all know that. The agent will say: If you want to ship this to Portland, we can have the car here tomorrow morning; but if you want to send it to Halifax you cannot get a car until next week. The hon. gentleman knows that as well as I do. The company can send the freight in any direction it likes practically without giving any special instructions to its local agents. If the local agent is not smart enough to know what the company wants he will be dismissed. A smart sharp agent knows just where the company's interest is, and he will provide for transportation to the point that pays his company best.

Mr. FOSTER. The Canadian Northern railway at present has no terminals in Montreal, but proposes building them. Does the minister know where the proposed site of these terminals will be?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. FOSTER. But it will not be the Grand Trunk terminal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think they will have separate terminals.

Mr. FOSTER. My hon. friend knows of course that this contract with the Grand Trunk railway concerning the terminals of that company in Montreal runs for ninety-nine years.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. He contributes to them so much according to the terms. If he now proposes to have exchanges with the Canadian Northern railway, he will also have to arrange for terminals with that company, and will be put to similar expense. Has the minister thought about what that would cost, and is that the reason why he has not made arrangements for an interchange with the Canadian Northern railway? He could not make the interchange without having terminal facilities.

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to be sure what I am going to get in return for the Intercolonial railway before I would ask the Grand Trunk railway to consent to cancel the other arrangement for interchange of traffic. It is evident that the Grand Trunk railway will be urging for the cancellation of the arrangement, and the cancellation of the arrangement would mean its entire cancellation. I do not know that that will be done. But I place myself in a position to take every advantage if the Grand Trunk railway insists on cancelling the arrangement. We pay the Grand Trunk railway $140,000 a year rental, and we contribute a certain amount to the upkeep. If we have that arrangement annulled we would not have the double expense, but we would not make arrangements with the two companies for the same purpose. If the arrangement with the Grand Trunk railway were cancelled, we would be free to make arrangement with the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. DANIEL. When the agreement goes into force with the Canadian Northern railway, the present arrangement with the Grand Trunk railway for sending its freight over the Intercolonial railway will cease. Is that what we are to understand?

Mr. GRAHAM. It would not be in the public interest for me to say too much about this agreement at present. Conditions might arise under which an arrangement could be made with the Grand Trunk railway, and we would handle part of their traffic, and they would handle part of ours, and also have an arrangement with the Canadian Northern railway to have their freight traffic go over the Intercolonial railway. I do not say that we could make such an arrangement with either company, but if the government found itself in the position to make just such an arrangement, the Canadian Northern railway would be compelled to make that arrangement with us.

Mr. McCALL. The discussion for the last hour has not made it at all clear that the country is protected with regard to the delivery of freight over the Canadian Northern railway to the Intercolonial railway. This company which has such enormous

grants ought to state clearly what it is prepared to do. In every important centre the railway companies have paid solicitors canvassing for freight over their lines. Will it be asking too much to inquire from the minister what he proposes to do? If he will take us into his confidence, the country will be satisfied to have this other trunk line available for business, and to act as a feeder for the Intercolonial railway. I would again suggest that some arrangement should be come to with the Canadian Northern railway by which they would work the Intercolonial railway on some joint contract or lease it on terms satisfactory to Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As regards section 14, my hon. friend could not have heard the Minister of Railways. He said that the Canadian Northern railway could be obliged to come into an arrangement at once, but that the government has now a binding agreement for ninety-nine years with the Grand Trunk railway. That agreement is mutual. Under it all the unrouted Intercolonial railway traffic bound westward must be delivered to the Grand Trunk railway at Montreal. And the Grand Trunk railway must send its unrouted traffic for the maritime provinces over the Intercolonial railway. Involved in that agreement is also an obligation on the part of the Intercolonial railway to pay a rental for the use of certain terminals in Montreal. What would be the result if parliament were by resolution to tie the hands of the Minister of Railways absolutely and definitely by providing that there shall be an agreement for mutual interchange of traffic between the Intercolonial railway, and the Canadian Northern railway? The Grand Trunk railway would to-morrow morning say that the government is at once bound to enter into a traffic arrangement with the Canadian Northern railway. Involved in that is the delivery over by the Intercolonial railway at Montreal of all its unrouted traffic to the Canadian Northern railway. The Grand Trunk railway would say: Mr. Graham, we have you now, we want you to cancel the agreement which you have with us, and to cancel it on our terms. Mr. Graham would say: Oh, it would not be in the interest of the country to do that. But the Grand Trunk railway would say: Parliament has bound you to do it, you must do it. Cannot the hon. gentleman see in what a disadvantageous position it would place the government through the Intercolonial railway, and in what an exceedingly advantageous position it would place the Grand Trunk railway? The Grand Trunk Railway Company is allied with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. They will have a road from Lévis to Moncton completed very soon. The road is now completed through New Brunswick from Moncton to Plaster Rock, and by next year it will be completed through to Lévis. The Grand Trunk railway, being allied to the Grand Trunk Pacific, is naturally desirous of handing over to the Grand Trunk Pacific the traffic which it is now obliged to hand over to the Intercolonial railway. If you tie the hands of the Minister of Railways by making a positive obligation on his part to enter into this arrangement for an interchange of traffic with the Canadian Northern railway, you simply give the whole case of the country away to the Grand Trunk, and they would demand and could exact whatever terms they might think in their own interest, and the government would be absolutely powerless to refuse to cancel the agreement on the Grand Trunk's own terms.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understand that notwithstanding the stipulations in this agreement about an arrangement, the government could enter into no arrangement with the Canadian Northern for an interchange of traffic for 99 years without the consent of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. GRAHAM. Not altogether that. The government can cancel the agreement on giving notice; the Grand Trunk cannot, but the government can on giving notice. At the present time, it is a paying traffic for both the Grand Trunk and the Intercolonial railway. To enter into an arrangement at the present moment would do what the Minister of Public Works says very largely, but if we could do that, so long as the arrangement with the Grand Trunk stands, it would be folly to make any other agreement, because we could not carry it out until we cancelled the Grand Trunk agreement. We got from the Grand Trunk this year of traffic both ways, about $1,600,000 and until we are in a position to say what we would get by this new arrangement, and what arrangements we could make with the Grand Trunk, and with the Canadian Northern, it would be suicidal from an Intercolonial railway standpoint to absolutely make any agreement. Leaving it as it is we have a free hand, always having it in our power to say to the Grand Trunk railway: On notice we will cancel the arrangement with you.

Mr. DOHERTY. I suppose we are to take it that the Minister of Railways speaks for the government, because there seems to be an absolute contradiction between his position, and that of the Minister of Public Works, who says that to bind the Minister of Railways to enter into any arrangement with the Canadian Northern at this time would put us absolutely into the hands of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. GRAHAM. Would it not be notice absolutely to the Grand Trunk: We want to cancel this arrangement with you. Then the Grand Trunk railway would say: That being the case, by statute, here are our terms.

Mr. DOHERTY. I thought the minister said the government could break the traffic arrangement at any time.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but there is another arrangement for terminals, and they are bound up together to a certain extent.

Mr. DOHERTY. If the traffic arrangement is so bound up with the terminal arrangements that although the government could cancel the traffic arrangement on giving notice that would absolutely bring about the cancellation of the terminals arrangements, which would have to be made upon the terms of the Grand Trunk itself, it seems to me that the Minister of Public Works perhaps stated the position more accurately than the Minister of Railways. But that brings us back to the fact that we are to-day in such a position that we cannot make any arrangement with the Canadian Northern about its traffic for 99 years to come unless we get the consent of the Grand Trunk, and the Minister of Public Works seems to consider that the consent of the Grand Trunk might cost us a very considerable amount, in fact he describes the situation as being that if we tried to make an arrangement to-day with the Canadian Northern we would be putting ourselves in the hands of the Grand Trunk.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will see that you cannot make a bargain for the delivery of the same goods with two people at the same time.

Mr. CROSBY. I have listened to the discussion of how the freight on this new road would be taken to the ocean ports in the east. We have listened to that on many occasions. We in the east have heard much talk of this kind. Our great hope was when the Canadian Pacific railway was being constructed. In Nova Scotia, and particularly in Halifax, we had every reason to believe that the construction of the Canadian Pacific railway was going to be a great boon to eastern Canada, that we were going to be assisted to a large extent by the traffic brought from the west through Canada to the ports in Nova Scotia. Later on we discovered that while Nova Scotia had given perhaps the strongest support and assistance of any province to the Canadian Pacific railway, nevertheless when that railroad was constructed it did not touch Nova Scotia at all. Every city and community touched by the Canadian Pacific railway has benefited and prospered, in fact that road has largely made Canada, yet it did not touch Nova Scotia. When the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was formulated, and ratified by this parliament we were told in Nova Scotia in the election of 1904 that the whole question of transportation was solved, that the province of Nova Scotia was now to come into its own. We were told by no less a man than the Minister of Finance, and by other men contesting seats in Nova Scotia that within two years from 1904 we would have the Grand Trunk Pacific connected with the port of Halifax, and I have no doubt that in the province of New Brunswick they were promised that they would also be connected with the Grand Trunk Pacific. He said that in two years we would have a double track on the Intercolonial railway, and the Grand Trunk Pacific running into Halifax. In fact, he said it would go to Country Harbour, a harbour in Nova Scotia that is noted for its excellence, and one where a great deal of traffic could be carried on. Now we find the Grand Trunk Pacific being constructed to the town of Moncton, and no intimation of any kind that it is to run into the province of Nova Scotia. I must say that, so far as I have met public men, I have never met one who could equal the Minister of Railways in the plausible movement of the hand, the genial smile, and the pleasant word. I remember the first time I had the pleasure of hearing him I thought him one of the nicest men I had ever come across. And so he is, if there is anything behind his words——

An hon. MEMBER. Have you changed your mind?

Mr. CROSBY. He forced me to change my mind. Any one who makes statements and does not carry them out forces an honest man to change his mind about him.

Mr. GRAHAM. Will the hon. gentleman give any statement that I made, and that I did not carry out, thus forcing him to change his mind?

Mr. CROSBY. The hon. gentleman then, as to-night, intimated many things that meant nothing. He tries to give the House and the public the impression that he is going to have the traffic come down to Montreal over the Canadian Northern and then that it is to go over the Intercolonial to St. John and Halifax. He knows in his own heart that he is so tied up that he could not give them a running right over the Intercolonial. His contract with the Grand Trunk prevents him from allowing the Canadian Northern to take one train load over the line.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is nothing in the arrangement with the Grand Trunk to pre-

vent giving running rights to the Canadian Northern or any other road.

Mr. CROSBY. Does the minister tell me that he can give the Canadian Northern running rights over the Intercolonial?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, or any other line.

Mr. CROSBY. The Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. CROSBY. Then, why does he not give it to the Canadian Pacific railway? I am very glad to get that statement from the hon. gentleman, because when he comes down to the province of Nova Scotia he will not be able to get away so easily as in the past. He has been asked by every board of trade, and especially by the board of trade of Halifax, time and time again, to give running rights to the Canadian Pacific railway over the Intercolonial. Is not that true?

Mr. GRAHAM. It has been true.

Mr. CROSBY. Is it not true to-day?

Mr. GRAHAM. The proposition for running over the Intercolonial always made by the Canadian Pacific railway was that we should allow them to pick up local traffic on the Intercolonial, on behalf of the people of Canada, I have taken the ground that the local traffic of the Intercolonial could not stand to be divided with the Canadian Pacific railway. I am prepared at any time to make an arrangement which the Canadian Pacific railway, will run their trains through to Halifax and leave our local traffic alone.

Mr. CROSBY. Then, what position does the hon. minister take with relation to the Canadian Northern?

Mr. GRAHAM. The same.

Mr. CROSBY. That is what we say, that we have no way of getting a line to Halifax. But St. John is better off, having the Canadian Pacific railway, and they have benefited greatly by it. But we have the Minister of Railways rising in this House, or coming to the people of Nova Scotia, with nice words and pleasant smiles. We have been deceived right along, as we are to-night, by the statements the minister makes about the outgoing freight of the Canadian Northern. We have great hopes of the Canadian Northern. It has done a great deal for us. They brought their splendid boats to Halifax last year, even without facilities to accommodate them. And no matter what railway connection you have, if you have not the accommodation and facilities for steamer traffic the connection is not worth much. As the business of the Intercolonial is growing it is impossible for both to do the work that they must do if we are to have the western trade go through the Atlantic port of Canada. We in Halifax are not jealous of the freight going through the ports of Montreal and Quebec in summer time. The Minister of Railways asks me what made me change my mind. On many occasions I have seen him in Halifax, and have heard people speak of him as one of the finest men they ever met. He came down two or three months ago and told us one story, but he found some difficulty in the way, and now he tells us another story. And Halifax is in the same position, so far as railway accommodation is concerned, as it was in 1903. We Nova Scotians are pleased to see the west build up and improve its railway accommodation. We rejoice when some of our people come home from the west, and tell us what great railway accommodation they have there. But is it not reasonable that Nova Scotia, which stretches out into the Atlantic as if it were a wharf, put there specially by nature to facilitate the transatlantic trade of this Dominion—is it not reasonable that it should get its full share of that trade? And yet we have no better facilities there than we had 40 years ago, so far as railway accommodation is concerned. True, we have better facilities for traffic. The road has built up very good accommodation so far as the road itself is concerned. But it is impossible for any one road to handle the traffic that should come over the Intercolonial during the winter when the ports of Montreal and Quebec are closed. And there is no hope for us in Halifax or in the province of Nova Scotia by the proposition made here to-night, unless the Minister of Railways can give us something more substantial, and greater evidence of desire that the traffic of the west should come down to the Atlantic ports at least during the winter months.

The Minister of Railways says we are tied up to the Grand Trunk Pacific and to the Grand Trunk railway for 99 years. I have heard the hon. gentleman make that statement in making his railway budget speech. He has stated in this House that the Grand Trunk railway did not treat the Intercolonial as well as it expected to be treated, as well as he thought it should be treated. I thought from what he said that the Grand Trunk railway must have been sending freight to Portland instead of sending it over the Intercolonial. He did not make that statement, but I inferred as much from what he did say. Now it behooves every man from Nova Scotia to see that the port of Halifax is treated as well as the port of St. John, that it is put on the same footing as far as export traffic is concerned. But we have no effort on the part of the government to do that, although they have been appealed to time and again. The

merchants of Halifax have come to interview the Railway Commission, and they were told that the Railway Commission had no control, and could not do anything for them. That is the way we have been humbugged in the province of Nova Scotia, and particularly in Halifax. Now if the Minister of Railways and the government mean to give us fair play in this matter it is time for them to do it. Let them tell us frankly how this trade of the Canadian Northern is going to be sent down to the ocean ports. As soon as the Canadian Northern brings freight to Montreal, notwithstanding that they have boats at Halifax, if they can send that freight from Montreal to Portland or to Boston, 250 miles instead of 830 miles, why, they are going to do it. As the leader of the opposition has pointed out, what are they likely to do as good business men? Are they not likely to send their freight by the cheapest route? If they can send it from Montreal to Portland or Boston at a less rate than to Halifax, which is three times the distance, are they not going to send it to an American port? Are they not going to bring their boats to Portland to take the freight from that port, although they might be anxious to go to Halifax, which is a better port and a better harbour. Would it not be natural for them to take their freight to the port that it will cost them less to reach?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would they not rather take their freight where they can meet their own steamers?

Mr. CROSBY. The minister surely can understand that their steamers can sail to Portland as well as to Halifax. He is a keen business man, and if he had vessels that he could sail, either to Halifax or to Portland, and if he found that he could deliver his freight cheaper in Portland than in Halifax or St. John, why, of course he would bring his steamers to Portland. I say that the natural conditions will force them to do that and it will prevent us from getting any advantage out of this trade. I have spoken of the election in 1904, when Nova Scotia sent a solid Liberal delegation to support this government. Why? Because they were told by every ministerial candidate and by every ministerial campaigner who came into that province, that inside of two years the whole province would be a perfect hive of business by reason of the Grand Trunk Pacific. But in 1908 things were entirely different, the bright promises that had been made were not fulfilled, and there is to-day no sign of anything of the kind. We have that promise repeated to induce us to support the resolution that is before us to-night, but all we know is that we are tied up to the Grand Trunk railway and cannot do anything to help ourselves, we cannot do anything with the Canadian Northern railway, we cannot do anything with anybody. There is no pretense of an intention on the part of the government to double track the Intercolonial railway. I am glad to see they are putting a little money in the estimates for facilities at Halifax.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How much does the hon. gentleman call a little money?

Mr. CROSBY. Not quite as much as you put in Courtenay bay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $600,000 more?

Mr. CROSBY. If the hon. minister added up all the sums he has spent in Courtenay bay during the last three or four years, it would almost purchase a province. This may be larger than some of the individual sums.

Mr. PUGSLEY. $600,000 is not a bad amount to start with in Halifax harbour.

Mr. CROSBY. I am not complaining of that; I am complaining of the railway facilities, and I have every reason to complain of the general facilities. We have been waiting all these years for the government to do something, at the same time that the Minister of Public Works has been building sawdust wharfs and squandering money in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Will the hon. gentleman tell the House whether he is in favour of this resolution or not? I have listened patiently to the hon. gentleman for half an hour, and I do not know yet. Would he be kind enough to tell us?

Mr. CROSBY. There is one thing I can say, and that is that I have some independence in this parliament. I am not like the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I am not prepared to swallow everything that is brought here. So far as I am concerned, I am pleased indeed to see the Dominion of Canada giving the west so much accommodation, but what I say is that the province of Nova Scotia has not benefited from all that up to the present time. I would like to hear what my hon. friend has to say about the way in which Nova Scotia has been treated, including Country Harbour that he talks so much about when he goes to Guysborough. There are some intimations now that something is going to be done, because a provincial election is coming on in Nova Scotia, but so far as my hon. friend is concerned, he has taken no action. If I had the power he has in this House, or the influence he has with the government, I would get something put into this Bill that I would like.

Mr. SINCLAIR. What would my hon. friend propose to put into this resolution that is not in it?

Mr. CROSBY. I think my hon. friend was in this House when the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme was evolved.

Mr. SINCLAIR. Answer the question.

Mr. CROSBY. I will answer any question the hon. gentleman wants to ask. I want to ask the hon. gentleman if he had a seat in this House when the Grand Trunk Pacific was proposed. The idea at first was to build it only from Winnipeg to the coast, but the members from the provinces of Quebec and Ontario said, we cannot put up with that, we want it to go farther. They had force enough to get it built to Moncton, but when it got there, there was not a member to say, bring it to Nova Scotia; and my hon. friend had a seat in this House at that time.

Mr. SINCLAIR. I asked my hon. friend a simple question. He said that if he was on this side of the House, in the position I am in, he would make some proposal with regard to the resolution that would be of greater benefit to Nova Scotia than the proposal is as it stands. I asked him what his proposal is, and he has not answered.

Mr. CROSBY. I would have it arranged that the Canadian Northern would have traffic rights over the Intercolonial railway to Halifax or to St. John. I have no desire to ask anything for Halifax that I do not ask for St. John or Country Harbour. I do not care where it goes to, but I say, let us have a share of the money that is being spent. We have not had a share of it in Nova Scotia. I ask my hon. friend from Guysborough to use his influence with the government in power to compel it or induce it to give us a fair show in the province of Nova Scotia. What is good for Halifax is good for the whole of Nova Scotia or any port in his constituency. I am not here to stand particularly for Halifax, but I stand for Nova Scotia. My hon. friend has not raised his voice to say anything. As far as we have any information in this resolution, the traffic over the Canadian Northern, when it comes east, stops at Montreal. My hon. friend is a professional man, a man of some experience in this parliament and before he came here, and if his experience is worth anything, he ought to be able to suggest some way in which that freight should be carried to the east. There is not in this resolution the slightest hope for us except in the fact that Mackenzie and Mann have to do with it, and they have treated us fairly well as far as they have gone. Although this resolution says that the traffic shall be carried through Canadian ports except when it is specially routed, there is no way provided for getting it down to the east. I challenge the Minister of Railways to show how it can be taken from Montreal to the province of Nova Scotia or the province of New Brunswick during the winter months when the navigation on the St. Lawrence is closed. He has made no arrangement whatever. It would have been only fair to the maritime provinces that he should have made that a part of his arrangement, even if it involved the construction of a new road or the extension of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the city of Halifax the city of St. John, or the double tracking of the Intercolonial railway from Moncton to Halifax to St. John, or, if you will, making a connection from Moncton to Country Harbour. I am not jealous of my hon. friend having a good harbour there, but I am jealous about the maritime provinces getting a share of the traffic that comes from the west to the east, and therefore I say it is unfair to us that some arrangement has not been made by which the traffic should have an outlet at our Atlantic ports.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to ask the minister what the object of this agreement is, as far as the government is concerned. According to the clause, the object apparently is 'to develop commerce through Canadian ports and to afford the government system of railways in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island an interchange of through traffic.' Turn to clause 13, where we look to find what it is the government is going to get for this enormous guarantee that it is entering into. We find this, and it seems to me all that the government is getting:

That all freight originating on the line of the Canadian Northern Railway Company or its branches, or on the line of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined to points in Canada, be carried over the Canadian Northern railway or the Canadian Northern Ontario railway, or the connections of either, or over any railway within Canadian territory.

Where does the government come in? What are they getting for their guarantee? According to this, the Canadian Northern may transfer its traffic originating on its road to the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific railway or any other railway in Canada. That comes within the letter of the agreement. Not a word saying that in consideration of this enormous guarantee, they must give it to the Intercolonial railway. What is the hon. gentleman getting for his guarantee, I would like to know?

Mr. GRAHAM. One can see at a glance that the main object of this is to get better transportation facilities for the people of Canada. That is what we are getting for the guarantee. If the hon. gentleman living in Hamilton, had goods shipped to him from the west, Hamilton not being on

the line of the Canadian Northern, if we did not allow the company to transfer the goods to another line, how would he get them? You could not fairly compel them to hand traffic over to the Intercolonial at Montreal until the Intercolonial railway is prepared to give them something in return.

Mr. BARKER. You are giving them this enormous guarantee.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not so much for the Canadian Northern railway as for the benefit of the people of Canada. When the Canadian Pacific railway bargain was made there was no arrangement to hand traffic over to the Intercolonial railway anywhere, and when the Grand Trunk Pacific bargain was made it was thought to be in the public interest, and there was no bargain about the Intercolonial railway traffic.

Mr. BARKER. The opposition did its best to get it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The arrangement with the Intercolonial railway is incidental, and if we can carry it out it will be of great benefit to every person concerned. There is at present an arrangement with the Grand Trunk, and we cannot make the same arrangement for the delivery of the same goods to two companies at the same time.

Mr. CROSBY. That means the Canadian Northern cannot come down east at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not mean anything of the kind. The one cent per 100 pounds discrimination is part of an arrangement with the Grand Trunk, which if this arrangement goes through in its entirety and we are able to do something I have in my mind, but which it is not in the public interest to discuss in detail, would be one of the things that would be abrogated.

Mr. CROSBY. Will you abrogate it?

Mr. GRAHAM. A minister has some responsibility that my hon. friend (Mr. Crosby) may understand some time, but it will be some time. I am in correspondence with the Grand Trunk over that very matter, but the president is in the old country, and the matter will be referred to him when he returns.

Mr. BARKER. And the result is that for all this enormous guarantee you may never get one pound of traffic over the Intercolonial railway.

On section 14,

Mr. GRAHAM. The leader of the opposition made a suggestion this afternoon which to my mind is very valuable. He suggested that if default were made, and the line has to be taken over, it would not be much use unless the terminals at Montreal and Port Arthur were available. The Board of Railway Commissioners has now the power to grant one railway the right to use the property of another on a case being made out, but the board would probably refuse if a rival company asked to use the terminals of another company, and thus injure its business. I suggest that the following additional clause be added:

That in the event of default and of the consequent acquisition by the government or by any railway company other than the company of the line hereby aided, neither the company nor the Canadian Northern Railway Company will oppose any application to the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada for an order providing for the use by the government, or by such other railway company, of terminals at Port Arthur or Montreal owned or controlled by the company or by the Canadian Northern Railway Company, in so far as such use is reasonably necessary in connection with the operation of the said aided line, and on reasonable terms and compensation established by the said board.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is this road going to have a physical connection with the Intercolonial railway at Montreal, and is there anything in the present agreement between the Intercolonial railway and the Grand Trunk railway which would prevent a similar agreement being made with the Canadian Northern railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am afraid I will have to spread the explanation on the pages of 'Hansard' again.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I have listened to you explain it several times, and I cannot catch on. You seem to try to give the impression that the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific are one and the same road.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not try to give that impression. At present we have an arrangement with the Grand Trunk by which the Intercolonial railway is to hand its traffic over to the Grand Trunk, and the Grand Trunk hands its traffic for the maritime provinces over to the Intercolonial railway. To make an agreement with the Canadian Northern we would have to give a quid pro quo to the Canadian Northern railway in traffic for traffic. Our arrangement with the Grand Trunk would prohibit that because we cannot deliver the same traffic to the two roads at the same time. That arrangement may possibly, a little later, be either annulled altogether by agreement, or it might be changed so that we can make a partial traffic arrangement with the Canadian Northern. But, as I pointed out before, the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific having identical interests, there will be strong urgency brought upon the government to abrogate that agreement

altogether. I do not know whether we can come to an arangement to have it done, but I am inclined to think it can be done a little later, and I want to be in a position with a perfectly free hand to be able to make interchange of traffic with the Canadian Northern on all their through business on terms which will be agreeable to us both.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That does not quite answer the question. The Grand Trunk business arises in Ontario territory. which is not at present touched by the Canadian Northern. I see no reason why an agreement should not be made between the Canadian Northern railway and the Intercolonial railway for an exchange of western traffc, by which the Intercolonial railway will receive a certain amount of the eastbound traffic.

Mr. GRAHAM. And the Grand Trunk railway can claim, by agreement, the westbound traffic, and further the Canadian Northern railway will shortly have numerous ramifications in the province of Ontario as well as the Grand Trunk railway.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). We have made vast expenditures on the Intercolonial railway and a portion of that road which should be made to flourish, the extreme terminal at Halifax is neglected.

Mr. GRAHAM. We do not agree with that.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Anybody who has been where there is a good terminal must know that the Halifax terminal is neglected. The whole policy of a privately owned railway is to develop traffic at its extreme ends where there are terminals, and not cut it off at one half or one quarter of the way. The Intercolonial railway is well managed as regards its physical character, but no effort is made to send the traffic from one end of the road to the other. Contrast that policy with the policy of the Grand Trunk railway. The line from Midland to Montreal is a great deal shorter than the line from Sarnia to Montreal taking the lake and rail traffic, but the Grand Trunk railway chooses to send its traffic over the long haul. Why should not the government take its through traffic over the long haul and get a proportionate rate out of the total mileage moved. But when you tranship freight at St. John instead of sending it to Halifax, you are giving that much more money to the other railway out of the carriage to the sea, and doing that much damage to Halifax, which should be a participant and enjoy a proportion of that traffic. The Minister of Railways has a joint rate, for instance, from Sarnia to the sea. If the goods are sent over the Intercolonial railway and the Grand Trunk railway to St. John, the proportion of the rate claimed by the government will only be from St. John to Montreal, while if they were sent through to Halifax, even though the freight rate were just the same, the proportion which would go to the government railway would be much greater. I have no desire to find fault with the shipping of freight at St. John, but I do not think that Halifax is receiving proper encouragement. We have large elevators there which are idle most of the year, we have every convenience for shipment and transshipment, yet a great many of the docks are idle compared with those at other places. Any one who looks up the statistics of traffic to the American ports must come to the conclusion that instead of the traffic via Canadian ports increasing, and that via the American ports decreasing, the Canadian freight that goes over the American roads is increasing, and the amount of freight that goes over the Canadian roads is decreasing. Last year the total value of Canadian freight shipped through the five large ports of the United States was something like $45,000,000 out of our total foreign shipments.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman aware how much of foreign goods were shipped to the port of St. John during the past winter? Is he aware that one third of the total exports of $24,000,000 shipped from the port of St. John were goods from the United States carried over Canadian railways and shipped through the port of St. John?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That has nothing to do with the argument.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has a great deal.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Certainly not. What is the use of shipping foreign goods over our railways at cheap rates and sending our freight over American railways, and letting our road bear the burden of the cheap foreign traffic? The freight rate from Chicago to St. John is cheaper——

Mr. PUGSLEY. We should be glad in St. John to get all the American freight we can in that way.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Why should not Canadian traffic go through St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Before this resolution is through, I will produce the figures of foreign shipments at the various ports in the United States, and they will bear me out in my statement that the amount of freight shipped from these American ports has been increasing, and is a great deal larger than the amount of shipments from the port of St. John—twice as large. If St. John is so attractive why should any

goods go through Baltimore or Portland at all? It is for this House to consider whether it is advisable, considering the enormous profits arising from the carriage of our own goods, whether we should divide these profits with the American roads. There has been no attempt made by this government to keep hold of this traffic yet still we are asked to adopt a new policy which will send a great deal more traffic through the American channels. Over $40,000,000 last year of the products of the farms of Canada went through these American ports, or nearly twice as much as through the port of St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman give me the figures of the total American goods that went through Canadian ports last year? Take Montreal, St. John and Halifax.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). It is absurd for the minister to ask me to furnish him with these figures. If he has any argument to give with respect to them let him produce them. But what are the figures of foreign traffic? I challenge the hon. minister to show what they are, or to show that the shipments of American goods through Montreal are as large as the shipments of Canadian goods through Portland.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was merely suggesting——

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). You merely made the statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY—that if my hon. friend thought there was any great importance to be attached to the proportion of shipments of products of one country through the ports of the other, he would naturally have studied both sides of the question, and would have been able to tell us at the same time the value of American goods shipped through Canadian ports. If, for instance, we have $100,000,000 of American goods shipped through Canadian ports and $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 of Canadian goods shipped through American ports, upon the whole we would be rather getting the better of it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman has a very fine line of hypothetical questions and reasons. He rushed madly into this discussion without knowing anything of the figures at all. He did not know, as a matter of fact, whether a pound of American goods was shipped through Montreal.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I knew that.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The large number of American cars going eastward over Canadian roads, must be the source of his information, but they go to Portland; they are largely through meat from Chicago, and he will find that the amount of American freight that passes through Montreal is less than he thinks. Will he give any information as to the amount of American freight shipped through Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not profess to know the exact figures, but I do know the figures through St. John, and I say that it is a remarkable tribute to the ability of Canadian roads to handle western traffic, that during last winter they have been able to draw away the large amount of over $8,000,000 worth of American goods and ship them through St. John, notwithstanding the somewhat longer haul. I know that many millions of dollars worth of American goods are shipped through Montreal. All I suggested was that, my friend having given attention to the figures, I could not conceive it possible that he would think of the figures only on one side and not have seen the figures on the other side.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The minister, as I have said, injected himself into an argument on a topic about which he knows nothing. As a minister entering on such a discussion, he should be able to furnish the House immediately with these figures. Now he confesses he has not the figures, although he imagines a large amount of American goods pass through this country. That is not at all the question. Our railroad policy should be to have not only large quantities of American goods shipped through our harbours, but also to have all the Canadian freight shipped through Canadian harbours. We will need it all, we need the money, and we find that the amount of Canadian goods shipped through Canadian harbours is increasing very materially, in fact it is a large proportion of the total foreign shipments, and I understand this amount is largely credited to our trade with the United States, and that our real trade with the United States is much less than the figures in our Blue-books show. The minister should know, and I would ask him now what method is adopted by the government to ascertain the quantity and value of foreign shipments through Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not the knowledge which, of course, the Minister of Customs would have, but my information is that on the manifests of goods which are sent to a port for shipment, it appears whether they are domestic or foreign. I know this is the case in St. John, and every season we know how many millions of Canadian goods have been shipped during the winter and how many millions of foreign.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Again the minister has shown himself at sea on this

question. He does not know the method adopted by his government to ascertain this, or the value of the goods.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think I have answered.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not think my hon. friend is capable of answering, and when it comes to a freight question, or a question of this kind, he should leave it to the Minister of Railways and the parties discussing it, because the Minister of Railways, even if he does not know the facts, generally gives an intelligent answer. Some clause should be inserted in this resolution whereby an interchange of traffic would be enforced or obtained between the Canadian Northern railway and the Intercolonial railway. Unless this is done I feel satisfied that before long the Intercolonial railway will be so starved that anybody would be glad to get rid of it while it should be the policy to encourage the Intercolonial because any one who knows anything about the history of railroads and railroad building, development and management, knows that the tendency of this age in foreign countries, is for the governments to take possession of and own and control their railways. We have France, Germany, Japan and Australia, all owning and controlling their roads. I shall not enter into a discussion of the merits of government or company ownership, but we can all recognize that it is the coming policy, and if this government is going to starve the Intercolonial railway, and especially to deprive that portion of the road between St. John and Halifax of freights, and prevent Halifax from being what it should be, the main terminal of this road, being the end of the road, that is certainly not a policy that will benefit the Intercolonial railway. The minister has not said whether the Canadian Northern will be compelled to have even a switching or physical connection with the Intercolonial railway at Montreal. That is not in the agreement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot give any more explanations than I have given. I have exactly explained the situation at Montreal at least ten times.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Cannot the minister state that the Canadian Northern railway and the Intercolonial railway will have a switching connection?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will understand that the Intercolonial railway has no line into Montreal. It runs over the Grand Trunk railway and has no power to make switching arrangements with the Grand Trunk.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Then there is no switching connection?

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe there is a switching arrangement now between the Canadian Northern railway and the Grand Trunk railway at Montreal, but it is not our arrangement.

Resolutions reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 211) respecting aid for the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

House in Committee of Supply.

Public Buildings—rents, repairs, heating, furniture, &c.—Rideau Hall—improvements, &c., $50,000.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). This amount is required to make the improvements at Rideau Hall which, after consultation with the equerry, of His Royal Highness, the Duke of Connaught, who is expected to arrive here in September to take the position of Governor General of Canada, we deem it desirable to make. These improvements consist of the removal of some of the buildings at present there, and the erecting of two cottages for the servants of His Royal Highness and a garage, and also decoration—some of the rooms are in special need of repainting and decorating, and improvements to the sewerage arrangements, His Royal Highness is particularly anxious as to the last. The chief architect, who went carefully into these questions with the representative of His Royal Highness, reported to me that $50,000 would be required for the improvements. We are anxious to get to work immediately, and get these improvements all made, if possible, before the arrival of His Royal Highness.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the minister say some portions of the buildings are to be removed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the chapel is to be removed, and I think, some of the outbuildings. I am sorry I have not the documents before me giving full details, but I had not hoped to have the item under consideration to-night. I will undertake, however, to lay the report of the chief architect on the table.

Mr. BLAIN. Will this vote cover the total cost?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is the report of the chief architect, and after going very carefully into the matter with the representative of His Royal Highness. I may say that the Duke of Connaught sent a message to us by his representa-

tive that he was desirous that we should not go to any unnecessary expense; but it did seem as if the improvements which have been agreed to are really absolutely essential in order to give the reasonably comfortable accommodation that is required for His Royal Highness' household.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it not a pity that this building had not been torn down some years ago and a new building erected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is. I do not know that I speak for many when I say that. My own view is that the present Government House is not creditable to a country of the importance and wealth of Canada. Our population is rapidly increasing, and so is the wealth of our people, and I think that Government House ought to be a building of a character which would be a credit to the country, and in which the people would take a pride. The interior of Rideau Hall is pretty good; the rooms are comfortable, the accommodation is very good. But the exterior appearance of the building is not at all such as one would expect for the Government House of a country like Canada. Four years ago, when I became minister, I found in the estimates an appropriation of $100,000 for building a façade on the present building, and making very large improvements. I think that tenders had been called for, and were pending when I became minister. The lowest tender I think, approached very nearly the sum of $300,000. I thought that entirely too much money to expend upon this old building which, I thought, even after the money had been expended, would not be just what the country would want. My own preference is for the erection of an entirely new building, and my personal view is to erect it on a different site. I would choose a site in the vicinity of Rockliffe on the high ground that overlooks the Ottawa river, and from which there is a view for twenty miles, one of the finest views, I think, to be seen any where in the world. It would be an ideal situation for a Government House. The land on which the present Government House stands could be sold, I believe, for something like $600,000. It has been valued by the Ottawa Improvement Commission, and their estimate is that, if laid out in building lots, it would bring, at a conservative estimate, the sum I have named. I think it would be very much better to take steps in the near future to acquire another site, and erect a building which would be not too expensive, but which would be suitable for the residence of the Governor General. However, of course, we cannot do that in time for His Royal Highness, and so it is necessary to make the expenditure for which we are now asking authority.

Mr. MARSHALL. I quite agree with what the minister says about this building. I do not think it is in keeping with the surroundings, or with the purpose for which it is maintained. It is a pity that we cannot avoid this yearly expenditure of $50,000, and sell that building and build somewhere else. Every year an estimate comes down for repairs to Rideau Hall. I think it is high time that we put an end to this expenditure and erected a new building. I would gladly support any reasonable amount the government might ask for a new and suitable building. The present one looks more like an old barracks; it is a gloomy place, not at all such as Canada should provide for her Governors General.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The story the minister tells us to-night is the same old story we have been hearing for the last twenty years. Every year we are asked for about $50,000 for repairs on this building. Every year we are told that something is going to be done towards a new building, but nothing is done. There has been enough money spent in repairs on that building since I have been in this House to put up a residence that would be a credit to the gentleman who occupies it and a credit to the country. I would like to know how much longer we are going to hear this story told. I do not think there is a member in this House who does not regard that residence as a disgrace to the country. There are enough unnecessary expenditures called for in the supplementary estimates to build half a dozen residences. I do not think this item should go through unless the minister promises to do something towards a new building. The present Governor General vacates the office in a short time, and we are going to have another representative from the King, a representative of whom we shall be proud. But I think when he sees this residence he will not have a high opinion, either of Canada or of its government. As for the present building, I do not think the Minister of Public Works would live in it even if it were offered him free. On this side of the House we want to see the Governor General lodged in a decent residence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I entirely agree with what my hon. friend from Grenville (Mr. Reid) has said, that money would have been saved to this country if all that has been expended in repairs for the last fifteen or twenty years had been used to put up a new building. The difficulty of the situation is that the Duke of Connaught is expected here in the latter part of September, and it is only possible to make the residence suitable for him by making further repairs on a building which should have been torn down long ago. It is not an economic way of proceeding, but I suppose under the circumstances no other

course is open. As I understand it, the Duke of Connaught has sent a representative here to obtain information with regard to that and other matters, and these repairs have been decided upon after consultation between the Duke's representative and the Minister of Public Works. I do not see how this proposed expenditure can be avoided, and I do not think there should be any objection to provide the money to make these repairs.

Mr. FIELDING. I think it would be a pity if the report should go out that Canada is not providing for His Royal Highness a decent and comfortable accommodation. It may be well to put up a new building. The old building is a piece of patchwork, an old homestead, which has been added to from time to time without any particular method, but I think all the Governors General who have occupied it will testify that the house is exceedingly comfortable. If it is not a thing of beauty it is at all events a comfortable home. With the improvements which the minister proposes to make, I am quite satisfied we will have an accommodation for the Governor General which will not be a discredit to Canada. Let us, however, keep in view either the enlargement or the construction of another building. I think we are hardly doing justice to the old building when we say that we are not giving the Duke decent accommodation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have no objection to this estimate being passed to put the building in decent shape for the Duke of Connaught. What I am complaining of is that the Minister of Public Works has been making repairs for the last twenty years which would far more than have sufficed to put up a new building. More than that, he is wasting the money of the country in various parts, such as building canals in places where there is no water, and then he says there is not money enough to build a new residence for the Governor General. He came down here the other day with $17,000,000 in the supplementary estimates, the largest expenditure that was ever known. Why doesn't the minister put something in the estimates for a new building? The minister has no trouble in finding the money for unnecessary expenditures when an election is coming on, but he has no money with which to provide a decent residence for the Governor General. The Minister of Finance, like the Minister of Public Works, is trying to make excuses. I think if the Governor General saw that building and went back to England and described it, there would not be much more immigration from England. Now, I ask, again, when is something to be done about a new building?

Mr. FIELDING. I have no recollection of ever having spoken on the subject before, but this is not the only case in which the hon. gentleman has drawn on his imagination.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The memory of the Minister of Finance is getting very short when it is necessary for him to clear himself. Before this session ends I will show him where it has been drawn to his attention.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not the point. I said I had no recollection of ever having spoken on the subject before. Possibly I did, but, if so, I have no recollection of it. My point was that this is not an indecent building, but a very convenient and respectable building, and Canada need not be ashamed of it. Let us not send out to the world the idea that Canada does not provide the Duke with decent accommodation.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Just before the arrival of the Sheffield Choir in Ottawa, a pamphlet was sent out containing cuts of the government houses in the various other colonies, and every member who compared the buildings there shown with the collection of shacks we have down at Rideau Hall would be ashamed of Canada. It would take only a year or two to erect a building that would be a credit to this country, and the time to commence it, if we have neglected to do it up to date, would be now. It is to be hoped that the architecture of the new government building would be a little better than that of the latest public building erected, that is the famous museum. For a long time I was puzzled to know the origin of that style of architecture. I had a hazy idea that I had seen a building like the museum before, but I could not place it until a short time ago when I saw a picture of the old ice palace that was put up in Montreal many years ago. I then recognized in the museum a replica of the old ice palace, even to the cracks in the wall; and I would not be surprised if the whole thing melted away some day. But, all jokes aside, there is no doubt that unless you make a beginning of a good building for our Governor General, and make a beginning soon, we shall not have one at all, because if our reciprocity policy is going to be in vogue in a few years, we shall have no need for a Governor General.

Mr. FIELDING. Would it not be a pity to spend so much money on the building if that is the outlook?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I can quite understand my hon. friend's desire to be economical on that score.

Mr. BLAIN. Evidently the government are changing their policy on this question. If I understood the Minister of Public

Works correctly, he said that three or four years ago when he took office advertisements had been sent out and tenders had been received for a new building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, for a front.

Mr. BLAIN. Evidently then the government had decided on an expenditure of about $300,000 at that time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government had not decided on that expenditure. The government had decided on making improvements, of which the chief architect had made a rough design, and which it was supposed could be made for about $100,000; but, after plans were prepared and tenders were called for, it was found that the cost of the work would be in the vicinity of $300,000. Then I brought the matter before my colleagues, who thought we would not be justified in going to that large expenditure to make an improvement in the present building.

Mr. BLAIN. The government had evidently decided to make some extensive improvements on the building. Since then they have abandoned that policy altogether. Whatever the Minister of Finance may say, the question of providing a better building has been discussed in this House for many years, and it has been practically decided that a better building should be provided. I am very much surprised that the halting policy of the Minister of Public Works should put us in the position we are in now, though the House is practically unanimously of the opinion that a new building should be provided because of the importance of the representative coming to occupy the premises. Some censure was due to the Minister of Public Works for having failed even to look for a site for a new building when he evidently contemplated something of the kind. During the four years since then he has done nothing except spend a considerable amount every year, and now the committee is asked to vote $50,000 again, which will not be of much service if the policy of erecting a new building is carried out. The Minister of Finance defends the old building, while the Minister of Public Works condemns it. Until we get harmony in the government in this matter, I do not think the country can expect very much.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have heard rumours to the effect that as soon as a Governor General leaves the premises, people, not necessarily from Ottawa, flock to the house and carry off pictures, paintings, carpets, furniture and everything else, and the incoming Governor General has to be supplied with an entirely new outfit. I understand that that has been the way in which the materials, including many things of great value, have been disposed of. I would like to know if the minister has heard of this going on.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not heard of any such thing, and I would be greatly surprised if there was any truth in the statement. I understand that when a new Governor General comes, it is necessary to put in some new furniture, in which case the old furniture would be sent to the place where these things are usually sold, and disposed of at public auction, and for the public benefit. But I cannot imagine for a moment that there is any truth in the rumour which my hon. friend has heard. We have a very reliable man who remains in charge in the interim between the departure and arrival of a Governor General and he would see that nothing of the kind takes place.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand it is quite a custom.

Mr. SPROULE. I have heard it stated most positively more than once than when a Governor General leaves Canada parties in the House give away a large portion of the furniture to their friends as mementos, and that practically the house is pretty well cleared out. I have heard that statement made by those in a position to know.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have never heard it said by any one who knew, and I have never even heard the rumour before.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Now that the new art gallery is erected, will the minister gather in it all these valuable paintings that have been distributed around Ottawa?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Some of the paintings which will ultimately go to the art gallery are in this building and possibly in some other government buildings, but I never heard that they had been distributed around Ottawa among private individuals as the hon. member's remark would imply. I would be greatly surprised if there was any truth in that statement. The hon. gentleman must be speaking from rumour for which there is not the least foundation.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Where are all these valuable paintings that are owned by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will take occasion to ascertain.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Will the minister lay on the table of the House a list of the paintings and such, that have been purchased by the government and their present location?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can probably have that done, and if my hon. friend calls attention to it again, I shall be glad to give such information as is available. Let me say in justification for my own delay and perhaps

for the fact that the government have not taken action to erect a new building or to make large improvements in the present building, that the question is not free from difficulty. When I suggested a different site, I was expressing my own personal view, and not the view of the government. There are many people—and I have no reason to doubt that some members of the government are among them—who think that the present site is admirable for a Governor General's residence. The site is very beautiful, the trees are fine, and altogether the land is capable of very great improvement. But, the building would have to be erected on the site of the old one, and it would mean that for two years there would be no residence for the Governor General, and his family.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Apart from the present site, is there not sufficient room on the grounds for a new building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know of any other available location on these grounds; in my opinion, the land would not lend itself to the erection of a large building on any other part of it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The famous confederation picture, portraying the fathers of confederation which used to hang in the Railway Committee room has disappeared, and nobody seems to know where it has gone. There is a rumour that it has been sent away for the purpose of painting in the portraits of the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Public Works as fathers of confederation. Is there any foundation for that rumour?

Mr. FISHER. That painting has been lent to the Festival of Empire in London as the representation of a very important historical event, and no addition will be made to it in any way.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). This item should be allowed to stand until we have information supplied us as to the total amount of money spent on Rideau Hall. There seems to be a universal opinion that action should be taken towards erecting a new building right away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will get that information for the main estimates. It is very desirable this vote should be passed as quickly as possible, because there is not a day to be lost in getting these improvements ready by the time the Duke of Connaught will arrive as Governor General. We will have to keep the whole staff working right on to the very moment of his arrival to complete the work.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have no objection to this item going through. The minister told us that four years ago he got out plans and asked tenders for a new building.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was for an improvement to the present building.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There evidently was some discussion among the members of the cabinet regarding the unsuitability of these premises, because the hon. gentleman says that some of the other ministers thought this was a suitable site, and others thought that another would be better. I am of the opinion that the whole trouble is that the Minister of Finance will not supply the money.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is very economical

Mr. REID (Grenville). He is until just before the elections and then it is surprising how elastic his conscience becomes. Does he intend doing anything towards getting a proper residence for the Governor General? The excuse given by the Minister of Public Works why we cannot begin another building is that in the meantime His Excellency could not use the present residence, but that excuse will prevent another building ever being erected on the present site. We might just as well start now and provide a building in another place. It is all very well for the Finance Minister to say that the present building is satisfactory. I say it is not, and I am sure the Duke of Connaught will be very much disappointed when he finds the sort of residence provided for him. If the Minister of Finance will put in an amount now to erect a new building and have it begun at once, we will agree to that. We have told him that from year to year. He has been spending $50,000 or $60,000 every year since he has been in office on the present old building—enough to supply completely new premises.

Mr. FISHER. It is not fair to saddle all the responsibility on my hon. colleague the Minister of Finance. The hon. gentleman has made some tempting offers, but I have a suspicion that he could not deliver the goods. We have not yet heard that he is leader of the party opposite, or can speak for his friends. I do not mean to say that his offer would influence us one way or the other, because if we should assume the responsibility of erecting a new building, we would take the whole of it on our own shoulders. I can bear testimony to what the Minister of Finance has said regarding His Excellency the Governor General's opinion of Rideau Hall as a residence. Several governors have declared it to be a most comfortable house, very well fitted for a vice-regal residence. The facade is not very prepossessing or grandiose, and some four years ago, when I was for a short time acting Minister of Public Works,

the suggestion was made that we might be able to improve the facilities for a better entrance. The officers of the department prepared plans and made an estimate and tenders were asked for. But the lowest tender was so much higher than the estimate that the government decided that to spend so much money on an old house was altogether out of the question. The lowest tender involved an expenditure of some $300,000 simply on an improvement, and the government decided that that was too large an amount. That was some five or six years ago.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the hon. gentleman thought it was not a fit building for the Governor General?

Mr. FISHER. No, I said nothing of the kind. True, suggestions have been made for the purchase of another site, and for the pulling down of the present building and the erection of a new one on the same site. The latter would put us in this position, that for two years we would be without a government house, and we preferred to make some expenditures every year or two on improvements. Just now there will be some extra expenditure in view of the arrival of the Duke of Connaught. This is an emergency vote to a certain extent for the purpose of carrying out improvements which are required in consequence of the approaching change. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, has already said that he has no objection to this vote, and I do not see any reason why it should not go through. There are other votes on public works, in the discussion of which the House can get all the information with regard to Government House or other expenditures required, but I think it would be well to let this vote go through at once.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would ask the minister to bring down a statement of the amount of money expended for paintings, furniture and furnishings at Rideau Hall since the government came into office, and at the same time the amount received for the disposal of similar goods. Then we will be able to see just how the matter stands.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will be glad to get that for my hon. friend.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. He will then find I am justified in making the statements I have made. With reference to the new museum, and the national paintings I understand that they have been placed in a number of different homes merely for safe keeping in many instances, but that they have not been returned to their proper places.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is all news to me, I will make inquiries.

Mr. MARSHALL. What is the nature of the improvements, is it to be an addition to the present building or to improve the building as it stands?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The improvements will consist of certain painting of the building both outside and in, certain decorating of some rooms. It will include the building of a garage. There is no garage at present, and the Duke uses automobiles very extensively, and will bring a number with him to this country. It will include the building of some additional cottages for the accommodation of his servants and a thorough renewal of the sewerage arrangements in connection with Rideau Hall. It will include also the removal of the chapel erected by Lord Aberdeen, and which, by reason of additions which have been made since, is now a source of danger in case of fire. It is thought desirable to remove that chapel which is no longer used.

Mr. JAMESON. To substitute the garage for the chapel?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it would be called properly a substitution. There will be some new furnishings also. These matters have been gone over very carefully with Major Bulkeley, the equerry of His Royal Highness, and we have concluded that these things ought to be done and the chief architect is of the opinion that the amount asked is the least for which they could be done.

Mr. RUSSELL. Then only a small amount of this expenditure is on the old building?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Except for painting and decorating.

Mr. REID (Grenville). From the statement of the minister it would appear that every Governor who comes here when he sees the building complains to the government for giving him a place of this kind to occupy. The Minister of Agriculture stated that when he was acting Minister of Public Works he decided that a new building was necessary, and even went so far as to call for tenders, but that something happened. Of course the government decided that they could not afford to spend that amount of money. That is practically what the Minister of Agriculture said, that they could not afford to spend $360,000 to erect a building that would be a credit to Canada, and he decided to go on patching away, spending $50,000 a year which has been done ever since. I have no doubt that the $360,000 has been used up entirely in patchwork. That does not appear to me to be very good judgment. I feel that the Minister of Agriculture has confirmed my opinion about this matter, that is, that the Minister of Finance is

responsible for these works not being gone on with, because something happened and the money could not be provided. I have understood that when any minister lays an estimate before the Minister of Finance, if that minister draws his pen through it that ends it, and I suppose he must have told the Minister of Agriculture, who was Acting Minister of Public Works, that he could not possibly see his way clear to do anything towards erecting a new building or fixing up the premises for the Governor General. No doubt the present Governor has complained, as the others have done, but has had to submit and go through his term with the premises as they are. I venture to say that after the Duke of Connaught has been here for five years we will find the same old buildings and the same patchwork and the same promises if the Finance Minister has to decide whether the buildings are to be rebuilt or not. I am under the impression that after the general elections the present opposition will have to decide as to the building which the Governor General shall occupy, and I can assure the Minister of Agriculture, although I am only speaking for myself, that the members on this side of the House are generous enough to provide a proper building for the Governor General, although the government apparently are not. I believe the members who sit behind the government would be quite willing to join in seeing that Canada gives to the Governor General a proper residence.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to make a further suggestion with reference to the Art Gallery. We have many valuable paintings, I understand, in the fire trap at the Fisheries Exhibit on O'Connor street. They should be transferred to proper quarters as early as possible and we ought to have a decent art gallery for the people who come to visit Ottawa.

Mr. FISHER. Every painting in the National Gallery which was in the Fisheries building, is now in the new Museum, and has been for some weeks.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I was there within a very few weeks, and the removal had not been made then.

Mr. FISHER. I was there more than a month ago, and they were there then.

Ottawa Public Buildings — Governments's share of cost of pavements, sidewalks, &c., laid down by municipal authorities in front of these buildings, $9,610.80.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is to pay our proper share towards the pavements laid down by the city.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is the government prepared to pay its share of sidewalks in front of public buildings, in other cities? We are doing it constantly in Ottawa, but I understand it is not done in other cities, especially in Toronto.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do the same in other cities in the case of a permanent pavement in front of a public building.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). For three or four years I have been trying to get something like this from the department in relation to the city of Winnipeg, but we have not seen the colour of their money yet. We get nice promises.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg) has been looking lately to see how the matter stood. An order in council passed some little time ago for payment of the money to the city of Winnipeg. I presume it is paid. If not, it is going through the regular course of payment.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I got a letter a week ago, and it was not paid then.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Does not the hon. member (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg) know that it takes six months for money to go through the department?

Mr. FIELDING. There are one or two items in the way of payments of Indian annuities that it is of the utmost importance to have voted. These are matters of treaty, and we cannot explain to the Indians the rules of parliament which cause delay. One of these is an item 260. This is a group of Indian items, including the grant for annuities. But, to make the vote of the annuities effective, we have to have the whole item. Then there is No. 264, which is in the same position. I would suggest that these might be passed with the understanding that if there is anything to be discussed abundant opportunity shall be afforded later for the discussion.

Indians—Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Northwest Territories, $673,186.

Mr. SPROULE. The amount for annuities in this is $170,345. The whole item is a large one and might cause some discussion and inquiry.

Mr. FIELDING. Could not we have the item passed with the understanding that there will be no limitation to the discussion of it later on?

Mr. SPROULE. When the item is passed, there is no check. It is unfortunate to put us in that position.

Mr. FIELDING. The item is a large one.

Mr. OLIVER. All that we really need is the annuity money, as $170,345, but, in order to get that, apparently, we have to ask for the whole item.

Mr. SPROULE. There is usually a good deal of inquiry about these votes, and a good deal of explanation required. It is not exactly reasonable to put through a half million in this way without an inquiry as to what is proposed, or what has been done in the past. That is hardly what might be expected of parliament.

Mr. FIELDING. I had hoped the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) would waive that objection, but if he presses it I cannot object.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Do I understand that the annuity cannot be voted without the rest of the items?

Mr. FIELDING. As the hon. gentleman will see these items are numbered, half a dozen different amounts grouped under one item. Under the method of dealing with these items in Committee of the Whole, if only the annuity amount is passed, it will not be reported, but will stand in committee. We shall have the expression of the committee's good will, but I do not think that the Auditor General will regard the passing of the item as authority to give the money.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Well, does the minister propose that this whole item—

Mr. FIELDING. I say that if objection is taken, I cannot press it. I think the criticism is a fair one, and I cannot object.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think the House is willing to grant the annuity money because that is money belonging to the Indians themselves.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know how the Auditor General may view it. I think, on the whole, it will be better to take the annuity items. They will remain in committee and not be reported, but whether the Auditor General will regard that as sufficient authority for him will be for him to decide.

Mr. RUSSELL. Are all these amounts in connection with the Indian affairs?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, they are all for the Indians.

Mr. OLIVER. I hope the committee understands the absolute necessity of getting this money in order to keep faith with the Indians. While we do not wish to ask the House a large item without due consideration, we do ask that the government be allowed to keep faith with the Indians in regard to their treaty money. If only the amount for annuities is adopted, I would like it to be with the idea that, if the Auditor General does not see fit to allow the payment of the money we shall have to come back to the committee and ask for further consideration.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not see why there should be any such urgent hurry. We have been sitting over six months and surely this could have been foreseen and arrangements made accordingly. It seems to me that if foresight had been exercised over the business that would have been done. I do not know what time of the year the Indian annuities are paid, but I understood it was in the fall.

Mr. OLIVER. The parties who pay treaty in northern Alberta have already started. The party for northern Ontario has to start in a few days, or it cannot make its dates. Generally speaking, the arrangements have to be made in time or we cannot meet the dates with the Indians. I am not urging the House to show its confidence in the government to the extent of passing this large vote but I am sure the House would rather show that confidence in the government than have a treaty broken with the Indians.

Mr. BLAIN. This is one of the items mentioned by the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) a day or two ago, and agreed to by the leader of the opposition (Mr. R. L. Borden). Of course the responsibility of securing the money and making the payments will rest with the government. The leader of the opposition stated in the House that he was quite willing the Indian annuities should pass. The opposition now are willing to carry out this agreement.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman is not satisfied, if he wants to pass the whole item, I will be happy to have it passed.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I was present when the discussion took place. The leader of the opposition asked if that was a payment of money arising out of the treaty, and the Prime Minister said, yes. Now, there is a large item here involving, with the annuities, $250,000. If it is desirable that the money should be also voted, I think the minister should give us a general statement of what that means.

Mr. SPROULE. It was a question whether we should vote these items in toto, or only sufficient of them to carry on the service until September. The Prime Minister said there were certain items which needed to be voted in toto, and among them was the annuities to Indians.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is correct, I move that the committee rise.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.05 a.m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FRIDAY, May 12, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 212) to amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill (No. 209) respecting grain.—Mr. Oliver.

Bill (No. 210) to amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act as regards the delivery of wood.—Mr. Sinclair.

THE BANK ACT.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 213) to amend the Bank Act. He said: The object of this Bill is to extend the charters of the banks for one year. Before this parliament shall reassemble after adjournment the banks under the existing law would be without charters. It is proposed to extend the charters for one year so that instead of their lapsing on the 1st of July, 1911, they will not lapse until 1st of July, 1912, before which time it is hoped we will have a general revision of the Bank Act. In the schedule will be found the names of a number of banks which are going out of business either by absorption or by suspension, but it is necessary to include them, not in expectation that they will continue business, but that they may have all necessary powers for winding up their affairs.

Mr. FOSTER. This Bill is nothing else than simply to extend the charters.

Mr. FIELDING. Absolutely nothing else.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

MORNING SESSIONS OF HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That from Monday, the 15th of May instant, and until the end of the session, the House shall meet on that day and on every subsequent sitting day at eleven o'clock in the morning; and that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock p.m., there shall be also an intermission every day, including Wednesday, from one to three o'clock p.m.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution seems to mean that Monday next will not be included.

Mr. FIELDING. It was intended to apply to Monday next.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand this resolution, it applies not only to the date of adjournment, but to the sessions of the House after we meet in July.

Mr. FIELDING. That would be the effect of it, but of course when the House reassembles in July the question can be further considered.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The understanding with the Prime Minister was that in order to facilitate business we should meet next Monday morning and continue sittings in the morning until the date of adjournment. But the Minister of Finance is including in this resolution the remainder of the session after we reassemble.

Mr. FIELDING. That particular point was not discussed between the Prime Minister, who drew the resolution, and myself, but it certainly would have that effect.

Mr. FOSTER. It goes too far.

Mr. FIELDING. Does it? When we reassemble the House can then say what it wants to do. The difficulty just now is as to the exact date of adjournment, because some gentlemen have suggested an earlier day than the 23rd of May.

Mr. FOSTER. The resolution can read that we will sit in the mornings until the date of adjournment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is made to extend to the 23rd inst., it would cover everything even if we did adjourn on the 19th.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps that would be the better way.

Mr. EMMERSON. Why should we not meet in the mornings until the end of the session? Committees are now through with their work, and when we come back in July we don't want to stay here until Christmas. I speak, not as a party man, but as a member of this House, and I know that my constituents expect me to come here in the morning and attend to the business of the country, so that, if possible, there may be an end to this session. I say it is our duty to sit here in the morning, and I strongly urge that the resolution should remain as it is.

Mr. FOSTER. There are different posts of duty, and when we come back after the adjournment, we will have duties to perform in committee as well as in session of the House, both of which are important. I certainly think we ought not to tie ourselves at this time for that indefinite period. I think it would meet every emergency if this resolution went until the time of our final adjournment in May. Then, when we come back, we can decide as a House of Commons what we will do. I am afraid that the government will then be just about as powerful, with its majority, as it is now, and can carry, if it wishes, a measure which at that time may seem suitable in

order to help the government with the business.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is found necessary to revive the motion when we reassemble that can be done. For the present I accept the suggestion that it be made effective until the 23rd instant. If we should adjourn earlier, it will be non-effective.

Motion as amended, agreed to.

BARRINGTON PASSAGE BAIT FREEZER.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to give some information to my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), who asked about a return with reference to a bait freezer at Barrington Passage, and about the cancellation of a fishery lease to Mr. Markey. I communicated with the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, who received the following letter from Mr. Newcombe, the Deputy Minister of Justice, under date of April 4:

I have the honour to acknowledge your letter of the 21st ultimo, No. 118, and in reply beg to state that as the question of the recovery of the $500 advanced by your department for the construction of a bait freezer at Barrington Passage, Nova Scotia, is now under consideration with a view to the taking of legal proceedings if it is thought that such proceedings would be successful, I do not think that any of the papers relating to the matter should be returned to the House of Commons. I am also of opinion that the cancellation of the fishery lease to Mr. Markey, being now under advisement, none of the papers relating to that matter should be returned to the House of Commons.

That explains the delay in the return sought by the hon. gentleman.

MANITOBA CENSUS ENUMERATORS.

Mr. STAPLES. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if the enumerators for the taking of the census in the province of Manitoba have been appointed.

Mr. FISHER. I think they all are; if not, with very few exceptions.

Mr. STAPLES. By whom were they recommended?

Mr. FISHER. They were recommended by men in whom I have confidence.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not think that is an answer to my question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow a debate on the orders of the day.

Mr. STAPLES. I have a further question to ask. Had the Liberal organizer in the province of Manitoba anything to do with the appointment or recommending of the enumerators for that province?

Mr. FISHER. That is a question which I decline to answer.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the Liberal organizer of the province of Manitoba anything to do with the schooling of the enumerators before they begin their work?

Mr. FISHER. No.

NIAGARA RIVER WATER-POWER.

Hon. WM. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I promised my hon. friend the leader of the opposition to make a statement to the House in reference to an article which he quoted yesterday from a newspaper relating to applications which the newspaper intimates are being made for the diversion of further water from the Niagara river. In the article from which my hon. friend quoted I find the following:

The situation is peculiar. The waterways treaty with Canada, signed January 11, 1909, while apparently limiting the amount of water which might be taken from the falls, has, on the contrary, increased this diversion. The power development companies have taken advantage of the outside limitations of the treaty and to-day are demanding what will come to 68 per cent more water than is now being drawn into the tunnels for the purpose of turning the giant turbine engines.

I may say to my hon. friend, as I have no doubt he is aware, from a consideration of what has passed during recent years, that previous to certain legislation which was enacted by the United States Congress, and previous to the framing of the treaty between Great Britain and the United States, the question of allowing certain diversions of water from the Niagara river was assumed, I think by common assent, to rest with the province of Ontario and the state of New York respectively. At the present time, under the amendment to the Navigable Waters Protection Act, I think that any diversion of the waters of the Niagara river could only be allowed by the Department of Public Works of this government, because it is now provided that no person or company can erect any work in a navigable water without the consent of the Governor in Council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works. That was not the case under the old law, and the province of Ontario assumed to grant authority to divert the waters of the Niagara river, and quite a number of companies did receive authority from the government and the legislature of Ontario to make such diversions. The state of New York also gave authority to companies to divert the waters upon the United States side, and power companies were formed there as well as upon the Canadian side, and did divert a considerable quantity of water. In the year 1906

Congress acted in the matter, and passed a statute which provided that no diversion on the water of the Niagara river, on the American side should take place except with the consent of the Congress of the United States, or the Secretary of War of the United States under its control. That Act was passed in 1906. It was to be in force for three years after its passage. Later on, I think in the year 1909, a joint resolution was passed by the House of Representatives, and the Senate, extending that statute for a further term of two years pending what was then in contemplation, the coming to an agreement between the two governments, and the framing of a treaty with reference to this matter. The extension provided for by that joint resolution will expire by limitation on the 29th day of next month. The joint resolution to which the newspaper from which my hon. friend quoted refers, is now pending before the Congress, having been introduced by Senator Burton. That resolution is as follows:

Joint resolution extending the operation of the Act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara river, for the preservation of Niagara Falls, and for other purposes.

Whereas, the provisions of the Act entitled 'An Act for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara river, for the preservation of Niagara Falls and for other purposes,' approved June 29, 1906, and extended by joint resolution (public resolution numbered fifty-six) for a period of two years, approved March 3, 1909, will expire by limitation June 29, 1911; and

Whereas, the extended date provided therein for the termination of the operation of said Act was so extended that there might be consummated a more permanent settlement of the question involved by a treaty with Great Britain and by further legislation appropriate to the situation; and, whereas, article 5 of a treaty between the United States and Great Britain, proclaimed May 13, 1910, provides a maximum limit within which the United States may authorize and permit the diversion within the state of New York of the waters of the Niagara river above the Falls of Niagara for power purposes;

Therefore, be it resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, that the provisions of the aforesaid Act be, and they are hereby, extended from June 29, 1911, being the date of the expiration of the operation of said Act, to remain in full force and virtue during the life of said treaty, save in so far as any proportion thereof may be found inapplicable or already complied with.

I may say that under the statute of 1906, the Secretary of War was permitted to authorize a diversion to existing companys to the extent of 15,000 cubic feet per second, and also to grant temporary permits for water in addition. It is important, in view of the quotation from the article in question, to bear in mind that that Act does not place any limitation on the right to divert water for sanitary and domestic purposes, but expressly authorizes that right and take it out of the other provision with respect to the diversion of water for power purposes.

After a careful consideration of the International Waterways Treaty, after examination by engineers, and seeing their report, it was decided that, having reference to the interests involved, and the industries which had been established upon the United States and Canadian sides respectively, it would be reasonable to permit a diversion on the part of the United States to 20,000 cubic feet per second, and to permit diversion on the Canadian side to the extent of 36,000 cubic feet per second, so that the right—if it may be so called—to divert water on the Canadian side is almost twice as great as on the American side—36,000 cubic feet per second to 20,000 cubic feet. That limitation is contained in article 5 of the Boundaries Treaty between Great Britain and the United States. I will just read the third clause from article 5 of this treaty:

So long as this treaty shall remain in force, no diversion of the waters of the Niagara river above the falls from the natural course and stream thereof shall be permitted except for the purpose and to the extent hereinafter provided.

The United States may authorize and permit the diversion within the State of New York of the waters of the said river above the Falls of Niagara, for power purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 20,000 cubic feet of water per second.

The United Kingdom, by the Dominion of Canada, or the province of Ontario, may authorize and permit the diversion within the province of Ontario of the waters of said river above the Falls of Niagara for power purposes, not exceeding in the aggregate a daily diversion at the rate of 36,000 cubic feet per second.

Under the treaty the United States have the right to authorize a diversion up to 20,000 cubic feet per second, and the Canadian authorities have the right to authorize a diversion to the extent of 36,000 cubic feet per second, but to what extent the United States will allow the diversion on their side—whether to the full extent of the 20,000 cubic feet per second or not—is a matter entirely within their control, and with which we have nothing to do.

The resolution introduced by Senator Burton into Congress is for the purpose of limiting the power of the State of New York to grant a diversion up to the full quantity provided by the treaty.

Mr. FOSTER. That does not include what may be diverted for sanitary or domestic purposes?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, that was excepted in the statute passed by Congress in 1906, and which the joint resolution by Senator Burton, is intended to extend.

I notice that in the article quoted by my hon. friend the statement is made that the treaty has increased the diversion. That is not the case. The treaty gives no power to make a diversion, but simply limits the right to allow a diversion. If the treaty had not been passed, the state of New York might have done just as the province of Ontario has been doing—authorize a diversion to any extent. That is the right claimed and exercised by the province of Ontario. But what this treaty does is to limit the right of Canada on the one side and the United States, or the state of New York, on the other, to allow a diversion beyond 36,000 cubic feet per second by Canada, and 20,000 cubic feet per second by the United States.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood from the minister that at one time the diversion on the United States side was limited to 15,000 cubic feet per second. If I am correct in that, it would seem that the treaty has increased the maximum amount what might be diverted, because that amount is now 20,000 cubic feet per second.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said that in 1906, the limitation apparently, as I read the statute, for permanent diversion which would be allowed by the Secretary of War was about 15,000 cubic feet per second, but in addition he could grant temporary permits. That only extended over three years. Afterwards when the engineers made their examination and decided on what they would recommend, it was found necessary, in order not to destroy existing industries on the Canadian side, to allow Canada a larger diversion, which was fixed at 36,000 cubic feet per second, and to allow the United States a diversion of 20,000 cubic feet per second.

This article states that the power companies are taking 68 per cent more water than is at present being drawn into the tunnels. I cannot believe that that is true because the difference between what was authorized by the statute of 1906, and the treaty, adding the temporary permits, could not exceed more than 25 per cent at the outside.

Mr. HAGGART. Might I ask whether the jurisdiction over the user of the water is entirely in the hands of the Dominion and the United States, independent of the province of Ontario and the state of New York?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure as to that. I think that would be a very nice question. The state of New York has claimed the right to authorize the diversion. Ontario has claimed the same right on the ground that it is the owner of the soil or the riparian owner. The state of New York claims the right, I presume, because it is a question of property which comes within the definition of state rights. However, by the statute of 1906, Congress claimed their right to intervene, under the treaty the right to divert is expressly limited, and under the American constitution a treaty becomes the supreme law superseding any statute of any state. Under the constitution, the treaty becomes the supreme law of the country and supersedes any statute of the state of New York.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It would not in our country, it would not supersede the rights of Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am speaking now of the state of New York. So far as our country is concerned, of course that point is immaterial. In reference to the point raised by my hon. friend, I am inclined to think that under our present law, as the Niagara river is, for the most part, a navigable river, no works could now be placed in the river for the diversion of water without the consent of this government. I may be wrong in that, but I think that would be the effect of the statute.

With regard to the right which was given by the treaty to divert water for sanitary or domestic purposes, as I have said, that right was recognized by the United States Congress in the statute of 1906, to which I have referred, it is recognized in the treaty and I think it is a right which each country would claim. That is always claimed with respect to boundary waters, but it is absurd for this newspaper to make the statement that these power companies could divert a large quantity of water under the pretense that it was for domestic or sanitary purposes. The water which would be diverted for these purposes would be infinitesimal as compared with the full flow of the Niagara river. They could not and they would not be permitted under the treaty to use water for creating power which was ostensibly diverted for sanitary and domestic purposes. That matter would be under the control of the Joint Commissioners to be appointed under the Boundary Waters Treaty.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Would that include the supplying of cities with water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly it would, and water for sewage purposes, but that was recognized in the Act of Congress and the treaty makes no change in regard to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This is not a newspaper article, it is a statement issued by the American Civic Association. The statement does make the claim that the

treaty increased the maximum diversion. The allusion is no doubt to the fact that formerly the United States fixed the maximum at 15,000 cubic feet per second, and the treaty increased the diversion to 20,000 cubic feet per second. There is an increase in that regard subject, of course, to the qualification mentioned by the minister, by which it appears that the Secretary of War of the United States had power to grant temporary or special permits increasing the diversion beyond 15,000 cubic feet per second. I have not examined the statutes and regulations to which the minister has alluded, so I cannot speak with regard to that and accept his statement. However, I do think that this government has a duty to perform in the matter. In the first place, it has the duty of seeing that the diversion on the United States side is not greater than that permitted by the treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Secondly, this government has the duty of seeing that the provision which declares that water may be diverted beyond 20,000 cubic feet per second for sanitary or domestic purposes is not abused. I do not say that there is any intention of abusing it, but there is certainly a suggestion in this statement which has been issued by the American Civic Association that some idea of that kind is to the fore at the present time. The statement may be an absolutely inaccurate one. Whether it is inaccurate or not, the government should have it in mind and see that no pretense of that kind is made use of by these corporations of the United States which are interested in securing a supply of this water, that no pretense founded on that provision is allowed to have any such effect as would be contrary to the true intent and meaning of this treaty.

Mr. TURRIFF. When does the minister expect to take up Bill (No. 36) in connection with the appointing of the Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. On Tuesday, if it is possible to reach it, I will take it up.

COPYRIGHT ACT.

Bill (No. 184) respecting Copyrights—Mr. Fisher—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1, short title,

Mr. FISHER. I gave a fairly full explanation of the Bill on the resolution, and since that time the Bill itself and a memorandum on its provisions have been very largely distributed in the country. Every one who had written about this Bill, and every member of the House has been sent a copy of the Bill and a memorandum of its provisions. The consequence has been that I have had some replies, and I am gratified to find that on the whole, rather universally, the Bill is approved by those who have taken an interest in this very important question. A good many questions have been addressed to the department indicating some misapprehension on the part of the writers. I think that those misapprehensions have been removed by our replies, and I rather gather that with the removal of these misapprehensions the writers are pretty well satisfied with the Bill. There are, however, two points on which there is some little divergence of opinion. One provision of the Bill is that only British subjects resident in Canada or bona fide residents in Canada shall have the right to copyright in Canada. Under the present law foreigners can obtain the right to copyright in Canada, by reason of the fact that the British Copyright Act is in force here. Under the Canadian Copyright Act, a foreigner cannot obtain a copyright in Canada, but by reason of the fact that the British Copyright Act has been in force in Canada, foreigners obtaining British copyright, could then obtain Canadian copyright, or have copyright protection in Canada by virtue of their copyright in Great Britain. That condition of affairs is about to disappear by the Bill introduced in the British parliament and by this Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the general rule in the various civilized countries in that respect?

Mr. FISHER. In most countries foreigners can obtain copyrights. But in the countries which adhere to the International Union that is not required, because, by the International Union, the privileges of copyright are conferred upon all subjects of the countries of the union. We now belong to the union, and it is quite probable that under this new Act we may be able to join the union, with possibly some reservations. We have been in the union for 15 or 16 years, and we hope under the new Act to be able to continue in the union. I am speaking now of the provision of our Act which applies to people of all countries which are not in the union, or to any country at all. We have made special arrangement for joining the union. We are under peculiar circumstances here, owing to the proximity of the United States, and to the fact that the United States literature is largely similar to our own. We have to be a little more careful in regard to the provisions of copyright in Canada than any other country. That was the reason why, in framing the original Canadian Copyright Act, the privilege of copyright in Canada was confined to British subjects in Canada. This Bill

provides, not only for joining the union, but also for making special arrangements with countries outside the union. Possibly we may make an arrangement with the United States, if the United States is willing to make a fair arrangement. But I think this provision in our Act will be conducive to an arrangement with foreign countries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As I understand it, under our law as it has been up to the present time, the foreign author could get copyright in this country under the British Act; and in addition to that if the country of which he is a citizen, belongs to the union, he could get copyright in this country for the reason that Canada belonged to the union. So that he would have a double right in that respect. Now the British Copyright Act is to be withdrawn so far as its application to Canada is concerned, and the law of the country will depend upon this Bill now under consideration. This country belongs to the union, the citizens of any country belonging to that union will have rights in Canada and Canadians will have rights in those countries; those are reciprocal rights. So far as other countries are concerned, the minister proposes to maintain the Canadian law as it has been in the past, and to retain it in that shape for the purpose of making reciprocal arrangements in regard to copyright with those countries which are not members of the union.

Mr. FISHER. That is one reason, but not the only reason. I have gone so far as to say that in joining the union I think Canada ought to make a stipulation that the privilege of copyright in Canada shall only go to the citizens or subjects of a country which is in the union. In Great Britain and some other countries a foreigner who is of a country that is not within the union, cannot obtain a copyright under the law of Great Britain. If we join the union, practically it gives the privilege in Canada to the citizens or subjects of every country in the world, provided they take a copyright in one of those countries of the union. It is not confined to citizens or subjects of the union countries. I consider that that is a mistake on the part of the union. There is, under those circumstances, practically no inducement to go outside the union, because the citizen or subject of that country, by obtaining copyright in a union country, can get all the advantages of the union. I would, therefore, propose joining the union with a reservation, that the privileges of copyright in Canada shall be extended to the countries of the union so far as their own citizens or subjects are concerned; but if they choose to give to a citizen or subject of a country outside the union, copyright in their country, that will not give to the individual a copyright in Canada.

Mr. FOSTER. Does the United States belong to the union?

Mr. FISHER. No, and that is the trouble. If the United States belonged to the union, and if we had the privilege in the United States which the union gives to all other countries, the difficulty would be solved.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It seems then that Great Britain admits the copyright of all foreigners. Great Britain belongs to the union, and a foreigner taking out a copyright in Great Britain, therefore, can take out a copyright in Canada. We joined the union unreservedly. Then the next question is this: Would it be permitted us to join the union with the reservation which the minister suggests?

Mr. FISHER. That is just what we cannot say. We now belong to the union, and as long as we continue in the union we cannot help ourselves. But under this Bill we have the right to withdraw from the union. We joined the union by the voluntary act of the Canadian government some 16 or 17 years ago, and in doing that we got the privileges of the union and gave the privileges of the union. We gave the privileges of the union then, to a large extent, because one country against which we might desire to defend ourselves had all the privileges of the union in Canada through the British Copyright Act. Now under the new British Copyright Act they will not have that privilege, and we have the power within ourselves of giving or not giving that privilege. I think it would be a wise policy for us to say that we will not give privileges where the other people do not give us privileges. I think that is a reasonable position to take. I took that position in the conference in London last spring, and I do not think I am divulging any secret when I say that the conference admitted the principle and accepted that proposition. But England is so committed to the union, and so desirous of remaining in the union, that I am not prepared to say that England will join the union with the same reservation. I believe the conference was disposed to advise that, but I cannot say what will be done. I think that Canada ought only to join the union with a reservation, and if the union refuses to accept that reservation I would be disposed to stay out of it. I would do that with great regret, but at the same time I think it is necessary, and I am free to admit that it is necessary because the United States is not in the union. If the United States were in the union, and we got the privileges in the United States which we would get if they were in the union, then I would not hesi-

tate, but as long as an American citizen can get all the privileges and advantages in the union countries without the United States joining the union, or giving the same privileges in the United States. I do not feel disposed to join and give these privileges in Canada which they refuse us in the United States.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What position would you be in if you withdrew from the union?

Mr. FISHER. We would be in an isolated position, very much like the United States is, but we would have the control and management of our own copyright in Canada.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). You would have to make a separate arrangement with each country?

Mr. FISHER. With each country. This Bill contemplates what I call reciprocal arrangements within the empire. I would advocate very strongly that as soon as this Bill passes we immediately give to British copyright holders in Great Britain the full privileges of Canadian copyright, on the understanding that Great Britain shall give us the full privileges of British copyright. I would also propose that we should give the same privileges to Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and Newfoundland. I am satisfied that these different self-governing parts of the empire would treat us in the same way that we would be disposed to treat them. When it comes to foreign countries, supposing we were outside of the union, I would like to deal with them on a reasonable basis of mutual advantage. It may be in one way with one country, and in another way with another country, but I would like to do it on the basis that we get something for what we give. I cannot tell what our success in that respect would be, but I have hopes that to-day the Canadian market for literature, music, dramatic works and things of that kind, is becoming of sufficient importance to induce other countries to desire to have copyright privileges in Canada; in fact, I know that that is the case with many, and I have reason to believe that if we were withdrawing from the international union immediate steps would be taken by a number of countries to obtain the privileges of the union in Canada. I hope the reservation that I have indicated will be accepted by the union, but I cannot be sure of that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I would like to ask the hon. minister whether any investigation will be made as to the copyrights that will be granted to different periodicals or books that will be printed in Canada? I merely ask that because I know that at the present time there are magazines and books coming into our country that should not be coming in.

Mr. FISHER. I do not quite know what the hon. gentleman is referring to. If he would specify perhaps I could give him a little more information.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I understand the minister is preparing a law to grant copyrights to people who wish to come in and dispose of their books in Canada. Am I correct in that position?

Mr. FISHER. I am proposing a Bill which governs the whole question of copyright in Canada, and part of that Bill proposes to give the Governor in Council power to make arrangements with foreign countries on terms of mutual advantage. That would be done by order in council, and each order in council would specify just what the privileges were, and what extent they were granted to each particular country.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the order in council specify the names of the books that will be allowed to be brought in?

Mr. FISHER. No. The order in council would have to be in general terms, not specifying books at all. I do not know what my hon. friend is referring to in that respect, but I could give him more information if he would let me know what he has in mind.

On section 2,

Mr. FOSTER. Are these the same interpretation clauses as in the British Act?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, verbatim. Most, if not all, are definitions arrived at by agreement in the union.

On section 3,

Mr. FISHER. I beg to move:

That subclauses 2 and 3 of clause 3 be stricken out and the following three subclauses be substituted therefor:

2. Every copy of a literary work published in Canada other than maps, musical, scientific and artistic charts and plans, shall be printed or made in Canada.

3. Every copy of a work published in Canada shall bear notice of copyright.

(a) If the work is a book or other printed publication on the title page or on the page immediately following; or,

(b) If the work is a literary (other than a book or other printed publication) or a musical work, engraving, photograph or cinematograph, on the face thereof; or,

(c) If the work is a volume of maps, charts, plans, tables, music, engravings or photographs, on the title page or first page thereof, in the words, 'Copyright,' Canada. 19— by A. B.'

4. Every painting, drawing or work of sculpture published in Canada shall bear the signature of the author which shall be notice of copyright.

The resolution as printed would mean that every musical work, drama, map or

anything of that kind would have to be printed in Canada as well as a literary work. It has been represented that there are obvious difficulties in that, and we propose that in the case of these articles which are sometimes very difficult to print, sometimes only a single copy would be wanted, the printing may be done outside of Canada. For instance, a sculptor who made a statue would get copyright, but we would not require him to produce the statue in Canada. Frequently a Canadian artist goes abroad to study and he might copyright his painting in Canada without being obliged to paint it in Canada.

On section 5—term of copyright.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the usual term?

Mr. FISHER. That is the term that has been adopted by the International union. It has been accepted by England, and is contained in the Bill of Mr. Buxton.

Mr. FOSTER. What was the former period?

Mr. FISHER. In Canada, 28 years, with a renewal for 14 years, making 42 years. In England it was alternative—during the life of the author and 7 years, or 42 years, whichever was the longer period. The English committee which investigated this question of copyright under the presidency of Lord Gorrell, went into the matter very thoroughly, and made an elaborate report recommending this term.

Mr. FOSTER. It is very long. It might be a hundred years.

Mr. FISHER. Yes, and I must say that at first sight I was rather opposed to it; but the argument of the committee in their report, and the discussions that took place, convinced me that on the whole it was a fair proposition. Considerable exception was taken to it at first, but I see that it has been accepted by the imperial parliament, without any modification.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the longest life of your patent?

Mr. FISHER. Our patent is only for 18 years. I might state very briefly the reasons for this term of copyright. It is to give fair and reasonable reward for really intellectual work. The contention is that a work that is not of great value will practically pass out of any advantages of copyright long before this period expires, and the existence of such copyright is no detriment to the public. In the case of a work of great value, which is generally produced when a man is mature or in advanced years, it is thought that his descendants ought to have a right to some advantage.

On section 6—license to republish or perform work in public granted by minister upon petition.

Mr. FISHER. This is a provision which some authors in England have rather objected to in the English Act.

Mr. FOSTER. But the English Act qualifies it by making it after the death of the author.

Mr. FISHER. That has been done in England, and I must say that I do not quite see why the public should be deprived until the death of the author. In this country we are a little more liable to hurt if there were not this provision than they are in England, because it is quite possible that the author might not think it worth his while to publish a work for the small market in Canada, and this would give the public the right to secure the enjoyment of the work, of which we give copyright protection, and I think the public would have a right to it. In England they thought it was sufficient to do it after the death of the author, but I see no particular reason why we should wait for that. In the Act now in existence in Canada, in section 23, there is this provision, and I think it well to maintain it and continue it for the future.

On section 7, ownership of copyright, &c.

Mr. FISHER. This is the same as the British Act with the exception of the last clause, clause 6. In the British Act there is no provision for the machinery of assignment. We have a provision requiring that the assignee shall fulfil the conditions of the law the same as the original owner of the copyright.

On section 13, penalties for dealing with pirated copies.

Mr. FISHER. This corresponds practically with clause 11 of the English Act. The penalties are similar to those imposed in the Bill which this House passed two years ago, but which did not become law because not passed by the Senate. It was an amendment to the Criminal Code, and the criminal penalties are introduced into this Bill at the special request of a large number of people interested in copyright.

On section 16, importation of copyright works.

Mr. FISHER. This is different from the English Act, and involves printing of the work in this country. In England, there is no such condition, they do not object to a work being printed abroad, provided it is published in England, and publication in England means simply sale. A foreigner may print his work in his own country, and if he sells half a dozen copies in England that gives him copyright. That is not the case in Canada, and consequently we prohibit importation.

On section 33,

Mr. FISHER. I ought to explain that this section, although it gives full rights as to-day existing, if an individual having such copyright at present does not fulfil the conditions of the new Act, he will not reap the advantage of the longer period of the copyright. He would have the length of the copyright he had under the old Act. But if an author chose to fulfil the conditions of the new Act, he would then have the copyright for life and it would extend for the 50 years after the author is dead.

On section 35,

Mr. FOSTER. For the sake of a point to which I called the attention of the minister, I will say here that as regards the extension of these reciprocity arrangements, it is proposed to do it by order in council. I have no objection personally to that being the ultimate authority in case of reciprocity with individual countries. But when we come to the International Union it seems to me that the matter should be laid before parliament. I wish to state that here so that it would not be said that I had asked for it in one case and not in the other. I do not think it is of the same importance with reference to ourselves as it is to others.

Mr. FISHER. I have a great deal of sympathy with what the hon. gentleman has said. This is taken from the English Act. His Majesty in Council takes power under the English Act, as he did under the former English Act, to adhere to the union, and also to make arrangements with countries not in the union. My hon. friend knows, perhaps, that there is, not a convention, but an arrangement of an informal character between Great Britain and the United States, and that is made, not by order in council, but by a mere exchange of letters. But under the old British Act his Majesty in Council has such power, and under the new British Act, His Majesty in Council also has that power. As a matter of public policy, I would hardly think it justifiable for the government to make an arrangement on such an important question with a foreign country, without informing the House. But I think it would be well to leave that clause as it is.

On section 35, subsection 2: extent of order in council.

Mr. FOSTER I think the minister would be well advised if he would put in there a proviso which would ensure the order in council being submitted to parliament for its approval. The government does not wish by order in council to take any more of the legislative functions than are absolutely necessary, and this is quite as important in one sense as a trade treaty. I do not think there should be any objection to it.

Mr. FISHER. No, I think the hon. gentleman is quite right. An arrangement of this kind would mean a great deal to certain classes in the community, and I think the representatives of the people ought to have the final say. I did not intend to take this Bill out of committee to-day, and if my hon. friend would allow the clause to pass, before the final disposition of the Bill, I will draft a clause and add it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are some provisions in the English Act which seem to be omitted. I suppose this has been done after consideration.

Mr. FISHER. There are a number of clauses in the British Act which apply to their conditions in various ways, and which do not apply to our conditions at all; but there is no principle involved in the British Act that is not included in this.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 35 stands for further consideration.

On section 36: evidence of foreign copyright.

Mr. FISHER. This is simply a provision with regard to evidence that a person has a copyright in a foreign country when an international arrangement is made.

On section 37: certified copies as evidence.

Mr. FISHER. This is the same as section 32 in our present Act.

On section 38: validity of documents.

Mr. FISHER. This is the same as section 33 in the present Act.

On section 39: registration fees.

Mr. FOSTER. Are there any changes in the fees?

Mr. FISHER. No, they are under clause 24 in the present Act, and they are the same.

Mr. FOSTER. The fees are simply nominal?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, practically nominal.

Mr. FOSTER. Do the fees that come in go any distance in meeting the expenses?

Mr. FISHER. No, there is not a great deal of expense in the administration of the Act. Beyond the civil government salaries there is nothing.

Mr. FOSTER. Why should not copyright provide for its own expenses?

Mr. FISHER. I suppose that there has been a desire not to tax the production of intellectual work. I would not like to advise raising the fees.

Mr. FOSTER. That is hardly treating them with very great respect, it seems to me.

Mr. FISHER. I think they are quite willing to endure it.

On section 43: orders in council; publication; laid before paarliament.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know whether that would be sufficient—I hardly think it would be—to meet my hon. friend's suggestion.

Mr. FOSTER. This had better stand as well.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 43 stands for further consideration.

On section 45: repeal.

Mr. FISHER. These are the copyright laws of Canada.

On section 46: commencement of Act.

Mr. FISHER. This Act is brought into force by proclamation because it cannot come into force until the British Act is put into force. The government in Great Britain do not contemplate bringing the Act into force for some time; I think they propose a year from the first of July. Of course, we cannot really bring this Act into force until the British Act goes into operation.

On the first schedule.

Mr. FISHER. This gives an explanation of the existing right.

On the second schedule.

Mr. FISHER. The second schedule contains a list of the British statutes which now apply to Canada and which, under the British Act, power is conferred upon this parliament to repeal in so far as they apply to Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It should be made plain, I think, in section 44, that the Acts repealed are Acts of another parliament. The reference in section 44 is to enactments set forth in the schedule, but there is nothing to indicate in the schedule that they are the Acts of any particular parliament.

Mr. FISHER. No, I see that it is not specified, but of course on the face of the schedule it is shown that they are imperial Acts. I think it would be better to put in that they are Acts of the imperial parliament.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Shall section 44 be reconsidered?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think that section 44 need be changed if the second schedule is changed to show that these are Acts of the imperial parliament. I will see that the change is made in the schedule before the Bill goes out of committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The second schedule stands for further consideration.

Mr. FISHER. I feel very much gratified that the Bill is receiving such cordial acceptance and support.

Mr. FOSTER. With such a large attendance in the House!

Mr. FISHER. Still, those who are here have taken the trouble to understand a rather complex question. I trust that the Act will receive the same acceptance in the country that it seems to have received here. I have hopes that it will, because of the communications I have had. I will keep the Bill in committee in case any other members of the House wish to say anything on the matter, or in case any further representations are made with regard to it.

Progress reported.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Post Office Act by providing (a) for annual increases to the salaries of the superintendents of city post offices until a maximum salary of $2,500 is reached; and (b) for raising the minimum and maximum salaries of railway mail clerks to $500 and $1,400, respectively; and making the yearly increases for all railway mail clerks $100 instead of $50 until a salary of $800 has been reached.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is but one of the resolutions with respect to increases of salaries to Post Office employees, and if the House will permit me to explain the two resolutions now it will better give an idea of what we purpose doing for the post office employees.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There is no objection to that.

Mr. FOSTER. I am sorry the discussion comes up in so thin a House, but perhaps my sorrow brings joy to the Postmaster General.

Mr. FISHER. It may facilitate progress.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have brought in the resolutions at the earnest request of both sides, and I think they will meet with general public favour. The immediate increase that will be involved under the proposed Bill will be about as follows:

To inspectors	$5,100
To assistant inspectors	6,100
To superintendents of the railway mail service	3,800
To railway mail clerks	6,350
To clerks in city post offices, offices of the superintendents of the railway mail service and post office inspectors' offices	30,500
Total	$51,850

Mr. FOSTER. That covers both resolutions.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. I may explain that we have post offices which are under the Civil Service Act, others which are called city staff offices, and then we have the rural offices. The offices under the Civil Service Act are those in which the postmasters and staff are appointed by the Governor in Council, and whose salaries are paid out of the parliamentary appropriations. The proposals now before us in the first resolution apply to such offices. In the city staff offices the postmasters and staff are appointed by the Postmaster General; they do not come under the Civil Service Act, and the salaries are paid out of the revenue of each particular office. Formerly, the postmaster was paid a lump sum, and he provided for the salaries of the clerks appointed, but it was found some years ago that the postmasters were paying their employees on the sweating system, and we intervened, with the result that certain city staff offices where the revenue had attained a considerable amount, and the postmasters were paying low salaries to their clerks and pocketing larger salaries than city postmasters, were taken over by the Postmaster General so that the clerks might be more generously treated. We gave to the postmaster a salary and we ourselves paid the salaries of the clerks; these salaries, up to $900, being the same as paid to clerks under the Civil Service Act. These city staff post offices are not important enough to be classified with the Civil Service post offices.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that these salaries are fixed by the department, and not by the Governor in Council?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes, and paid out of the revenue of that particular office.

Mr. FOSTER. And the revenue turned in from such offices is the total revenue, less the salaries paid out?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Quite so.

Mr. FOSTER. Is it not time that system were changed? We ought to have the total revenues and the total expenditures of the post office on the same basis as the other departments.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree with my hon. friend. I have discussed that point with the heads of the department, and later on during the session I may amend the Post Office Act in that direction.

Mr. FOSTER. That is very desirable.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In certain places where the revenue amounts to so much and where the population is so much, we have introduced a free delivery system, and we might make the same distinction in this case, and not leave to the whim of the postal authorities the payment of these postmasters out of the revenue of the particular post office.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I understand that cities of a certain size, I think 12,000 population, are entitled to free mail delivery.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The rule is 12,000, but in these days of intercommunication, I always shade it for cities between 10,000 and 12,000; that is, for letter-carriers' delivery.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Does that apply to towns as well as cities?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I see an announcement in a Brockville paper that Brockville is to have free mail delivery in the near future.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the population?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). About 9,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not heard of that myself.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Why should Brockville be favoured as against other towns of 10,000 or 12,000?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no discrimination whatever. I give letter carriers' delivery where any reasonable application is made. I will take that case up and inquire into it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Do the increases apply to all the employees of the post offices that are referred to in this resolution?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will tell my hon. friend at once to what offices the increases apply, and by elimination my hon. friend will find that an answer to his question. The city or staff offices are as follows: Charlottetown, Halifax, St. John, Fredericton, Quebec, Sherbrooke, Montreal, Ottawa, Kingston, Peterborough, Toronto, Hamilton, Brantford, London, Windsor, Winnipeg, Brandon, Regina, Calgary, Edmonton, Vancouver, Victoria. The semi-staff offices are: Sydney, Moncton, Trois Rivières, St. Hyacinthe, Cornwall, Brockville, Belleville, Picton, Lindsay, Station 'D,' Toronto, St. Catharines, Chatham, Sarnia, Guelph, Berlin, Owen

Sound, Port Arthur, Fort William, Portage la Prairie, Moosejaw, New Westminster, Nanaimo, Whitehorse, Dawson. I will give a comparative statement of the present scale and the proposed scale, for the outside service in the city post offices. Stampers and sorters at present receive from $500 to $600 a year, by annual increases of $50. This class is abolished. In the present class of fourth-class clerks, the salaries at present are from $500 to $700, by annual increases of $100. This class also is abolished Third-class clerks are at present divided into two grades, junior third and senior third. In the junior third class the salary at present is from $700 to $800 by annual increases of $50. Correspondingly, under the new scale there will be grade B, with salaries varying from $500 to $800 by annual increases of $100. In the senior third class the salaries at present range from $800 to $900 by annual increases of $50. Correspondingly under the proposed scale there will be a grade A of third class, with salaries ranging from $800 to $1,000 by annual increases of $50. In the class of junior second-class clerks, there is at present a junior second, with salaries ranging from $900 to $1,000 by annual increases of $50. Under the proposed scale there will be a corresponding grade B, with salaries varying from $1,000 to $1,200 by annual increases of $50. In the senior second class at present the salaries range from $1,000 to $1,200 by annual increases of $50. Correspondingly, in grade A of the second class it is proposed that the salaries shall vary from $1,200 to $1,400 by annual increases of $50. For first-class clerks the present scale is from $1,200 to $1,500, as the Postmaster General may determine. Under the proposed scale there will be a grade B, with salaries ranging from $1,400 to $1,600 by yearly increases of $50, and a grade A, with salaries ranging from $1,600 to $1,800 by yearly increases of $50. At present we have no chief clerks, but we propose to create a limited class of chief clerks to be appointed only as the revenue of the offices will permit, with salaries ranging from $1,800 to $2,100 by yearly increases of $50. Formerly many employees have received increases in their salaries by the good-will of their superior officers or the Postmaster General. I have framed this Bill so that in future they will be dealt with exactly as are the employees under the Civil Service Act. It will not be by the whim or the fancy of their superior officers or by political influences or by the whim of the Postmaster General that they will get the yearly increase. They will be entitled to it provided they pass the qualifying examination, and the promotion examination. Hon. gentlemen will see that all along there is an increase of $200 to the salary paid at present until the maximum is reached.

Our superintendent of city post offices receive to-day $1,800. In future they will receive $1,800, with an annual increase of $100 until they reach $2,500. In the case of Post Office Inspectors, Superintendants of Railway Mail Service and Money Order and Exchange Offices, the present scale for fourth-class clerks is from $500 to $700 by annual increase of $100. This class has been abolished. We have now third class comprising the junior third, who receive $700, with an annual increase of $50 up to $800, and the senior third with salaries from $800 to $900 by yearly increases of $50. Corresponding with the present scale, there will be Grade B with salaries of from $500 to $800 by increases of $100 per year. The committee will note that the large yearly increases apply only to the lower grades. We must help the man who starts until he reaches a decent salary. When he reaches $800 he gets a yearly increase of $50, but until then his annual increase is $100. There will be a Grade A in the third class in which the salaries will be from $800 to $1,000 by yearly increase of $50. There will also be a second class. To-day there is a junior second which gets $900 to $1,000 by annual increases of $50, and a senior second which is paid from $1,000 to $1,200, with an annual increase of $50. Corresponding to the present scale, there will be a Grade B with salaries of $1,000 to $1,200 by annual increase of $50 and Grade A, with $1,200 to $1,400, annual increase, $50. The first-class of that division, namely, the Post Office Inspectors, Superintendents of Railway Mail Service, and Money Order and Exchange Office, receive to-day $1,200 to $1,500. They will now receive, under the present scale, in Grade B, $1,400 to $1,600, by yearly increases of $50, and in Grade A, $1,600 to $1,800 with yearly increases of $50. There are no chief clerks in that branch, and they are not necessary, because there are only from six to twelve clerks employed in that special branch of the Post Office Department.

Now, I come to the railway mail clerks. Their present scale is $400 on appointment and $500 after six months with increases of $50 a year until they reach $1,200 plus their mileage. Under the proposed scale the railway mail clerks will receive on appointment $500, and go by annual increases of $100 to $800 per year. After that they will receive an annual increase of $50 until they reach their maximum $1,400. So that my hon. friends will see that the government is helping more liberally the man who starts. Instead of giving him an annual increase of $50, he gets an annual increase of $100 until he reaches $800, and he gets $500 immediately on his appointment, instead

of waiting six months as at present. Then he receives $100 per year increase instead of $50, until he reaches $800, after which he receives an annual increase of $50 until he reaches $1,400, plus his mileage. That means that in many cases the railway clerks will receive salaries not far from $2,000 per year. Those who have a good run, say from Montreal to Toronto, or Ottawa to Toronto, will probably get more than $2,000 if you add their mileage.

Mr. DANIEL. How many years will it take to reach their maximum?

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend can compute that himself. A man is appointed at $500. He will reach $800 by annual increases of $100, and after that he will get an annual increase of $50 until he reaches $1,400. I am taking, not a radical, but a liberal step, in those increases. When I examine the very small increases in salaries that have been heretofore paid railway mail clerks, and clerks generally in the Civil Service, I find that I am quite liberal. My hon. friend must not lose sight of the fact that there are thousands of young men employed in banks and business offices, and insurance companies, who hardly get what the civil servant gets when he first enters our employ. I know many young men in banks who do not receive $600 a year. I know of some banks, very wealthy institutions, in which the young clerks start with salaries between $400 and $500 per year, whereas a railway mail clerk is appointed at $500.

Mr. DANIEL. At what age?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They are taken at the age of 20 or 21, and we can have them at 18 or 19. The younger they come the better for the service, and the better for themselves. $500 with a yearly increase of $100 until $800 is reached is not a bad salary for a young man. After all the man who does not want to fight his own way in the world and is satisfied to take an appointment in the railway mail service must be satisfied with that salary. He will reach $800 at an early age by yearly increases of $100. Then he will reach the sum of $1,400 by annual increases of $50, and you must add to that his mileage. Of course the mileage varies. We give to the old hands the best runs, and that is quite reasonable; but a man who is willing to do his duty, who is sober, who shows some intelligence and regard for his duties, will soon reach the maximum, and soon have a good run.

The present scale is quite a forward step and should receive the approbation of the House. It is very easy to take sides with clerks in the outside civil service. I am myself the son of an old civil servant who has been nearly 50 years in the service, and I have a great deal of sympathy with the clerks, inside or outside, but, after all, we must not exaggerate things, we must not forget that there are in the country many institutions of the highest standing where salaries lower than the scale proposed by my hon. colleague the Minister of Customs and myself are paid the employees. After all there is a certain stability in a government salary paid to a civil servant, and that is quite an item of difference in salaries paid as between a government and an ordinary institution. Therefore, under those circumstances, with the substantial increases that I gave this year, I think there should be general satisfaction. It is, of course, impossible to please every one, but I think I have dealt fairly with the outside service. The letter carriers have been exceedingly pleased with the substantial increase I gave them two years ago after a conference with both sides of the House. This year they knew this Bill would come before me. I met a deputation in Montreal the other day and they said to me: Mr. Lemieux we might also ask an increase, since you are giving a general increase, but we are satisfied with what you did for us two years ago. It is now the turn of the other clerks, and we shall not embarrass the department by our demands at this time. They did not say they would never come to me in the future, but this year they were satisfied not to make any further demand.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister explain why he grants increases of $100 a year to the new men from $500 to $800 while the men longer in the service who receive between $800 and $1,200 do not appear to have had any increase, and the men over $1,200 have had an additional increase of only $50 a year? What is the reason, beyond offering an inducement to them to come into the service?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The men who have been in the service for a great many years have already reached their maximum, $1,200, and it will take only three or four years for them to reach the new maximum of $1,400, the railway mail clerks, for instance, and the principle is the same with the other clerks. But does not my hon. friend believe with me that it is well to help the young man who goes into the service, to give him an inducement, so to speak, to become a good and efficient clerk. He receives $500. He cannot marry on that salary, he cannot found a home, but if he received $600 a year after, and $800 in three years' time, he could think of that very important event in his life. Therefore, we must help the man who is just beginning. But when he has reached $800 a mail clerk receives a larger mileage and in that way a greater remuneration.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What would the increase in mileage amount to?

Mr. LEMIEUX. We give them longer hours or hours of service which command a larger salary. A man on night duty is paid more than a man on day duty.

Mr. LALOR. Does the $500 man have to pass a civil service examination?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He has to pass qualifying examination. We have many difficulties in finding young men ready to pass the examination, say for mail clerks. To many the position is no attraction because it requires a certain amount of study, and in other cases young men have forgotten their school work, and they come into the service as labourers. They work for a certain period of time, five or six months, and then, having studied, and having learned their business, they can pass the examination. Then they are entered as regular mail clerks. I propose to insert a section in the Bill by which I will be authorized for the future to take young men, who have not passed these preliminary examinations, for a period of one year, but no longer; that is to partly overcome the difficulty of getting young men.

Mr. DANIEL. Does the Superannuation Act apply to railway mail clerks?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It applies to old clerks. Of course there is a movement on foot to reopen the question of superannuation. Speaking for myself only, I would view with sympathy a return to the old state of things. I believe that a man who devotes his life to the service of His Majesty's government should be provided for in his old age, and that superannuation should exist. Not very long ago a deputation met the Minister of Finance and laid before him the question of a return to the superannuation system. The question will be considered in due time by the government.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think this is the proper time to say something on the mileage question, as it is liable to be misunderstood by some of the members. I do not think that mileage should be considered in determining the salary at all. The majority of the clerks get a very small amount for mileage. There are a few runs, such as Montreal and other long runs, where they get $400 or $500 a year. But in order to do that, they have to work so much harder, and so many more hours, that in reality I think they save the department probably the use of another man. The country is saved somewhat in the salary of other extra men, because in order to make a large amount of mileage he has to work long hours and work hard. During the winter I had occasion to look into the average mileage. I took the run from Toronto to London and back, and that run pays a mileage of about $250 per year. That is what I would call an average run. When you consider that a man on that run has to pay his hotel and other expenses, and consider the time he is away from home, and the long hours he has to put in before he reaches his home again, I do not think that the question of mileage should be taken into consideration in determining the salary he is to get. I think it is no more than what he should get, in view of the inconvenience he suffers from being away from home, and the danger he runs. The scale of wage is no more than he would receive if he were working in a city post office, in some cases it is hardly as much. I think, even on the longer runs where they do get a little larger amount of mileage, we should not consider that against the man in determining his wages.

Another thing I want to speak about is this $500 class. I really think that the Postmaster General might raise that to $600. It has been a good many years since the present scale was framed, probably thirty years, when they got $400 on entry. Now there is no question that if $400 was considered an adequate salary at that time, $600 ought to be the least amount they should get to-day. Surely there must be a reason for raising the salaries and granting the increase that is proposed at the present time, or it would not be done; and I think the reason is sufficient to enable the men to benefit to a little greater extent than the Bill proposes. I am perfectly satisfied with the $200 increase. It averages up to about $200 increase all along the line. But what I contend is, that where a man has got to the top of his class, and has been here, we will say, for a few years, or has got near the top of his class, when the new order comes into effect increasing the scale by $200, he should then occupy the same position in the new class that he occupied in the old class; then he would receive the benefit of that $200 increase. Suppose he has two or three examinations to pass to get to the top of his class, I think he should be placed in the position in the new class which would bring him to the top of his class. I think in interpreting the arrangement in that way, justice would be done to these clerks, whereas in the other way I think there would be an injustice. This increase no doubt was due two years ago. The Postmaster General promised at that time that he would look into it, and do something for the mail clerks, and other postal clerks. Last session he was too busy to take it up. I think under the circumstances, if he could see his way clear to place these clerks in the same position under the new order of things, under the new classification, it

would be right and just; I do not think there would be anything wrong in doing that, and the men then would receive what they are entitled to. Take a $50 increase, and take a man that is, we will say, near the top of his class under the old regulation, he has got to go along and work for four years to get the $200 increase for the last two or three years he has had to wait. If this increase were taken into consideration it would place him near the top. I hope the Postmaster General will view favourably the suggestions I have made.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have taken into consideration all the hon. gentleman has said; but I think that until the outside service in the larger post offices is brought under the Civil Service Act, we must be content with this. When they come under the Civil Service Act they will have a fair claim to ask what the Civil Service now obtains, that is to say, a flat increase. I have framed this Bill, I say it frankly, with a view to bringing the larger post offices, at some day not far distant, under the Civil Service Act. I think it is time we should take that step. The Bill is outlined, in respect to salaries, exactly in the same way as regards the various classes mentioned in the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LALOR. There is one feature of this Bill that I do not understand very well, and I wish to call the attention of the Postmaster General to it. Take the run from Goderich to Buffalo. The mail clerks upon that service are not permitted to remain in Buffalo over night, but must return to Goderich again in order to establish that their residence is in Goderich. I know cases where mail clerks who have been in the service of the government for many years, are compelled to comply with that requirement, at great inconvenience to themselves. Where the train service ends practically in Buffalo, they are compelled to return to Goderich in order to fulfil the requirement of residing in Goderich. Even though their family lives in Buffalo they have to return to Canada at night and remain in Canada, instead of remaining over night at Buffalo. It is a source of considerable inconvenience to them, and I think the regulation in that respect is rather harsh.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will look into this case. That matter has been brought to my attention by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Stewart). If there is any hardship I will see that it is discontinued. If the committee will say 'carried,' and if my hon. friend has any further remarks to make, we will have a Bill based upon this resolution, and he will then have an opportunity of discussing the question.

Mr. LALOR. I just wanted to call the minister's attention to it.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Nipissing).

Mr. LANCASTER. I have offered an amendment to this Bill, and in discussing the matter with the hon. member in charge, who is not now present, he seems disposed to accept the amendment, but he said he would let me know later, but he did not. This is a very contentious matter, and as we will have to divide on the third reading anyway, I think it should be held over until Monday, when the whole day will be given to private Bills.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have no reason to suppose this is not a bona fide scheme, but if it is constructed as outlined on the map it is certainly an interprovincial road. Were the hon. member in charge of the Bill present, I would ask him to state if he believes it is a bona fide scheme, and that the entire line is to be constructed, and if he made such a statement I would raise no objection to the Bill in that respect. There is, however, an objection to the name of the proposed railway. One of the great railway corporations of Canada has financed a railway in Ontario under the name of the Ontario and Quebec railway, and the name assumed by this railway would lead to confusion. The legal gentleman in charge of the Bill has suggested that the name be changed to the New Ontario and Abitibi railway, but the promoter of the Bill not being present, we had better not go on with it now.

Progress reported.

GRAIN GROWERS' GRAIN COMPANY, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 171) to incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.

Section 14, subsection (b),

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why should a Grain Growers' Association want such extensive powers to provide electricity and all kinds of things that are mentioned in this clause.

Mr. RUTAN. The clause as amended is the standard clause used in all such Bills. The company had already these powers by letters patent from the province of Manitoba.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They did not have these powers under the Manitoba Act.

Mr. RUTAN. Yes, and much wider powers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My friend is under the impression that this company would take over the Manitoba charter.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They do not. All they take over is the property and franchise. The charter will lapse, and they ask a new charter from this parliament to enable them to acquire these assets.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is quite evident to me that this Bill is to take over the Manitoba company, and get a Dominion charter with wider powers. Are they dealing in electricity at present?

Mr. RUTAN. I am not aware that they are, but they have the power to.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the hon. member in charge of this Bill tell me what business this Grain Growers' Association, now in existence under the the Manitoba charter, are in at present, and what they are doing?

Mr. RUTAN. So far they have been dealing in grain and the products of the farm. They have been in business some five years. They want power to increase their business, to enter into other lines, and to extend it outside of the province of Manitoba, and, therefore, they come here for a charter. It is necessary for them to have the same rights and powers as other companies if they are to engage in manufacturing or other industries.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman has not answered my question. I did not ask for an explanation of why they were coming to this parliament. What I asked was this. The Grain Growers' Association, I understand, is an incorporated company at the present time in the province of Manitoba, with certain powers under a charter obtained from the legislature of Manitoba. Will the hon. member tell me the capital of that company? Does it own any real estate? Has it any timber limits? Does it own any lands? Does it own any water-powers? Does it purchase grain and re-sell it? Where is its head office?

Mr. RUTAN. Its head office is in the city of Winnipeg. It has been buying and selling grain very largely for a number of years. If the hon. gentleman looks at the records of the grain business in Winnipeg, Port Arthur and Fort William, he will find that last year this company handled nearly half the grain in the country.

Mr. LANCASTER. Do they take delivery of that grain and re-sell it, or do they merely act as middlemen?

Mr. RUTAN. They do both.

Mr. LANCASTER. How much did they actually have delivered to them, and hold and sell again?

Mr. RUTAN. I cannot answer that question. I cannot say what the capital stock is. I did not expect that these questions would come up. The powers the company has under its Manitoba charter were stated the other evening.

Mr. KNOWLES. There is not the slightest doubt that this company is a very large purchaser and seller of grain; it is always in the market, and is probably the largest dealer in grain in the country. With regard to giving the company the right to deal in electric or other power——

Mr. REID (Grenville). Will the hon. gentleman please answer the few questions I asked: what is the capital stock, how much is paid in, and does the company own any water-power, timber limits or lands?

Mr. KNOWLES. I do not know that it owns any property, but I know that it is a very wealthy company. I do not live near enough to the head office to know what property the company owns. I know that it is a very large dealer in grain, and I have never yet heard its honesty or financial competency in the slightest way questioned. With regard to the question why it should be given such legislation as that in the clause referring to electric power, I think we will agree that it is in the interest of the public and of the great industry of agriculture in the western country that reliable and reputable men should be allowed to enter largely into general dealings with regard to grain, having their flour mills, elevators and things of that nature. We know that these things cannot be carried on without considerable power, whether water-power, steam-power or electric-power; and, as in the case of any concern that uses water or other power, they are not always able to estimate the exact amount they want to use, and, therefore, it would be in the interest of the public to make provision in this Bill by which they would be in a position to dispose of any surplus power which they may not have occasion to use, always remembering that it is under the control and the close supervision of the Board of Railway Commissioners of Canada.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As far as I am concerned, I wish to do everything in the

interest of the farmers, whether in Ontario or the west; but to my mind this Bill proposes to give to this company power by which a few men might injure many farmers by getting them to subscribe for stock and put their money in, and then not using it for the purposes for which it was put in. We have had many instances of that kind, and the very name of this association is likely to draw many farmers into it. There has been a company formed in Manitoba, I understand, called by the same name as this.

Mr. KNOWLES. Everybody knows the difference between the association and the company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This is a company, but I understand that it is taking over the Grain Growers' Association.

Mr. KNOWLES. No, no.

Mr. RUTAN. I might inform the hon. member for Grenville that the name in this Bill is exactly the same as the name under which the company is working in the province of Manitoba.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is practically the Manitoba Company being taken over by this company. I would like to know the capital of the Manitoba Company, how much money has been invested in it, whether it owns property of any kind, and what are its assets.

Mr. RUTAN. It owns land in Winnipeg at present. This Bill was amended in the Private Bills Committee to enable the company to put up a building and rent the surplus floor space for other purposes and thus utilize its property. Whether it has property outside of Winnipeg I am unable to say. I will find out in a few minutes what the capital of the company is.

Mr. NESBITT. This company is only asking what several other companies have got from this House. It might go to the wall like any other corporation which we might charter, but there is no more danger in its case than in any other. This company is asking for wider privileges than an ordinary company, but not any wider than we have given other companies we have chartered here—two or three this year. So that it would be unwise to refuse this company the privileges we have granted others especially as we have taken the trouble of surrounding these privileges with all the safeguards possible under the Bill as amended. I was opposed to the Bill as it stood in the first place, but since it has been amended I think it is perfectly safe to grant this charter, and it would be unwise to refuse it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I cannot agree that there is no more danger with all these powers than if some of them were struck out. It seems to me that innocent farmers will be induced to invest in this company under the impression that it will only deal with the products of the farm, whereas nine-tenths of the powers given the company have nothing whatever to do with farming in the ordinary sense of the word or the handling of farm products. It is an omnibus company with power to deal in every sort of manufacturing and other business, which its title does not indicate, and consequently is in that way apt to mislead the ordinary farmer, who knows nothing about stock manipulating or stock jobbing operations.

Mr. RUTAN. For the information of the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) I have obtained the figures he asked for. The old company have about $1,000,000 capital and $400,000 paid up. As to the fears expressed by the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) it seems to me that the farmers in our Northwest know pretty well what they are investing in, and I cannot see why they should not have the same rights as men in any other line of business. I do not believe there is a farmer in the west who does not know all about the Grain Growers' Grain Company, and what benefit it has been to him the last four or five years in the way of marketing his crop and getting the best value for him out of it. Several times in Winnipeg I had occasion to be in the Grain Exchange and heard elevator and commission men enlarge very strongly on the power this company seemed to be wielding throughout the country. They appeared to look upon it as a competitor. The men on the exchange spoke of the patronage the Grain Growers' Grain Company were receiving, and they thought that company was a serious competitor. That is exactly what we want. We do not want any line of elevator people or grain men to have a monopoly of the grain business, and the people have as much right to form a company and help to make competition and get the value out of their products as lawyers, doctors, or merchants have to form associations to protect themselves. This company is only asking for powers which any one may obtain by letters patent, and which we, as a parliament, have no right to keep from them. I see no reason why the Bill should not pass.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There is no disposition on this side of the House to block the passing of this Bill, and any remarks that have been made are with a view to safeguarding the public. If we adopted the name of the Grain Growers' Trading Company, then the title would show that they were grain growers, and that they were

trading, and no one would be misled by solicitors for stock or in any other way.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I wish it distinctly understood that anything which I think is in the farmers' interest I will support. I do not wish to do anything against the wishes or interests of the farmers of the west or of any part of this country. The present name, however, I feel is misleading to the farmers, and it may mislead the farmers in the county I represent. Gentlemen whose names I see in this Bill are organizing grangers meetings all through Ontario, and it may be that at the same time they are soliciting stock for this company. In the west the Manitoba government could look after the interests of the people, and the objects of the company are better understood there, but now you are coming to the Dominion, and placing yourself in a position to solicit stock in Ontario.

Mr. NESBITT. They could any way.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, but the farmers would not be so likely to go into the Manitoba Company as they would be with a Dominion company. I am quite willing to accept the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works that the name be changed, and the company be called the Grain Growers' Trading Company.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is in error. I stated that the only difficulty I had with regard to the Bill was by reason of the name. Afterwards the hon. member in charge of the Bill declined to make a change in the name, and I said I did not see that any other name could be suggested which would not be free from objection if it were to indicate that the company was a company organized and managed by grain growers, and I understand that that was essential to them. Upon that I withdrew my objection to the name, and any suggestion as to change being made in the name.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They are forming grain growers associations throughout Ontario.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I rise to a point of order. Has not the name been settled in the first section?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Yes, the name has been settled under section 1, but as I understand the argument of the hon. member is that he will not have much objection to this particular clause if they do not insist on the title. I think his argument is applicable.

Mr. STAPLES. A lot of time seems to be taken up discussing the name of this company. It has been suggested that a company has been in operation in Manitoba for a number of years under the name of the Grain Growers' Grain Company. They are as jealous of that name as any other company operating in any province, which may come here for extended legislation as this company do. They may have vested interests in Manitoba, and while my colleagues appear to be very careful about the protection of the various farmers in other parts of the Dominion, that is their privilege and possibly their duty; but I do not think there is any possible danger in giving this grain company the name they have had, and under which they have operated for a number of years in Manitoba.

I cannot see any serious objection. But I do not think there is anything to be gained by simply holding up this particular legislation. No doubt the government have decided to give them that name. So far as I am concerned, coming from the province of Manitoba, a farmer myself, and having shipped some grain through the Grain Growers' Company, I do not see any serious objection to extending their legislation throughout the Dominion of Canada. I think other companies have been granted such privileges in Bills that have gone through this House. The other night we saw different companies given legislation by letters patent, and this company could have got this charter by letters patent, and thus saved the House some time, but they are getting it through a different channel. So far as I am concerned, I have no objection to the Bill going through.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is notice of a proposed amendment in subsection (j) of section 14, to read as follows:

That subsection (j) be struck out, and the following be inserted instead thereof:

Advance money to customers of the company notwithstanding the provisions of section 167 of the Company's Act, provided that in no case shall a sum exceeding $10,000 be advanced to a director of the company.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is subsection (b) intended to give the company power to sell, and distribute electricity within a municipality?

Mr. RUTAN. Subject to a by-law of the municipality.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill was referred to by the Railway Committee to put in those protective clauses that were put in in Committee of the Whole. But the standard clauses of the Railway Committee controlling the sale of electricity are now in the amended Bill.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. LANCASTER. There still remains this objection, that this company under this section, is practically doing a beneficially insurance business. It seems to me we are going a long way in allowing the

Grain Growers' Company, apparently a farmers' grain growing company, to go into the life insurance business.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amendment as printed only allows for superannuation or annuities to officers and servants of the association. They cannot go outside of them. It is limited to officers and servants of the company, the same as banks and railway companies have obtained authority from parliament to grant superannuation.

On section 14, subsection (e),

Mr. LANCASTER. There should be some provision surely that anything they do under their railway authority should be under the same supervision as that which any other railway is subjected. If a railway company is carrying its freight part of the journey by water it is under the supervision of the Railway Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This company cannot build a railway for general transportation.

Mr. LANCASTER. But this company can do part of what a railway company does, and what that railway company does is under the Railway Commission. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works has forgotten it, but the other night I read the section of the Railway Act applicable to that point.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I looked at that afterwards, and I found that my hon. friend was right.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Railway Act provides that when a railway company is carrying goods by water its rates are under the supervision of the Railway Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But you have to build your railway first as a part of the system.

Mr. LANCASTER. True, but we are allowing the Grain Growers' Company to carry goods by water with no authority over them whatever while they are dealing in the same kind of transportation as other railway companies which are subject to the supervision of the Railway Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What control have we over the Midland line running steamers from Port Arthur and Fort William to Sarnia, and right down the St. Lawrence, or what control have we over the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company? The Board of Railway Commissioners has no control over their rates.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

PAVEMENT IN FRONT OF GOVERNMENT BUILDINGS, WINNIPEG.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take the earliest opportunity of correcting an error, and I do it as a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. It will have to be with the consent of the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I informed the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) yesterday that orders had been given for the payment of an amount to the city of Winnipeg for pavements. I find that I was mistaken. I had recommended the matter to council and authority was obtained for the payments, but they had to be provided for by parliament. My hon. friend will find an amount in the supplementary estimates, and I have no doubt he will be glad to help me in getting these estimates through as quickly as possible.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee upon resolution to amend the Post Office Act.—Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the nature of the examination provided for junior clerks upon entering the railway mail service?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have not before me the subject matter upon which the candidates are examined, but it is in the nature of the ordinary examination which civil servants must pass. There is a selection of subjects such as grammar, arithmetic, geography and literature. In Quebec the aspirants have the option of using both languages in the examination. The examinations are not very severe, but still we find it difficult to get the number of men which the service requires. The service is extending so much, with the opening of new routes, especially in the west, where the country is grid-ironed with new railway lines, that we have sometimes to take men who have not passed the examination. But, as I stated before six o'clock, I am making provision for the future in order to be within the law. Not to have to be resourceful in order to evade the law, and at the same time give the public the service required, I have a clause in the Bill which will be based upon this resolution, which will give the Postmaster General authority to employ men who have not yet passed their examination, but who may pass it within a year. Six months after having passed the preliminary examination, clerks, not only in the railway mail service but in the service generally, are subject to a promotion examination. They are examined on their special duties. A railway mail clerk would be subject to examination on his route, and on the map of the various railway lines connecting with the line upon which he travels. That is the gist of the examination which they pass.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I am glad to observe that the prospective changes embodied in this resolution are in the right direction, and we are only too pleased to give the minister credit for them. My remarks will apply to the Post Office Act, and what I have to say will be with reference to the service west of the lakes. I will first refer to the letter carriers in the city of Winnipeg, and what I say with reference to the letter carriers, perhaps may apply also to other branches of the service. There, these humble servants of the post office are on meagre salaries. Their work is increasing every year, and under any circumstances, supposing you employ extra hands, still the increase in the business means more work for those who happen to be in the service.

We must remember, too, more especially in the city of Winnipeg and all through the west, rents are very much higher and are increasing every year; living is higher, fuel is more expensive. Many of these are married men; they live up practically to the full amount of their wage; there is very little prospect of promotion, and although we may say that there are those living in Winnipeg who would take their jobs for the same pay, that is not a fair statement because these men have had a training, and it is only after years of experience they become familiar with their work and with the district they serve. We have another minister who is a little more thoughtful of the people of the west than the Postmaster General, for on page 96 of the estimates we find that the Minister of Inland Revenue has this entry:

Provisional allowance of not more than $125 each to the officers in Manitoba and the provinces west thereof whose salaries do not exceed $1,000 per annum.

The officials of the Inland Revenue Department do not work any harder than those poor fellows who have to trudge the streets of Winnipeg in sometimes bitter weather. If you saw them with the loads they have to carry, you would think it would not be unkind for the Postmaster General to provide them with mules.

Mr. HENDERSON. Or automobiles.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). That would be better still. I call attention to the following statement in the report of the Civil Service Commission at page 28:

Before leaving this branch (the outside service) of their inquiries, your commissioners have to draw attention to the fact that while in the older provinces of the Dominion the struggle for existence is the lot of the average official, yet in the province of Manitoba and British Columbia, and in the Northwest provinces the struggle is intensified. With the long hard winters and the high prices charged for fuel, and also in consequence of the increased rentals caused by the great boom which has struck the northwest, your commissioners have had reported to them that the lot of the civil servant in that part of Canada is much more pitiable than that of the civil servant in the older provinces; and whatever may be the result of these inquiries, your commissioners earnestly commend to the attention of the government the condition of employees in Manitoba and the northwest.

I think that language applies more to the letter carriers than to any other class of persons in that province. The Minister of Agriculture was kind enough to say on the 29th of July, 1909:

I need not point out that the cost of living has immeasurably increased since that time (1857), that the work and responsibilities imposed upon the Civil Service of Canada have greatly increased, and that their relationship to, and standing in the community, has become so enlarged as to require that they shall have greater consideration in this year of grace 1909 than they had when Canada was a small, inconsiderable and cheap country in 1857.

I call the attention of the Postmaster General to the fact that there is a great difference in the city of Winnipeg between the conditions in 1909 and in 1911, when these words were uttered. Sir William Mulock when Postmaster General had occasion to remark:

The duties of our railway mail clerks are onerous, responsible and hazardous, and with very rare exceptions have been performed with uniform cheerfulness, efficiency and fidelity. I feel fully warranted in saying that Canada has no more deserving and worthy officers than her railway mail clerks.

As applicable to all the civil servants in Winnipeg, not simply the letter carriers, I call attention to a letter signed by Mr. W. L. Ball, manager of the Eastern Townships Bank in Winnipeg, in which he says:

With reference to our conversation as to the cost of living here and in the east, I may say that our bank makes a special western allowance of $300 for each clerk we have in the west.

I support everything that has been proposed in favour of the mail clerks. They deserve every cent of the increase, and I believe the Postmaster General would have been justified in making the increase greater. Not only are their duties arduous, but they are thrust into a post of danger; scarcely a railway wreck but there is some poor mail clerk one of the victims, and it would be pretty hard to properly remunerate that phase of their employment. If the Postmaster General would amend this first resolution and make provision for not less than one hundred and fifty dollars a year extra living expenses for post office employees in Manitoba and the west, he will only be doing what is just and he will have

the support not only of his own party friends, but of the members on this side of the House.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I agree that the cost of living in the west is much higher than in the east, and of course the cost of living, generally speaking, has grown greater year by year for the last twenty years. The Post Office Department has recognized, just as has the Inland Revenue Department, the principle that a special provisional allowance should be paid to our railway mail clerks, letter carriers, and postal clerks generally in the west. Every year we take a vote in the estimates for that purpose. This provisional allowance is paid to post office employees commencing at Fort William and Port Arthur, and extending throughout Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta and British Columbia. Employees in city post offices, including letter carriers, of course, employees in the post office inspectors' office and the office of the Superintendent of Railway Mail Clerks, whose salaries are $800 a year and under, are paid $15 per month or $180 a year provisional allowance. Those officials in the west get $180 per annum provisional allowance over the salaries paid in the east. Then, the provisional allowance to employees whose salaries are over $800 and under $900 is the amount required to make up a total of $980.

The allowance to employees whose salaries range from $900 to $1,200 a year is at the rate of 10 per cent of their salary. The allowance to employees whose salaries range from $1,200 to $1,320 is the difference between the salary and $1,320. The railway mail clerks are paid at the rate of $10 a month when the salary is less than $800 a year, and on salaries ranging from $800 to $1,200 the allowance is 10 per cent on their salary. That is a special provisional allowance paid to our postal clerks, letter carriers, clerks in city post offices, railway mail clerks in the west, and clerks employed in the offices of superintendents and inspectors. So that the increase is quite a substantial one, if we consider what increases have been given since 1896. I fully admit that some years ago, generally speaking, the salaries paid in the post offices, especially to the lower grade men, were a mere pittance. The lower grades in 1896 started at a minimum of $400, and went to a maximum of $800. In 1903, in Sir William Mulock's time, the minimum was increased to $500, and the maximum to $900, and under the proposed Act this maximum is being expanded to $1,000. Under the Act of 1896 the amount of yearly increase was only $40. This has been raised to $100. There is thus a material increase over the old conditions. Under the old Act a man would in ten years have a possibility of earning $5,800; under the proposed Act he can earn a total of $8,300, or an increase of $2,500, that is, 43 per cent of his salary. The second-class clerks in 1896 had a minimum of $900, and went up to $1,200. Under the proposed Act they will go up to $1,400, which gives them an increase of 11 per cent, or increased earnings of $1,250 in a period of 10 years. Under the old conditions a first-class clerk started at a minimum of $1,200, and went up by annual increases determined by the Postmaster General until he obtained a maximum of $1,500. Inasmuch as it depended upon the determination of the minister, there was no certainty of the increase being given, and a large number never received it. Under the proposed Act the $1,500 will be increased to $1,800, with a statutory increase of $50 per annum, instead of being subject to the whim or caprice of higher officials or even the will of the minister. This insures regular increases up to the maximum when a man deserves them, and gives an increase of 20 per cent of the maximum, making a difference in ten years of $2,250. The minimum of this class, formerly $1,200, has been raised to $1,400.

Mr. BRADBURY. What is the difference between the salaries allowed in the west and in the east?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The salaries themselves are not differentiated, but there is in favour of the west a provisional allowance ranging up to $180 or $200 a year. As regards the letter carriers, let me assure my hon. friend from Winnipeg that I have met several of them, and have received many communications from them during the course of this session, and generally speaking they are satisfied with the increase I gave them two sessions ago. At that time they received a very poor salary. Now they receive a minimum of $2.75 a day, plus in the west the $180 a year which I have mentioned. Besides, let us always bear in mind that much as we may sympathize with the men, and I do sincerely sympathize with them, as my hon. friend does, that they are certain of keeping their situations as long as they wish, they receive two uniforms a year from the department, including their footwear, and, in the large cities where we have tramway services, they get free transportation. This costs the government in Montreal about $8,000 a year, in Ottawa about $8,000, in Toronto about $10,000, in Winnipeg $8,000 or $9,000, and about the same rate in other cities of the west which have tramway services.

Mr. RUSSELL. Do the railway mail clerks get any uniform or footwear?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. RUSSELL. I want to make a plea for the railway mail clerk who, under the

new schedule, enters the service at $500 whereas the postman enters at $600 or a little better, and gets his clothes and boots. I think it would be only fair to raise the minimum of the railway mail clerk to $600, so as not to ask them to start at a lower salary than the postmen. I think they are entitled to $600 a year to start with.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend must bear in mind that while the letter carriers receive a maximum of only $1,200, the railway mail clerks receive special treatment, getting a maximum of $1,400, plus their mileage. But I am ready to consider the question of clothing the railway mail clerks. A few days ago I received from a gentleman in Winnipeg—a good Canadian by the way and his views reflect my own—a comment to the effect that the American mail cars are splendidly equipped, beautifully painted, with the talismanic words 'United States Mail,' and the Star Spangled Banner and American Eagle blazoned on it, but if you look at a Canadian mail car, provided by our railway companies, to which we pay heavy subsidies, you will simply see the letters 'G.P.O.' inscribed on it, and sometimes nothing at all. You should, he said, urge our railway companies to give us postal cars equal to those supplied by the American companies, I replied that I thought his suggestion was very good, that we should give our mail cars a toilet equal to that enjoyed by the American cars, and equal to that given to the mail cars in every other country. I have noticed in France and Germany and England that the mail cars there are conspicuous by their external decorations. But coming to the employees inside, I admit that there is something in the suggestion of the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Russell) that perhaps our railway mail clerks should have a uniform. As regards the scale of salary, however, that is a question of policy for the government. It is not merely my own volition that I have to follow in the increases I submit to the committee, but the matter is one which pertains to the government as a whole, and we must take into consideration not only the opinion expressed by my hon. friend, but also what the public thinks about it, and what the administration of public affairs warrants. Let us not forget that besides the increases in salaries which we have given since a few years, we have also given to the public the benefit of many material decreases in postal rates. I shall not weary the House by recounting these decreases, but I think we have given the public very substantial decreases in postal rates, and we intend to follow the same progressive policy in the future. If the House will leave to my tender care the employees of the Post Office Department, the clerks will not regret it. They have been satisfied in the past with what increases I have obtained from parliament for them, and I think they will be in the future. Of course many would like a little more. That is only human nature. But we must stop at some point, and I think that on the whole the policy I have explained is in the right direction in so far as the resolutions I have submitted to the House are framed according to the Civil Service Act, and with the view of bringing the clerks in the large city post offices under the Act in the near future.

Mr. BRADBURY. I heartily concur in the legislation which the hon. the Postmaster General has submitted, but as regards the salaries of the officers in western Canada especially, I desire to point out that there is a greater difference between the conditions at Winnipeg and those in eastern cities than has been met by this legislation. A clerk in any occupation in the city of Winnipeg gets more salary today than he would in Ottawa, Montreal or Toronto, for doing the same work, and the extra allowance provided for letter carriers in Winnipeg does not make up the difference. The Winnipeg letter carriers are among the hardest worked officials of the government. Winnipeg is a very big city, the routes are long, and the mails to be carried are very heavy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And many foreign settlements.

Mr. BRADBURY. They are a very efficient class of men and worthy of the best treatment. I believe that the Postmaster General is trying to do what is right. I believe he is trying to make legislation which will apply to all parts of the Dominion as fairly as possible, but there is a great difference between the wages in western Canada and in eastern Canada. What might be a fair salary in Ottawa, Toronto or Montreal, would not be considered at all adequate in Winnipeg. If you pay your letter carriers in Winnipeg only the same salary as you do in Ottawa or Montreal, I do not think you are treating them fairly and I do not think that the extra allowance will make up the difference, 10 per cent, I understand, is the basis of your extra allowance. I hold that the increased cost of living is much greater than ten per cent in the west over the cost in the east. These letter carriers have to be very intelligent, and the men who are doing that work in Winnipeg should command a higher salary than they are now doing. Of course, as the minister has pointed out, their position is permanent, but I do not think they come under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Under the Post Office Act.

Mr. BRADBURY. Are they entitled to superannuation?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The older men who were appointed before the Superannuation Act was abolished are, but not the others.

Mr. BRADBURY. Then there is no provision for these men after they have served as letter carriers for 15 or 20 years.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. BRADBURY. In view of that fact the government should at least give these men salaries equal to any they could command in the cities where they are employed, I fear this has not been done in Winnipeg. The minister knows well the increased cost of living in the west in comparison with the east, and must realize that the extra allowance to a man getting a salary less than $800 is not going to make up the difference between the salary he is getting and that which he would command in any other occupation in the city of Winnipeg. I would urge strongly that either the extra allowance or salaries be increased. Just a word about the mail clerks. I want to emphasize what the hon. member for Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) and other gentlemen have said about the mail clerk service.

There are no men in the employ of the government who are entitled to greater consideration than the men who take charge of the mails on railway trains. They endanger their lives every time they enter their cars and in addition it is a most unhealthy occupation. A mail clerk on the train impairs his health more than any other government official. I have been told by porters on Pullman cars that the average usefulness of a porter is less than 18 years, I presume owing to the motion of the car and the consequent injury to his health. If that is so, the mail clerk occupies just as unhealthy a position as the porter, and anything the Postmaster General has done for the mail clerks will be appreciated by the people of Canada. I believe he could go even further than he has done, and would still receive the support of every man who knows anything about the services rendered by these mail clerks. I would urge the minister to take the western part of Canada into consideration. He realizes that there is a great difference between the men performing these services in western Canada and all other government officials there; that they are entitled to greater pay proportionately than they receive in eastern Canada on account of the extra cost of living, and the extra work they have to do. In Winnipeg the post office officials are worked very hard, the city is growing very rapidly, and it sometimes taxes the ingenuity of the service to handle the mail matter that goes into that city. I would urge upon the minister to increase either the salaries or extra allowances of letter carriers in Winnipeg.

Mr. BRADBURY.

Mr. FRASER. I wish to endorse what has been said. The railway mail clerks of the east should also come in for some consideration if the minister contemplates an increase in pay to the mail clerks in the west. The railway mail clerk has very arduous duties, his quarters are very cramped and poorly ventilated, and all the conditions that he has to meet with tend to make his life rather a life of hardship. With all this he has a great deal of responsibility, having complete, and absolute control over all the matter in the mail car, registered mail and all other things of the kind. Besides that he literally takes his life in his hands every time he goes on the train. The railway mail clerks should receive the first consideration, because their duties are very hard, and even the post office clerks, I think, receive a very small salary to start on, $500. $400 twenty years ago was worth more than $500 or $600 to-day, and as the country progresses the government should increase the remuneration of their employees if they wish to keep up the standard of their service. The mail clerks and the post office employees have responsible duties which they perform generally very well. There are very few complaints against the post office in this country. Small payment means poor service in everything. The increase which has been made from $400 to $500 seems a very small one, and the government would find many sympathizers if they could see their way clear to raise the salaries of these people who are doing the hard work in the department. I am well aware that there are many soft snaps in the department where officials are paid relatively much higher salaries. To the railway mail clerks and post office clerks, who actually do hard work, more than $500 should be paid.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would ask the Postmaster General to try and place this salary limit a little higher. I am perfectly satisfied with the increase of $200, and I think the men will all be satisfied. It is a long time since the old scale was fixed and probably it will be a long time before this one will be changed. I think the Postmaster General should make the increase of $200 general all along the line, and should give the clerk entering the service $600 where he had $400 before, just as he has raised the $1,200 limit to $1,400. That, I think, would satisfy all concerned. I find that an increase of $50 a year amounted to 16 cents a day, or 4 per cent of a man's salary of $1,200. I consider that that increase is too small considering the increased cost of living. The poorer class of labouring men in Toronto are to-day getting 50 per cent to 75 per cent more than they got 10 or 15 years ago. This increase of 4 per cent seems to be hardly anything at

all. A man in the service who is within two or three years of the top of his class will go on getting the regular increase to which he was entitled, and then he will have to work along three or four years more to get to the top of the new class, so he would have to be of a good age before he would get to the maximum of the new class. I think what I contended for this afternoon is nothing more than fair, that the increase should be general all along the line. Where a man is near the top of his class he should hold the same position in the new class with that increase of $200. I want to ask the Postmaster General if he can hold out any hope of increasing this scale?

Mr. LEMIEUX. While there is life there is hope. I have given a résumé of the policy of the government for the present year. I think the postal clerks, the mail carriers and the railway mail clerks have no fault to find with the increases I have given. Of course, as I said a moment ago, it is human nature to ask for more, but there must be a stopping point. We must advance progressively towards better salaries, we cannot expect to reach high water mark at once. All I can say is that I have taken into consideration the remarks made by the hon. gentleman, and in the future I shall certainly do my best to meet each case as it arises. Speaking about this provisional allowance for the west, although the cost of living is higher in the west, yet we must not forget that an additional sum of $15 a month, besides the salary paid to the clerk, is quite a bonus to the western clerks. Certainly they should be satisfied with that. A clerk receives $800 a year, and if he resides at Port Arthur, or Fort William, or Winnipeg, or any other point west of Lake Superior, he receives an additional sum of $180 a year. Certainly they cannot ask the Post Office Department to do more. The high cost of living is recognized, and we pay accordingly. My hon. friend says that $500 to begin with is a very small salary. Now I make an appeal to his common sense and his knowledge of business. Go to the city of Toronto, or the city of Ottawa, and you will find young men 18 or 20 years of age, unmarried, fresh from school or college, having received a fairly good education, though perhaps not a high education, and if they knock at the door of the Bank of Montreal here in Ottawa, or the Bank of Ottawa, or of any insurance company, what salary will they receive? Look at a young man in the Bank of Montreal as a clerk, with a nice dress, a high collar and nice cuffs, receiving the public with a smile behind the wicket, receiving dollars, and notes, and heaps of money from the public—what salary does he receive? Sometimes only $400 I have known cases in the best banks in the country where young clerks receive only $350. They consider the position very desirable, because they learn the business, and they come in contact with the business public. How are increases given in those banks? Are they given by the hundred, or by the two hundred? According to my knowledge they receive less than that. I know many clerks in the banks, married men, who would be glad to receive after ten or fifteen years a salary of $1,500. Now take the railway mail clerk. Of course he knows what risks he has to run on the railway trains, but he accepts those risks joyfully. We generally have more applications for the position than we can fill. After a few years, if they behave well, they receive increases in salary, and are afforded chances of promotion, and pass automatically from one class to another. The best men in the service to-day, the men who are the rock bottom of the Post Office Department, are men who came in at $500 or $400 a year. Take the case of George Ross, general post office superintendent for the whole Dominion. There is a man with twelve children, a Scotchman, with a French Canadian family.

An hon. MEMBER. No Irish?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No Irish in him except the wit, he is a very witty man. He worked his way up in the department until he became practically indispensable in the service. There is nothing to good for George Ross, in my estimation, because he knows the business from A to Z. He started at the beginning. Take the case of Mr. Gaboury, assistant postmaster at Montreal. There is a young man with a classical education, and who, for family reasons, accepted at first a very modest employment in the Montreal post office. He started at the beginning, and worked his way up until he became second only to Mr. Ross. Take the case of Mr. Green, the inspector in Quebec; take the case of the postmaster in Winnipeg. The best men in the west have all come from the east, because we were creating new districts in the west. They are all men who began at the very beginning, and worked their way up intelligently, courageously, until to-day they are receiving good salaries. But the clerk who has no ambition, who has no grit in him, will remain in his class, receiving his $50 increase, and will pester the minister, pester the members, both Grit and Tory, will pester the officials of the department, to get him a higher salary. Is not that a true picture of the existing evils in the service? The man who is willing to work, and fight his own way, to fight the battle of life bravely, that man will inevitably pass into the higher grades, and is bound to succeed. That is my experience.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am afraid I have been labouring under a delusion. I have been fighting for a class of men that the Postmaster General tells us does not exist. I was not aware until now that he was getting bank clerks to work in the railway mail service. I am surprised to hear it. There is a reason why banks employ such cheap labour. The young fellows they employ, as a rule, come from rich families whose parents can find nothing else for them to do, and who are glad to get them into some bank where they are satisfied to work for almost nothing.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Take a young man out of a high school in Ontario, who has received a very good education, and if there is no favouritism, no nepotism exercised in his favour, he will go to a bank, or an insurance company, and will be glad to take a position. They are not from rich families, far from it.

Mr. LANCASTER. They are serving an apprenticeship.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thought I was fighting for men who had reached the age of 21 or more, who had some responsibility in life, and who probably had families to provide for, or widowed mothers, or something like that. I did not know that the department could secure railway mail clerks enough at from $300 to $500 a year. If they take them at 18 years of age and can get all they need, I am afraid there will not be much room for me to argue on their behalf. But, I was under the impression that a man had to be of the age of 21 years to enter the service, that he had to pass an examination, and I thought that the department would probably require a man with some responsibility about him and with some sort of matured mind to take charge of a railway mail car. I thought that the responsibility of the position called for the engagement of men instead of boys. That is the reason I look upon the salary of $500 as being far too small. I was figuring that a responsible, intelligent man should really start at $600 and work his way up. I would ask the Postmaster General if he could find it in his heart now to amend his Bill so as to make the yearly increase, if it has to be a yearly increase, $100 instead of $50 all along the line, make it $100 up to $800, or, if he can do so, amend the Bill so as to make it $100 a year increase until they get to the top of their class, and apply it to all the men in the service who are receiving more than $800 a year up to $1,400. I think that is fair. If we cannot get the whole loaf we will have to be satisfied with a half, and I suppose we will have to be satisfied with anything we can get, but I would ask the Postmaster General if he could not see his way clear to amend the Bill so as to provide that railway mail clerks shall get $100 a year increase until they get to the top of their class, and postal clerks as well. That $100 yearly increase should be made general. When the minister considers that $50 is only 16 cents a day I think he will realize that twice 16 cents is not very much of an increase to these men who have been waiting three years for it. There is no question that if the inside service received their increase on account of the high cost of living, these other men have had to put up with the high cost of living as well. They were then entitled to an increase, and if they had received it at that time they would now have very nearly reached the top of their class. I ask the Postmaster General in all seriousness if he will not promise to make that amendment to the Act. I think I am asking only for what is fair. I am not here to boost salaries, I have the interests of the country as much at heart as anybody else, and I think I am asking for only what is just and fair. Will you promise it, Mr. Postmaster General, if you please?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not like to make promises that cannot be implemented.

Mr. RUSSELL. If you give your word I guarantee it will go through.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I know that my hon. friend is in earnest in his request, but the resolutions that are submitted to the House represent the policy of the government. As I have explained to the committee, these Bills will follow the lines of the Civil Service Act. We cannot change these increases. They will follow the increases in salaries in the corresponding classes of the inside service.

Mr. RUSSELL. How about the $150 flat increase to the Civil Service?

Mr. LEMIEUX. But these officers are not yet in the Civil Service. I said this afternoon that when the outside service, as is contemplated, is brought under the Civil Service Act, I can promise my hon. friend, if not a flat increase, at least a fair consideration of a flat increase, but I cannot say more than that.

Mr. RUSSELL. While the poor fellows who are in the outside service have the benefit of a minister such as we have at the head of the postal department, I think we should take advantage of the fact and increase the scale to what is right, because I am afraid that if they come under the Civil Service Act they will get into the hands of another minister, and they will have a poor chance for advancement. Let us try and fix this up before they come under the tender mercies of this other minister. I think that would be a fair thing to do.

Mr. BEATTIE. I have listened to the arguments of the railway mail clerks, but I

think the best point was made by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr. Bradbury) who stated that the life of a conductor on a Pullman car is from 10 to 12 years. We all know that he rides on cushions in a beautiful palace car with springs, while the poor railway mail clerk has to ride in a rough box car without any springs at all. I would like to ask the minister if he knows what the average life of a railway mail clerk is.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have travelled with them day in and day out.

Mr. BEATTIE. If there is any truth in the statement that the life of a Pullman conductor is only ten or twelve years, I do not see how it would be possible for a railway mail clerk to get up to the maximum of his class if that time represents his working years, and I think that he should get the small increase that has been asked for on his behalf. I also think that the car should be improved. You might have that beautiful flag that I like so well painted upon the side of the car. It would be merely an act of justice to give more salary to the railway mail clerks. The railway mail clerks are a good class of men, and I am surprised at the statement that it is difficult to get good ones. I know that the railway mail clerks running in and out of London are first-class men, and I do not know where you can get better ones. The employees in the post office are not any better although those who occupy those positions are of a superior class. It should not be difficult to get good men to fill these places. I know that when the higher positions are to be filled it is not difficult to get men. They do not take men who have been in the post office service when they desire to fill these higher positions. I hope the Postmaster General will see his way clear to give these men the consideration to which they are entitled.

Mr. CARVELL. It is not very often that I address this House on the question of the Civil Service; in fact, I have never made any remark upon the subject, but once in my life. In my opinion there is no class of men who are paid so well as civil servants both in the inside and outside services. They are not giving anything like the service which is being given to the banks, insurance companies and commercial establishments, and I believe I am safe in saying that on the average they are receiving fifty per cent more salary than like ability and service would command in any other walk in life in Canada. Never a month goes by in this House that I do not hear members advocating an increase of salary for somebody. Why, we are granting salaries around the city of Ottawa that I am heartily glad my constituents do not know anything about. I do not send the blue-book containing the civil list home, because I do not want them to know anything about it. I perhaps feel a little bit sore about this question. It is some time since my hon. friends have recommended people for these positions, but when the time comes, if it ever does come in their lifetime, they will find that they will not have any difficulty in getting enough people to fill these positions at the salaries provided. The only difficulty now is to weed out from the great number of applicants the proper parties. I do not know that any minister will say that he has ever found any difficulty in finding men willing to take these positions. My experience is that they will apply for these positions, and you would think that they would be happy for the rest of their lives, but it won't be three months before they are back looking for an increase of salary. I believe we are responsible for that through giving in to them too much; there seems to be no man with stamina enough to get up and say: You are overpaid now. Railway mail clerks have been receiving perhaps less for their labour than do other classes of civil servants, but I think the minister has very well met the deficiency in the resolution before the House. While my hon. friend from Toronto no doubt speaks from the very best motives possible, I think he is a little unreasonable. You will find there will be no railway mail clerk resigning because he did not get a greater increase. I repeat that the civil servants of this country are paid fifty per cent more than any other class of labour of equal ability and equal service. I think we are granting clerks as much as they are entitled to, and as much as the taxpayers of Canada can afford.

Mr. EDWARDS. It was refreshing to hear the candid remark of the Postmaster General to the effect that if a man in the service, particularly the railway mail service, were to expect advancement he must have some grit in him. However, it was not any more refreshing than to hear the member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell), advocate anything in this House in the direction of lessened expenditure. That feature of the discussion this afternoon is one of the most remarkable things that has ever occurred in this House since confederation. Now, I believe there is a very great difference between a man on a railway train acting as mail clerk, and a man in the inside service or a bank clerk. We must in all fairness consider the responsibility of the position of the mail clerk, the dangers attendant on it, the long hours of labour, and the fact that for a good part of the time he is away from his family, while the inside civil servant or the bank clerk

is enjoying the comforts of home. It seems to me that the minimum salary at which railway mail clerks commence is small. I would ask the Postmaster General if the retiring age is 65 years?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There are railway mail clerks who are in good health, and who are past that age limit: Under the old superannuation system, they can be superannuated when they reach the age of sixty or sixty-five, but that only applies to a few cases now. If they are in good health, they are not forced to resign.

Mr. EDWARDS. A man who has been a mail clerk for twenty years, and reaches the age of sixty-five years will not in my opinion, be in very good health. He may have been robust when he entered the service, but he will have his health pretty well shaken up by the time he reaches that age. Now, what the Post Office Department should do is, when railway mail clerks attain a certain age, put them in the inside service and let younger men get out on the road. If a man has efficiently served as railway mail clerk until he reaches the age of fifty-five, he should be given a position in the inside service where he would be able to experience the comforts of home life.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is just what happens in the service to-day.

Mr. EDWARDS. Yes, if a man has pull enough to get there.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is not a question of pull. I would be ashamed of myself if I took stock only in the pull that employees may have. The only reproach I receive is from men with pull who are disappointed in not getting what they wish. Not long ago Mr. Talbot, the Railway Mail Superintendant, at Quebec, who has been in the service for years, required assistance in his office, and I took a railway mail clerk, who had seen twenty years service, and put him in the position of Assistant Post Office Superintendant. He lost his mileage by accepting the position, and I had an order in council passed granting him the mileage he would have been entitled to had he kept his run. That man is perfectly satisfied, but other railway mail clerks, who are only thinking of the pull they could use with the minister, were very mad because I selected a gentleman who had been appointed under the old government. You cannot bluff the public that way; a man who has rendered faithful service is generally, and in my department always, first choice. I look to the men who have not simply fulfilled their duties with more or less efficiency, but men who have shown intelligence and love of their work, and I promote them, as in the case mentioned,

without caring for what pull other men may have.

Mr. EDWARDS. My reason for mentioning 'pull' is because of the evidence I have in my own very county where political pull seems to be brought into play even in such a little matter as appointing a postmaster who gets $35 a year. About a week ago I called the attention of the Postmaster General to this case in my own county; the father was appointed postmaster, and for nine years his son had discharged the duties faithfully and satisfactorily, and when I asked that the son be appointed postmaster I am told that I should get a letter from the president of the Grit association of the county of Frontenac, and if I did so it would be done. Knowing the president of the Grit association, I spoke to him personally about the matter, and his reply was that it would probably take two or three weeks, as he had written to that part of the county to get the opinion of half a dozen or more people as to whether he should recommend the appointment of this man who, for nine years, had given satisfactory service, or whether he should recommend some one else.

That is the reason why it occurred to me that possibly a pull was necessary to a man to get promoted. Not only do the men who do service as mail clerks on the train have an unpleasant life, being deprived of many of the pleasures which other people have, but a comparatively small percentage of them live to say 55 years of age. It seems to me, speaking as a medical man, that their occupation must necessarily be a very unhealthy one, not only because of their cramped quarters in the mail car, but because of the constant shaking of the train, and every consideration should be given to these men. If I understand this resolution aright, the maximum salary is $1,400. This is as high as a man can expect to reach, no matter what his ability is. I do not see that a man has a great chance of making his way in the world, or is given very much encouragement at this rate. He starts at $500, and is allowed an annual increase of $100 until his salary reaches $800; that will take three years, and then he has $50 a year increase until it reaches $1,400. He will be 15 years in the service before he reaches the splendid salary of $1,400 a year, and there he stops. That is as high as he can go as far as that provision is concerned.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Plus his mileage.

Mr. EDWARDS. That makes a difference, but I think the minimum salary should be at least $600. I think the length

of time for the annual increase of $100 should be lengthened from three years to five years at least.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I crave the indulgence of the committee in order that I may bring to the attention of the minister a subject to which I do not observe any reference in these resolutions. I understand that a deputation of postmasters from the towns and villages and country post offices waited on the minister last winter and urged upon him certain privileges and reforms, as well as something better in the way of remuneration. I want to emphasize my thorough accord with the request of these men. The country is indebted to the country postmaster to a very great extent, much more than to the men who are in the service in the cities. Not that I wish to make any comparisons, because comparisons are always odious; but the postmasters in the country, and in the towns and villages give services to the public for which they get no remuneration whatever from the public except their good-will, and in these days of high prices and high cost of living good-will will not go very far towards paying for a square meal or a barrel of flour. I want to urge on the Postmaster General the necessity of being more liberal in respect of the country end of his department, which I think is the largest end. I am satisfied that it is the end that gives him the most faithful service. When he is in bed sleeping the sleep of the just, the country postmaster is very often up waiting for the mail bag, and he really gets nothing for doing so. In view of the fact that the service has flourished as well as it has under the care of the present Postmaster General, I think that a little of the surplus in his department might go to ameliorate the condition of these men. I do not wish to detain the committee at any length on the subject, but I would like to hear the views of the Postmaster General while we are discussing this resolution, so that they may be a matter of record.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is true, that I met during the month of January, a large delegation of members of the House who were accompanied by members of the Association of Rural Postmasters. My hon. friend was not in the House at the time; I think he was ill; but several other members from that side of the House were present. I have in my hand the memorial submitted to me. It bears the signatures of many of the postmasters who were the officials of that association. I need not recite the various allegations of that memorial, because I think it was placed in 'Hansard' in February last. Amongst the requests made were the following: an increase in their salaries; larger light allowance; to be supplied individually with the annual report of the Post Office Department; to be supplied by the department with pencils, pens, inkstands, paper and other supplies needed in the post offices; and that instructions be given to the various newspaper offices in Canada to fold their newspapers in such a way as to facilitate the work of distribution in the various post offices. My hon. friend, who is a newspaper man, knows that sometimes, in order to rush the mailing of newspapers, they are sent without being folded, much to the inconvenience of the receiving postmaster. I answered the delegation that as regards their salaries I was quite willing within a reasonable time to consider favourably their demand. I reminded them that their minimum salary some eight years ago was only $12 a year; and that I raised that first to $25, and later to $35 a year. Of course, many of the postmasters in the rural districts receive much better salaries than that, but that is the fixed minimum. I believe the day is not distant when we can raise the minimum say to $50.

I need not come before the House with a Bill to raise that minimum because we can do it by order in council, and pay it out of the funds available in the department. As regards light allowance, whenever that increase is given to the rural postmaster, proportionately the light allowance will go up, as it did when I raised their salaries from $12 to $25, and from $25 to $35. As regards the supplies, postmasters receive special ink for stamping presses, they receive a stamping machine, some official paper for their returns and printed envelopes. If the Post Office Department should start the business of distributing supplies to something like 15,000 officers from the Atlantic to the Pacific and from the polar circle to the boundary line, do you not believe that this would give rise to some very unsavoury payments, and that, with the best intentions in the world, money would be spent which ought not to be. I think after all, that the postmasters had better be paid in specie for what little supplies they require, and let them buy the supplies themselves. I would rather give them a little raise, and let them buy their own supplies than have the department keep a store. We have of course to supply the postmaster with bags, and the necessary office equipment, but I do not think it would be wise to keep a store. Although I have the greatest confidence possible in the gentleman who is in charge of the postal stores, Mr. Sydney Smith, one of the most able and obliging of officials in the service, I would not care to start a postal store for the 15,000 officers to whom paper, pencils, pens and ink would be distributed right and left. As regards blue-books the postmasters understand that their demand is out of question.

I told them that any of the postmasters who cared to see the annual report of the department might apply to the member or the minister, and he would get it. We send them the postal guide and in that they can get the information they require, but it would cost an enormous amount to distribute among 15,000 postmasters that bulky report—and for what reason? Many of them would not read it. That report contains details of expenditure which are of use to members of the House or specialists, but are not required by postmasters. However if any postmaster should require the annual report, I would be only too pleased to give it to him at his request.

My hon. friend states quite truly that the Post Office Department depends largely on the intelligence, integrity and fidelity of the rural postmasters for the service of His Majesty's mails, and I quite agree with him that in the near future we must yield to the reasonable request which they made when they came here in January last.

Mr. GOODEVE. In my constituency there is a very large mileage, and a number of these letter carriers employed, and I cordially endorse all that has been said regarding an increase of salary to them. I was somewhat surprised at the attitude taken and the arguments advanced by the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). To say that there are other men who would be glad to take the places of these men is not an answer to the claim that they should have a fair salary. There are always men ready to take another man's place, and that is a very unfair argument for refusing to pay a fair remuneration to the holders of the office. There is scarcely any position in life, no matter how inadequate may be the salary attached to it, which you will not find outsiders ready to take. While possibly down in his portion of the country these men were receiving fair wages for the labour they did, in our western country the cost of living is considerably higher, and that cost of living has gone up all over the country, so that what might have been a fair remuneration a number of years ago would not be at all fair to-day. I heartily endorse the argument of my hon. friend from Winnipeg (Mr. Haggart) with regard to our western country. The rapid development of that country has brought about a condition of affairs in which men are in some cases making very much more money than they could down east. It is apt to cause an unrest, an uneasiness among these men who feel, looking at their neighbours making larger sums of money, that their salaries look small. Therefore, it would probably tend to a better service along the lines suggested by the Postmaster General himself; there would be an esprit de corps, men would feel that they were being recognized and their good work appreciated and they would take a deeper interest in their work, and you would get a better class of service. I am glad that is the stand that is being taken, and I hope it will guide the Postmaster General in dealing with this question.

Mr. CROTHERS. I have a suggestion to make and I make it with a pretty strong hope that it will be adopted, because I have always found the Postmaster General willing to consider any reasonable proposition, and to do anything within the bounds of reason for the benefit of the public or to remedy a wrong. I would suggest that the increase of $100 a year proposed to be given from $500 to $800, should continue until the $1,400 is reached. That would take nine years. It would seem to me a man should reach the maximum of $1,400 in nine years. I rather find myself disagreeing with some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House because I pretty fully agree with the propositions made by the Postmaster General in these resolutions. I think he is making a very fair allowance for the services rendered.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The railway mail clerks and others will be satisfied to receive the increase proposed, and as occasion may arise, as it will in the future, I will certainly consider the requests made this evening by hon. members.

Mr. CROTHERS. Is this provision for the increases of $100 a year to $800 and $50 after that, in accordance with the provisions of the Civil Service Act?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. CROTHERS. I am glad the Postmaster General proposes to increase the salaries of the rural postmasters, but I do not think he has gone far enough, I do not know how many there are getting these very small salaries. I shall not ask anything like what the minimum salary should be, as it would be such a contrast, but just fancy a postmaster in a rural part of the country, in a little village where he is at the beck and call of every citizen in the neighbourhood, perhaps from six o'clock in the morning until nine o'clock at night for 312 days, getting $100. It seems a trifling sum for that service. They have been receiving only $35.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend must not forget that they receive at the same time a commission on the stamps sold, and of course many of these offices where the minimum is $35, do not earn the salary. For instance, the other day I opened an office at Bark Lake, in Argenteuil, for summer visitors. We had to advertise for the courier service and pay the courier, the office is open for four months and the postmaster receives $35 in addition to the

commission on the stamps he sells. Where a postmaster is obliged to be on his feet for ten or twelve hours a day he receives much more than $35, and of course he has the commission on the stamps, and at such an office he receives mails at night and in the day time, for which there is an extra allowance, so they are not so badly treated. We all admit the salaries at some of the little country offices are very small, because these offices must be kept open at any cost, in order to give the public newspapers and letters. I quite agree that the fact of keeping an office open to the public, whether the postmaster is kept busy or not, should imply the payment of a decent salary, and I contemplate in the near future to give the rural postmasters another lift.

Mr. CROTHERS. Will the Postmaster General give me an idea of the additional income from the sale of stamps and from other sources, where the salary is only $35?

Mr. LEMIEUX. He receives 40 per cent on the sale of stamps, and besides, receives a fuel allowance and a light allowance. Many of those small country offices afford $500, $600 to $700 a year; it depends upon the business of the locality. But there are some offices where the business transacted does not amount yearly to $15, or even $10. But we must have an office there. Where there is a small settlement we must give them a mail service, and we pay the postmaster at least $35, plus whatever commission there is on the sale of stamps.

Mr. CROTHERS. The minister says we must have an office, and we must have a postmaster. That postmaster becomes a public servant, and he ought to be fairly remunerated for the service he renders. Now the postmaster, at these little country offices, is at the beck and call of every one from seven in the morning until nine at night. He sells $25 worth of stamps a year, which would give him $5 additional.

Mr. LEMIEUX. And about $15 extra as an allowance for fuel and light.

Mr. CROTHERS. That would be $60 for 312 days. I am not speaking of these little offices that are opened for the convenience of tourists in the summer time But I am not making an unreasonable request of the Postmaster General that, instead of making the minimum $50, he make it $60. That will only give a trifle of over $1 a week extra for six days' service. I think that is reasonable.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have to leave for home in a few minutes, and before I go I would like to make one more appeal to the Postmaster General. I know he would like to see me going home happy, and if he will promise to make that increase $100 a year instead of $50, and raise the minimum from $800 to $1,400, I would go home as happy as could be, and I know that there are hundreds of mail clerks throughout the country who would also be made happy. I want to say a word with reference to something that the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) said a little while ago. It is probable he has seen some of the civil servants around Ottawa when he says they do not earn their money. But I know railway mail clerks who have to leave their homes at six o'clock in the morning and hurry off to get their trains, and who don't get back home again until ten at night. I think when a man puts in that number of hours he earns his pay pretty well.

Mr. CARVELL. Does the hon. gentleman know of railway mail clerks in Toronto who are performing a service like this every day in the week? Or is it only one day, and then he lays off for a few days?

Mr. RUSSELL. Would the hon. member expect any man to perform that service every day in the week?

Mr. CARVELL. I do not expect it. But my hon. friend is putting that forward as an argument, and one would infer from his argument that that was the case. I know that is not the case, because no man could stand it.

Mr. RUSSELL. If you divide the number of hours that man puts in throughout the week, he puts in over eight hours a day every day in the week. You can't expect him to go out every day and work 16 or 18 hours in the day. One word more. Won't the Postmaster General please, please grant that little request, and make that increase $100 instead of $50? Then I will sleep happy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am very sorry, but if I were to grant his request which he makes so vehemently, though it might give him a happy sleep, it would give me a nightmare. Before framing this Bill, I consulted even some of the railway mail clerks. I had a visit the other day from one of the oldest of the mail clerks in the service, who declared himself perfectly satisfied with the provisions in the Bill. Why, Sir, some of the railway mail clerks, when they reach the maximum will be receiving the indemnity of a member of the House of Commons, with the mileage. Do not you think, Mr. Chairman, that it is going a little bevond the mark to insist that we should give them so much? I think they are well treated. I think to-morrow the railway mail clerks and the postal clerks will be satisfied. The work performed by a railway mail clerk, in my judgment, does not

compare with that of the letter carriers, yet the letter carriers receive only $2.75 a day.

Mr. RUSSELL. They have regular hours, and the mail clerk does not.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The letter carrier has to keep walking up and down the streets, he has sometimes to go up two flights of stairs, and wait at the door, in good weather or bad weather. I think their case is a stronger case than that of the mail clerk. I do not minimize the services rendered by the railway mail clerks, but when we give them an increase of $200 over the maximum they have already had, they should be satisfied, and I think as a matter of fact they are satisfied.

Mr. CROSBY. The Postmaster General told us to leave this matter to his tender mercies. In so far as the Postmaster General personally is concerned, and as long as we have to have the government opposite I am quite willing that he should hold that position. Like many other hon. members on this side of the House I was struck with the statement of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell). I have often thought I would like to see the hon. member for Carleton standing on a good solid foundation, and making a good solid argument on some honest, fair case; I believe he could do himself justice. I have heard him on a good many occasions when he has not had that advantage and he has always been able to put up a fair argument. I would like to have heard him a little over a year ago when we were passing $350,000 to distribute amongst the civil servants of Ottawa. I wonder where the hon. gentleman was on that occasion, and why he did not stand up and protest against it. I am sure he would have given us some information on an occasion of that kind, that he would have done himself justice and that he would have had a good many admirers in this House. I have nothing to say against a man getting all he can get in so far as salary is concerned, but I must express my regret that in place of the resolution we have before us to-night we have not had presented to us a proposition to place the outside service, and particularly the railway mail clerks, under the Civil Service Act. It would be a great advantage not only to the Postmaster General himself but to the old country, and to those who are engaged in that service. I would also like to say a word in connection with the argument that has been made here to-night in favour of an increase in the allowance to postmasters. I have called the attention of the Postmaster General to the case of a postmaster who has been in the service for 43 years, who keeps a post office in which a daily mail is received, and who only gets $30 a year. No allowance is made for rent for the building. He may make something on the sale of postage stamps, but that cannot amount to very much, and I am glad to hear to-night that the Postmaster General is soon to take this matter into his consideration. I hope my friend the postmaster to whom I have referred will live long enough to be able to participate in the increase which the Postmaster General is going to give these officials. I trust the minister will be able to meet the views of my hon. friend from Elgin and make it $60 if he can. With regard to letter carriers, we have two letter carriers in the city of Halifax who had the misfortune during the early winter to slip and become disabled. I understand that these letter carriers have not been paid during the time they were idle.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend might send me their names? Generally in these cases we pay them their time as if they had been at work provided they accompany their claim with the certificate of a doctor. The treasury board has to pass upon such claims, and the treasury board sits when it can. There is a heap of papers before the treasury board at present, and I think that these two cases are included in the recommendations which I have sent in. At all events, my hon. friend might send me their names.

Mr. CROSBY. I will be pleased to do that. It would be nothing but fair that a medical certificate should accompany any claim of the kind. I am glad to hear that the matter is under consideration. With regard to railway mail clerks, we have the statement of the Postmaster General very definitely that the government have come to the conclusion that they could not make the minimum salary more than $500. I regret that that is the case, but I will not take up the time of the committee upon the subject, as a good many arguments have been presented from this side of the House in support of the claim that this amount should be increased. Then, some rule has been made with regard to the age of postal clerks. As a matter of fact, the Postmaster General knows that there are not very many men 18 years of age in the railway mail service. Generally we find them from 20 years up. A very strong argument could be made to show why these men should receive more than $500. Five hundred dollars means $9 a week. Reference has been made to the high cost of living in the west, but the Postmaster General is arranging for reciprocity so that things will be very cheap in the west, and the west will be helped in that regard.

Mr. BRADBURY. How about reciprocity in the east?

Mr. CROSBY. It is not going to touch us very much down there. You are looking for cheap living in the west, and you are likely to get it. While 25 or 30 years ago a young man in Halifax could get a respectable boarding house for $3.50 or $4 a week, to-day a young man cannot get board and lodging in any respectable place in any city at less than $7 a week, therefore, we have a young man starting in the railway mail service with barely enough to pay his board. Some reference was made to young men starting in banks. There is no comparison at all, because a young man goes into a bank to learn the business. He learns how to water stock, and a great many other things, and perhaps in a short time he can go out, organize a merger, make money, and become rich, whereas the poor railway mail clerk will never make a merger unless he runs one car into another, loses his life, and leaves a widow and children unprovided for, because he cannot save much out of his $9 a week. That is the condition that the railway mail clerk faces every day, whereas the other man is exposed to no danger whatever. He has cuffs and collars, and a nice tie, and he meets nice people, and if he happens to be in the ladies branch where nobody but ladies are permitted to go he has pleasure all the day long. The banks, particularly in western Canada cannot get clerks, and they are bringing young men out from the old country and paying their passage. The other day I had the great pleasure of travelling with fifty young Irishmen who were coming out to the Canadian Bank of Commerce.

Mr. LANCASTER. Nothing too good for the Irish.

Mr. CROSBY. If there is anything good they are going to look after it. I was talking to these young men——

Mr. CARVELL. Will they learn to water stock?

Mr. CROSBY. If they get acquainted with my hon. friend he will be able to teach them something about that or about any other kind of stock. These young men had all their expenses paid, and they were starting at not less than $600 a year, and were learning a business besides. I am not an expert in physiognomy as I ought to be, I have learned most of what I know about it from looking at the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite, but I should say that these young men were from eighteen years to twenty-one years, and they were starting out in a far better position than young Canadians could start in the post office service of the country. The banks are taking our money from the east to the west and they are sending our young men after it, but they don't stay in the banks out west, they go on farms and get rich and the first thing you know they are able to spend the winter in England. The reason you get good men in the east to fill these positions is that our farms are not very enticing, our manufacturing industries are not as great as we hope they will be, and our railway facilities are inadequate, especially in the maritime provinces, and there is lacking diversity of employment to keep our young men at home. We all know that the minimum of $500 is too small and that is admitted by the Postmaster General himself. But, now that he is proposing this resolution, he should urge on his colleagues to make the increase $100 a year until the maximum is reached. It does seem to me that with the knocking about a railway mail clerk gets on a train he has to be of pretty good stuff to live the fifteen years which entitles him to get the maximum under the proposal of the Postmaster General. When the Postmaster General spoke of a man getting promotion in the post office service if he had 'grit' enough in him, I take it that he did not mean grit in the sense we generally understand it, and I say this in case some of my friends over here who are less scrupulous than I am may use that expression against the Postmaster General when the elections come around. In view of the surplus of $750,000 in the Post Office Department, the Postmaster General should not be niggardly with his employees, and I am confident that if he uses his persuasive powers on his colleagues he can get them to assent to our proposition that the increase should be $100 per annum and should not be limited to $50 after the first three years. I trust that the Postmaster General will make provision in the Bill that the railway mail clerks, instead of having an increase of $100 a year for the first three years only, will have an increase of $100 a year until they reach the maximum of $1,400.

Mr. BRADBURY. I want to congratulate the Postmaster General on increasing the salaries of the smaller officers. I had the pleasure of attending the meeting held by the postmasters of the Dominion, and at that time, if I remember rightly, I drew the attention of the Postmaster General to the special conditions that exist in western Canada. Take my own county, for instance. It is a very large county, and we have not the advantages of good roads. It is a prairie country, and in rainy seasons the roads are very muddy, and the people who come for their mail leave the post office in a condition that it is worth almost all that the postmaster gets for the week to clean it out. I would like to impress on the Postmaster General that there is a great difference between the districts in Canada regarding the remuneration

which a postmaster ought to get. In many cases it is a great sacrifice on the part of these people to keep the post office. The remuneration of the country postmasters in the country west of the lakes really ought to be more than $50 a year, though I appreciate the action of the Postmaster General in increasing it to that amount.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not to $50, but to $35.

Mr. BRADBURY Well, I am disappointed, because I understood that this Bill was to increase it to $50. I felt satisfied that those representing the postmasters of the Dominion had made a good case.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I stated a moment ago that I was considering the question. It would not come under this Bill, because the postmasters do not come under the Civil Service Act.

Mr. BRADBURY. Perhaps it will suit my purpose to leave the question open, as it will give the Postmaster General an opportunity to deal with that phase of it which I am bringing to his attention. In addition to what I have said, a postmaster who keeps an office in an isolated situation in the province of Manitoba often has to entertain his neighbours who come to get their mail about meal time.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say to my hon. friend that since I had that interview with the Association of Postmasters, and the members of the House, I have started to prepare a scale which the House may know of before the session is over.

Mr. BRADBURY. The postmasters also brought before the Postmaster General the question of supplies for the country post offices. That is a very small request. There are more supplies wasted here during the session than would perhaps supply half the post offices in Canada. I think the minister should provide supplies of that kind to the post offices, especially those that deal with registered letters, and things of that kind.

Mr. EDWARDS. I regret that I cannot see my way clear to add to the floral tributes which have been handed to the Postmaster General to-night, because I do not think the Post Office Department has any right to have a surplus of three-quarters of a million. I do not think there is any credit due to the head of that department for having such a surplus. Every cent of it comes directly out of the people, and should go back to the people in more efficient mail service. Therefore, I do not feel like throwing bouquets so long as there are people in my constituency, as the Postmaster General knows very well there are, who have to travel 5, 6, 7 or 8 miles for their mail. When the Postmaster General raises the salaries of the country postmasters I will throw my bouquets, but it is a little soon to do it now. The country people of Ontario are not getting a fair share of the post office revenue, and so long as that state of things exists, and people have to go down on their knees and beg facilities which should be granted to them without a moment's hesitation, and when there is a large surplus in the treasury, every member who represents a rural constituency should rise and make his protest.

Mr. SEXSMITH. I agree with my hon. friend from Frontenac that while we have a surplus of three-quarters of a million dollars many of the rural parts of Ontario are getting very poor service. In my riding there are places where there is a mail only every other day, and other places where there is a mail only twice a week. I made application for a daily mail, and I had good reason to believe that the hon. Postmaster General was going to grant it, but apparently there was not revenue enough to pay for the service, and we did not get it. If we are establishing rural mail delivery in many places, there are many others which are badly neglected; and if we have the money, there is no reason why we should not give the people better mail service. Another subject which my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Crothers) spoke of was the poorly paid postmasters in the rural parts of Ontario. $50 is absolutely nothing. In many offices, it will not pay to sweep them out. The minister says that while $35 is the minimum, the postmaster has a commission on the stamps he sells. But many of these offices where they serve many people with their mails, have a very small sale of stamps. In my county there are a couple of offices which are four miles from the village and which, while they handle the mails of four or five other offices for the accommodation of the people, have a very small sale of stamps because the people buy them in the village. I think $60 surely should be the minimum paid for any post office in the country. There is no reason why we should ask any one to keep a room for the postal accommodation of the people for less than that.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I am sure the Postmaster General can see that the best way out of the difficulty with the country postmasters is to increase rural free mail delivery. I am sure he will take into consideration the increase from $800 up to $1,400 at possibly $100 per year until the limit is reached if the Civil Service Act will allow it. Would he say when we are likely to have the railway mail clerks and those in the city post offices come under the Civil Service Act? Judging from the remarks of the hon. member for Carleton (Mr. Carvell) and the

minister himself, I would conclude that there are plenty of applicants; and if these applicants come under the Civil Service Commission, I am satisfied that the Postmaster General will be rid of a great deal of trouble anl have no difficulty in obtaining employees.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not tell exactly when the outside service in the larger post offices, such as Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, Quebec and Winnipeg will come under the Civil Service Act. In my judgment we should bring them under it as early as possible, and that is the view shared by other members of the government and of the House. But there are difficulties in the way which will have to be overcome. I hope that within a year or so I shall be able to put these large offices under the operation of the Civil Service Act.

Mr. KIDD. I quite agree with the hon. member for Frontenac, that when we have such a large surplus we should change in many places our mail delivery, and have the mails delivered twice a week or three times a week instead of once. There is nothing to boast of in a large surplus when we have such inefficient service, especially in the rural districts. Really $35 a year is scarcely sufficient to pay for cleaning out the post office room. The amount should be at least $100 or $2 a week. I have an application from the county of Carleton for a small section of rural mail delivery which I trust the minister will take into consideration and deal with favourably.

Mr. HENDERSON. I simply rise to say that I heartily endorse an increase for the small offices. I quite understand that the Postmaster General has in his mind to do something for these offices and purposes at an early date bringing the minimum up to $50. This country is big enough and rich enough to pay that. There is no reason why people living in the country should keep their houses open for the accommodation of their neighbours for the small sum of $50 and, perhaps, the minister's generosity will add something to that. I leave it in his hands and have no doubt he will be as fair as he can. With regard to railway mail clerks, they are, perhaps, entitled to more consideration than any other class in the service, owing to the more hazardous nature of their employment. I believe the Postmaster General has that idea fairly in his mind and is keeping that in view in arranging their salaries. With regard to the letter carriers, they are a class whom we do not have in my county, beyond a few rural mail deliveries which I believe are working very successfully. I am sorry that that system has not been further extended, but still I have no hesitation in expressing my opinion that the mail carriers are fairly well paid. We hear a great deal about the increased cost of living, particularly in the west, but it would be more accurate to speak of the increased extravagance of the people, and if we did that we would not have so many applications for increases in salary. The increased cost of living was one of those things that came about the time the Liberals came into power and a great deal is made of it. I trust that the Postmaster General will do justice, particularly to the smaller post offices; but there is a middle class of post offices in towns with a population of 1,200 or 2,000. In these the public are much more exacting than they were 20 or 25 years ago. For instance, if a postmaster were now to lock up the post office and go to dinner, as they used to do, the Postmaster General would probably receive a wire complaining of that, so that the postmaster is obliged to employ more help and more efficient help and he needs more revenue to do that. I hope the Postmaster General will do his best to assist this class of postmasters.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. FRASER. The rural mail delivery system can be operated most properly and successfully in Prince Edward Island because that province is much more thickly settled in proportion to its area than any other in Canada, and I hope if this system is generally inaugurated we will have our full share of it. I also think the salaries to the rural postmasters are too small, the minimum should be increased from $35 to $50.

Resolution reported, read the second time, and agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 216) to amend the Post Office Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

CIVIL SERVICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Civil Service Act by:

(a) changing the classification of the clerks in the city post offices, offices of the post office inspectors, office of superintendent of railway mail service, and in the money order and exchange offices by abolishing the stampers and sorters class and fourth class clerkships, and substituting therefor third class clerkships, ranging from $500 to $1,000, and divided into two classes known as third class 'A' and 'B';

(b) abolishing the junior and senior second class clerkships and substituting therefor classes 'A' and 'B' of the second class, and increasing the maximum of the class formerly known as junior second, and now known as class 'B,' to $1,200, and increasing the maxi-

mum of class 'A,' corresponding with the former senior class, to $1,400;

(c) dividing the first class clerkships into divisions 'A' and 'B' with maximum salaries of $1,800 and $1,600, respectively, and increasing the minimum of the first class clerkships from $1,200 to $1,400, and creating a new class of clerks, to be known as chief clerks in the city post offices, subject to certain restrictions;

(d) improving the position of office superintendents in city post offices, and changing what was formerly a fixed salary of $1,800 to a minimum of $1,800 and a maximum of $2,500;

(e) providing for the employment of temporary clerks in the above-named offices for a period of not more than one year, at a fixed salary of $500, and temporary helpers to meet the exigencies of the service, at a salary not exceeding $2.50 a day;

(f) increasing the salaries of certain inspectors, assistant inspectors and superintendents of railway mail service in recognition of years of service.—Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have discussed the two resolutions concurrently, but one is to amend the Civil Service Act, and the other to amend the Post Office Act.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 217) to amend the Civil Service Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.47 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MONDAY, May 15, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill (No. 214) respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

Bill (No. 215) for the relief of William Francis Currie.—Mr. Pardee.

THE BAHAMAS AND CANADA.

Mr. FOSTER. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Finance if he can give any information to the House as to the exact situation at the present time of the proposed negotiations between the Bahamas and Canada for admission to the confederation. It is stated in the press that papers have arrived at home, and that the matter is being taken up by the premier in London during his present visit.

Mr. FIELDING. There are really no negotiations whatever. We are aware from public discussion that the people of the Bahamas are interested in the matter, and it is not improbable that the question would arise in England and would be discussed between the Prime Minister and the authorities of the Colonial Office; but nothing official whatever has occurred on the subject.

PRIVATE BILLS.

NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 170) to incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Nipissing).

On section 7, and the proposed amendment thereto of Mr. Lancaster.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When this Bill was last before the committee, my hon. friend from Lincoln was desirous of ascertaining the opinion of the Minister of Railways upon it. As the Minister of Railways is not able to be here this morning, he has left a memorandum with my hon. friend the Secretary of State in which he says that he sees no objection whatever to the Bill, as the gentlemen who are promoting it have given him the assurance that they intend to build the principal line proposed as well as the branches, and he is of opinion that the Bill ought to go through with an amendment changing the name to the New Ontario and Abitibi railway, so that it will not conflict with the name of another company already in existence.

Mr. LANCASTER. I must insist upon my amendment, because there is a very serious principle involved. The government and the House of course can take the responsibility of rejecting it. I cannot see any force in the minister's statement that he sees no harm in this Bill. It undertakes to incorporate three lines of railway, two of them 25 miles each in length to connect with the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, a provincially-owned and operated railway, with the assets of the province of Ontario involved in it and the taxation of the people of Ontario behind it, for the purpose of developing an undeveloped portion of the province. These two lines of railway provided for in clause (b) and clause (c) of this Bill, are purely local works, entirely within not only the province, but one electoral district of the province. The third line named in clause (a) is a line that, if it were going to be built, would have to have a Dominion charter; but the two other little lines ought not, under any circumstances,

to be incorporated by this parliament. It would be in absolute conflict not only with the British North America Act, but with our own Railway Act, which provides in section 8 that a railway owned by any provincial government shall not be subject to Dominion legislation with respect to through traffic without the consent of such government.

The Ontario government sent a protest to our committee against our giving a charter to build the two twenty-five mile railways, which are to connect with the Ontario government railway now being operated and thus putting these two small lines under federal jurisdiction. If we do that our Board of Railway Commissioners cannot control the provincial line with which we connect these two little railways and the provincial Board cannot control these two little railways which we incorporate. Besides under the British North America Act we have no right to incorporate any railways which are entirely within one province unless we go the length of saying, for some special reason, that they are for the general advantage of Canada. No such declaration, however, is made in this Bill, and none such could be made because it would be utterly opposed to the facts. There is nothing to prevent these two small lines getting a charter from the province, and thus coming under the same jurisdiction as the line with which they propose to connect. I have been asked why in the railway committee I did not move to strike out these two clauses. But assuming that the company are going to build east and west and run across the boundary line into the province of Quebec to Lake Abitibi, I would not object to their having a Dominion charter in that case, because that would not be an unfair interference with provincial rights. Therefore, I moved an amendment that they should not be prevented building these two twenty-five mile branches, provided they first build their main line, 160 miles east and west, which is their only excuse for coming here. So that instead of moving to strike out these clauses, I moved that the company might be allowed to build these two short lines provided they first build the main line across into Quebec, which is their only excuse for coming to this parliament at all.

The Minister of Public Works says that the Department of Railways has been assured by the promoters of the Bill that they intend to build this line of railway mentioned in section (a) to connect with the Transcontinental. If that be the case, no harm can be done by saying: You shall do that before building these other two.

Hon. Wm. PUGSLEY (Minister of Public Works). These two branches will connect with the National Transcontinental as well as with the Ontario and Timiskaming. Will he inform the committee how they will in any way interfere with the Timiskaming and Ontario any more than with the National Transcontinental?

Mr. LANCASTER. Clause (c) begins at the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario, runs northerly and easterly along the Abitibi river to a junction with the line described in paragraph (b), being a distance of twenty-five miles, and the line in paragraph (b) connects with the National Transcontinental.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not that make one line connecting with the Transcontinental and running around to the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario?

Mr. LANCASTER. It would make a line connecting the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway with the Transcontinental railway if they are both built. But even so those two little lines are entirely within the province of Ontario, and within the one judicial district, and we have no right to charter them at all unless we take the responsibility of saying they are for the general advantage of Canada. But we do not say that, and it would be absurd to do so. The fact that these two lines, if built, would connect the National Transcontinental with the provincial railway does not give us jurisdiction. But because they want a Dominion charter, the company apply for a charter to build a road to run across into the province of Quebec to Lake Abitibi. The Minister of Railways implied by his statement the other night repeated by the Minister of Public Works to-day, that he had an assurance from the promoters of the Bill that the company are going to build that line of railway provided for in clause (a), which is an interprovincial railway and therefore should have a Dominion charter. If that is the case, what possible objection can there be to my amendment which simply provides that they shall be compelled to build that part of the railway before they build the two branch lines of 25 miles each, which are really the most outrageous interference with provincial rights in the sense of interfering not only with a provincially controlled but with a provincially owned railway, which is under the control of a different railway commission from our Board of Railway Commissioners. Without my amendment the assurance which the minister has received does not amount to a snap of the fingers.

Mr. NESBITT. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has admirably argued his point, and surely he would now be willing to trust to the vote of the committee to see whether they think with him

or against him. Let us have a vote and get rid of the Bill. I am not interested in the Bill in any way.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I have just discovered that a great part of this proposed road is in my riding. It is unnecessary for me to tell the committee where I stand in regard to provincial rights, and the requirements for railways throughout New Ontario. The minitser says he has an assurance from the promoters that they are going to construct the proposed main line. The difference made by the amendment of the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara is that the amendment will compel them to build the main line first, while the statement of the promoters is that they will build the main line.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not first, they want to build them simultaneously.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). The amendment says they shall build it first, and the statement made to the Minister of Railways says simply they will build it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where is the objection to letting them build simultaneously if they want to?

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I know that the provincial government are opposed to this company receiving a charter from this parliament for the part of their line which is exclusively in Ontario, but if I had some assurance that the main line was going to be built, and that the project was not purely and simply a provincial matter, I would certainly favour the Bill, because I cannot see what harm it would do to the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway if this road connected both with the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario and with the National Transcontinental railway. If it opens up that country it will do great good to the people of that part. I also understand that one of the reasons for asking power to build one of the branch lines is that they want to connect some water-powers which they own with the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario railway, and by that means, after having it completed, will be able to get their machinery and other plant into their water-powers. They should have applied to the provincial government for that right, there is no question about that. But if we are given a substantial assurance that they are going to build the main line, and you can hold them down to that assurance, I would certainly vote for the Bill because we require all the railways we can have in that northern country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I might read a letter, a copy of which has been placed in my hands from one of the promoters of the Bill to the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) who, I regret is unable to be present this morning. The letter reads:

NEW ONTARIO AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.
Toronto, May 13, 1911.

George Gordon, Esq., M.P.,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—As one of the promoters of this Bill, I desire to impress upon you that the objection which has been raised that the company should be incorporated by the provincial legislature is unfounded. It is absolutely necessary, as you will see from the map, that about twenty miles of the railway should be in the province of Quebec in order to get around Lake Abitibi. It is the intention to proceed with the construction of the railway as speedily as possible, and for that purpose the promoters desire to carry on the whole of the work, including that of the so-called branches, simultaneously.

Yours truly,
L. M. WOOD.

I do not know what stronger assurance one could have than that positive statement of what their intentions are.

Mr. LANCASTER. The letter contains a statement that they intend to do all this simultaneously. My motion is that they shall do part of the work, the part which is properly the subject of Dominion legislation, first. We know that in practice a railway in course of construction is not all proceeded with at the same time. There would be no wrench to the assurance they have given if they were required to proceed with the Dominion controlled part of the road before proceeding with the part that is purely a matter of provincial concern. Now I appeal to the Minister of Public Works as a business man. He has read here a letter; should not he put the effect of that letter in the bond where it will have some meaning and effect?—which is the very intention of my amendment. I discussed the form of this amendment with hon. members, and the draftsmanship is the result of that conference. I think the language is correct and adequate but, if it can be changed with advantage I do not object. If they are going to work on both these lines simultaneously we know, as practical men, that they do not have their derricks, their teams, their men at two points at the same time. Then why not provide that they shall begin with the Dominion railway before they begin with that part which, standing alone is a purely provincial work. They must begin somewhere, and if they begin on the twenty-five mile line and stop there—which I have not any doubt is their real intention——

Mr. EMMERSON. Had we not better knock it out altogether?

Mr. LANCASTER. No. I admit that clause (a) ought to be in the Bill. If they are

going to build into the province of Quebec they have a perfect right to get a Dominion charter; but clauses (b) and (c) should not pass except with the qualification I suggest. Talk about 'assurance,' I do not want to be pernickity, as has been suggested, nor unduly uncharitable, but I want to be a little businesslike. Look at the names connected with this charter. The first is E. A. Wallberg. What does this government think of E. A. Wallberg, in view of the disclosures made on his contracts.

Mr. CARVELL. The Supreme court decided that he was all right.

Mr. LANCASTER. Oh, yes; the initials are all right. 'E. A.,' my children would probably say, were thoroughly respectable initals in view of the initials of their father's name. But it is the surname that is wrong, for proof of which I refer to the records of this House. The 'E. A.' is all right, but the 'Wallberg' is not.

Mr. CARVELL. Is not the hon. member (Mr. Lancaster) aware that the Supreme court has said that Mr. Wallberg is all right?

Mr. LANCASTER. I was speaking of what transpired in this House under the contracts Mr. Wallberg had. I have a list of them here. If the Minister of Public Works would show a disposition to be something of a business man where provincial rights are concerned, I would not trouble the House with this matter. But, he proposes to take the statement of the promoter of this Bill instead of putting the condition in the bond. He is going to take a mere letter which he knows, as a lawyer is not worth the paper it is written on, and cannot be enforced or dealt with in court. I have here a list of contracts by which this man had made thousands of dollars out of the people of the country—contracts with the Railway Department, with the Marine and Fisheries Department, and with others; a contractor working as close to the line as he dare, making all sorts of money out of the people of this country. And when this man seeks to go into the province of Ontario with a Dominion charter behind him and interfere with a railway owned and operated by the people, a provincial railway run by a business government, this government ought to establish reasonable, businesslike conditions in granting privileges. I think the more that is said on the subject the more reason there is why my amendment should carry.

Amendment (Mr. Lancaster) negatived.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In accordance with the suggestion of the Minister of Railways I would move that section 1 be amended so as to make the name of the company 'The New Ontario and Abitibi Railway Company.'

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). What is the reason for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a company already chartered known as 'The Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not the effect of the minister's amendment to put this railway under an entirely provincial name?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. But the name given in this section might be confounded with that of 'The Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.' Lake Abitibi, I understand, is not wholly in the province of Ontario; there is part of it in the province of Quebec.

Mr. LANCASTER. The part that this railway runs to is in the province of Quebec. Why not, as I suggested to the Minister of Railways, leave out the word 'new'? The Timiskaming and Northern Ontario Railway is developing New Ontario—that is what it was built for. It does not make much difference what the name of a railway is in one sense, but if you are going to change this name why not call it 'The Ontario and Lake Abitibi Railway Company.'

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). Besides, the people in Northern Ontario object to the name 'New Ontario.' It is the same old Ontario.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I see; Northern Ontario will soon swing the rest of Ontario—that is the idea. I should be glad to accept the suggestion of my hon. friend from Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) I move that section (1) be amended so as to make the name read the 'Ontario and Abitibi Railway Company.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not objecting. But as I understand it the title of the Bill cannot be amended in committee. If the title is to be amended it should be on the third reading.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This only amends section 1 by changing the name.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) agreed to.

Bill reported.

Mr. WHITE moved that the Bill be now read the third time, and that its title be an Act to incorporate the Ontario and Abitibi Railway Company.

Mr. LANCASTER. Before the Bill is read a third time, I want formally to move my amendment, which has been discussed and turned down by the Committee of the Whole:

That the said Bill be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House with instructions to add to section 7, as subsection 2, the following:—

The powers of construction granted by paragraphs (b) and (c) shall not be exercised until the line of railway authorized by paragraph (a) shall have been constructed to the respective junctions on that line to which the lines authorized by the said paragraphs (b) and (c) are to extend.

I just wish to say that in view of the provisions of the constitution with regard to provincial rights, in view of our own statute providing that we shall not interfere with government owned and operated railways in any province, in view of what I said a few moments ago and last week, and the week before, I want again to protest against the House passing the third reading of this Bill, and I warn the House that, if it does pass it, it will establish a very dangerous precedent. It is all very well for some people to say that it does not make any difference whether a railway is under the Dominion or under a province. It does make a difference, until the British North America Act is amended. I might join in petitioning the home government to amend that Act, and to place all railways under this jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament; but as the constitution stands to-day the provincial authorities have the sole right with regard to lines of railway wholly within the province; and in this case the province has a special right, recognized not only by the British North America Act, but by our own Dominion statute. In view of the fact that the lines of railway mentioned in subclauses (b) and (c) are to have connection with the provincially-owned and operated railway, this legislation is a most undue and unwarranted interference with provincial rights. Some of the other provinces, as well as the province of Ontario will be sorry in the future that this legislation has passed. We do not know when some other province may be struck at in the same way, and if we pass this Bill, as it stands to-day, we shall be making a bad precedent or else fish of one and flesh of another. The amendment I propose cannot hurt this charter if the company does what it promises to do. Under the circumstances, I ask the House to vote for the amendment, so that this improper interference with the province of Ontario will not be perpetrated.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the Minister of Public Works what serious objection he has to this amendment?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The motion is that one part of this road shall be built first. Now, what the promoters say is that they want to proceed at different points upon all parts of the line as may be most convenient for them. This is the memorandum which has been left for me by the Minister of Railways:

Mr. LANCASTER

This railway runs twenty or twenty-five miles through Quebec (not one mile, as stated by Mr. Lancaster). There is, therefore, no doubt about the jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament.

There is no reason for assuming that the Quebec part of the railroad will not be built or for questioning the good faith of the promoters. A glance at the map would show that the railroad must run through Quebec. The easterly portion serves the country south of Lake Abitibi, a country which has been surveyed by the Transcontinental and which is a very fine agricultural country. Lake Abitibi is fifty or sixty miles long and the easterly end of it extends ten or twelve miles into Quebec. The Transcontinental is to the north of Lake Abitibi and to get to it at the easterly end of Lake Abitibi it is necessary for the present railway to go through Quebec.

Mr. Lancaster's motion would have the effect of delaying the completion of the railway by about two years. It would take between two and three years to finish what is called the main line. If Mr. Lancaster's motion carried, it would mean, therefore, that the promoters could not commence the so-called branch lines for between two or three years, and it would then take perhaps two years to finish them.

The promoters are anxious to get the whole road built as soon as possible. They want to be able to commence at different points at the same time.

If the amendment of my hon. friend was carried, they could not strike a blow on any one of these branches until the portion mentioned in paragraph (a) was completed, which would take about two years. They must have in view the most convenient points to get in their supplies, and I understand that the construction of these branches is necessary in order to get in their supplies for the construction of the main line. It seems to me unreasonable that we should say what part of this road should be built first. If parliament is going to incorporate the company at all, surely it ought not to hamper them by saying that they shall first build one part of the line, which will take two years to build, and must not touch any other part of the line until that is completed.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Can the minister give any reason why they ought not to go to the local legislature for a charter to build the two branch lines?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When those lines are completed they will all be parts of one system of railway. One portion of the line could only be authorized by this parliament, because it extends into the province of Quebec. Does not my hon. friend see how inconvenient it would be for the railway company to have two charters, placing one portion of its system under the jurisdiction of the province, and another portion under the jurisdiction of the Dominion? It would be under the control of

two Boards of Railway Commissioners, and be subject to two jurisdictions. It would be entirely inconvenient, and I can see no possibility that any public interest could be served by putting the company in that position.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman is well aware that the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario is a provincially-owned railway, and these lines are to connect with it. This company is asking a charter apparently with the sole object of having Dominion authority to build branch lines as well as a main line connecting with the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario. Would it not be reasonable to say that, so far as the branch lines are concerned, they are a matter for the province to deal with. The provincial government are opposed to the Dominion granting this charter, and their interests should be given some consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That was all thoroughly threshed out in the committee.

Mr. BLAIN. When does the hon. minister expect that this road will be begun and completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have no personal knowledge, but I have the assurance forwarded to me through my colleague, the Minister of Railways, from the promoters, that they are acting bona fide and intend proceeding as rapidly as possible with the construction of the whole system. We have also the assurance of the hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gordon) that the promoters are acting in good faith. All these assurances had weight with the special committee which dealt with this matter, and ought to have weight with the House.

Mr. ARTHURS. Is the minister aware that any application has been made to this government for a subsidy for any part of these lines, or the whole?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not aware of any.

Mr. ARTHURS. The reason I ask is this: The Ontario government has built the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario, of which these branch lines will be practically feeders. The Timiskaming and Northern Ontario was built absolutely without any subsidy from this government, and it would be unfair to assist any company in building lines, which should be practically branch lines of the Timiskaming and Northern Ontario, by giving this company Dominion subsidies.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend explain why?

Amendment negatived on division; motion agreed to; Bill read the third time.

Mr. PUGSLEY moved that the Bill do now pass, and that the name of the company be changed to that of the Ontario and Abitibi Railway Companv.

Motion agreed to, and Bill passed.

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 158) to incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—Mr. Devlin.

On section 8: description of property and assets transferred.

Mr. NESBITT. Mr. Chairman, you have some amendments to the Bill, have you not?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There do not appear to be any proposed amendments to this section.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand that the objection has been met by a recital which has been placed on the notice paper to make the matter clearer. With that recital, section 8, I understand, will be quite clear.

On section 10,

The majority of the directors of the company need not be residents of Canada nor subjects of His Majesty, provided, however, that at least two of such directors shall have these qualifications and a minority of the directors, being non-residents and not more than two in number, may vote by proxy at meetings of the directors.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There are some proposed amendments. The law clerk has attached to the Bill a memorandum in regard to section 10 which I will read:

Section 127 of the Company's Act, which requires that the majority of directors of the company shall be residents in Canada and subjects of His Majesty, does not apply to this company. (See clause 12). In the third line of clause 10, the words 'of such' are ambiguous. Probably any two directors are meant, and the words 'of such' should be struck out. The last two lines of the clause as amended are either ambiguous or not what is intended. The matter has been explained to Mr. Miller, chairman of the Banking Committee. I would suggest the following as clause 10 of the Bill as covering what is apparently intended:

10. At least two directors shall be residents of Canada and subjects of His Majesty. Two non-resident directors may vote by proxy at meetings of directors.

(Sgd.) A. H. O'BRIEN,
Law Clerk.

Mr. FOSTER. Just what is the difference between this and the company's Act requirement?

Mr. FIELDING. Under the company's Act the majority must be British subjects. This is a company with an organization already established in Paris, and probably it would not be possible to apply the company's Act to it. This firm has been established in Paris and has been operating throughout the world for a long time, but it is a French firm.

Mr. FOSTER. It seems to require a pretty good reason why the company's Act should be departed from. I do not quite understand from what the Minister of Finance says why it could not be so arranged that the majority would be British subjects.

Mr. BARKER. The proprietary interest in this company is really in France. Revillon Bros. are a French firm who started a company here to carry on business in Canada. By some mistake made in the chartering they found that they could not really incorporate themselves and the business has been going on for some years. This Act is intended to properly constitute and organize the company, it being thoroughly well known that the proprietary interest is in old France. But they propose to have an incorporation here with at least two directors resident in the province of Quebec. I would suggest, however, that if there is no danger of interfering with the Bill, we allow it to stand for another day. I was asked by the committee to take some part in revising the Bill and I did so, but since then there have been other words introduced by the law clerk and I would like, if I am to have any responsibility in regard to it, to have an opportunity of looking at them. It is very important that this Bill should be free from blunders. They have twice attempted to put themselves right, and while no doubt the law clerk may be perfectly correct in his wording, I would prefer to let it stand until the next meeting.

Mr. DEVLIN. We have tried to follow as closely as possible the wording of section 9 of the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company. As the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) has pointed out, this Bill presently arises through a misunderstanding in the incorporation of the company in the first instance. Revillon Brothers sought incorporation by letters patent, and were incorporated as Revillon Brothers, Limited, and in the letters patent they are also called Revillon Frères à Responsabilité Limitée. They were also incorporated by Act of Parliament under their letters patent, but they could not organize in any shape or form, so the attorneys in charge of the present Bill have made out the Act which is now before parliament in order to regulate the whole thing, and I think that if possible it would be well for the committee to leave the clause as originally suggested, as it would save a great deal more trouble than trying to right matters here.

Mr. FIELDING. I think my hon. friend may accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker). The words added by the law clerk are probably correct, but I know that words added without much consultation in that way are sometimes found to be otherwise. This firm is of world wide fame and of the highest reputation and standing, and I am sure there is nothing in the Bill but what is there for good purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think there is any objection to the matter being made satisfactory. It was the desire of the committee to meet the wishes of the promoters.

Section 10 allowed to stand.

Progress reported.

CONTINENTAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 196) to incorporate the Continental Fire Insurance Company of Canada.—Mr. Molloy.

On section 7,

Mr. BLAIN. How far has the government control over the rates of insurance?

Mr. FIELDING. There is no such control—competition.

Mr. BLAIN. I think this question of rates should receive some consideration by the Finance Department. We are chartering companies every day giving them the right to insure plate glass. The government should have some general control over the rates.

Mr. FIELDING. The suggestion of my hon. friend is worthy of consideration; but I do not think that up to the present time abuses have been brought to our notice that would call for the intervention of the government.

Mr. FOSTER. I would suggest to the promoter of the Bill that before the word 'subscribed' in this section the words 'bona fide' be inserted.

Mr. FIELDING. Does that add anything to it?

Mr. FOSTER. I think so. At least, the Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) thought it added so much that in his outline of the new Banking Bill the word 'bona fide' was placed. The subscription might be a fake subscription, as was actually the case in the Farmers' Bank.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection to the insertion of the words. They would not do any harm.

Amendment agreed to.

Section 7 as amended agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

RICHELIEU AND ONTARIO NAVIGATION COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 192) to provide for increasing the capital stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

On motion to report the Bill.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the promoter of the Bill to give us some little idea of the reason for asking for this increase in capital?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The reason is that several companies are getting together. Lord Furness is at the head of this company and wants to invest a few more million dollars in Canada, and we think this a splendid opportunity——

Mr. ARMSTRONG. This is in preparation for a large merger?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I thought mergers were tabooed under the present regime.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Only the name.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the promoter of the Bill made any investigation to see whether or not we are likely to have a repetition of such results as those of the cement merger?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. This is not at all on the same line. The Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company are taking over the Northern Navigation Company and the Inland Navigation Company and are about to acquire other companies as well. They have not sufficient capital stock to take them all over and simply ask for authority to make new issues.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. All right, we will take your word for it.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

BOILER FLUE CLEANER AND SUPPLY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 187) respecting a patent of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Mr. FOSTER. We ought to have from the Minister of Agriculture an explanation of why this legislation is necessary. We should like to know that he approves it.

Mr. FISHER. I cannot give the details, but before the Senate Committee the deputy commissioner appeared and went into the matter, and he reported to me that there was no objection to it.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

TRUSSED CONCRETE STEEL COMPANY OF CANADA.

House in committee on Bill (No. 188) to confer on the commissioner of patents certain powers for the relief of the Trussed Concrete Steel Company of Canada, Limited.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Mr. FISHER. The reasons for this Bill are set out in the preamble. The case is peculiar. This concern has a company in Michigan and also one in Canada. They obtained a patent in the United States. The head office in Michigan thought the Canadian office was looking after the patent in Canada and the Canadian office thought the Michigan office was attending to the matter. The time expired during which they had a right to obtain a patent. The Bill was before the Senate Committee, the deputy commissioner reported to me that there was no objection.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

MUNDERLOH AND COMPANY, LIMITED.

House in committee on Bill (No. 203) respecting certain patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited.—Mr. Rivet.

Mr. FOSTER. What is the explanation of this?

Mr. FISHER. The same as that of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, The first term of the patent expired and they desire to have it extended for a second term. The matter has been before the Senate.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CHATHAM, WALLACEBURG AND LAKE ERIE RAILWAY COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 206) respecting the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—Mr. Gordon (Kent).

On the preamble,

Mr. ARMSTRONG. What is the extension of time granted to this company?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER (reading):

The said company may, within two years after the passing of this Act, commence the

construction of its railway and expend fifteen per cent of the amount of its capital stock thereon, and may, within five years after the passing of this Act, complete the said railway and put it in operation; and if, within the said periods respectively, the said railway is not commenced and such expenditure is not so made, or the said railway is not completed and put in operation, the powers of construction conferred upon the said company by parliament shall cease and be null and void as respects so much of the said railway as then remains uncompleted.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Is the promoter of the Bill present? Could he give us any assurance that they are going on with it? My reason for asking is that there is another company that is considering extending in that direction, and I merely want to get an assurance from the promoters of the Bill that they intend to carry out the instructions contained in that clause.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I would say to my hon. friend (Mr. Armstrong) that the promoter of the Bill will not be back again before the adjournment, and, therefore, I do not think there is any one who could give the assurance which the hon. gentleman asks. From my knowledge of the road I know they are very desirous of making the extension, but beyond that I cannot go. This is a road which, I am sure, my hon. friend will be very glad to get. They have a line running from Wallaceburg to Lake Erie and it is well equipped.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I may say that in so far as Petrolea is concerned, the people there are interested in this road and anxious to have it. But, there is another company that is extending in the same direction. I was anxious to know whether these men intended to proceed with the work that would be necessary.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

At one o'clock, the House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

RELIEF OF GERTRUDE MARY GRANTHAM.

Bill (No. 200) for the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I do not consider that I am charged with any greater responsibility than each other member of this House in respect to Bills for divorce, though I generally look over the evidence when these Bills come to this House. In the case of this particular Bill my attention was specially drawn to the circumstances from the fact that, as I understood it, the Private Bills Committee felt considerable hesitation as to reporting the Bill. At the first sitting, at any rate, when it was considered by that committee, the decision to hold it over for further consideration was made instead of the usual course of reporting it being followed. On reading the evidence, I must say that I was not astonished that the Private Bills Committee should have felt considerable hesitation in the matter, because, speaking for myself, after having read the evidence, I think this case is certainly going as far in the way of granting a divorce without there being any distinct evidence of any particular or specific act of adultery as any case that has ever come under my notice. I want to call the attention of the members of the committee to what the evidence exactly is, and to all that there is in the way of evidence. The application was not opposed by the husband. It is the wife's application based on the usual grounds. The evidence in support of the application consists of the testimony of three witnesses—the wife, the family doctor and the wife's father; that is all. No one of them speaks of anything within his or her own knowledge, but each speaks of occasions when the husband made to him or her certain admissions or statements in regard to his conduct. Without further preface I want to read to the committee exactly what each one of these witnesses says, and that is all the evidence presented here, upon which this Bill is supported. The wife was the first witness examined. She was not cross-examined at all, but was merely examined by her own counsel; and in reading the evidence I ask the attention of the committee to the form in which the questions are put, that the committee may consider to what extent these statements were the statements of the witness, the wife herself, and to what extent they were suggestions made to her by her own counsel. After the usual preliminary inquiries and the establishing of the marriage, which took place in 1898, and the statement that the husband and wife had lived for some years in the city of New York, the counsel says:

Q. You lived with your husband in Toronto for some time?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you continue to hear stories about his infidelity?—A. Yes.

Q. His going about with other women and cohabiting with them?—A. Yes.

Q. Did you finally challenge him about it?—A. Yes, he told me.

Q. What did he tell you?—A. He told me about a certain woman living in Buffalo.

Q. Do you know her name?—A. No, I do not quite remember her name.

Q. What did he tell you?—A. He said he met her at hotels.

Q. Slept with her, do you mean?—A. Yes.

Q. Cohabiting with her?—A. Yes.

That is the wife's testimony. The next is the family doctor:

Q. Did you attend Mr. Grantham at his home while he was living with his wife or

while they were living in the same house together?—A. Yes, on Balmoral avenue.

Q. Are you able to state to the chairman and members of the committee what his habits were as to sexual relations with women?—A. Yes. I think he had very free sexual relations with other women than his wife.

By Hon. Mr. Jones:

Q. You think that?—A. I know it from his own statements to me.

Q. He said so to you?—A. Yes, many times.

Finally, the evidence of the wife's father:

Q. Did you have any talks with Grantham about his faithfulness or unfaithfulness towards his wife?—A. In the course of conversation he admitted to me at one time that he was not.

Q. What did he say?—A. That he was not and did not propose to be.

Q. That is, that he would cohabit with other women?—A. That is the meaning I took from it.

Then, a little further down:

Q. Can you tell us his language when he said he proposed to continue that method of living?—A. He said that men were different from women, that they were polygamous in their habits.

A little further:

Q. It was at that time that he referred to his past infidelity and his intention to continue those infidelities?—A. It was just a general conversation, and he said that a man was constituted differently from a woman.

That is the whole of the evidence. Now, if this were a legal proceeding, an ordinary suit between two parties, in which the one sued to collect a debt from the other, I fully concede that it would be not merely prima facie evidence of the debt, but conclusive, if witnesses deposed to the court that the defendant had admitted to them on different occasions that he owed the money. Any court, any jury, or any man would be quite justified in acting upon such an admission. But it seems to me that it is a different state of things altogether when you are considering whether or not there is evidence upon which a divorce ought to be granted by parliament. A proceeding for divorce is not in the nature of a mere private proceeding in which the parties themselves are alone interested. There is a large public interest in preserving the sanctity of marriage relations. In the old country that interest is recognized by the appointment of an officer known as the King's Proctor, who frequently intervenes under direction of the court in cases where there is any reason to suspect that the husband and the wife may each wish to be free of their marriage obligations, to that extent concurring if not actually colluding in promoting the effort to separate them. Apply that idea to the situation here. Speaking for myself, I think it is very likely that this lady is entitled in fact to be divorced, that her husband has in fact committed adultery, probably done so repeatedly; but the question for us, it seems to me, is, has that been here proved? It may be that the evidence exists, and that with a little difficulty it could be found and produced. If that is the fact, there will be but little hardship upon the parties if this measure is not passed, and they are left to apply at the next session of parliament, and then to produce the evidence which might have been, I venture to think, obtained if there had been the proper effort to secure it before the present application was made. Everything here rests upon what the husband stated to his wife, his wife's father, and the doctor. I do not question for a moment the exact truth of what these witnesses have said that he said; but if one may suppose that this husband is as anxious to be free from his wife as his wife is to be free from him, may it not have been that he said these things for the very purpose of inducing her to make the application which she has made. His statements were not made under oath. He may have been boasting—that is the language of counsel, not my language—of his exploits.

I think our experience is that a man who would boast of such a thing is not one upon whose word much reliance is to be placed, but rather a man desirous of furnishing evidence upon which his wife might procure a divorce. However that may be, here at any rate is an instance in which the House is asked to decree divorce without any pretense of being able to conclude that at a certain time, with a certain woman, the offence of adultery was committed. We are asked to give judgment simply because this husband is a man of such moral character as his statements to his father-in-law would indicate, a man who would not hesitate, upon the opportunity offering, to commit adultery, but who, even upon his own statement, in the evidence we have, is not shown to have at any particular time or with any particular woman, or at any particular place, committed the offence with which he is charged.

Mr. BARKER. I have not read the evidence very carefully, but I did read it, and it appears to me that, in the absence of any probability of collusion between the husband and the wife, there was here made as strong a case against the husband as it is possible to make, unless you can get eye-witnesses. The argument of the Minister of Justice goes almost as far as to say that unless you can get eye-witnesses of the offence, you cannot get a divorce. What are the facts here? We have three witnesses. First of all, we have the wife, who swears—and there is no reason to doubt her testimony—that her husband confessed to her misconduct and cohabita-

tion with a woman in Buffalo at a hotel. She did not recollect the woman's name, but there is nothing very strange about that. Probably she never asked. The husband admitted to her cohabitation with this woman more than once in a Buffalo hotel. Then we have the evidence of the private doctor of the husband, who has been treating him and his family and a brother for a considerable period. Of the character and standing of this doctor there is not the slightest question, and he says that this man confessed to him—and confessed not merely on one occasion—that he had frequently given way to the commission of adultery. Any one who reads the testimony cannot fail to come to the conclusion that it was a frequent habit of this Mr. Grantham to cohabit with women in such a way that the doctor said it was impossible for his wife to live with him. Then we have Sir William McKenzie, the father of the complaining wife, who says that he spoke to his son-in-law about this, and the son-in-law not only admitted it, but claimed that as a male he had a right to do so. He distinguished the right of the husband from the right of the wife, and held the theory that what would be wrong in a wife was right on the part of a husband. He not only admitted this to the father of the wife, but he refused to say that he would reform. He boasted of his right as a man to go on and sin. So we have the wife who swears that her husband told her that he was in the habit of cohabiting with this woman in Buffalo, and we have the husband's doctor declaring that he had been treating him and his brother for some sexual or mental trouble, saying that his conduct had come to be a disease, that the man admitted again and again his offences, and made no pretense of concealing them. Then the father-in-law approached the husband to see whether there was any possibility of reform on the part of the latter, and the husband said 'No, as one of the male sex, I consider that is my right; we have our rights, and I intend to exercise them. I would think a good deal of the argument of the Minister of Justice if there were on the face of this case anything to create the suspicion of collusion between the husband and wife, but there is not. I do no see, therefore, why the evidence of eye-witnesses should be indispensable.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). I had the opportunity of being before the Private Bills Committee when the evidence given before the Senate Committee was fully considered and discussed, and I cannot agree with the Minister of Justice in the conclusion he has arrived at. While it is no doubt the right of the Committee of this House, to which these Bills are referred, to reverse the decision of the Senate Committee, that power is one which is rarely exercised. I only know of one case in a long period of years when the House of Commons did interfere in a decision at which the Senate arrived. In this matter we are very largely in the position in which a court of appeal would be in reviewing the action of a subordinate court, which has seen all the parties connected with the matter, has heard their evidence, and has arrived at the conclusion with all the advantages furnished the court in the first instance. I think that this House should not lightly overturn or interfere with a decision arrived at by the Senate Committee under these circumstances. There can be no doubt about the integrity of the tribunal which determined this matter in the first instance, and there can be no doubt that they gave it every attention in order to arrive at a conclusion in the interests of justice. The Minister of Justice frankly admitted that, in an ordinary case, the evidence submitted would be sufficiently strong to result in a judgment for the plaintiff on the question of fact, but he thinks there should be additional evidence in order to enable a finding to be arrived at. But there is a point in connection with this matter which we are apt to overlook.

The question as to the weight of evidence has nothing to do—as the Minister of Justice knows full well, and will readily appreciate what I say in that regard—with the matter of collusion. If, as to the matter of fact, we have proof here—and we have the finding on that point of the competent tribunal appointed to deal with the matter—there is evidence sufficient to warrant a separation of the parties. With the evidence that is submitted and the statement of my hon. friend, we are bound to believe we have that evidence. If that is so there is no use in theorizing as to what is possible in regard to collusion. Besides, it is shown that, after the admission of the facts made that there was cohabitation and relation with other parties, the wife never lived with her husband; and consequently there could not be that collusion between them which might exist and which if it did exist would destroy the full effect of the admission. On page 8 of the evidence given by the wife is the following:

Q. You have never lived with him since he really admitted that to you?—A. No.

Q. No collusion between you, no arrangement?—A. Oh, no.

Thus we have the admission of facts sufficient to enable the finding to be made, together with the total absence of any relation—even, apparently, speaking relation—between the parties until the time of her appearing before the Senate Committee. All possible theory of collusion is thus repudiated. Besides, we have the sworn evidence of the parties. And I do think

that we should at all times hesitate in this House about overturning the decision of the Senate and its committee in these matters. That is a practice to be resorted to only in extreme cases or where it is evident that great injustice is being done to some one. My hon. friend says frankly that he thinks this is a case in which the parties ought to be separated. That being so, the general considerations of policy and duty which this House should adopt in this class of cases lead us to the position that we should support the decision of the Senate Committee and the action of the Senate.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I have been entirely misunderstood by my hon. friend (Mr. Macdonald, Pictou), and possibly by other members of the committee, if it has been supposed by others than my hon. friend that I was suggesting that there was collusion between this husband and wife. The circumstances all demonstrate the contrary. I do not suppose there has been any communication between them on the subject. But I think there is a very strong probability that, without communicating with each other, and without colluding on the subject, each of them equally desired to be free from the other; and I think it is entirely possible that with that idea in each mind the husband made this statement to his father-in-law, his wife and the doctor.

Mr. LANCASTER. In this case I must agree with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) in the main. It seems to me this is a case where, for the sake of not doing an act of disrespect to the Senate committee, as urged by the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), we are asked to strike a blow at the social condition of this country and to do a great injury to young people who have marriage in view, by granting a divorce on the grounds involved here. I have no doubt, as a matter of common sense and human nature, and after reading the evidence. that this young woman, after conniving at her husband's conduct, now applies for this divorce because she has some other man in view whom she wishes to marry. Her father's evidence shows that she must have been suffering for months and for years under the miseries she now speaks of if her story is all true. But she did not then tell her father about it at all. But on the eve of the application for the divorce for the first time, she tells him of the condition of affairs under which she says she has lived for years. As a matter of common sense, I do not believe her. When a person wants to change his or her mate, to make an exchange of one husband or wife for another —instead of trying to cure the faults complained of or to repair the character that is thought deficient, and so maintain the vows that were made, and build up the social condition of the country—when they think they can make a pretty fair exchange of one husband or one wife for another they come to this House and ask us to advise the King to dissolve their marriage. I cannot vote for this divorce, because it sets a bad example, and is a step in the direction of a most dangerous state of things for this country. We are telling people that if at any time their marriage does not please them, then on evidence of general admission of wrongdoing sworn to by the one who wants the divorce, corroborated in this case by the wife's father—if it is corroboration—parliament may be petitioned and will advise the King to dissolve the marriage. There has been in effect connivance and agreement in this case. It is not a case of disputed facts. It is not the case to which my hon. friend from Pictou sought to compare it, the case of the court of appeal feeling bound to accept the decision of the lower courts as to disputed facts because the lower courts had had the advantage of hearing the evidence given by the parties. In this case the facts are not disputed. The facts do not show that there is any bona fides on the part of this young woman in seeking this divorce. She is taking advantage of the condition of affairs, the loose way of granting divorce in the other chamber. Thirty or forty divorces are going through every session. It being the fashion to get a divorce, she thinks she might as well, while it is the fashion, take advantage of it. And as she wants to break her marriage vows, and perhaps change her mate, she petitions this parliament to grant her this divorce. I do not think that any good purpose can be served by passing this Bill under the admitted facts of the case. It is a case in which this House, if the Senate did not do so, ought to advise the King not to grant the divorce, and I shall vote accordingly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I desire to say a word or two in regard to the effect of the evidence. The fact in question here must be proved by admissible evidence, just as any fact would be proved in the ordinary course of judicial proceedings. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) has illustrated the view he takes of this case by suggesting that a husband desiring to be free from his wife might make admissions the acceptance of which would be the proof of the case against him. And he has argued therefrom that such evidence ought to be sufficient to justify a decree for the plaintiff in a proceeding of that kind. If the argument of the Minister of Justice means anything, it seems to me to mean that. I never had the advantage of appearing before a committee

of the Senate in any such proceeding as this. But I have acted as counsel in a good many divorce actions in the province of Nova Scotia where we have a King's Proctor as well as they have in England, where every precaution is observed; and I have never known such evidence to be refused. It always is accepted; and if it is accepted by the court or by the divorce committee of the Senate, and if it is proper evidence—as it is admitted to be—then you must either give weight to it or not give weight to it. You have to consider, in that case, whether the witnesses are telling the truth or not, and if you come to the conclusion that they are telling the truth you must conclude that the defendant in the proceedings was guilty of that particular act.

That is the law as I have always understood it, and I have never known any judicial pronouncement which is inconsistent with that view. Therefore, if it be true that this defendant did, on three different occasions, to his wife, to the physician, and to his wife's father, admit that he had been guilty of infidelity to his marriage vows, it is simply a question as to whether or not you believe that these persons were telling the truth. The Minister of Justice says you must have more direct evidence than that, that the husband may have been making this statement because he desired that a divorce should be procured against him. You could say exactly the same thing if the petitioner had proved absolutely the act of infidelity. It might be said that he had committed that act because he desired to have a divorce procured against him by his wife. The argument would be as valid in the one case as in the other. In the present case it touches only the question of collusion. So far was the effect of admission carried on in one English case, as every lawyer in the House will remember, that, in an action against a respondent and co-respondent the admission of the respondent was regarded as evidence against her, sufficient to enable the court to make a decree, although the co-respondent with whom the act was alleged to have been committed was absolutely discharged, because there was no evidence against him. That is to say, the evidence of the respondent was evidence against herself, but it was not evidence against the co-respondent. It was alleged that the act charged had been committed with the co-respondent, and it was held upon the admission of the respondent that the act of infidelity with the co-respondent had been proved as against her, but as against the co-respondent there was no evidence whatever. It was a perfectly logical deduction from the principle that the admission of the defendant was evidence against the defendant, but was not evidence against the co-respondent. Under the circumstances it is purely a question as to whether or not the persons who gave this evidence were telling the truth upon their oath, and there is, of course, the further point which the Minister of Justice has suggested rather than raised, the question as to collusion. So far as collusion is concerned I am sorry there is not the same precaution before the Senate Committee that is to be found in the courts which are charged with the decision of these matters, and I entirely agree with the Minister of Justice in one respect, that there ought to be the most careful scrutiny of the evidence, there ought to be every possible safe-guard against collusion. I do not know whether it would be practicable or not to have the Senate pass a standing order by which the taking of evidence upon all these Bills would be relegated to a judge, say the judge of the Exchequer Court, upon whose finding of fact the Senate might afterwards grant or withhold a divorce. I think that would be a better method than the one at present adopted. If that course were adopted you would have all the safeguards of King's Proctor, and everything of that kind which are usual, and most proper safeguards in proceedings for divorce before the courts.

So far as the present case is concerned, the circumstances do not seem to me to point to collusion. In the first place, the woman, after the confession of her husband ceased to cohabit with him. In the second place he was guilty not only of very outrageous, and threatening conduct towards her, but of actual violence, as I gather from the evidence, which I had an opportunity of looking over a moment ago, and the relations between the husband and wife from first to last since the confession have not been such as to justify the idea that she was colluding with him in any way for the very reason that there was no object or purpose in her colluding with him. He had made his confession to her admitting his adultery with a certain woman at an hotel in Buffalo, he had made general admissions to his physician and to her father of his infidelity on many occasions. There was no reason for collusion, because his confession and admission given in that way were perfectly admissible evidence against him in the absence of his own testimony to the contrary, which was not given. While I entirely agree that the evidence should be most carefully scrutinized I still think this is a question as to the admissibility of the evidence. The evidence being admissible, and leading to the conclusion that the husband was guilty of the offences charged, I do not see any reason why we should not concur in the view taken by the committee of the Senate in the first instance.

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

CANADA NATIONAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 201) respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company.

On section 2—extension of time.

Mr. McCRANEY. I have a few remarks to make with reference to this Bill. On June 11, 1908, a company having its head office at the city of Saskatoon, was incorporated by the Saskatchewan legislature under the name of the Canada National Insurance Company. In the following year, 1909, an Act was passed by this parliament, incorporating the company which is now applying for this Act under the name of the Canada National Fire Insurance Company. The names are so similar that I am sure no one in this House will contend that, had it been brought to the attention of parliament in 1909, when the Dominion incorporation was given, this name would have been given to the Dominion company in view of the fact that it so closely resembled the name which had already been given to the provincial company by the Saskatchewan legislature. It is pointed out, I understand, by those who are applying for the present legislation that subsequent to the passing of this Act by this parliament the provincial secretary of Saskatchewan, was asked if there was any company having a name similar to the Dominion company, and the reply was that there was none. In that connection I would only point out that that inquiry was made of the provincial secretary, and the answer was obtained subsequent to the incorporation of the applicants by this parliament. The action of this parliament was not in any way founded upon the letter of the provincial secretary of Saskatchewan. The effect of the letter, so far as the incorporated, is simply nil. It could not repeal that Act nor affect any right which the Saskatchewan company had to its name. The Saskatchewan company is in the hail and fire insurance business. I understand that it obtained its license from the Saskatchewan government in the fall of 1909, and issued its first policy on the 3rd of January, 1910. I would move, Mr. Chairman, the following resolution:

That the Bill respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company be referred back to the committee on Banking and Commerce for amendment by changing the name of the company to one which does not conflict with the name of the Canada National Insurance Company, the head office of which is in Saskatoon.

The only reason, it seems to me, which can be urged for the pressing through of this Bill without any clause amending the name of the Dominion company is that the Dominion company have already made some considerable expenditure in the way of printing and organization. I would only point out the fact that if they have made any considerable expenditure this is only the beginning of a situation that will become more strained, more money will be spent, and now, therefore, is the time to make the correction in the name and to give this company another name before it has begun business which does not conflict with the name of the company already incorporated by the province of Saskatchewan.

Mr. BLAIN. I would ask, you Mr. Chairman, if this amendment is in order?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment is not in order at this stage. The amendment is that the Bill respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company be referred back to the Banking and Commerce Committee for amendment. That is a motion that can only be made when the Speaker is in the Chair.

Mr. LANCASTER. Was there any notice given of it?

Mr. McCRANEY. I could not give notice because the Bill was only reported this morning.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Notice is not required. Is the motion that the committee report progress?

Mr. McCRANEY. I move that the committee report progress.

Mr. NESBITT. It is quite true, as my hon. friend (Mr. McCraney) has stated, that the letter from the provincial secretary of Saskatchewan was written after this charter was obtained by the present company from the Dominion parliament. The company were chartered by the Dominion House in 1909. Before they started to sell their stock they wrote to the provincial secretary of Saskatchewan and asked him if there was any company chartered under that name, and he replied that there was not. They went ahead, sold their stock, and got the money ready to deposit. Whether it is deposited or not I do not know, but I think it is. It was only by accident that they did not get their license. They were a day late. They have prepared a very large quantity of advertising material, they have got their policies all written, they have their signs up, and their agencies all arranged for. Then, the names are not exactly similar. The name of the other company is the Canada National Insurance Company while the name of the company asking for an extension of its charter is the Canada National Fire Insurance Com-

pany, one located at Saskatoon and the other at Winnipeg. When they get doing business, one will be known as the Canada Natinal of Winnipeg, and the other as the Canada National of Saskatoon. That will be the practice if we may judge from our experience of other similarly situated companies. It is no fault of this company that they did not get their license, and I would ask that the committee do not rise and report progress, but pass the Bill now.

Bill reported.

On the motion for third reading of the Bill

Mr. McCRANEY moved:

That the Bill be referred back to the committee on Banking and Commerce to change the name of the company to one which does not conflict with the name of the Canada National Insurance Company, the head office of which is in Saskatoon.

Amendment negatived, and Bill read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READINGS.

Bill (No. 174) to incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—Mr. Martin (Regina).

Bill (No. 190) for the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.—Mr. McCarthy.

Bill (No. 191) for the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 199) for the relief of Fanny Mary Healey.—Mr. Clarke (Essex).

Bill (No. 186) respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.—Mr. Dubeau.

Bill (No. 195) to incorporate the Western Canal Company.—Mr. Tolmie.

Bill (No. 204) respecting the Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—Mr. Smith (Nanaimo).

Bill (No. 193) respecting La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company.—Mr. Geoffrion.

Bill (No. 166) to incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Rutan.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 214) respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

CENTREVILLE BREAKWATER.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Have any petitions been received asking for the construction of a breakwater at Centreville, Digby county, N.S.? If so, how many and when?

2. Is the government aware that the public breakwater at Centreville is said to be out of repair, and liable to be carried away in any severe storm?

3. Is the government aware that the carrying away of such breakwater would leave the boats fishing out of Centreville without protection and the fishermen without means of landing their catch?

4. Is the government aware that the lack of a suitable breakwater at Centreville will seriously handicap fishermen, and those engaged in fish curing business, and compel them to discontinue or restrict business operations at that place?

5. Is the government aware that the prosperity of the village of Centreville is said to be dependent upon the construction at the earliest possible time of a breakwater suited to the needs of the port?

6. What action, if any, is the government going to take with respect to the said matter and when?

7. Will an appropriation be made during the present session for the erection of a suitable breakwater at Centreville? If so, when will the work be commenced?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. (a) Yes. (b) Five. (c) December 21, 1907; January 21, 1910; February 17, 1910; February 24, 1910, and March 9, 1911.

2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7. The department is making a careful examination into conditions at Centreville, and the situation is having most earnest consideration.

THREE RIVERS POST OFFICE.

Mr. CLARE:

1. Did the government erect a temporary wooden building to be used as a post office at Three Rivers, or any post office building after the fire at Three Rivers, about two years ago?

2. Of what was the building constructed, and what was the cost of it?

3. Does the government contemplate replacing this building by a permament one at an early date?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. Yes.

2. (a) Frame building; (b) $15,609.75.

3. Yes, plans are now being prepared.

GRAIN AND HAY IMPORTS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What were the quantities and values of barley, oats and hay imported into Canada from the United States during the fiscal years 1910 and 1911?

2. At what ports of entry was such grain and hay admitted into Canada, and what was the quantity and value of such grain and hay at each place?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity and value of barley, oats and hay entered for consumption in Canada from the United States during the fiscal years ended March 31, 1910 and 1911, was as follows:

—		Fiscal Year, 1910.		Fiscal Year, 1911.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
			$		$
Barley	bush.	164,532	99,810	155,564	96,469
Oats	"	23,361	13,833	12,199	7,524
Hay	tons.	7,680	141,956	12,247	230,393

2. The quantity and value of barley, oats and hay entered for consumption in Canada from the United States, by ports, during the fiscal years 1910 and 1911, respectively, was as follows:

Ports.	—	Fiscal Year, 1910.		Fiscal Year, 1911.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
			$		$
Bridgeburg	Oats bush.	20	10	.....	.....
	Hay tons.	2	99	.....	.....
Chatham	Oats bush.	6	7	13	6
Cobourg	Oats "	.....	.....	1	1
Fort William	Hay tons	261	2,876	.....	.....
Galt	Barley bush.	.....	.....	1	1
Gananoque	Hay tons.	13	130	.....	.....
Hamilton	Oats bush.	10	15	10	11
	Barley "	.....	.....	20	24
Kenora	Hay tons.	11	213	.....	.....
London	Oats bush.	4	10	.....	.....
Niagara Falls	Barley "	227	174	232	294
	Oats "	4,568	2,749	4,979	3,597
Orillia	Oats "	30	10	.....	.....
Peterborough	Barley "	163,884	99,220	128,791	80,541
Port Arthur	Oats "	125	44	.....	.....
	Hay tons.	195	2,152	20	217
St. Thomas	Oats bush.	.....	.....	21	8
Sault Ste. Marie	Oats "	.....	.....	30	18
	Hay tons.	483	5,869	483	6,342
Toronto	Barley bush.	108	135	159	205
	Oats "	4	2	4	2
	Hay tons.	2	71	.....	.....
Tillsonburg	Oats "	.....	.....	4	2
Windsor	Barley "	.....	.....	1,111	706
Beebe Junction	Barley "	.....	.....	17	13
Montreal	Barley "	45	48	35	45
	Oats "	18	38	150	228
	Hay tons.	.....	.....	2	20
St. Johns	Oats bush.	3	7	5	13
St. Armand	Hay tons.	.....	.....	2	7
Halifax	Oats bush.	15,000	8,850	.....	.....
St. John, N.B.	Barley bush.	50	25	.....	.....
	Hay tons.	4	110	.....	.....
Woodstock	Hay "	1	10	.....	.....
Brandon	Barley bush.	18	18	4	4
	Oats "	38	37	120	41
	Hay tons.	.....	.....	19	268
Emerson	Hay "	.....	.....	5	42
Gretna	Oats bush.	6	15	24	14
	Hay tons.	.....	.....	16	140
Portage la Prairie	Barley bush.	5	3	.....	.....
	Oats "	21	16	5	3
Winnipeg	Barley "	.....	.....	60	68
	Hay tons.	63	451	227	2,317

Ports.	—	Fiscal Year, 1910.		Fiscal Year, 1911.	
		Quantity.	Value.	Quantity.	Value.
			$		$
Cranbrook	Oats bush.	20	18		
	Hay tons.	7	50	217	3,937
Fernie	Oats bush.			2,425	1,412
	Hay tons.	183	3,048	136	2,481
Grand Forks	Barley bush.			21	14
	Oats "	155	87		
	Hay tons.	712	10,280	668	12,348
Greenwood	Barley bush.	58	47	318	221
	Oats "	1,287	758	870	469
	Hay tons.	188	2,925	709	14,062
Nanaimo	Barley bush.			12,404	7,306
	Hay tons.	61	933	1,045	19,120
Nelson	Barley bush			11	12
	Hay tons.	941	15,141	1,805	31,837
New Westminster	Barley bush	4	5		
	Oats "	494	250	1,925	957
	Hay tons.	39	524	775	11,715
Prince Rupert	Hay "	212	4,154	161	3,793
Rossland	Barley bush.			21	18
	Hay tons.	307	4,717	393	7,013
Vancouver	Barley bush.	58	61	17	23
	Oats "	62	47	59	42
	Hay tons.	812	11,767	1,969	34,205
Victoria	Barley bush.	25	26	28	32
	Oats "	145	178		
	Hay tons.	431	7,229	1,724	28,802
Kaslo	Hay tons.	51	796		
Charlottetown	Oats bush.	17	16		
Calgary	Barley "			12,302	6,879
Edmonton	Barley "	34	42		
	Oats "	18	9	2	5
Lethbridge	Barley "			10	11
	Oats "	400	142	42	27
	Hay tons.	1	4	14	247
Moosejaw	Barley bush.	14	3	2	2
	Oats "	72	61	34	20
	Hay tons.	1	15		
North Portal	Oats bush.			1,160	433
Regina	Barley "	2	3		
	Oats "	113	52	40	12
Saskatoon	Oats "			2	5
Dawson	Oats "	590	304	62	44
	Hay tons.	1,853	46,368	1,337	37,612
Whitehorse	Oats bush.	135	101	212	151
	Hay tons.	846	22,024	520	13,832

IMPORTS OF SHEEP, LAMBS AND HORSES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What was the number and value of sheep and lambs imported into Canada from the United States during each month of 1910 and each of the first four months of 1911, and at what points did they enter Canada?

2. How many horses were admitted into Canada from the United States free with settlers during the fiscal years 1908-1909, 1910 and 1911, and what was the estimated value in each year?

3. How many horses were imported into Canada from the United States in each of the above years on which duty was paid, and what was the value and the amount of duty collected?

4. How many horses were admitted into Canada in each of the above years from the United States for the improvement of stock, and what was the estimated value of same in each year?

Mr. PATERSON.

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The number and value of sheep entered for consumption in Canada from the United States during each month of 1910, and each of the first four months of 1911, by ports, was as follows:

Port.	Date.	Number.	Value.
			$
Fort William	March, 1911	1,348	4,382
Toronto	April, 1911	520	2,549
West Toronto	March, 1911	831	3,637
	April, 1911	2,344	11,871
Yarmouth, N.S.	March, 1910	2	30
Montreal	June, 1910	9	61
Greenwood, B.C.	January, 1910	540	1,215
	June, 1910	634	1,902
	July, 1910	529	1,587
	August, 1910	923	2,694
	September, 1910	687	1,909
	November, 1910	2,742	7,129
	December, 1910	1,594	4,728
Nelson	June, 1910	248	1,348
New Westminster—			
1910.		Number.	Value.
February		28	232
May		130	365
June		11	55
July		1,912	4,588
August		260	1,092
September		427	1,466
October		3,486	8,838
1911.			
January		2	38
Vancouver—			
1910.			
January		230	921
February		497	2,005
March		380	1,737
April		357	1,552
May		.....	.....
June		4,084	20,397
July		2,854	12,845
August		1,433	6,299
September		1,805	7,898
October		2,620	11,573
November		3,183	13,469
December		3,135	14,110
1911.			
January		500	2,250
February		1,570	7,066
March		2,490	11,209
April		1,150	5,166
Victoria—			
1910.			
January		495	1,933
February		417	1,765
March		323	1,235
April		.....	.....
May		438	1,845
June		230	1,252
July		343	1,628
August		437	1,794
September		440	2,060
October		320	1,432
November		460	2,095
December		380	2,906
1911.			
January		326	1,619
February		225	1,074
March		450	2,107
April		296	1,426
Rossland—			
1910.			
March		32	150
Lethbridge, Man.—			
1910.			
August		1,966	4,315
October		7,430	14,002
November		4,222	7,425
December		15	150
1911.			
January		1,203	1,203
Winnipeg—			
1910.			
March		440	2,227
1911.			
April		221	1,138
Moosejaw—			
1910.			
February		1,199	2,990
September		340	680
October		4,958	16,374
November		1,837	3,674
1911.			
January		1,174	2,958

2. Impracticable to determine the number of horses admitted into Canada from the United States free with settlers effects.

3. The number and value of horses entered for consumption in Canada, from the United States, and the duty collected thereon during the fiscal years 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911, was as follows:

——	Horses over 1 year old, value $50.00 or less			Horses, n. o. p.		
	No.	Value.	Duty.	No.	Value.	Duty.
1908	849	39,653	10,612 50	3,167	263,021	65,755 25
1909	360	17,665	4,500 00	3,090	268,040	67,010 00
1910	86	3,600	1,075 00	6,518	397,908	99,475,75
1911	70	2,700	875 00	7,351	613,265	153,316 25

4. The number and value of horses entered for consumption in Canada from the United States for improvement of stock was as follows, during the fiscal years, 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911.

	Number.	Value.
1908..	594	$366,666
1909..	582	325,055
1910..	634	378,153
1911..	568	350,769

HASSETT, HAVELOCK AND NEW TUSKET POST OFFICES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. What are the respective distances between the following post offices, viz., Hassett, Havelock and New Tusket?
2. Has the post office at New Tusket been moved recently? If so, upon whose recommendation, and why?
3. When was the late postmaster at Havelock appointed, how long did he serve as such, and when did he cease to officiate?
4. Who was the acting postmaster after the former postmaster ceased to perform the duties of the office, and how long did he serve?
5. Who is the present postmaster at Havelock, when was he appointed, and upon whose recommendation?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Distance between Hassett and Havelock is 3¾ miles; between Hassett and New Tusket is 5½ miles; between Havelock and New Tusket is 1¾ mile.
2. No change has recently been made in the site of the New Tusket post office.
3. The late postmaster of Havelock was appointed on the 1st of November, 1872. He was in charge of the post office until his death on the 25th of September, 1904.
4. The post office remained in charge of the assistant postmaster, Mr. Charles R. Nowlan, from the death of the late postmaster until the appointment of the present postmaster.
5. The present postmaster is Mr. Herman Mullen. He was appointed on the 24th of October, 1910, on the recommendation of the Hon. W. S. Fielding.

THE NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. MADDIN:

1. What are the names of the medical examiners of naval recruits in the province of Nova Scotia?
2. When was each of them appointed, and what salary does each receive?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. Amherst, Dr. Ross Millar; Annapolis, Dr. R. Withers; Antigonish, Dr. J. J. Cameron; Arichat, H. I. Fixott; Barrington Passage, Dr. H. H. Banks; Canso, Dr. P. A. McGarry,; Digby, Dr. L. H. Morse; Liverpool, Dr. H. G. Farrish; Lunenburg, Dr. A. E. G. Forbes; North Sydney, Dr. T. H. Smith; Pictou, Dr. Smith Anderson; Port Hood, Dr. R. St. John Macdonald; Shelburne, Dr. J. S. Morton; Windsor, Dr. J. V. Reid; Yarmouth, Dr. C. A. Webster. At Halifax recruits are examined by the surgeons on board of H.M.C.S. 'Niobe,' who receive no extra remuneration.
2. After arrival of H.M.S.C. 'Niobe,' at Halifax on 21st of October, 1910.

These gentlemen receive as remuneration, a fee of $2 for each recruit examined.

PURCHASE OF CARRIER-LAINE WORKS.

* Mr. MONK:

1. What was the price paid by the government for the Carrier-Lainé establishment at Lévis, P.Q.?
2. Upon what date was the purchase price paid?
3. From whom did the government purchase the Carrier-Lainé works or establishment at Lévis?
4. Has the said property been leased by the government? If so, to whom?
5. What is the duration of the said lease?
6. What is the rental payable to the government by the said lease?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1. $380,000.
2. Final payment made on 7th of August, 1909.
3. From the Bank of Montreal.
4, 5 and 6. Part of the property leased to the Canadian Shoe Machinery Company, for thirty years at $4,000 for the first ten years and $6,000 a year for twenty years; a store to S. Paradis at $240 a year, and the Barras wharf to the Quebec and Levis Ferry Company, at $500 a year; the two latter are subject to cancellation at any time.

QUEBEC EXPERIMENTAL FARM.

*Mr. MONK:

1. From whom did the government purchase a farm in the county of Quebec?
2. What was the amount paid for said farm?
3. In what parish of said county is said farm situated?
4. Did the government, before making the said purchase, obtain a report upon the proposed acquisition? If so, by whom was said report prepared, and what is its date?
5. For what purposes has the said farm been so acquired by the government?

Mr. FISHER:

1. Gustave A. Langelier.
2. $45,000, including the implements and all other movable property on the farm with the exception of the live stock and the furniture in the house.
3. Parish of St. Félix-du-Cap-Rouge, county of Quebec.
4. Yes. Mr. J. H. Grisdale, director of Experimental Farms, of date the 6th of October, 1910.
5. To be used for experimental farm purposes.

TRADE COMMISSIONER TO MEXICO.

Mr. MONK:

1. When was Mr. Bouley appointed Canadian Trade Commissioner in Mexico, and upon whose recommendation was he so appointed?
2. What is Mr. Bouley's salary?
3. What were the total expenses of his office last year, and how are these expenses made up?
4. What is the date of Mr. Bouley's last report, and how many reports has he made since his appointment?
5. Have any complaints been received by the government in regard to Mr. Bouley? If so, from whom?

Mr. KING:

1. There is no Canadian Trade Commissioner named Bouley. Mr. A. W. Donly is the Trade Commissioner in Mexico. Mr. Donly was appointed January 1, 1905, upon the recommendation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce.
2. Mr. Donly's salary is $3,200 per annum,
3. The total expenses for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1911, were $5,454.10, made up as follows:

Salary as Trade Commissioner	$3,100 00
Rent	600 00
Postage	50 00
Salary of assistant	1,200 00
Stationery	70 14
Office furnishings	51 00
Fuel, light and janitor	159 30
Sundries	188 16
Newspaper subscription	35 50
	$5,454 10

4. The last report published was dated March 30, 1911. The last weekly diary report was dated April 29, 1911. Since Mr. Donly's appointment he has made 41 regular reports. In addition, he has made 68 weekly diary reports since January 1, 1910, at which date the weekly diary reports were established. This report consists of a daily record as to interviews held and notes of miscellaneous information.
5. No.

ECHO LAKE POST OFFICE.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Has any application been made to the Post Office Department for the establishment of a post office at Echo Lake, in the county of Frontenac?
2. If so, when and by whom was such application made, what action has been taken by the department, and what is the intention of the department in regard thereto?

Mr. KING:

1. Yes.
2. A petition was received from Mr. William Alport on the 27th January, 1908, and was duly reported upon by the inspector, who stated the locality was not well settled, and not likely to improve, and that, in his opinion, there was no need for another office. Recently an application was received from Mr. C. Cox, which was acknowledged, and referred to the inspector on the 9th March, but the inspector has not yet reported, and he has been instructed to make an immediate report.

CANSO AND GUYSBOROUGH MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

Has the contract for carrying the mail between Canso and Guysborough been let? If so, who was successful in obtaining same, what was the price paid and the number and amount of all tenders.

Mr. LEMIEUX:

(a) Yes. (b) Wm. McDougall, $2,270 per annum. (c) Three tenders received, viz.: Wm. McDougall, $2,270 per annum; James Sullivan, $2,290 per annum; John C. Myers, $2,375 per annum:

ROCKLIFFE RIFLE RANGE.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Referring to the item of $75,000 in the further supplementary estimates for the purchase of additional land at the Rockliffe rifle range, how many acres of land does this embrace?
2. Where is each lot or parcel of this land located, and who are the present owners, respectively?
3. From whom was each lot or parcel of land purchased by the government, if purchase has been made, or from whom is it intended to purchase?
4. What is the purchase price per acre paid, or to be paid, by the government for each parcel of land?
5. How many transfers or assignments of each of the parcels of said land have been made within the past four years, on what dates, from whom, to whom, and for what consideration in each case?
6. What options were obtained from the owners on any or all of the prospective parcels of said land, by whom were such options obtained, and on what dates, respectively?

Mr. KING:

As negotiations for the purchase of the land required are still in progress, it is considered that it will be inadvisable to make public, at the present time, the information now asked for. It may, however, be stated that valuations have been obtained, but that the prices asked by the various owners concerned are so much in excess of these valuations that it will, in all probability, be necessary to take expropriation proceedings. None of the properties have yet been acquired.

MOTION AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, papers, reports and other documents in any way re

lating to the proposed extension of the Rockliffe Rifle Range and the acquisition of land. —Mr. Jameson.

SUPPLY—EXPERIMENTAL FRUIT AND VEGETABLE FARMS AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION.

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

Mr. W. O. SEALEY (Wentworth). Mr. Speaker, before going into committee, and pursuant to my statement on the morning of April 22, that I would re-mould my remarks respecting an experimental fruit and vegetable farm for our district, and submit them to the House at a later time, I would like to say that, in view of the failure of my amendment to carry, I have hoped the hon. Minister of Agriculture would see his way clear to establish an experimental fruit and vegetable farm in our midst, as well as a pre-cooling plant, and a pest-destroyer department. The hon. minister has frequently said that the production of the highest quality of fruits, vegetables, &c., would command the best market prices under all circumstances, and it seems now to be up to him to assist in helping to produce this highest quality. True, he has done a great deal along this line, but he has done more for general agriculture, and has not particularly specialized in horticulture. He may say that this will cost money, and so it will, but not very much. However, if there is any serious complaint about expenditure in the Agriculture Department, it is not that the present expenditure is not well and judiciously made, and has not brought excellent results, but that there is not sufficient money spent along agricultural and horticultural lines, and that an increased expenditure under his department would bring greatly increased results. I notice in the supplementary estimates brought down last week, an item of $25,000 'towards the establishment and maintenance of additional branch stations.' I also notice a further sum of $25,000 'for experiments in cold storage for fruit.' I do hope that these items, or part of them at least, are intended for a beginning in our district.

This is about all I had intended saying at that time, but since the present opportunity has afforded I will explain that I am not sectional or selfish on behalf of Wentworth only in this matter, but I submit for the consideration of the Agriculture Department and the House generally that I believe a most practical thing for the Agriculture Department to do would be to establish an experimental farm of, say, 10 acres, in every county in the Dominion, and if not practicable for the whole Dominion, then I feel that it would be for Ontario anyway, as I may not be capable of speaking with personal knowledge for a wider area. This, of course, could not all be accomplished in a day, but a beginning could be made at once with that end in view.

Mr. BLAIN. May I be permitted to ask my hon. friend a question? I understand that the local government of the province of Ontario established, some few years ago, an experimental fruit farm in the county adjoining that of my hon. friend. Is that correct?

Mr. SEALEY. The local government are doing good work in that respect, but not sufficiently fast for the general good of the province or the Dominion. This government has been doing good work, but not sufficient of it and not fast enough to give the best possible results.

Now to illustrate, many farmers have planted large orchards in many parts of Ontario, and after they matured in, say, 20 years, they wakened up to the idea that they had not planted the right varieties best suited to their particular locality, and thereby suffered a very considerable loss. This has probably been the experience of 50 farmers in a single county, whereas a small experimental farm in each county would have demonstrated at small average expense the varieties best suited for the soil and climate of that particular county, and thereby saved large amounts to the individual farmer.

Now tobacco is growing very successfully in Essex and Kent, and thereby increased the value of farm land formerly used for growing grain from $75 per acre to $200 per acre for growing tobacco. Now I believe we in Wentworth are growing grain on land worth $75 that would grow tobacco and immediately become worth $200 per acre, and thereby stop a considerable part of our immense imports of tobacco and retain very large sums of money for the Canadian producers.

And so on all along the line, I believe an experimental plot in each county would do much towards raising the standard of grazing land to grain land, and grain farming to dairy farming and dairy farming to tobacco and fruit farming, and hardy fruit farming to the finer fruit and vegetable farming and horticulture generally, and so on, and I believe the character of our general products could be raised to the extent of increasing land values by from 50 per cent to 100 per cent This would surely be conservation of the most profitable character.

Then, educationally, a man or two could be kept at each of these plots under direction of a central head, and not cost any more than to have a large farm with a large staff at one central point, and the experiments would be infinitely more valuable as to soil and climatic experiments than could possibly be had at any central point.

Now, educationally, this would be a school where every farmer, young, or old, in the community could go and learn from actual observation under his own home conditions, and would be a continuation class to the Agricultural Department of the public schools, or perhaps a county model school as it were, for continued education from youth to old age, and in winter time it would be the rendezvous for progressive farmers seeking further and more advanced agricultural knowledge.

To more particularly illustrate what I mean. Canada I believe is seriously considering the adoption of more advanced technical education along agricultural lines. A Canadian technical education commission is now at work, and I will read a copy of a letter I addressed to Dr. Robertson, chairman of that commission, last fall, and a further letter more recently both of which I trust will bring useful results, and I trust may be further enlarged on by the House, for I fear that commission may give most of its attention to technical mechanical education for our industrial centres, rather than technical agricultural education, which is vastly more needed and will serve to assist a vastly increased number of people in Canada, and their report should in a very large measure serve as a text book to begin this great work of such momentous importance and profit I trust, to the agricultural community of Canada.

The letter is as follows:

Hamilton, Ont., Nov. 1, 1910.

Dr. James W. Roberston, Chairman of Technical Education Commission, Ottawa:

Dear Sir,—Pursuant to your request at the close of my examination as a witness before your commission at Hamilton, I herewith enclose you the further statements you asked for.

Pardon me if I reiterate the opinion that I firmly believe that technical education is just as important, just as necessary and just as profitable, if applied along agricultural lines as along mechanical or any other lines, notwithstanding the splendid and important educational work our agricultural departments are at present doing.

In applying the same along agricultural lines, I would suggest: first, that your commission devise a plan for transmitting agricultural information by chart, tabulated illustrations or otherwise, whereby the agriculturists could get the results of agricultural experiments, &c., at a glance, in a minute, rather than by having to read innumerable pages of blue-book reports, for time is money to the agriculturists whether in reading, managing or labouring.

I think technical education along the lines of the commercial side of agriculture, providing for the selling of agricultural products to the best advantage, is most important and necessary, and would add greatly to the profit of the agricultural business, because to a very large extent agriculture has become a business, an industry, a profession rather than slavish drudgery.

Technical education along the lines of co-operative selling or marketing would be of inestimable value, and technical education along the lines of co-operative packing and transporting to the best and most profitable markets is most important. Fruit, although now most carefully packed, is greatly damaged in transit to the markets, and a direct loss is sustained by the farmer in consequence.

Technical education along the lines of co-operative fighting of pests, noxious weeds, diseased stock, &c., is also most necessary.

Technical education could be extended by establishing more demonstration farms, where not only the technical process of growing the various kinds of crops could be demonstrated. but also the technical advantage of the various kinds of crops and stock.

Technical methods of producing and testing the various kinds of seeds could be extended.

Technical instructions could be given as to the best methods of preparing produce for market, such as wool, poultry, eggs, dairy products, &c.

Technical education in the frequent daily publication of market reports in order that pricese can be more easily compared than at present in the daily newspapers.

Technical education along agricultural lines for the new-comers to Canada so their service for themselves or their employers would be rendered much more valuable.

Technical education in preparing and marketing meats, &c., so that the farmers would come directly in contact with the dealers or consumer without their produce having to pass through the interests controlled by the packers' trusts and combines which now makes for high cost of living.

Technical education in road making, whether it be corduroy across the swamps by the new settler, properly drained and graded in the medium district or high class drainage, crown macadam and oil in the older districts, so the best markets can be easily reached with the largest loads with the least disturbance or damage to the contents and smallest amount of injury to the vehicle, and least wear and tear on the horses.

Technical education as to the many advantages and various applications to numerous purposes to which rural mail delivery may be utilized or made possible.

Technical education re crop prospects generally, and price reports in convenient and quickly readable form—simplified schedules.

Technical education along electrical lines for local co-operative telephone companies, so the average farmer can keep in repair his own telephone instrument and wires; also the running of motors, so when Hydro-Electric power is supplied to the farmers they can keep in order the lights, motors and machinery, &c., coupled with co-operative business methods of organizing and running same.

Technical education re freight rates, express rates, classification of products and shipping conditions.

Technical education in correspondence re market conditions, prices, transportation rates and transportation facilities.

Technical education in agricultural observation.

Technical education in expressing one's opinions along agricultural lines that the farmers'

interests may be more effectually advocated and safe-guarded before parliament, commissions, in the public press, &c.

Technical education in drainage—a most important factor in farming.

Within a radius of ten miles of Hamilton there are sufficient apples, pears and other fruits, left on the trees and on the ground unpicked and unpacked to supply the requirements of the whole of Hamilton's 75,000 population during the winter, that annually go to waste, the same is largely true of vegetables, &c. Cannot the technical commission evolve a plan of educating at least a portion of the indifferent city population to gather these fruits on shares or some other way, so that want and downright hardship and suffering during the winter months would be unknown, or at least greatly modified, and, besides, avoiding this shameful waste of a bountiful Providence?

The same is partly true of grain and other farm products. Educate the farmer to save his 'waste,' which would make a handsome additional profit to the average producer.

Educate the public to make the tilling of the soil so profitable that the non-prosperous city population will forsake the towns and become prosperous agricultural producers, and in this way solve the most difficult of social problems. 'Back to the farm.'

Trusting the above may interest you and that your commission will evolve a system of technical education therefrom along agricultural lines, in addition to mechanical lines, that will place Canada, 'the leading agricultural country in the whole world to-day,' so far ahead of its present self that not only will our own people become more prosperous, happy and contented, but that the world will be attracted to Canada, and that millions more of the best people will flock to our fair Dominion and share our blessings, particularly in this respect.

With best wishes for yourself and the commission, yours truly,

W. O. SEALEY.

Mr. BURRELL. May I ask, from what document is the hon. gentleman reading?

Mr. SEALEY. From the letter I addressed to Dr. Robertson, the chairman of the Technical Education Commission.

Mr. BURRELL. The hon. gentleman Mr. Sealey's own letter?

Mr. SEALEY. Yes. It certainly reads well, and it is on a matter of great importance. I am glad the House is taking so much interest in it, and I hope it will benefit the House as well as the country.

I took the opportunity of writing again a few days ago, and as I believe the matter is of considerable importance, I will read the letter:

Ottawa, Ont., May 2, 1911.

Dr. Jas. W. Robertson,
Chairman Technical Education Committee,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—Pardon me for again addressing you, but this is merely to mention, that if your report is published in one volume, it will be so large that distribution will be inconvenient, and readers will have so much difficulty turning to the sections specially interesting to them, that it may be little read, and not appreciated.

Now if it were published in 4 or 5 volumes it would also be cumbersome, inconvenient, and expensive to distribute. But if it were in 20 or 40 volumes, as the case may be, a volume for each heading or branch of work dealt with, one complete volume would serve to distribute to say 40 people, the sections they were particularly interested in, and they would be more likely to read that particular volume, and profit greatly by it (a few might be bound in whole for libraries or other public references), and this suggests a further idea:—

That the report be drafted with a view to educational as well as descriptive matter, re the various items of observation as well as suggestion, so when the report was printed, it would be suitable for a primary text book for schools, such as the 'Atlas of Canada,' published by the Department of the Interior, which has been adopted by many county school inspectors as an ordinary text book, and I venture the opinion, that the children in these counties, as well as their parents, have acquired more knowledge of Canada in the short space of say three years, since the Atlas was first published, than they ever learned or knew during their whole previous life, and in this way, these text books have been supplied by the government free.

Now if your report be published in small volumes, each dealing with a particular class, and printed by the million, they could be used as free text books in a temporary way, and perhaps a more suitable text book evolved therefrom, and in this way, without much expense, the principal of technical education could be adopted and initiated at a much earlier date, without waiting for the country to digest the report, and discuss for a year or two the advisability of adopting the principal (because I believe the utilizing of the report in this way would prompt the adoption of the principal), and then wait for another year to get a suitable text book edited and authorized.

Then, if adopted (which I feel certain it would be), a more suitable text book could be evolved by the joint effort of the teachers, who are daily by way of teaching, experimenting practically with it, and thereby save the usual heavy copyright royalty, on the newly authorized text book, that would belong to Canada as a whole, and also make this part of the educational system in Canada uniform throughout the whole Dominion.

Again hoping you will pardon me, and trusting you may find something of value and usefulness in the suggestions.

Yours truly,

W. O. SEALEY.

Mr. LANCASTER. What reply did the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sealey) receive? Will he read that?

Mr. SEALEY. A very nice reply to the first letter—very appreciative.

Mr. LANCASTER. How about the second?

Mr. SEALEY. My letter was forwarded to the commissioner in the old country, and there has been no time for a reply as yet. I feel there is considerable merit in it, and I hope the House will feel the same way about it. If not, it is my opinion anyway.

Mr. BLAIN. Do I understand the hon. gentleman to say that the Atlas sent out by the Dominion government has been adopted as a text-book in certain counties? If so, will he say in what counties?

Mr. SEALEY. Wentworth, anyway.

Mr. BLAIN. By the authority of whom?

Mr. SEALEY. The inspector.

Mr. BLAIN. I thought the provincial government were the only ones who had power to adopt text-books for the public schools?

Mr. SEALEY. I think the inspector has the authority——

Mr. BLAIN. No, he has no authority. My hon. friend knows that.

Mr. SEALEY. However, it is important at this time to consider this phase of the question, because I rather fear that the Technical Commission are inclined to give most of their attention to technical mechanical education, rather than to technical agriculture education which is more needed and would benefit a much larger number of people, and, I believe, result in far greater advantage to the country. However, they can serve both purposes well. I do not remember exactly what instructions they were given in the matter, but, so far as I can gather from the reports of their inquiries and from personal attendance at one of their meetings, they were giving their attention rather to technical mechanical lines than to technical agricultural lines.

Mr. KING. I think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Sealey) is mistaken in assuming that the commission will give more attention to one industry than to another. As I understand, the chairman and members of the commission, are trying to take in all industries. And the chairman himself is a special expert in agricultural industry, and I am sure that in his hands the subject of agriculture will not lack attention.

Mr. SEALEY. I am glad to be corrected in that matter by the minister (Mr. King). I trust and feel satisfied from his statement that the agricultural side will receive careful consideration.

Mr. FISHER. I have listened with great attention and interest to what my hon. friend from Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) has said in favour of the establishment of a branch farm of the experimental farm system in the Niagara peninsula, among the fruit and vegetable growers there. A deputation of fruit growers, introduced by my hon. friend (Mr. Sealey), some time ago, laid before me two requests. One was for the establishment of a farm or station in that vicinity for the special purpose of illustrating fruit and vegetable growing, but the delegation rather laid stress upon their other proposition, that it would be well to make an experiment in what is commonly called the pre-cooling of fruit before shipment. My department has been looking into that system of pre-cooling of fruit for some time. A year ago Mr. Ruddick, the Cold Storage and Dairy Commissioner, was in the west and visited California for the express purpose of investigating the system adopted there by which the fruit when packed in the cars for shipment is thoroughly cooled, and then the cars closed up and sent forward. The system is there carried on on a very large scale at central points, the cars being brought in from the fruit growing districts to the central plant and cooled before being forwarded. The suggestion was made that something similar might be adopted in the Niagara peninsula, which is probably the largest individual fruit growing section of the Dominion of Canada. I authorized Mr. Ruddick to look into the possibilities of establishing something of this kind there and thought that the principle as to assistance which we have applied to cold storage warehouses might be applied to this service also. I am asking in the supplementary estimates for a vote for the purpose of carrying that out, I have been urged by the people there to give them early advice as to the possibility of doing this, so that they might be able to take advantage of it for this season. All I could say was that I am recommending to parliament a vote for this purpose, and that if parliament grants that vote, I shall be very glad to establish such a system.

In regard to the establishment of branch experimental stations in the Niagara district, I accept with pleasure the remarks of my hon. friend as an evidence of the value of these branch stations in the different parts of the country. I have had abundant evidence of the value of these stations, not only from the people in the different localities, but from members of the House who have been asking for the establishment of such branch stations in their respective districts. I am very glad of this because it quite coincides with my own policy and my own views. I would be glad to see branch stations of this character scattered broadly over the country. As an evidence that this is my view I would point to the fact that in the last five years or so, I have actually acquired no less than eight such stations, in addition to the original five experimental

farms, which have been in existence now for about 25 years. I would be glad to go on with that. I am asking parliament this year for a vote for this purpose. I am glad to say that last year parliament accorded me that vote, and I am asking a vote in the main estimates and a further vote in the supplementaries, because the demands and requests made to me have been so general and so insistent that I did not think the amount I had asked in the main estimates, which were made up last fall, would be sufficient to meet the requirements. I trust that parliament will grant me this money, and I will take steps immediately to see that it is expended to the very best advantage. In picking out the place where one of these branch farms may be established, two or three things must be kept in mind, first, that the conditions of the situation are similar to the conditions in a pretty considerable area. We could not at once, or perhaps for a long time, establish these farms in every locality, even supposing parliament was to vote large sums of money to establish them. Therefore, we must first choose the place where the benefit from the individual station will be spread over as large an area as possible. Secondly, we ought to consider the accessibility of the individual places to as large a public as possible. I would be very loth indeed to establish any farm which would be far from a railway station, and from easy means of communication. Thirdly, I think it would be proper and right, in view of the enormous influx of people into the western country, many of whom are at least indifferent farmers, and many quite without experience, that we should try rather to give them the benefit of these examples than to place the stations in portions of the country where there has been and is first-class farming to-day. For this reason I have rather added to the number in the west in larger measure than to the number in the east. In the fourth place, I want to recognize the different parts of the country, not to devote the whole time or the whole labour, or the whole money, to one particular portion of Canada, widespread as the Dominion is, but rather to thoroughly distribute this money which comes from the whole people of Canada. It is with these objects in view that I first of all, some years ago, established such a station at Lethbridge, where there was a comparatively dry area needing irrigation, and also needing example of what is called dry farming. I also established one in Northern Alberta, at Lacombe. Then came one down in the east in Prince Edward Island, where people were a little cut off from the advantages of other farms. Then came one at Rosthern, in northern Saskatchewan, where the country is a little different from the prairie country, and where there is a considerable element of foreign population, who do not perhaps understand our agricultural conditions and methods as well as our own people. The next one was in Scott, also in Saskatchewan. The Nova Scotia government bought a property at Kentville, Nova Scotia, in Kings county, for the purpose of establishing a special station for fruit experiments, as well as for other operations. That is just now being organized. Last fall I purchased two in the eastern portion of Quebec, where agriculture is certainly backward, and where it is very desirable that something should be done. I also got an establishment in British Columbia, in the Columbia Valley, at a place called Wilmer, where we have a small area of land in that valley, which was presented by a company there, and we are now preparing to commence operations.

I have had my officer examining sites in British Columbia, in order to secure one on Vancouver Island and one in what is called the fruit belt of the interior—perhaps in the Okanagan country or thereabouts. I have been a little delayed in being able to do anything there partly because of the difficulty in the choice of a really suitable situation and partly also because of the high prices which are asked for any land which seemed at all suitable. In Ontario I also have been hoping that just as soon as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway is accessible we will be able to find out where the proper situation would be to establish one or perhaps more in what is called the great clay belt of northern Ontario. I confess that in the southwestern part of Ontario, where my hon. friend lives, I have not felt so much the necessity for the establishment of these branch stations for two reasons. In the first place, from the point of view of agriculture and horticulture, that region of Canada is the best on the continent of America and the farmers there need less help or example. The ordinary farmers are thoroughly well up themselves. Secondly, the Ontario government has been doing a very considerable amount of work. As my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain) said a few minutes ago, they have stations somewhat similar in character in this Niagara district and several other places in the southwestern part of Ontario. Under these circumstances, while I would not for a moment say that we should not go on in that part of the country it seemed to me that the establishment of these branch farms was less pressing, less insistent, there than it was in other parts of Canada. In view of the fact that the people represented by my hon. friend from Wentworth and others in the Niagara peninsula have pressed for this other thing, which I think will be of great value to their industry, and that we are trying an experiment which will be of service to all

other fruit growing and fruit shipping parts of the country, I have rather felt that I was called upon first to do that, and doing that, perhaps other expenditures of public money would be better in another part of the country than just alongside of this experiment with regard to fruit shipping and at a place where the Ontario government have an experiment station at which they are doing very good work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Excellent work.

Mr. BARNARD. I am sure the House is very much interested and pleased at the somewhat laboured attempt of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to pull the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) out of the hole he has got into by reason of the reciprocity pact.

Mr. FISHER. No reason for it at all.

Mr. BARNARD. In the somewhat rambling remarks of the minister he told us of experimental farms in the Kootenay Valley, in the province of Quebec, in the Ontario clay belt and a number of other places, but he did not, in so far as I could hear, give the hon. member from Wentworth very much satisfaction in so far as that particular constituency is concerned. I do not wish to take up the time of the House but there is a question that I would like to obtain some light upon from the Minister of Agriculture and it is as to what provision he is making for a farm on Vancouver Island. I can assure him that if he is desirous of pulling anybody out of a hole he could very probably get busy in the constituency of the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Smith) because that constituency has been promised an experimental farm for the past two or three years. The minister has had an official of his department on the ground who has reported upon several sites. The Hudson's Bay Company offered a certain property to the minister for the purpose of establishing an experimental farm at a considerably lower price than it could be purchased for in the immediate neighbourhood and yet he has never gone on with the project with the result that the minister might find that he would now have to pay two or three times as much for the land than the figure at which he could have purchased it at that time.

Mr. FISHER. It was too high to buy for such a purpose then and I certainly could not think of buying it now.

Mr. BARNARD. Under those circumstances I suppose we are to take it that the minister does not intend to establish an experimental farm there on account of the high price of land?

Mr. FISHER. I did not say so.

Mr. BARNARD. Possibly when his reciprocity pact come into operation and the price of land has gone down he will be in a better position in regard to it.

Mr. BURRELL. I would like to say that I thoroughly agree with the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) in the enunciation of his general policy with regard to these experimental farms and I would also like to suggest to him that he rarely gets criticism from this side of the House for asking too much money to be expended in the interest of agriculture. On the other hand, it is generally for not having asked enough for agriculture. I have never noticed on this side of the House any disposition to criticise the minister harshly on account of the extravagance of the Department of Agriculture. It is rather the niggardliness of the department that we complain of. I need not call the minister's attention to the fact that two years ago I took the opportunity of pressing upon him the necessity for the establishment of an experimental farm in the semi-arid belt of British Columbia where some $15,000,000 or $20,000,000 have been invested by a large number people who are absolutely dependent upon horticulture and who are looking forward very anxiously to see the promise which the minister made on that occasion implemented. I would be very much gratified if the minister could give us an assurance that the promise which he made on that occasion would be carried out at a very early date.

TAKING OF CENSUS IN MANITOBA.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I desire to call the attention of the House and more particularly that of the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) to some of the questions which I asked him upon Friday last, his answers thereto and to some others that he refused to answer. I am not Irish; therefore, I cannot assume the attitude of the Irishman who was kicked by a mule. I purpose for a moment or two to consider the impolite, undignified and unusual manner in which the minister undertook to answer my questions on Friday night. I can tell the minister that in so far as the yaps and sneers which he threw across the floor of the House are concerned they are not going to quiet any person not even myself. I pay no more attention to his yaps and barks than a locomotive does to a sky terrier as it rolls over the rails to the next station. I would suggest to the minister that it would have been much to his advantage if he had kept cool, slicked his silver beard, spoken more calmly, and not flown off the handle when I put these questions to him on Friday last. I did not ask them from mere curiosity. I had a reason for asking these questions and the constituency that I have the honour to represent had a reason in desiring that they should

be asked because they wanted to know how things were moving along in so far as the census taking of the constituents I represent is concerned. I asked the minister some questions with regard to the activity of the Liberal organizer of Manitoba. He knew then and he knows now that he has been actively engaged in taking a census of Manitoba. When he made the denial he was stating what was not the fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. FISHER. Order.

Mr. STAPLES. You may call order, but I will support what I am saying by evidence, and direct evidence with regard to the facts of the case. The question asked the Minister of Agriculture will be found reported in 'Hansard' as follows:

Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture if the enumerators for the taking of the census in the province of Manitoba have been appointed?

Mr. FISHER. I think they all are; if not, with very few exceptions.

Mr. STAPLES. By whom were they recommended?

Mr. FISHER. They were recommended by men in whom I have confidence.

Mr. STAPLES. I do not think that is an answer to my question.

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow a debate on the orders of the day.

Mr. STAPLES. I have a further question to ask. Had the Liberal organizer in the province of Manitoba anything to do with the appointment or recommending of the enumerators for that province?

Mr. FISHER. That is a question which I decline to answer.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the Liberal organizer of the province of Manitoba anything to do with the schooling of the enumerators before they begin their work?

Mr. FISHER. No.

The Minister of Agriculture answered, 'No,' in a very sharp voice. I want to tell the minister that the enumerators have been going to the office of the Liberal organizer for Manitoba in the city of Winnipeg, on his invitation, and the first witness I will call to substantiate that is Mr. Perry himself, the Liberal organizer. This is a letter signed by the Liberal organizer in whom the Minister of Agriculture has every confidence, and no doubt he has reason to have confidence in him, because this man has been very beneficial to the Liberal party in Manitoba as well as in Saskatchewan, in by gone days. The letter reads:

MANITOBA LIBERAL EXECUTIVE.
Confidential circular.
Organizer's Office,
Winnipeg, Canada,
April 17, 1911.

Dear Sir,—Re census in federal constituency of Macdonald. I beg to advise you that you have been recommended as enumerator for the following official census enumeration division of the above constituency:—

Sec. 54 That part of the parish of St. Charles north of the Assiniboine river.

I inclose copy of rates as officially announced in the 'Canada Gazette' of April 15, 1911, and would be pleased if within ten (10) days of date hereof, you would acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours in the good cause,
H. E. PERRY.

(Whenever you are in the city, we shall be pleased to have you call.)

Catch on to the words 'Yours in the good cause.' Now, who is Mr. Perry, and what do we know about him? He has been a great actor who has played some very important parts on various political stages, always for the Liberal party, not only in Manitoba, but in Saskatchewan, and in order that the House may understand how he plays his part on these political stages, I will recall just one instance out of many which will be sufficient to satisfy the House, and it should be sufficient to satisfy the Minister of Agriculture that Mr. Perry is not a man in whom he should have the utmost confidence; that is, if he wishes to play the game of politics fairly. It will be remembered that there was an election in the constituency of Prince Albert, Saskatchewan, on the 13th day of December, 1905, and the Liberal party had as their candidate Mr. Tyreman, and Mr. Donaldson was a candidate of the Provincial Rights party. Mr. Donaldson was recognized as much the stronger candidate, and the Liberals decided to beat him at any cost, and something had to be done. What was done was to call into play the Grit machine, and after it was sufficiently oiled and greased it was put into operation. The first move was to select the battlefield, and if the House will take the trouble to look at the map, they will find that the constituency of Prince Albert runs far into the wilds of the north, and so the northern wilds were selected by the Grit machine for its handiwork and robbery. Mr. Moberley, the Liberal organizer, made application to returning officer Sinclair for three polls to be opened in the north, and needless to say the application was immediately granted. It was understood that Mr. Donaldson, the provincial rights candidate, was to know nothing of it then, and in order to jockey time, Mr. Sinclair, the returning officer, rode forty miles into a little town called Shell Brook, from which the mail only leaves twice a week. On the 5th of December, after the mail had left, Mr. Sinclair, the returning officer, mailed a notice to Mr. Donaldson that there would be three polls opened up in the north, and it was absolutely impossible for Mr. Donaldson to get this notice until the 7th of December, or six days before the election.

when he could not possibly get there himself or send a representative on that short notice to protect these three polls. The next move was for Mr. Sinclair, the returning officer, to select three deputy returning officers and he procured the efficient services of a Mr. McLeod, a Mr. Neilson, and a Mr. Sutherland, and they started on the northern trip. After journeying for some time they came to a desolate and lonely spot, and they concluded that they had travelled far enough, so they also concluded that it was a most ideal place to do the work they had gone out to do, and to set the Grit machine working. Therefore, they made a camp fire and sat down. They had some liquid refreshments and although the narrative does not say what foodstuffs they used, it is supposed it was the standard Grit machine grub namely pickled pigs' feet and beer, and no doubt they smoked the Laurier brand of cigars from the good ship 'Arctic.'

After having a hearty supper, they decided that they would go to work. The first thing to be done was to make a list. So they got their pencils and paper out, and sat down and began putting down all the names they could think of. Finally their mental ability, and capacity of thinking of names became exhausted; yet they had not in their opinion quite sufficient names on the list to defeat the provincial rights candidate. At that moment, fortunately for Mr. Tyreman, but unfortunately for Mr. Donaldson, a rabbit went jumping by. The incident suggested the name of a new family that they might register, so they began registering the Rabbit family. They entered on the list Tommy Rabbit, Jack Rabbit, and I was told Jennie Rabbit, and all the rest of the Rabbit family. After they had got the Rabbit family all entered up, they counted up the list, and they found 151 names on the list, and they concluded, after a little consultation, that that was sufficient to do the trick. The next move was to open the polls. So they unlocked the ballot boxes, took out the poll book, took out the pad of ballots, and they got up, I suppose, behind the back log for a table, and began work. Now, Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the scene? Just imagine that you see those men at work, away up there in the north, at a poll constituted as I have said, and imagine you see Tommy Rabbit, and Jack Rabbit, and Jennie Rabbit, stepping into the poll announcing their names and demanding ballots; and there Mr. Sutherland, and Mr. Macleod, and Mr. Neilson hand out the ballots, and the Rabbits go back and mark them, fold them, and come back and drop them into the ballot box. Then I suppose they got their usual glass of beer and pigs' feet, and cigar, and went home to await the returns of the poll. After they had got the 151 ballots in the box, the time arrived to close the poll. The poll was closed. The ballot boxes were unlocked, the marked ballots taken out and counted. It was found that there were 151 ballots, and every one of them had voted right, they were all marked for Mr. Tyreman, the Liberal candidate. Then they gathered up their traps, and whatever little provision they had left, and started back to Prince Albert. When they arrived at Prince Albert they handed in their ballot box and made the solemn declaration to the returning officer, Mr. Sinclair, and he declared Mr. Tyreman, the Liberal candidate, elected by about 60 majority. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the way that incident occurred. But Mr. Donaldson decided that he was not going to stand for all that. He felt that he was entitled to some degree of justice. So he immediately took action against the three returning officers. They were taken to court, and were fined as follows: Mr. Sutherland, deputy, Mr. Macleod, another deputy, and Mr. Neilson, $200 each, and Mr. Moberly, $100. That quieted things for a time. But Mr. Donaldson was not satisfied with that. He then instituted proceedings against Mr. Sinclair, the returning officer. The charge he made against Mr. Sinclair was conspiring to defraud in the matter of the list. This somewhat alarmed the Liberal machine, and the Liberals throughout the country, and immediately they advised the deputy returning officers to skip out. After they were supplied with the necessary cash, and the assurance that they would be looked after, the deputies went across into the United States. And now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the point where I want to call the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the beautiful letters that were written by his friend Mr. Perry, in whom he has every confidence, and see what the House and even the minister himself think of them. These poor fellows were in the United States for a time. They were running short of cash, and they were anxious to get back. They had to be administered to, and Mr. Perry administered comfort to their souls, and cash in their pockets. I will read to the House extracts from some of his letters to Mr. Neilson. I hold in my hand facsimiles of all the letters that passed between Mr. Neilson, Mr. Perry, Mr. Sutherland, and the rest of the gang, so that they cannot be disputed. Some of them are rather spicy. This is from one dated June 10:

> Nothing new in the Sinclair case. Appeal to be heard by full court at Calgary, July 11.
>
> Moberly should have requested protection of court; as it is, it seems there is nothing for him to do but plead guilty.
>
> Tories threatening further prosecution.

I have heard it said that the missing deputies would be as well to keep out of sight. I think this is undoubtedly correct.

On June 11th, he writes further:

Ere this reaches you, no doubt you will have heard that Moberly was fined $100.

Tories are talking of other prosecutions, and are, of course, pleased with the results so far.

Prudence would, I should judge, suggest to the absent deputies that their safety lies in their remaining away.

These were written by Mr. Perry to Mr. Neilson. Here is another one:

Box 723,
Regina, Oct. 24, 1906.

Dear Mr. Neilson,—I write to inform you that the Tories are still threatening. You see if they lose the case against Sinclair it will make them hostile, while if they win they will be in good shape to prosecute further. That is the way they look at it, so I would advise extreme caution. I shall try to keep you advised. Am going up to Prince Albert shortly to see how things look. The 'Standard' here last night published a story that if the case went against Sinclair, he was going to squeal, but I don't believe that, as he would never do anything to help the Tories, he is a sore on them. Kindly consider this as absolutely confidential and done in your interests.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) H. E. PERRY.

This is the man in whom the Minister of Agriculture has every confidence. Here is a note at the bottom of this letter:

I heard that Pete Paul was trying to play private detective and had gone to the States for that purpose. He was a juror.

Neilson was the deputy returning officer who was up operating in the wilds of the north. Here is another letter written by H. E. Perry, the chief Liberal organizer of Manitoba, in whom the Minister of Agriculture has every confidence, to Mr. Neilson:

Box 723,
Regina, Sask., Oct. 29, 1906.

Dear Sir,—I enclose for your information and guidance copy of header of this day containing complete text of judgment of the full court in the Sinclair case, and which disposes of the conspiracy phase of the Prince Albert district election cases. It does not, however, dispose of the two counts against the deputy returning officers and poll clerks, namely:

Making false returns and stuffing ballot boxes, for which they are liable under sections 128 and 131 of the Territories Election Ordinance. Section 128 reads: Any person appointed a returning officer, election clerk, deputy returning officer or poll clerk, who fails to carry out any of the duties imposed by this Ordinance, or who contravenes any of its provisions, shall be liable to a fine not exceeding $500 and costs or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year or both.

Section 133 reads: Penalties under this Ordinance may be recovered on summary conviction before two justices of the peace.

The three deputies were fined on only one charge, that of not holding the poll at the proper time and place.

Moberley, a poll clerk, was fined for writing the word 'voted' after the names of parties in the poll book, his fine being $100, while that of each deputy was $200.

The Tories are naturally disappointed and sore over the decision of the full court, and I am informed that Moore, editor of their paper, 'The West,' and Macdonald, the organizer, are going to Prince Albert the beginning of the next week.

I am also informed on the best authority that the Tories say that any or all of the fellows who are away will be arrested immediately on their return, which quite bears out what I have understood all along, they were threatening to do.

I, therefore, cannot hold out any hope for your early return. Things will settle down after a while, when the by-election is over and after the end of next session of the House. I shall be pleased to give you any further information, if possible to obtain it, and you so desire.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) H. E. PERRY.

This was the Liberal organizer for the province of Manitoba in whom the Minister of Agriculture has the utmost confidence. Here is another one of Perry's racy epistles, written by him to John Neilson during the latter's exile in the United States. Neilson was evidently getting very lonely and restless:

Drawer 804,
Prince Albert, Jan. 17, 1907.

Dear Mr. Neilson,—I came here a little over a month ago not intending to remain for any such length of time, however, it became necessary to do so.

I arrived December 13, got hold of Jim Sinclair, president of association 1905-6, and 14th prepared to call to executive. I went to Sturgeon Lake lumber mills and got Jim Wilson, secretary of the association, to also sign the call. Returned 16th, and 17th got Wilson to go out to Shillingworth with notice, while I went through Down Hill and Hales, 18th and 19th. Executive meeting on 20th. Decided to hold annual meeting some time about January 9th. Got notices for same out on 22nd. Started out for Shillingworth district, which I covered by the evening of December 31st. Did some short drives following week. Convention held on 9th. A. Turgeon received the nomination. The Tories, when they found out we were calling a convention, scambled out and called theirs for the 8th, the day previous to ours. S. J. D. received their nomination. The fight promises, according to some, to be pretty hot. I do not entirely agree with that opinion, but do not propose to take any chances, as I shall have good organization all over the district. After December convention the 9th, the city Liberals banqueted the delegates and friends from the country. We had a fine turnout and a fine time. The weather has been very severe so much so that there are very few moving around. The train service is badly demoralized. Premier Scott has been very low with pneumonia, and indeed may not be past danger

yet. I understand he will shortly, when able to be moved, take a trip to the south. His illness has thrown arrangements to the calling of the legislature, &c., all out. Trust your health and that of Archie is good.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) H. E. PERRY.

A note at the bottom reads:

The Senator returned to Ottawa on the 11th. He never came near me. I only saw him merely to shake hands and once when he was going into the banquet. I had no conversation at all. If you have any private matter with him, you might write him direct to the Senate, Ottawa. He keeps clear of me, as we cannot agree. You will get further particulars regarding convention and banquet from the 'Advertiser,' which I trust you receive regularly.

There is another letter written by Grit Organizer Perry to John Neilson, one of Mr. Perry's friends and possibly a friend of the Minister of Agriculture also:

July 18, 1906.

Dear John,—Received your letter this a.m., and I am sending the other along at once.

I wonder what that other was?

Having forwarded everything that came here just as fast as it arrived. The court has not given a decision yet, but will let you know as soon as we hear what they do. This may come along any day. The other boys have settled down out west, but have not heard from them for some days. You had better stay there for a while, as we may get some news for you and it would not pay me to move just now. There is absolutely nothing to tell you about this thing as they are just keeping still and waiting a chance to get hold of some of you fellows. Sutherland's wife and family have gone to him and intend to stay there. I may be in Chicago in a week or ten days and will let you know. Write me the same as usual here, and mail the same and it will be looked after even if I am away for a few days.

Yours,
(Sgd.) M.

Here is another letter, apparently from a kind of go-between Chicago lawyers, possibly counsel for the criminals in their exile:

January 28, 1907.

Alex. Scott.
Mark Sands.

Sands & Scott,
Lawyers,
218 La Salle Street,
Chicago.

Mr. John F. Neilson,
600 W. 62nd St., City.

Dear Mr. Neilson,—Please find herewith a letter sent you in my care by Mr. Perry. This came one day last week, but I kept thinking that you would be in and so did not forward it to you. I did not call you on the telephone because I have been knocked out with grippe about ten days. Drop in when convenient as I also had a letter from Mr. Perry, although I presume it practically covers the same subjects as yours.

Very truly yours.
SANDS.

Here is another letter written by Murray to John Neilson concerning things at home:

Dear Jno,—Have been very busy, but have intended to write you for the past few days. Have been in province of Quebec and have seen all of the parties interested and can assure you that everything is going along all right and all that can be done is now being done. All the matters that you spoke to me about will be attended to in proper time, so you need have no worry about them. Expect court to give decisions to-day and will let you know how they turn out. Have had several interviews and when this case is over it may change the whole thing, but all feel sure that if you return before the warrants are withdrawn it will mean trouble at once. Everybody is prepared to stand by their guns and do what is right by you, and what I ask is that you hold steady for a while longer until all can be arranged.

See Mark and he will fix things up with you. Thought best to send it that way.

I may have to make another trip south in a week or ten days and will let you know and see you then. You can depend upon it that I am doing all I can to hurry things along. You will hear from me again in a few days.

Yours,
M.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these are some of the letters that have come to light that have passed between Mr. Perry, the Liberal organizer, the man who is taking an active part in conducting the census of the province of Manitoba, the man whom the Minister of Agriculture claims is a very warm friend—

Mr. KNOWLES. Would the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) mind passing these letters over? Would he mind letting me see them?

Mr. STAPLES. I will be pleased to do so. I would advise the hon. member (Mr. Knowles) that the paper I have here and the facsimiles of the letters are from the library. So he will be sure he has the real thing in the letters.

Mr. KNOWLES. Will the hon. member please send me what he read?—

Mr. STAPLES. They are there; the facsimiles, too.

Mr. KNOWLES. Those the hon. gentleman read to the House? I think he read what is lying on his desk. Will he show me that?

Mr. STAPLES. Yes, if the hon. gentleman wants them,—in a moment; I want to use them.

Mr. KNOWLES. I will pass them back in five minutes. Let me have what the hon. gentleman read or nothing at all.

Mr. STAPLES. Certainly, let him have it. I have no objection to letting the hon.

gentleman from Moosejaw having these letters. He will find they are indentical with the facsimiles.

Mr. KNOWLES. I have no doubt they are.

Mr. STAPLES. I was telling the Minister of Agriculture that these are some of the letters that have passed between these men and his friend, Mr. Perry, in whom he has great confidence, the man who is taking an active part at the present time in taking the census in the province of Manitoba. And, in conclusion I ask the acting Prime Minister, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) to discipline the would-be supreme Minister of Agriculture, just a little, and see if he cannot get him to withdraw his confidence in Mr. Perry, the Liberal organizer of the province of Manitoba who is very actively engaged in taking the census of that province.

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). I had placed in my hands a motion this afternoon which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) said he was going to move—

Mr. STAPLES. I beg pardon. I want to move the motion. But my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has my copy of the motion.

Mr. KNOWLES. I will send it over to the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples).

Mr. STAPLES. Mr. Speaker, I will appeal to the hon. member from Moosejaw to play a little fair and not try to appear so cute and clever, but to send me back my papers to which is attached the motion I purpose moving.

Mr. KNOWLES. Is it—

Mr. STAPLES. I asked the hon. gentleman to send back the paper I was kind enough to let him have.

Mr. KNOWLES. I rise to a question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. Since sending it over—if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Staples) does not wish to take my word for it, it does not matter—I found this attached to the paper. I had no idea that these letters were attached to the motion.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Send it over.

Mr. KNOWLES. I will send it over I had no idea it was there.

Mr. STAPLES. I beg leave to move in amendment:

That in the selection of public officers the government is exercising a public trust and should be guided by considerations of the character and capacity of the persons whom it proposes to appoint. That the delegation of such public trust to a local party committee or organizer is a public scandal and deserves the censure of this House.

Mr. STAPLES.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) began his remarks by alluding to some answers I gave to questions he put, and I gathered, I think correctly, that if the answers had been to his liking, nothing further would have been heard of the matter.

Mr. STAPLES. No, you are wrong.

Mr. FISHER. I am very glad, indeed, that the answers were not to the hon. gentleman's liking, because it has given him an opportunity, of which he has been pleased to take advantage, to show a vein of facetiousness, and to tell some pretty stories about a camp fire, a journey in the northwest, and so on, which I have no doubt, interested a large number of members, and evidently created great amusement amongst his friends around him. I confess I was not particularly interested in them, and I do not think that they are of particular value in regard to the motion before the Chair. As to the first part of the motion, that in the selection, and appointment of public officers the government is exercising a public trust, and should be guided by considerations of the character and capacity of the person whom it is proposed to appoint, this is very true, one might perhaps think it a platitude because it has been, as far as I know, the guiding principle of governments in Canada for some time past, how long past I would not like to say.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Long past.

Mr. FISHER. Well, for 15 years past. Then the hon. member goes on and says that the delegation of such a public trust to a local parliamentary committee or organzation is a public scandal, and deserves the censure of this House. If my hon. friend had changed this a little and said that the delegation of such a public trust to a local parliamentary committee or organization would be, if done, a public scandal, and deserve the censure of this House, I might not greatly object to it, but the implication here is that that has been done.

An hon. MEMBER. So it has.

Mr. STAPLES. What does the letter which Perry has issued to the returning officer show? If the minister will look up his official and private correspondence in connection with this Mr. Perry he will find a good many other letters.

Mr. FISHER. I do not hesitate to say that Perry has made recommendations to me just as others in Manitoba have done, and these recommendations have been considered by me, and sometimes they have been acted upon, and sometimes not.

Mr. ROCHE. Why did the minister refuse the other day to say who had made recommendations?

Mr. FISHER. Because I never do say, I never divulge the recommendations on which I act, and I do not propose to. The recommendations to a minister in regard to public appointments, as to other things, are confidential in their nature. I look upon them as recommendations, I act upon them, or do not act upon them in the exercise of my judgment in the administration of my department. Whether they are turned down or not turned down I do not propose to tell hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a matter between the people who make the recommendations and myself, and I decline to answer such questions.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the minister still think, in view of the exposures that have been made in regard to Perry, that he is a fit and proper person to recommend any officer to the government?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know exactly what these exposures are. My hon. friend has read certain letters. I do not know whether these letters have appeared in any court or trial.

Mr. STAPLES. They have all. They are——

Mr. FISHER. It is the first time I have heard anything about it.

Mr. STAPLES. What I said was that the parties with whom this correspondence was carried on by Perry were in court and were fined.

Mr. FISHER. And were these letters filed in court?

Mr. STAPLES. I do not know whether or not the letters had come to light then.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know either, and I do not propose to accept anything except records of trials.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. Because an hon. member of this House reads letters I am not going to accept them necessarily as correct.

An hon. MEMBER. Good.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend's party accepted the counting of the ballots which put his candidate in.

Mr. FISHER. I think it must have been the returning officer who accepted the counting of the ballots, and that was an official action which that gentleman was called on to perform. I do not know anything about the trial referred to.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Don't want to know, either.

Mr. FISHER. I do not care particularly. I have not studied the matter, I never looked into the trial, and I know nothing about it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You had better look into it.

Mr. FISHER. That is the opinion of the hon. gentleman. I do not intend at present to enter into the study of it.

Mr. LAKE. Is it not the case that in 1906 the minister issued orders for the recall of this man Moberly mentioned this afternoon, from being employed in the Census Department because he had been involved in these Prince Albert scandals?

Mr. FISHER. I remember recalling a Mr. Moberly, because he had been proved in a trial to have been guilty of improper practices. I would do the same thing under similar circumstances to-day, but I have not any proof that Mr. Perry has been proved guilty of anything. There is a difference between a man being proved guilty of an improper practice and an assertion on the part of people that another man is unworthy of confidence. Mr. Perry is not an officer of this department. He has no connection, official or otherwise, as far as I know, with the taking of the census, and I have nothing to do with Mr. Perry except, when I receive a letter from him, to answer it in accordance with my judgment. My hon. friend, says and I believe that Mr. Perry has been appointed the manager or organizer of the Liberal party in Manitoba. That, to me, is a recommendation.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FISHER. That, to me, is a recommendation of the man. I do not believe that the Liberals of Manitoba would deliberately choose a man to do work for them who was disreputable or unworthy of their confidence. I venture to say for myself and I think for the government that we have confidence enough in the Liberals of Manitoba to believe that they will do what is right.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Would the minister say what Liberals in Manitoba recommended Mr. Perry, as he says?

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend has not been listening. I did not say that Mr. Perry had been recommended. He has never been recommended to me in any respect, but an hon. member has said that he has been appointed by the Liberals of Manitoba to be their organizer in political affairs. He is not an officer of my department, and he has nothing whatever to do with taking the census in Manitoba or anywhere else. Mr. Perry has written to me on various occasions respecting appointments

in connection with the census. I have taken these recommendations and these letters into consideration, just as I have done with the letters of other gentlemen in Manitoba and elsewhere. I have judged the recommendations and acted in accordance with my judgment.

Mr. STAPLES. What authority had Mr. Perry to issue that letter to the enumerattors?

Mr. FISHER. He had no authority as far as I know. I gave him no authority.

Mr. STAPLES. I suppose then the minister will look after Mr. Perry?

Mr. FISHER. Certainly not; I had nothing to do with Mr. Perry. He can write as many letters as he likes. The hon. member himself can write a letter if he chooses and I shall not refuse him the privilege, nor shall I refuse Mr. Perry the privileges if he chooses to write letters. But Mr. Perry does not use any authority in that or anything else in regard to the census, and, knowing a little about Mr. Perry and judging from the correspondence, I venture to think that he will not say he has any authority from me or from the government or from the department to deal with the census in any way whatever.

Now, let me say a few words further. The hon. member for Macdonald calls Mr. Perry my confidential adviser, or something of that kind. He assumes that all the recommendations that I have received from Manitoba in regard to the census have come from Mr. Perry. Although I told him the other day that I had acted upon the recommendations of people in whose judgment I had confidence, he assumes that these recommendations were all from Mr. Perry and nobody else. In that respect he is entirely in error. I have received a number of recommendations, some from ex-members, some from present members and some from other people in the different constituencies in regard to the census enumerators. I am sorry to say, as a matter of convenience to myself, that I get, I suppose, several hundred letters every day in regard to the census and the appointments to it.

An hon. MEMBER. Read a few of them.

Mr. FISHER. No, I am not going to read any because I look upon them as confidential; I look upon them as matters between the writers and myself and I am not going to divulge them any more than I will other recommendations in regard to official appointments in this country. The hon. members mentioned Mr. Neilson, or Mr. McNeill,—I do not remember which it was.

Mr. STAPLES. Mr. Neilson.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know the gentleman and I never heard of him till now, I want to say here clearly and distinctly that when I receive a recommendation relating to any appointment and questions are asked about it in this House or elsewhere I hold that recommendation confidential and I do not reply to those questions. That is a principle which we have laid down as members of the government and I have acted upon it in this case as in many others. My replies to the hon. member the other day were no shorter and were no more based on an inclination to refuse to answer his questions than they have been on other occasions of a similar character. That was threshed out many years ago, here, it was thoroughly considered, and I believe the House thoroughly agreed to the principle that recommendations from various people in the country with reference to appointments to offices are not to be divulged and certainly I do not propose to divulge them.

I noticed one letter which was quoted there and I caught the statement that certain returning officers were fined. I noticed that two or three men were fined because they did not open their polls at the right time in the morning.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. LAKE. It was because they did not open them at all.

Mr. FISHER. Well, that had nothing whatever to do with the census or the taking of the census or anything else I know of. I understood that another man was fined for some other trivial offence of that kind in connection with——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. My hon. friend derides the statement that it was a trivial offence That is the impression that I got at the moment when hearing the letter read. It struck me that it was more an error of judgment.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FISHER. Hon. gentlemen may laugh, but I never heard of it before. I listened to the letter when it was read and that is the impression I got from it. Three or four men, I judged from the reading of the letter, have been fined in the courts.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They were fined for voting rabbits.

Mr. FISHER. No, that is not what they were fined for. I do not think that the hon. member will find in any of the records of the courts any fine imposed for that reason. In order to convince me he would have to show the record of the court, but I do not believe it for a moment.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You say you do not know.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know, but I do not believe it all the same. There are certain things which, when stated, appeal to my reason as being possibly correct; there are other things which, when they are stated, do not appeal to my reason, and I do not believe them. I do not think the hon. member will state on his authority as a member of this parliament that these men were fined for voting jack rabbits or anything of that kind.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Well it was jack rabbit.

Mr. LAKE. It was rabbit skins.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I did not say anything about jack rabbits.

Mr. FISHER. I do not know whether it matters very much whether they were jack rabbits or rabbit skins. My hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake) has referred to a matter which justifies my action. During the taking of the census of 1906 a gentleman called Mr. Moberley was recommended as a guide to take some enumerator away to the north part of the country. I did not know Mr. Moberley from Adam. I took the recommendation. I cannot remember at the moment who made it. It was certainly not——

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). It did not matter; you would fill it any way.

Mr. FISHER. No, I would not. But, as a matter of fact I found out after that Mr. Moberley had been concerned in some fraudulent transaction in connection with an election.

Mr. CAMPBELL. But you say you did not believe it.

Mr. LAKE. The trivial offence you mentioned just now.

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember what the offence was. If the hon. member for Qu'Appelle can tell me I will accept the statement from him, because I do not think he would make a statement which is not correct, but I do not remember what the offence was. It was sufficient that when my attention was drawn to it I immediately recalled him, I did not allow him to have anything to do with the taking of the census, and if to-day I find that anybody is connected with the taking of this census who has been guilty of any improper practice, and has been convicted, therefor, or who is shown to me to be guilty of having acted in an improper way, I shall immediately cancel his appointment and recall him as I did Mr. Moberley from the far north. Moberley and those who were with him had started, had gone beyond the range of civilization, and I sent a special officer from the Mounted Police to cancel his appointment, to make him give up his papers and to take another man, and put in his place.

Mr. BLAIN. On whose recommendation was Moberley appointed?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot remember.

Mr. ROCHE. Would the minister take all that pains to recall a man guilty of only a trivial offence?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember Moberley's offence. The offence I took as being a trivial one was that quoted in the letter read by the hon. member for Macdonald. I did not know that the men he referred to included Moberley.

Mr. ROCHE. Yes, Moberley.

Mr. FISHER. Moberley was one of these four?

Mr. ROCHE. Yes.

Mr. FISHER. I did not catch the name, but I did not understand Moberley's name was amongst them.

Mr. STAPLES. I might advise the minister that this man Moberly had made an application to the returning officer, Sinclair to have three polls opened in the north. The three men who went to the north were McLeod, Sutherland and Neilson, but it was Moberley who arranged the whole affair. He was the ringleader.

Mr. FISHER. I may have been mistaken, and, therefore, my statement of its being a trivial offence may not have been correct, but my impression was that these men were fined because they had not opened their polls at the right hour.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. FISHER. That may have been incorrect.

Mr. STAPLES. It was for holding a poll at the wrong time, and in the wrong place. Nobody voted but themselves.

Mr. FISHER. I gathered that it was a matter connected with the opening of a poll. It depends altogether upon what the facts are, which I do not pretend to know.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As a matter of fact, they were not punished for all of these things. The facts are beyond dispute. They were guilty of eight or ten offences under the Election Act. In addition to that they were guilty of the trifling offences of forgery and perjury, that is all.

Mr. FISHER. I know nothing of what they were guilty of. The only thing I know about the case was the letter read by the hon. member for Macdonald, and in which these statements were not included.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister can understand himself: this was the case of two deputy returning officers going out and holding a poll, and returning 151 electors as having voted when there was not a single man appeared before them to vote at all; putting down fictitious names, putting in bogus ballots and making a solemn return under the Election Act that these men had actually voted and that a poll was held and then bringing that return back and having the votes counted for one of the candidates; surely the minister can understand what the offence was.

Mr. FISHER. None of these statements were contained in the letter to which I have referred, and this is the first time I knew in any shape or form of what these men were supposed to be guilty. But I want to point out that these men had nothing to do with the census. Mr. Moberley seemed to be connected with the transaction, and in the case in court was found guilty of something, when I found he was proven guilty I sent after him and recalled him, and refused to allow him to continue as census officer.

Mr. SMYTH. What is he doing now?

Mr. FISHER. I do not know what he is doing, but he is not acting in connection with the census in any manner, and if I found out to-morrow he was acting, I would cancel his appointment.

Mr. BRADBURY. What about Perry?

Mr. FISHER. Perry has never been proven guilty of anything.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. member say he has?

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not say he has, but I do say that as Liberal organizer in the province of Manitoba, he is sending out circulars inviting your agents to come into his office for instructions, and he was shielding these people who were guilty.

Mr. FISHER. Was that proven in court?

Mr. BRADBURY. I would think so.

Mr. FISHER. The statement is made that Perry was shielding these men who were guilty. Was that proven in court?

Mr. STAPLES. His own letter shows it.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Perry has nothing to do with the taking of the census for the Department of Agriculture. If Mr. Perry wishes to write to a census enumerator or commissioner, I have nothing to do with it. He is not doing so with my authority; he has no authority from the department or from me to do it, and he has nothing to do with the taking of the census.

Mr. STAPLES. Has Mr. Perry the patronage of the constituency of Macdonald at the present time? Will the Minister of Agriculture answer that?

Mr. FISHER. As far as I am concerned, Mr. Perry has no patronage of any place at all. But——

Mr. STAPLES. And so far as I know he has.

Mr. FISHER. Pardon me; the hon. gentleman asked a question, and he must let me answer it.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Call it six o'clock.

Mr. FISHER. I will not call it six o'clock until it is six o'clock. The hon. member (Mr. Staples) asked me a question, and I stated in answer that Mr. Perry has not the patronage and nobody else has the patronage of any particular place so far as I am concerned. If Mr. Perry or any one else makes a recommendation in regard to patronage or to an appointment I listen to these recommendations and I judge of them, and in accordance with my own judgment I make the appointment. I will now call it six o'clock, and leave hon. gentlemen opposite to think over that.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. S. LAKE (Qu'Appelle) Mr. Speaker this is not the first time that the history of the notorious Prince Albert elections has been given in this House. It was given by myself a good many years ago, in less eloquent and picturesque language, perhaps, but with the facts substantially the same throughout. The minister must have heard it on that occasion, as I am pretty certain he was in the House, and it was notorious throughout the whole of Canada, being printed in the public press from one end of the country to the other. The main facts are that there was a conspiracy to obtain illicit votes in favour of the Liberal candidate in the Prince Albert election. Three men started out into the wilds with the avowed purpose of opening three polls. They did not open any polls at all. They went to a secluded place, opened their poll booths and filled the poll books with fictitious names.

Mr. FISHER. Was that a provincial or a Dominion election?

Mr. LAKE. A provincial election. Amongst the fictitious names occurred very frequently the name of Rabbitskin. It was shown at the time that after the three deputy returning officers had exhausted the names they could recall to mind, the

ordinary every-day names, Mr. Moberley, who was with them, suggested that he had heard of a family of half-breeds in that neighbourhood called Rabbitskin. So they filled out a large number of the entries with the surname of Rabbitskin, with many different Christian names attached to them. Then, having filled the poll books with names, they filled the ballot boxes with bogus ballots, brought them back from the wilds into the town and produced 151 ballots, sufficient to elect the Liberal candidate. The minister will remember—in fact, he remembered to-day—that Mr. Moberley, the man who was very active in connection with that affair, who acted as poll clerk, and was fined for his connection with the business, was appointed to a job in connection with the census. The minister must have understood that the case was a very bad one, because he took summary proceeding, after the matter had been repeatedly brought to his notice in this House, to have Mr. Moberley recalled at some expense to the country. Two of the three deputy returning officers who were concerned in this notorious business were government officials. Both of them lost their jobs. I presume that even the present administration did not consider it safe to retain them in government positions. The third was a homesteader, and the government in his case was kind enough to protect his homestead, and grant him an extension of leave during his enforced absence in the United States, as a fugitive from justice. The case indeed was so bad that Dr. Tyreman, who had been declared elected by the returning officer, refused to take his seat in the legislature, and did not take his seat. Subsequently the Committee on Elections and Privileges in the Local House, having exhaustively inquired into the case, awarded the seat to Mr. Donaldson, the Provincial Rights candidate. The minister speaks of these men as having been guilty of a trivial offence. The leader of the opposition put the matter clearly and tersely this afternoon when he declared that these deputy returning officers, who were subsequently fugitives from justice, had been guilty of perjury and forgery. The minister says that he can see no connection between the Prince Albert election case and the appointment of census officials for the province of Manitoba. The connection is that Mr. Perry is proved by the correspondence which has been read in the House to-day to have been guilty of conspiring to defeat the ends of justice by assisting these men to become fugitives from justice and advising them to keep out of the way. Let me read Mr. Perry's own letter, a facsimile of which was subsequently published in the press of the country. This is what Mr. Perry himself said:

Box 723,
Regina, Sask., Oct. 20, 1906.

Dear Sir,—I inclose for your information and guidance copy of 'Leader' of this date containing complete text of judgment of the full court in the Sinclair case and which disposes of the conspiracy phase of the Prince Albert district election cases. It does not, however, dispose of the two counts against the deputy returning officers and poll clerks, viz.: Making false returns; stuffing ballot boxes; for which they are liable under sections 128 and 133 of the Territories Elections Ordinance.

Section 128 reads:—Any persons appointed as returning officer, election clerk, deputy returning officers or poll clerk, who fails to carry out any of the duties imposed by this ordinance or who contravenes any of its provisions shall be liable to a fine not exceeding $500 and costs, or to imprisonment for a term not exceeding one year, or both.

Section 133 reads:—Penalties under this ordinance may be recovered on summary conviction before two justices of the peace.

The three deputies were fined on only one charge, that of not holding the polls at the proper time and place.

Moberley, a poll clerk, was fined for writing the word 'voted' after the names of parties in the poll book, his fine being $100, while that of each deputy was $200.

The Tories are naturally disappointed and sore over the decision of the full court, and I am informed that Moore, editor of their paper, the 'West,' and McDonald, their organizer, are going to Prince Albert the beginning of the next week.

I am also informed on the best authority that the Tories say that any or all of the fellows who are away, will be arrested immediately on their return, which quite bears out what I have understood all along they were threatening to do.

I, therefore, cannot hold out any hope for your early return; things will settle down after a while, when the by-election is over and after the end of next session of the House. I shall be pleased to give you any further information, if possible to obtain it, and you so desire.

Yours very truly,
H. E. PERRY.

So that by the letter of Mr. Perry himself he stands convicted of aiding and abetting the escape of criminals from justice. And yet the minister appears to treat him as quite a fit and proper representative of the Liberal party in the province of Manitoba, and apparently he sees no harm in consulting him as a representative Liberal. Well, if ministers of the Crown consider such men fit representatives of the great Liberal party, we are content that they should do so. The Minister of Agriculture went on to say that he had numerous recommendations, many of which were from Mr. Perry for appointments to the census, but he refused to say upon whose recommendations he acted with

regard to the different cases. All the evidence, however, points to the fact that in a number of cases he acted on Perry's recommendation. At any rate the confidential circular issued by Mr. Perry, and which was read by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), shows that whether the appointments were made on the recommendation of Mr. Perry or not, it was he who was entrusted with the duty of notifying the successful candidates of their selection by the government.

Mr. FISHER. The enumerators were all notified by the Department. No one else had any authority to notify them.

Mr. LAKE. Apparently this Liberal organizer considered that he had the authority.

Mr. FISHER. He had none.

Mr. LAKE. Allow me to read the letter which he wrote, which will show that he acted as if the appointments came from him and from him only. This circular letter, which I am about to read, is headed:

Liberal Executive Organization Committee,
Winnipeg, April 17, 1911.

Dear Sir,—Re census in federal constituency of McDonald. I beg to advise you that you have been recommended as enumerator for the following official census enumeration division of the above constituency:—

Then follows a typewritten slip with these words:—

64. That part of the parish of St. Charles, north of the Assiniboine river.

Mr. Perry goes on to say:

I inclose copy of rates as officially announced in the 'Canada Gazette' of April 15, 1911, and would be pleased if within ten days you would please acknowledge reception of this letter.

Yours in the good cause,
H. E. PERRY.

P.S.—Whenever you are in the city, we shall be pleased to have you call.

Does the minister repudiate that letter?

Mr. FISHER. I say that Mr. Perry had no authority to give any intimation to the enumerators of their appointments. I had nothing to do with that letter and knew nothing about it.

Mr. LAKE. It is very strange this Liberal organizer should have known the persons who were recommended.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman must accept my statement that Mr. Perry had no authority.

Mr. LAKE. I am not disputing the statement and I take it that the minister repudiates this letter. This is a circular letter with the blanks filled in in another handwriting and with a slip attached in another kind of typewriting, which indicates that a number of different letters were written to a number of different individuals, and a rubber stamp is used for the signature. One cannot doubt therefore that Mr. Perry was cognizant of all those who were recommended for these appointments. Whether he was so informed by the minister or not is another question; but that he was absolutely personally cognizant of all these recommendations this letter fully establishes. It was the first notice that each person appointed had of his appointment.

Mr. BARKER. The minister should explain.

Mr. LAKE. Then the person recommended is asked to acknowledge within ten days the receipt of the letter notifying him of his appointment. Why was he asked to do so if Mr. Perry was not in some way connected with the official recommendation? The minister repudiated the idea that the enumerators were to go to the Liberal organizer for instructions. He may say that they were not to go to the Liberal organizer for instructions with regard to their work as enumerators, but the postcript attached to the letter shows clearly that they were to go to the Liberal organizer for instructions as to the side work and the canvassing they were to do in the interests of the Liberal party. I have no wish to detain the House any longer. Mr. Moberly was appointed on the recommendation of some one. On whose recommendation the minister cannot remember. Probably it was on the recommendation of Perry himself. The minister made the appointment and then subsequently had to put the public to considerable expense in order to send for this man and get him back from the wilds of the far north. Mr. Moberly had been convicted and fined and the time had come for the Department or the Liberal executive to reward him, and they apparently recommended him for this appointment in the census. This man, Perry, is convicted, according to his own letters, of endeavouring to keep fugitives from justice out of the reach of the strong arm of the law. Does the minister consider that such a person is a proper man from whom to accept any recommendations? Is he prepared to say that he did accept the recommendations of Mr. Perry for appointments as census eumerators? I pause for a reply.

Mr. FISHER. I am not ready to say that I have not accepted any of his recommendations.

Mr. LAKE. Then I hope the minister will now take steps to see that the persons

who were recommended by this man are promptly cancelled. It seems to me that these recommendations were improperly made, and I sincerely hope that this House will not endorse the action of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. G. H. BRADBURY (Selkirk). I do not intend to take up much time, but as this is a question which affects the whole province of Manitoba, I consider it my duty to give my views with regard to it. It is a question that deserves most serious consideration. Charges have been made against a gentleman ocupying the prominent position of Liberal organizer for the province of Manitoba. This gentleman is practically repudiated by the Minister of Agriculture, yet he assumes power and authority to write the letter that has been read by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle. (Mr. Lake) addressed to the enumerators throughout the province advising them of their appointment and asking them to call at his office for instructions, and I hold that this calls for some action by the minister who is responsible for the census. The minister says this man has no authority; he repudiates him, as I understand it. I ask him what action he is going to take. Is he going to remain silent in the face of this circular letter sent out by the Liberal organizer in Manitoba to the enumerators, asking them to call at this man's office. In view of the record of the Liberal organizers in Manitoba, and the experience of the Conservative party with these men, it becomes imperative for the Conservative members of this House to discuss this matter with the minister who is responsible, for the conduct of these men. I cannot conceive that any crime could be committed by any man occupying the position this man occupies greater than the crime which has been brought home to him in relation to this Prince Albert election. It is one of the most scandalous affairs that ever took place in Canada. These men manufactured three polls where there was not one soul living. According to the history of this case over 160 ballots were made up in a little bluff. These men sat down and deliberately manufactured a list. Yet this Mr. Perry, the Liberal organizer, is the man who shielded these men from justice, and when they were fugitives from the country, this man remained at home advising them that it was dangerous for them to return, that the Tories were threatening to prosecute. This is the man who organiezs the province of Manitoba for the Liberal party. History repeats itself in regard to these organizers. We have had other cases about as bad in that province. But we thought the Liberal party had been taught a lesson and that they would hesitate before they would again employ a man with a record as spicy as that of this man Mr. Perry. There is no question that this gentleman, in that Prince Albert election case, stood between these men and justice, that he shielded them, and that he was a party to the crimes they committed in relation to these ballot boxes. I do not suppose for a minute that the minister knew who this man was when he accepted his recommendation to appoint enumerators, but now that he does know, I ask him, is he going to confirm his appointment?

Mr. FISHER. I certainly will not change appointments until I find that the appointees are not worthy of their offices.

Mr. BRADBURY. I would ask the minister this question: What is he going to do in regard to this circular letter which this gentleman sent out?

Mr. FISHER. Nothing whatever. The gentleman has a right to write a letter, just as the hon. gentleman himself (Mr. Bradbury) has.

Mr. BRADBURY. I take a very different view of this question. The minister (Mr. Fisher) is responsible to this country for the proper taking of the census.

Mr. FISHER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BRADBURY. He is bound to safeguard the men who take that census. Put aside the fact that this man is a Liberal organizer. It might be any other man who would write a letter of that kind addressed to the enumerators, asking them to come in for instructions——

Mr. FISHER. May I see that letter?

Mr. BRADBURY. Certainly. I will read it to the House, and send it over to the 'Hansard.'

Mr. FISHER. It has just been read by the hon. member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Lake).

Mr. BRADBURY. It is so good I want to impress it upon the minister.

MANITOBA LIBERAL EXECUTIVE.

Confidential circular.

Organizer's Office, P.O. Drawer 2076,
Winnipeg, Canada, April 17, 1911.

Jno. Colnin,
Dickens' P.O.

Dear Sir,—Re census in federal constituency of Macdonald. I beg to advise you that you have been recommended as enumerator for the following official census enumeration division of the above constituency:—

No. 54. That part of the parish of St. Charles, north of the Assiniboine river.

Mr. FISHER. I understood the hon. member for Qu'Appelle to say that this gentleman was telling these people that they were 'nominated.' The letter as read by the hon. member for Selkirk (Mr.

Bradbury) is that they had been recommended.'

Mr. BRADBURY. I think the letter was read very clearly:

—of the above constituency No. 54, that part of the parish of St. Charles, north of the Assiniboine river.

The minister has repudiated this man, but I would ask him: How is this man in a position to give these minute facts in regard to what each enumerator was recommended for? It was not from the minister——

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BRADBURY— it must have been from some of his officials. This was not manufactured.

I inclose copy of rates as officially announced in the 'Canada Gazette' of April 15, 1911, and would be pleased if within ten (10) days of date hereof, you would acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours in the good cause,
H. E. PERRY.

(Whenever you are in the city, we shall be pleased to have you call.)

Mr. FISHER. May I interrupt my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury)? I understood him to say a few minutes ago that Mr. Perry had asked these men to come in for instructions. There is absolutely nothing in the letter to indicate that.

Mr. BRADBURY. I do not know why Mr. Perry should invite these enumerators into his office if it was not for consideration, consultation or instructions.

Mr. FISHER. That is gratuitous assumption on the hon. member's part. There is no foundation for it.

Mr. BRADBURY. We need not split hairs as to why he was asking them to call. But it is the duty of the minister to see to it that the public are safeguarded from a man like this taking upon himself the authority to write such letters to enumerators appointed to take the census of this country. If this man was not authorized, where did he get his knowledge of the number of the district which each man was to take charge of? Why, Mr. Speaker, it is as plain to me as anything can be that this organizer was given this information and was given an opportunity of picking these men—perhaps not by the minister; I have to accept his statement across the floor of the House—but certainly by some one in authority. I do not object to this man being chosen to take charge of the census of Manitoba because he is a Liberal organizer. In my own country, the man who is chosen to look after the taking of the census is the Liberal organizer of the county, Ira Stratton. Hs is more than that; he has a position that keeps him on the road all the time; he is secretary of the post office association. He boasts openly that he has the patronage of the county. Man after man has been appointed, to my knowledge, on his recommendation, and, more than that, he is the probable Liberal candidate in the next election.

An hon. MEMBER. He must be a good man.

Mr. BRADBURY. No doubt as good a man or a better man than our friend Perry, although I do not think he is so well qualified for the position he occupies as Liberal organizer as Mr. Perry is. I believe it is the duty of the minister to repudiate this Liberal organizer Perry and to warn the public that this man has no authority to write these letters broadcast asking these men to call at his office and get instructions. The letter bears on its face evidence that he is acting on authority from some source, and the minister, who alone is responsible to this House for the action of his department, must take the responsibility and repudiate this man unless he is acting with authority.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). I have never seen a minister so hard put for words, especially a verbose gentleman like the Minister of Agriculture who always has words to defend a question such as has been brought up by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples). This is one of the most indefensible things brought to the attention of the House this session. It has been shown that a certain man in the employ of the Liberal party in the west has been officially taking part in the appointment of census enumerators. I have in my hand a letter from the executive office of the Liberal organizer of Manitoba signed by the organizer and marked 'confidential circular' showing that this is not the only one that was sent out, that perhaps hundreds of others have been sent out to various enumerators, as I believe. It is evident that Perry has taken on himself a great part in the appointment of enumerators. It has been shown here that this man has been doing his utmost, perhaps for party reasons, to shield criminals; birds of a feather are noted for flocking together, and if he has been in the habit of shielding criminals, I have not the slightest doubt that in his choice of enumerators for this census he will not pick the cleanest men he can employ. The letters which he wrote to these fugitives from justice, if you can read between the lines, show that he kept these men while they were in the United States, fugitives from Canadian justice. The minister said that one of these men, Moberley, had been brought before the courts and found guilty of a trivial offence.

The Liberal party must be dipped in tar to call such offences as these men committed, trivial. This man was convicted of making false returns on oath, perjury of the worst kind, and the little old gentleman sits there and calls that a trivial offence against the laws of Canada.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. TALBOT. Has the hon. gentleman from Dauphin a right to call the Minister of Agriculture 'the little old gentlemen'?

Mr. SPEAKER. The words are not unparliamentary.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) can find a more appropriate term, after the speech we had from the minister, I would be glad to use it. Another offence which the minister calls trivial was the stuffing of ballot boxes. I would call that pretty near a hanging offence, but he might call it trivial because the stuffing of ballot boxes on behalf of the Liberal party has become so common that they regard it as trivial. Mr. Perry winds up his letter: Yours in the good cause. I would ask the minister what he considers the good cause in a letter from an organizer of the Liberal party to a criminal who is a fugitive from justice. May I ask an answer?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Vote.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Evidently the minister is ashamed of the cause, whether it is good or not. I am sure he is ashamed of the cause he is espousing to-night as is every Liberal on that side, because no one has risen to defend it except the minister and my friend from Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot), who made a very able defence. It was brought to your attention by the hon. member for Macdonald, Mr. Speaker, that Prince Albert, in the northwestern part of Canada, is known to have been perhaps the most crooked part of the whole of Canada in the matter of elections in the Liberal cause. It has been represented by a gentleman who is now a senator. I shall not further advert to him except to say that he has the honour of having been the sponsor for most of the gentlemen who did the kind of work which has been charged against Liberal workers out in that country. This is the part of Canada, Sir, that on one occasion was represented by the Hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Some years after the rebellion, in 1885, when the election was held, the great and only cry was: Vote for Laurier; he is the great white French leader down in eastern Canada and he is the man who said that if he had been up here when Riel was fighting he would have shouldered his musket; therefore you must vote for him, he being a good loyal French Canadian. He was elected and Mr. McKay was defeated.

An hon. MEMBER. Very fine.

An hon. MEMBER. Very good.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I do not know whether I heard my hon. friend who now represents Prince Albert say 'very fine,' but I presume that when he used those words he was referring to the methods which were employed in his deferred election. This is above all the place in Canada where corruption of all sorts has been perpetrated in the past, and I hope that in future we will not be justified in saying anything of the kind about it. If nothing of the kind can be said about it there will not be a Liberal member representing it. I hope that the good sense of this House will compel hon. members, regardless of their politics, to vote in strong support of the resolution brought forth by the hon. member for Macdonald.

Mr. W. E. KNOWLES (Moosejaw). Mr. Speaker, the motion which has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) in amendment to the motion to go into Committee of Supply is not very harmful. It is divided into two parts. The first part is such that no person would very seriously take exception to it. The second part is one, which, because of its innuendo, can scarcely be accepted by this side of the House without acknowledging that there has been that corruption which he says is not to be allowed to continue. However, the motion itself is not nearly as unfair, is not nearly as undesirable a thing to bring into this House, as some of the remarks which have been made by gentlemen who have spoken in favour of the amendment. The remarks of the hon. member for Macdonald, while generally in good nature, were such as scarcely to call for any serious reply on this side of the House. I think that if you take out his facetious references to 'beer and pickled pigs' feet,' take out his weighty arguments with regard to 'jack rabbits,' and eliminate some of the deep and ponderous remarks which, as the product of a curious mental process, poured forth from his lips, there is very little left which calls for any reply. The circular upon which he based his remarks is to my mind the most harmless communication that he could have brought here. There is nothing on the face of it, or on the back of it, which requires any defence from this side of the House. In the first place it is a confidential communication. I am not surprised at its use here. It is a circular and, in endeavouring to bring up a motion such as this I suppose these hon. gentlemen can go very far and very wide of the mark to bring forward

a document of this character, although they make use of a confidential communication signed by Mr. H. E. Perry. My first impression was to consider it a departure from good taste to read a confidential communication, but we will let that go as unimportant. They brought in one or two points that are absolutely foreign to the communication itself. The one which is most offensive which they endeavour to read between the lines is that the organizer called upon the prospective appointees to come into his office and receive instructions. Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, when they present that view of it, know full well that there is no such thought suggested by the letter. You can read that letter from beginning to end and there is no such idea in the mind of the writer as that which is suggested by these hon. gentlemen. There is a little postscript at the close of the letter which says: 'When in the city come in and see me.' Could there be a more ordinary thing to say than that? The organizer anxious to make good feeling says at the foot of his letter: 'Come in and see me.' There is not a suggestion of wrong-doing or of corruption in that little postscript. Notwithstanding the insinuation that hon. gentlemen endeavour to make with respect to the writer of that letter, I say there is nothing in it to be in the slightest ashamed of. It gives notice to certain men that they have been recommended. That letter might have been written just as well and in just as good faith by any hon. member on the other side of the House or by the Conservative organizer conveying the information to a certain man that he had been appointed to such and such a position.

Mr. STAPLES. That letter says: I beg to advise you that you have been appointed.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. STAPLES. He is the man who advises these gentlemen that they have been appointed.

Mr. KNOWLES. That is exactly what I am saying. It might be written by any one. This gentleman sits down and says: 'I beg to advise you that you have been appointed.' I have written many such letters in which I have made no recommendation whatever. I learn that a person has been appointed to an office and I write him, as I would write him with regard to anything else that might concern him, and say: 'I beg to advise you that you have been appointed.' If an hon. gentleman opposite learned in one of the departments in the city of Ottawa of the appointment of a rural postmaster would it not be the most natural thing in the world for him to sit down and write: 'I beg to advise you that you have been appointed to such and such a post office?' That would not mean that the writer had the ear of the government. My hon. friends from the west have written to more than one homesteader saying that there has been granted such and such a concession at the hands of the department. This is merely doing what we are doing every day.

Mr. BARKER. May I ask the hon. gentleman if he were writing such a letter to a man who had received an appointment to a post office, would he ask him to call at his office and be instructed in his duties?

Mr. KNOWLES. No.

Mr. FISHER. That letter does not say that; it does not contain those words.

Mr. KNOWLES. No, I would not ask him to come in and be instructed. If hon. gentlemen would stick to the letter, or bring a letter which says something about instructions, or else stop talking about instructions it would be more to the point. I would think nothing of it if the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) wrote a gentleman in Dundas advising him that a certain thing had been done in his interest, in the departments at Ottawa and saying in closing the letter: If you happen to be in the city, drop in and see me. Would we have read into that letter something greatly to the discredit of the hon. member for Hamilton; would we have said that he was a man of the most unworthy kind? No, would we not say rather that it was an innocent remark such as any man might put into a letter he was writing to a political friend, or indeed to any one else. That letter is, to my mind, the silliest kind of thing to base an argument upon. I think the argument based on that letter by the opposition, and on which they found a non-confidence motion is one of the most nonsensical I have ever heard during the six or seven sessions I have been in this House. I may have forgotten some of these non-confidence motions, there were very many so nonsensical, but I think that possibly this is the weakest case that has ever been made out by the opposition in this House from their point of view.

I wish now to deal with the Prince Albert election case, and I may say to begin with that it has as much to do with the taking of the census as the Indian mutiny has. What connection it has with the census, I cannot see, and I do not believe that any sensible man can. One Sinclair and one Moberley, and some one else, away back in 1905, a few weeks after we first became a province, went out, as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples), with his ponderous reasoning says, to watch jack-

rabits and eat pickled pigs' feet. And these men did what was wrong. The result was that two or three Liberals were coralled for having broken an election ordinance of the Northwest Territories such as it was then. They came back, they were punished. There lived in the province of Saskatchewan some of the very cleverest lawyers who are supporters of that provincial rights party; men who could have prosecuted these offenders, and if they thought they did wrong could have ensured that they were prosecuted to the hilt; men like the Hon. Frederick William Gordon Haultain, who was eight or nine years attorney general of the Northwest Territories, and who with his own pen had written the election ordinance they broke. Why didn't he, seeing that the courts of the land were open to every one, swing wide their doors and himself lay, or have some one else lay a complaint for forgery or perjury. Then there was Mr. J. T. Brown, now one of the judges of the Supreme Court of Saskatchewan who, had the provincial rights party been elected, would have been their attorney general no doubt, and there was every opportunity for Liberal and Conservative alike to prosecute these men to the hilt for just as serious a charge as it was possible to bring against them. There is no reflection on the Liberal party in connection with that matter. It is not the business of the Liberal party any more than of the Conservative party to prosecute men, even though they be party friends. But these men were prosecuted. They were fined by the magistrates who had been appointed by Mr. Haultain himself on the testimony produced before them such as it was. I merely mention that fact to show that there could be no suspicion surrounding their trial, and what the magistrate thought was a just punishment was meted out to them, and they bore it. Now, why is the Minister of Agriculture to be called upon to answer for all this? What connection is there between that and the appointing of some census commissioners in the province of Manitoba?

It is said by these gentlemen opposite that this man, Mr. Perry, some months afterwards, down in the city of Regina, wrote a few letters to these men telling them how the litigation was proceeding, and telling them that if they were to return they no doubt would be prosecuted, and stating that if they wished to avoid meeting a charge of that kind at that time, they had better not return within the jurisdiction of that court. There is nothing criminal about that. I would dare to say that any lawyer would write such a letter to his client; I would dare to say that any friend would send such a letter to another friend under similar circumstances. Even if I were not a lawyer, and not acting as solicitor, if I had a friend who wanted to know how litigation was proceeding, I would not feel that I would demean myself by giving him any information that any man in the land had to give that was present on the ground. Everybody knew these things which Mr. Perry was writing to that man, and there is absolutely no guilt resting on Mr. Perry, and there is absolutely nothing to connect him with a crime, and there is not even the slightest suspicion cast this afternoon in the remarks of gentlemen opposite that Mr. Perry knew anything about that offence before it was committed, or that he had ever dreamed of such a thing. The only charge they can make is that he knew of the threatened charge afterwards, and that he did a friendly act for those who were then away from the jurisdiction of the courts of Saskatchewan.

Let me say, however, since it has been brought into the discussion, that it was to the credit of the Saskatchewan government —and reflection has been cast upon that government this afternoon—that at the very first opportunity they gave that seat to the Conservative who had been the candidate. As soon as Dr. Tyreman knew of the grave irregularity that had been charged he endeavoured to place his resignation before the proper authorities that the seat might be vacated and go to Mr. Donaldson; but, according to our election ordinance, while the seat was under protest it was not possible until the litigation was over that he could offer his resignation, and the question was also before the Privileges and Elections Committee of the Saskatchewan house. I will admit that it was unfortunately a long time before Mr. Donaldson was able to take the seat, but I have never heard complaint or criticism on that score. At all events, the fact is that on the very first day it was possible for the government of the Hon. Walter Scott to make such a motion, they introduced a motion at the hands of the Attorney General of Saskatchewan vacating that seat, and then by special Act of the legislature of Saskatchewan Mr. Donaldson, the Conservative member, represented that constituency as the occupant of that seat for the rest of the parliament.

Mr. CAMPBELL. How many years did it take to find out that Mr. Donaldson was elected?

Mr. KNOWLES. I think two years.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Yes, a little over two years.

Mr. KNOWLES. I said there was an unfortunately long delay, but I have never yet heard the criticism offered that that delay was avoidable. I know it was done just as fast as the procedure of the legislative assembly and the litigation in the courts

would allow of its being done. At anyrate, as soon as it was possible to do so they did it.

Let me say, in conclusion, that probably the last man in this government that should have reflections cast upon him for his conduct in the discharge of his duty and in the administration of his department, is the Minister of Agriculture. I was pretty well pleased with the Minister of Agriculture when he stood up and said in effect, though not in words: that it was practically his own business where he got his recommendations from, that he declined to tell whence they came, and that he took responsibility for all his acts. I am pleased with that declaration of the Minister of Agriculture, and I trust that our friends opposite will read between the lines and, seeing that they are so keen on reading 'instructions,' see that there is a little instruction meant for them in that. And, I think that what the Minister of Agriculture meant is: that the Liberals are governing this country, that they make the appointments to office, that they get their recommendations where in their wisdom they think right. The ministers no doubt use their own judgment, and they seek the counsel of their friends, and if they wish it sometimes of their foes, but when it comes to the last resort I think what the Minister of Agriculture meant was that the sixty, seventy or eighty hon. gentlemen opposite should understand that for the present at least the Laurier government is governing this country and making the appointments to office. And this idea of gentlemen opposite, that because for a few days they may hold us up and waste our time and defer the business of the House, that, therefore, they are governing the country, is absolutely an illusion on their part. They are governing the country only as a man somehow can interfere with the lines of communication a little here and a little there, but when it comes to the long run they will find that just as for the last fifteen years so for many years to come the hand of Sir Wilfrid Laurier will hold the reins, and that the chariot of good government will be driven by him, and this country continue to prosper under his guidance.

Now, suppose that Mr. Perry did make some unfortunate recommendations; suppose he did recommend some unfit men, and suppose his recommendations were accepted —although we have not learned that he had any patronage; in fact, we learn that he had not and that he has no connection with the government directly or indirectly; suppose that he did make recommendations, why even a Conservative organizer can make recommendations if he wishes, but that is another matter—well, suppose he did make recommendations, and suppose the minister appointed his nominees, these men would go among the people, the people would know them and it is the people in the long run who will judge of what this government does. It is the people of Canada who, in every election since 1896, have judged what this government has done. We have heard a lot about the polling booths this afternoon, but in 1896, in 1900, in 1904, in 1908, despite the slanders that were uttered, the Liberal party went into these same polling booths in every constituency from the Atlantic to the Pacific and the people, time after time by overwhelming majorities, declared to Sir Wilfrid Laurier: Come back and govern the country again; we want to be governed by the Liberals and not by the Conservatives. And, Sir, we on this side of the House are not afraid that the Minister of Agriculture by this or any other act of his in the administration of his department will lose the confidence of the people of Canada or will do anything other than what he has always done, and that is to conduct his department with great credit to himself and to those who support him, and with enormous benefit to the welfare and prosperity of this country. We are not afraid of the impression our census enumerators will make in the country, nor have we any doubt that the Minister of Agriculture, in this or in any other act of administration will, as he has always done, conduct it so that those who support him will be prouder of him than ever. Hon. gentlemen opposite talk of the recommending system. Let me tell them that it will be a long day before they will serve any practical trouble with the recommending system, for it will, I believe, be many a long year before it comes their turn to do any recommending to offices. I am not surprised at our hon. friends from Manitoba being desirous of prolonging this debate as long as they can, for, without referring to the occupant of any particular seat, I think they have come to realize that their voters are not altogether pleased with the manner in which they have represented them during the larger part of this session; and so hon. gentlemen desire to bring up some other issue, something that they are not afraid to talk about among their constituents. It is more than pleasing to find supporters of the good old Conservative party in Manitoba shedding tears over the guilt of this government —men who support and follow a government, starting from the man who builds railways into sand pits that he owns——

Mr. CAMPBELL. Order, Mr. Speaker. I rise to a point of order. No hon. member of this House has any right to throw out any insinuations against the premier of my province.

Mr. KNOWLES. Mr Speaker, since it is so offensive to the hon. gentleman, I have no desire to hurt his feelings. He is always so careful of the feelings of others

that I shall not go further in speaking of the Conservative party of Manitoba, but will just say to hon. members of this House who are not familiar with the west that they are pretty much of a kind from the top to the bottom.

Mr. W. J. ROCHE (Marquette). Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat can regard the remarks which he has just addressed to the House as a defence against the accusations made against the Minister of Agriculture and against Mr. Perry in this House this afternoon and to-night, then he is very easily satisfied, and we on this side of the House have no complaint to make. The hon. gentleman, at the outset of his remarks, complained of an hon. gentleman on this side having read a confidential circular or letter that was issued by Mr. Perry to a private individual in the constituency of Regina ; and yet the hon. gentleman sits behind a government that has been guilty of publishing correspondence of a private character sent by private individuals all over the country to the Postmaster General prior to the coming into power of this Laurier government, of which we have heard so much from the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) to-night—publishing that private correspondence in a blue-book, and sending it broadcast throughout the Dominion. I have not heard the hon. gentleman condemn any action of that kind on the part of a minister of the Crown. I think the taking of the census is a matter that should be absolutely free from any taint or suspicion of party politics. By that I do not claim that the political proclivities of the census enumerators should be completely ignored, because I recognize that in this country we have party government, and in such appointments the party in power will always give the preference to their own political friends. With that I have no fault to find. But when the government ignore the character of the appointees, and when they select Liberal organizers who bear unsavoury reputations and appoint them, not only for their qualifications, but as a reward for party services of a most questionable character as has occurred in this instance, and in many instances in the past in the province of Manitoba, it is a different matter. As the hon. member for Selkirk has truly said, it is most unfortunate that the Liberal organizers in the province of Manitoba for years back have been men who have been guilty of questionable transactions which have resulted in bringing into disrepute not only themselves but the party they represent. It is only necessary to refer to the gentleman who preceded Mr. Perry as the Liberal organizer, Mr. R. E. Leach, the author of 'the thin red line,' by which he disfranchised a larger number of electors, and who was rewarded afterwards with an office in the Department of the Interior carrying $2,000 a year and expenses, and whose expenses have been so outrageous that the Auditor General has taken him strictly to task for them in his report of this year. It is also worthy of notice that nearly every person who worked with Mr. Leach at that time, and assisted him in disfranchising the electors, has also received a position under this government. It is only necessary to refer to Messrs. Macleod, Neigh, Ayotte and Duggan. It seems strange that men who are guilty of acts of the most questionable character on behalf of the party are able to hold up the government and secure almost any position they ask. Now, the hon. Minister of Agriculture was not quite so frank with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), as he should have been on Friday when answering his questions. In that somewhat important air which he sometimes arrogates to himself, he replied to some of the questions in the most emphatic manner. For instance, when he was asked if certain enumerators were appointed, he honestly and frankly stated that they were. When he was asked, however, who recommended them, he declined to answer, though to-day he is not nearly so reluctant to answer the question, for he did admit that Mr. Perry, the Liberal organizer, nominated some of the enumerators. To the third question, did Mr. Perry ask the enumerators to come into his office to be schooled, he most emphatically replied, no. We can all read between the lines and can realize that when Mr. Perry wrote that letter inviting the enumerators to come into his office and be schooled, he did not mean in order to count the heads for census purposes, but to school them to count political heads in order that this information might be utilized by the Liberal party in the province. This information would come in very well at this particular time, because in the province of Manitoba they are just now in the act of revising the voters' lists, in connection with which the information that could be secured by these census enumerators by turning them into party hacks would be of a most useful character. The information would also be most useful to this government when the redistribution takes place a few months hence, and in the election that is expected to take place in the near future. I have no doubt this was the schooling that Mr. Perry referred to when he extended his invitation to these enumerators to come into his office. It has been said, oh, he merely stated in this letter: 'I have the honour to advise you that you have been recommended.' I would ask the Minister of Agriculture whether this gentleman to whom

this letter was addressed was not appointed census enumerator.

Mr. FISHER. I really do not know. I do not know to whom the letter was addressed.

Mr. ROCHE. It was addressed to John Colnin, Dickens post office. The minister cannot tell us whether he was appointed enumerator or not, but evidently Mr. Perry was quite sure, or he would not have delimitated the area in which he was to work or sent him the rates, or asked for an answer within 10 days, or invited him to his office in Winnipeg on the first occasion he visited that city. There can be no doubt that this gentleman was not only recommended but appointed to the position of census enumerator.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the date of this letter?

Mr. ROCHE. April the 17th of this year. The hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) has asked what connection had the Prince Albert election to do with the selection of enumerators for Manitoba. Well, if the Prince Albert election has no direct connection with the selection of enumerators for Manitoba, it has a very direct connection with the gentleman through whose hands aparently these enumerators are being appointed, I refer to Mr. Perry. According to the correspondence read tonight, this man Perry stood in a very unenviable light indeed in connection with the shielding these fugitives from justice, who had to flee from the country because of their doings in the Prince Albert election when working the Liberal machine. That was one of the most disgraceful episodes in the political history of this country. Fancy these deputy returning officers and poll clerks being sent away out north to hold polls hundreds of miles from Prince Albert. They did not go within a hundred miles of the places where they were to hold the polls, but they sat down on the prairie, took out their poll books and poll boxes, and wrote in the poll books the names of 150 fictitious individuals—among them, as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has said the Rabbit family predominated—and they stuffed the ballot boxes with 150 ballots, every one of which was marked in favour of the Liberal candidate. And they came back to Prince Albert with their boxes and their poll books and hailed the result as a great victory in the far north for the Liberal candidate, morally and otherwise. They made out their false returns. Forgery and perjury are none too strong names to characterize their actions. When arrested and brought before the court, who was it appeared to prosecute them and who appeared in their behalf? Instead of the Dominion government prosecutor appearing before the court to see that justice was done, he appeared in their defence. They pleaded guilty and were fined. The deputy returning officers were fined $200 each and the poll clerks $100 each for having stuffed the ballot boxes and made false returns. The fines were paid by a clerk in the Crown prosecutors office. Where did the money come from? I think we need not stretch our imagination very much to say that it could have come from no other source than the Liberal campaign fund. But when recount of the ballots took place, after these men had been fined and after it was proven that 150 ballots were fictitious, the judge holding the recount, counted every one of these as legitimate. That may have been technically within the law, but there is not a man within the sound of my voice, be he Liberal or Conservative who will not say it was travesty of justice.

After the trial some of these deputy returning officers made themselves scarce. They fled south of the boundary line, and then this correspondence took place between Perry and these fugitives from justice, which the hon. member for Moose jaw (Mr. Knowles) looks upon as so innocent that he, as a lawyer, would do it for any of his clients. Well, I do not think the hon. gentleman will find his ethics endorsed by other practitioners at the bar; but in any event Mr. Perry was not acting as a lawyer for these men, but as the head of the Liberal machine in that province, as the Liberal organizer, and he was accessory to those offences, after if not before, because he was doing his best to keep these men out of the country lest there should be still greater rascalities unearthed if they remained or reappeared on the scene.

I do not propose to go through all this correspondence, but wish to refer to a few paragraphs in this correspondence which the hon. member for Moosejaw tells us was of such an innocent character. In the letter of June 10, I find these paragraphs:

> Tories threatening further prosecution.
> I have heard it said that the missing deputies would be as well to keep out of sight, I think this is undoubtedly correct.

This is the gentleman against whom the hon. member for Moosejaw says there has not been found anything wrong by reason of anything that transpired in that election or subsequently. The following day Perry wrote again:

> Tories are talking of other prosecutions and are, of course, pleased at the results so far.
> Prudence would, I should judge, suggest to the absent deputies that their safety lies in remaining away.

This is taken from correspondence between Perry and Neilson, and Perry was

not then writing as a lawyer to a client, but as the Liberal organizer advising these people to stay away until the trouble had blown over, as they would be subject to more prosecutions, should they reappear on the scene.

Let me quote one more paragraph out of a letter written by Perry on October, the 4th, to Neilson, who acted as deputy returning officer:

The 'Standard' here last night published a story that if the case went against Sinclair, he was going to squeal.

Squeal about what? Squeal on whom? Evidently there was something which had not yet been brought to light and which Perry was afraid might come out if further prosecutions took place. But he expresses his confidence in the returning officer Sinclair by saying:

But I do not believe that, as he would never do anything to help the Tories, he is too sore on them. Kindly consider this as absolutely confidential and done in your interests.

This came from Perry who evidently had the ear of the Department of Agriculture, if not the minister, and who assumed the responsibility of sending out a circular under the seal of confidence to his appointee notifying him of his appointment and inviting him to his office on the first opportunity. In a letter written on October 20th, 1906, Perry goes on to say to Neilson:

I am also informed on the best authority that the Tories say that any or all of the fellows who are away will be arrested immediately on their return, which quite bears out what I have understood all along they were intending to do.

I, therefore, cannot hold out any hope for your early return. Things will settle down after awhile when the by-election is over, and after the end of next session of the House. I shall be pleased to give you any further information if possible to obtain it and you so desire.

All through this correspondence, Perry as Liberal organizer, is trying to keep these men, who perpetrated these frauds on the electors, out of the country lest further exposures might result, should they return to the disadvantage of the Liberal party.

In connection with that election, I remember a memorable saying of the Prime Minister of that province (Mr. Scott). When the returns were coming in that evening from the thickly settled portions of the province and they were going against the government, Mr. Scott, in addressing his audience, said: 'Wait until you hear from the back townships.' Evidently he knew what these returns from the back townships would be and was not ignorant of what was transpiring in that portion of the country.

It is only necessary to look at the signature to the circular to show what connection there was between this government and the Liberal organizer. The Minister of Agriculture asks us to believe that any person might send out such a circular as that. Well, I wonder if a Conservative organizer sent out a letter like that, what the minister would have done. I fancy he would very soon have called him down. He would soon take him to task for arrogating to himself the authority to notify the enumerators as to their pay, as to the positions to which they were appointed, as to the territory they were supposed to cover, and practically to extend to them an invitation to come in and be schooled in his office. And when he winds up his letter 'Yours in the good cause' he emphasizes the fact that it was not for the census alone that he was writing, but rather that he might use them as political partisans—to count heads for the party as well as for the census. I think the minister (Mr. Fisher) should accept the motion of the hon. member for Macdonald. The minister says that for fifteen years past they have recognized that public office is a public trust. They have taken a very peculiar way to exhibit that to the country, if we may judge them by the appointments they have made. Leach, Mr. Perry, Ayotte, Neigh, McLeod, Duggan—all these men who figured in these scandalous transactions of the past have been provided for by one member of the government or another. Ingram, the organizer who tampered with the lists on election day, and who was also Liberal organizer for a time—I do not think he is now; I believe that Mr. Perry is the organizer—has also been provided for. I say the minister takes a peculiar way of showing his belief that public office is a public trust when he refuses to receive the motion put forward by the member for Macdonald. I think that one of his first duties in view of what has been brought to his attention to-day is to call Mr. Perry down in short order and show that he is really in earnest in saying that Mr. Perry has done this without authority. Mr. Perry should be notified to that effect, and that duty devolves upon the Minister of Agriculture, because he is the one whom this parliament will hold responsible.

Mr. FISHER. Does the hon. member know anything against this enumerator or against any of the others appointed?

Mr. ROCHE. I am not talking about the enumerators, but——

Mr. FISHER. The enumerator is the only official I have in this discussion.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I desire to call attention to the fact that the people of the

west are not the only ones who have resting upon them the burden of such men as Mr. Perry. In western Ontario we have a gentleman by the name of George M. Reid, and the minister may possibly tell us what connection he has with the western district in reference to the census taking. I see it stated that:

J. C. Macpherson, special census commissioner, is in London, and will be here for the next five days, instructing the census commissioners who have been appointed to supervise the census taking in this western peninsula. To-day, Mr. Macpherson met the commissioners from Lambton, Essex and Kent county.

I find in another column of the same paper the following:

Liberal club to approve the list.
Commissioner Scatcherd presents his census appointments for revision.
Says he gave the list to George M. Reid.
Majority of forty appointments find they have not the qualifications.

Mr. Scatcherd selected the brightest and best men according to his judgment, but he had to present their names to a committee in the city of London, the head of which was Mr. George M. Reid, whom surely the minister remembers in connection with the election frauds of years gone by, and how he was brought before the courts in Toronto. Yet he is still seen strongly in evidence in the western districts of Ontario in handling the affairs of the Census Department, a department, I am sure the minister must agree with me in saying, that can best be dealt with by taking it out of politics altogether. But let me read something that this paper has to say in reference to this matter:

Many young men of this city who made application for a position as census enumerators will be disappointed. Most of them will not secure the appointment.
E. W. Scatcherd, who is to have charge of the taking of the census, received something like 105 applications, and practically appointed the forty men required to do the work.
A committee of three of the Liberal politicians of the city was appointed to go over the appointments and ratify them.

I would like to ask the minister who are the three men in London, who are appointed to carefully pick out of the group nominated by Mr. Scatcherd men to be enumerators for that district.

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The minister is not aware. But it appears that three men with George M. Reid as their leader are appointed to take charge of choosing the men who are to take the census in the city of London. This committee went to work, and of their work the newspaper says:

The result is that but few of the names originally chosen are on the revised list. The majority of them got the axe and others were appointed in their places.

And on the same page of this newspaper appears a picture of George M. Reid and over it are the words 'Did he wield the axe?' And underneath is this explanation:

Geo. M. Reid, to whom Commissioner Scatcherd states he gave the list of enumerators, most of whom were cast aside, it is alleged because of failure to qualify politically. Commissioner Reid would say nothing about 'the committee of three.'

We find also that this newspaper asks some questions in reference to Mr. Reid.

The names of the committee who made the final appointments are not known, but it is said that Geo. M. Reid was the chairman of the committee.
E. W. Scatcherd stated to the 'Free Press' Saturday that he did not know the names of the committee who made the appointment. He turned his applications over to Mr. G. M. Reid.

Mr. Scatcherd closes by making this statement:

Mr. Scatcherd says he will allot the districts again with the new men, although he had the majority of them already allotted, with the expectation that the committee would put the 'OK' on his choice. He says he saw most of the applicants and chose the ones whom he thought would be most reliable and do the best, and at the same time quick work.

I merely rise to ask the minister if he thinks that a man with the reputation of Mr. Reid in that western part of the province is the proper man to gather the enumerators from the different counties around London, and those to be appointed in the city of London, and if he has charge of the enumerators in that city, and can conduct affairs as far as the census is concerned.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Reid has no control over the enumerators at all. The newspaper stories that the hon. gentleman has read may be true or may not be true; I know nothing about them.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why don't you find out?

Mr. FISHER. I don't care about it.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I do not understand the minister saying: 'It may be true or it may not be true.' It is plainly evident that Mr. Scatcherd was appointed to select the men according to his judgment, and he was compelled to turn over to George M. Reid the names of those whom he had chosen; and the minister must know that Mr. Reid is not a fit man to take charge of taking the census in that district. I was sorry to hear the minister

trying to make the House believe that he did not know what was going on about the Prince Albert election at all. No man knows better about these things than he does. He has had it drummed into him across the floor of this House as to how these frauds are carried on. I was surprised that he should try to lead the House to believe that he had heard nothing of it, and also try to belittle the member from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) for bringing forward a matter of national importance to the people of Canada. I sincerely hope the minister will see his way clear to support this resolution and thus help us to make sure that the men connected with the Census Department are free from political bias.

Mr. MONK. I have not followed this debate closely, nor am I familiar with the facts brought forward during this discussion, but I would avail myself of this opportunity to get from the government a clear declaration in regard to the opinion enunciated by my hon. friend from Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) who stated here that the government would not tell us the basis or the recommendation on which these enumerators were appointed in different constituencies. I think we are entitled to know whether that is the policy of the government, and whether they intend to act upon that principle. My hon. friend stated here: We are governing the country, we are in possession of power, we will satisfy ourselves as to the nomination of these enumerators, and you shall not know upon what basis they are appointed. Is that the principle upon which the government will act in the eastern as well as in the western portions of Canada? The Minister of Agriculture said the other day, in answer to an inquiry, that he was satisfied as to the qualification of an enumerator, and that he would not state who had recommended that man. Is that going to be the policy? If so, I think in the face of the declaration made here to-night by the member for Moosejaw, that we are entitled to a statement from the minister on behalf of the government.

What are the facts? Is it my hon. friend who pays for the cost of the census, or is it the people of Canada? Everybody knows that the minister in charge of the department does not himself know of the persons qualified to act in each electoral district. My hon. friend knows that, and will admit it. He is, therefore, obliged to seek outside information and, as a matter of fact, we all know that under the detestable and damnable system of patronage which prevails in this country the appointment is made upon the recommendation of whom? Of a political partisan, of a friend who makes the recommendation, somebody generally in the electoral division who has some personal purpose to serve. That, I suppose, is inevitable. But are we going to be told that the House of Commons, in its general inquisitorial power, will be refused information as to the reasons which guided the minister in making the appointment, that we will not be told upon whose recommendation he assumes responsibility for that appointment? Such a proposition is preposterous, and in the face of the declaration made to-night by the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) and applauded by the minister in his quiet little way, by slapping his desk, we are entitled to know whether that is the principle which is to guide the government. Was that the principle that governed in Quebec where some appointments have been approved of, and some are found very unwise? What was the motive, what was the recommendation that guided executive action? We are told that when governments get old they get faulty; I have read that in many places, and it has been said that among other things they profess that they are the masters, that they are the possessors of power, not the trustees of the people. We could have no better evidence of that than this refusal. I still believe that the government will not lay down the principle that we are not entitled to that information, but I would like to know the principle that is going to guide the government.

Mr. BARKER. One or two names have been mentioned here to-night in connection with the forthcoming census that I think call for a word or two from me, because I know some of the gentlemen who have been named. I know the career of Mr. Reid in the past as a politican. As the Minister of Agriculture knows, Mr. Reid was directly connected with the notorious Elgin frauds. His name was a household word, with that of O'Gorman, in connection with these frauds. He was later connected with O'Gorman, in the no less notorious London election frauds, which led to the resignation of a colleague of the minister. If the hon. gentleman thinks he can put his head into the sand and escape observation, escape opprobrium and contempt, by professing not to know who these men are, I tell him he is mistaken. The people of Canada know the history of those notorious cases, and they know that the minister is aware of every fact and detail, and yet the men who have been mentioned here are allowed to take part in making appointments upon the taking of the census.

Mr. CROTHERS. The taking of our census is not a mere formal or frivolous matter; it is a very important matter. The statistics gathered by these enumerators

will determine the representation in this House, and guide us in many other very important matters during the next decade, and it must appear to every member of this House that it is of the utmost importance that these statistics should be gathered in such a manner, and by such persons, as to command the utmost confidence of every man in Canada. I quite agree with the observations of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) when he finds fault with the position taken by the Minister of Agriculture. That hon. minister tells us: I do not pretend to know the enumerators whom I have appointed. If he were in a position to give his word that he knew every one of them, and knew every one to be sufficiently intelligent, and to be men of character, perhaps we would be satisfied with his word; but he does not tell us that. He tells us he does not know one of these enumerators whom he has appointed, and in the face of that he refuses to tell us upon whose recommendation he appoints these men. These men are to do important work for the whole people of Canada. They are to be paid out of funds which are the moneys of the people of Canada, and the people's representatives in this House, I submit, have a right to know upon whose recommendation he appoints them. He has admitted to us this afternoon, if I understood him aright, that he has appointed several men to the important position of enumerators, on recommendations made by this man Perry, and every moderate man will admit at once upon the evidence adduced on this motion that Perry is not a proper man, not a man of sufficient character to warrant the Minister of Agriculture in accepting his recommendation for the appointment of any enumerator. I could understand very well the Minister of Agriculture saying: Heretofore I supposed that Mr. Perry was a man of unblemished character.

I am satisfied upon the evidence I have heard here to-night that he is not; I will make further inquiry to ascertain the standing and character of the men I have appointed upon his recommendation before I permit them to go to work. Would not that be a reasonable position for the Minister of Agriculture to take, if, as he tells us, up to this moment, he never knew anything against the character of Mr. Perry? This is not the only case in which the taking of the census is being used for party purposes. This seems to be not the only case in which men are appointed enumerators upon the recommendation of worthless characters like Perry. It must appeal to all as it appeals to me, that the enumerators shall be men of character, men of intelligence, men whose work will be accepted freely by the people of this country as having been honestly and intelligently done. If such men are not employed the census will be utterly useless. The census will be a valuable thing if taken on a scientific basis by competent men, but if it is taken, as appears from this case and the London case, by party heelers as a reward for party services, then the government need not be disappointed if they find that the people have no confidence whatever in the results of the work of the enumerators. One or two of my friends have referred to this man Reid, and I should like also to refer to him for a moment also. It seems that Mr. E. W. Scatcherd has been appointed commissioner by this government for the city of London, and as I understand it was the duty of the commissioner to select the enumerators. I could understand the Minister of Agriculture selecting as a commissioner a man of reputation and character, whom he could trust to select competent and intelligent enumerators to work under him. What do we find this man Scatcherd doing? If the articles in the newspapers are correct, we find Scatcherd actually stating to the London 'Evening Free Press' that he handed over the names of all these one hundred and five applicants to G. M. Reid for him to determine who, if any, of those 105 men should be appointed to act as enumerators for the city of London. Could a greater outrage be perpetrated upon the people of London and the people of this country? Who is George M. Reid? The Minister of Agriculture said a few minutes ago that he would not recognize any charges made in newspapers or letters, even when facsimiles of the originals are produced. He wanted something proved in court. Well, this man, George M. Reid, has been in court. We all remember that very shortly after the passing of Bills establishing the new provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, we had a bye-election in the city of London, and the result of that election was a majority in favour of the government. We had it proclaimed from one end of this country to the other that this was a test of public opinion as to the Bills which had been carried by this House establishing these two provinces. What followed that? It was established in the police court of Toronto, not in the newspapers, that in one corner, one subdivision, of the city of London, because there was only one man who squealed who handled the money, 100 men had been bought at the price of $10 apiece, less a rake-off of fifty cents that was taken by the man who made the payments. That is how that bye-election was carried, that is how that large majority was obtained in favour of the Bills establishing the new provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. What followed that? Four men were arrested and indicted for conspiracy. One of the four was George M. Reid. These four

men were tried before His Honour Judge Winchester, the senior judge for the county of York, and convicted of conspiracy; yet George M. Reid is the man to whom the commissioner appointed by the Minister of Agriculture hands over the names to make the selection of those who are to make the enumeration. Of course, I do not state it as a fact that the commissioner handed these names over; I am saying that that is what is stated by this newspaper. I do not want to be misunderstood as to that. What confidence can the people of Canada have in a census taken in that way? We have a gentleman at the head of the department having control of the census saying: I will not tell you upon whose recommendation I have made these appointments; I have made them upon the recommendation of men whose character and standing were satisfactory to me. He does not get up and say: I will rectify the wrong, if there is any, I will inquire further as to the character of these men whom I have appointed on the recommendation of Mr. Perry, I will instruct Mr. Scatcherd that that is not the way in which I want the census taken; I do not approve of my commissioner handing over the names of the applicants to a man who has been convicted of fraud, of a serious offence against the election laws of this country. But, he does not take a position of that kind. I refuse to tell you who recommended these enumerators. It is a party matter; the hon. member for Moosejaw (Mr. Knowles) says; it is none of your business; we are doing this work on our side of the House; we are allowing such men as Perry chooses to be appointed as enumerators, a man who, upon his own confession, is of the character we have heard described here this evening. We are accepting the recommendation of this man who has been convicted in a court of justice of defrauding the electors of London. We are doing this work, it is none of your business, and we propose to continue it in this way. I ask what confidence the people of Canada can have in a census being taken in that way and costing over a million dollars?

Mr. BLAIN. I believe the people of Canada will condemn the Minister of Agriculture and this government for not accepting the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Staples) which simply declares for clean politics in the taking of the census and the appointment of census officers. The Minister of Agriculture occupied his present position in 1901 when the census was taken, and more than once was he condemned for allowing politics to interfere in a matter which should be free from politics. I have here a letter written to the Minister of Agriculture after the taking of the last census by Mr. Kelly, who was census commissioner for the county of Peterborough, and that letter, together with the circumstances attending it, show the Minister of Agriculture in an unenviable light. Mr. Kelly had an account for $653.14 which was large in comparison with the accounts of the other commissioners, and the department refused to pay it, but Mr. Kelly knew how to reach the Minister of Agriculture, and this is the letter he wrote to him:

> The Ontario elections are coming off the end of May or the beginning of June. Mr. B. O. Lott is the unanimous choice of the Liberal convention. I have made up my mind to do some hard work in this north riding of Hastings. Mr. Lott is the best canvasser and the hardest worker ever went into a political contest.
>
> I have the honour to remain,
> Your old servant,
> WM. KELLY.

Well, Mr. Kelly came down to Ottawa, and he brought with him Mr. Lott, who was the Liberal candidate for the legislature in the county of Hastings, and these two gentlemen interviewed the minister, and after Mr. Kelly went home he wrote this letter, and the account was paid at once.

An hon. MEMBER. Did anybody here see Kelly?

Mr. BLAIN. Oh, yes, the Minister of Agriculture saw Kelly, but Lott went to the United States and has not returned. You will remember that this was the same Mr. Lott who was interested in the ballot box stuffing case in the province of Ontario, and that is the company Mr. Kelly was in. The Minister of Agriculture talks about there being no politics in the taking of the census, but let me read to the minister the following advertisement in the Elora 'Express' of Wednesday, February 8, 1911:

> PILKINGTON LIBERAL ASSOCIATION.
> Notice of Meeting.
> A meeting of the Liberal Association of the township of Pilkington will be held on Friday, the 10th of February, 1911, At Three o'clock P.M.
> At the residence of the undersigned in Elora, for the purpose of naming census enumerators for the township of Pilkington.
> THOS. MARSHALL, President.
> Elora, Jan. 31, 1911.

Elora is the constituency of South Wellington, and the Minister of Agriculture knows that this meeting was held, and he has in his office the very men who were named at this political meeting. He won't deny that he appointed the men whose names were sent in from that meeting. Do we want any further proof that there is politics in the taking of the census? I do not condemn the Minister of Agriculture for taking recommendations from his own political support-

ers. It is a well known principle pretty generally observed that the government in power take recommendations from their supporters in this House and from the defeated Liberal candidates. That is fairly well defined policy in this country, but the Minister of Agriculture is not living up to that. In order to broaden the influence of the political machine he takes his recommendations from the Reform organizer of the province of Manitoba. Will the Minister of Agriculture say that Mr. Perry was the defeated candidate in the last election, or will he deny that Mr. Perry has the patronage for not only one but several counties in Manitoba? If Mr. Perry were a defeated candidate, I do not know that the House would complain if the Minister of Agriculture adopted his recommendations, because the principle would be fair and I do not think there would be any criticism from this side of the House. But Mr. Perry was not the defeated candidate in the constituency of Macdonald, and the charge is that the minister goes outside his supporters in this House and outside the defeated Liberal candidates and receives recommendations. The policy laid down by the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw is fair enough, but the Minister of Agriculture went outside of that policy in order that the political machine in Manitoba should be brought into operation. Not satisfied to take in the machine in one county, the Minister of Agriculture wants the whole machinery of the Grit party in Manitoba introduced so as to bring political influences to bear in order that the lists in Manitoba and the census in Manitoba shall be prepared in a way that will best help the Reform party in that province. We are suspicious of the Minister of Agriculture for another reason, and that is that before he came into office he preached economy, yet, the census taken under his direction in 1901 cost extravagantly more than the census taken in 1891, when his Conservative predecessor was head of the department. May I illustrate this by showing that in the county of Halton, in 1901, although the population had decreased by 2,437 as compared with the previous census, the cost of taking the census in that county was increased by $1,043.96, and sixteen more enumerators than in the previous census. In the county of South Perth there was a decrease in the population of 1,539, but it cost $1,136.90 more than the previous census, and there were nine more officers appointed. In the county of Peel the population had decreased 1,779, but the cost increased $865.28, and six more officials than previously were appointed. In the county of Cardwell, although the population had decreased by 2,322, the cost increased by $853.94, and the number of officials by eleven. In the county of Prince Edward the population decreased 1,025, but under the administration of the present Minister of Agriculture the cost had increased by $1,011.91, and he appointed thirteen more enumerators than were found necessary in 1891. This shows that my hon. friend has adopted the policy that when the population decreases the cost of taking the census increases. That is a policy that the people of this country knew nothing about until my hon. friend came into office. This is the reason why my hon. friend's department, especially in connection with the taking of the census, is surrounded with so much suspicion. It would have been to the credit of my hon. friend if, when this Prince Albert matter, with all its corruption, was referred to, he had stood up and said, as a minister of the Crown I have no defence for this, and I will condemn it. That is what we should have expected of my hon. friend, if we had not known him quite so well as we do. As my hon. friend has failed to measure up to what the people of this country would expect in an hon. gentleman occupying so important a position, he must take the consequences when he refuses to adopt so reasonable a resolution as that moved by my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples).

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, I would like to emphasize one matter that has not been very clearly brought out in the course of the debate. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture spoke of this notice as one which had been sent out apparently in quite an incidental way by Mr. H. E. Perry, who happens to be the Liberal organizer for the province of Manitoba. I would like to point out to him that this document certainly bears on its face the evidence of wholesale work of this character throughout that province. It bears the printed heading: 'Manitoba Liberal Executive, Organizer's Office, P.O. Drawer 2076, Winnipeg, Canada.' Then the circular is filled in by some kind of a machine, leaving blank spaces for three particulars—the name of the man and his post office address, the name of the constituency, and the description of the census enumeration division for which he is to be appointed. The circular bears a stamped signature. Any one who looks at it for a moment can see that it is stamped. So that this is simply one of perhaps thousands of these notices that have gone out in the province of Manitoba from Mr. Perry. That is perfectly obvious from the slightest perusal of this document. So that there can be no question or doubt that this notice is a part of a system under which hundreds and perhaps thousands have been sent throughout the province of Manitoba. Does my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture deny that? I will submit this to the judgment of any one of his supporters

in this House and ask him to say that the perusal of the document will not bear out what I am saying. A little slip is attached to indicate the census enumeration division; there is a blank for the man's name and a blank for the federal constituency, all indicating a system by which these appointments have in effect been made by the Liberal organizer for the province of Manitoba.

Mr. SMYTH. And in every other province too.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not know about any other province, but we have the evidence here of what has been done in the province of Manitoba. Now, it has been very well said to-night that the census is an exceedingly important event in our national life, and that the people of this country have the right to demand that it shall be taken fairly. They have also the right to demand that the public money of this country shall not be paid out for party purposes under the pretense of a census enumeration. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has been rather lordly about this matter. We have heard the doctrine proclaimed in this House this evening that this government is in power, and that they can act on the recommendation of criminals in the penitentiary if they see fit; that it does not lie in the mouths of gentlemen on this side of the House, or in the mouth of any citizen in Canada, to raise the slightest objection thereto, because Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government are in power, and they can act as they see fit, and do what they like with the public money of this country. That seems to be the theory of these gentlemen. Let us for a moment examine the attitude of the Minister of Agriculture with regard to this particular gentleman selected to make appointments in the province of Manitoba. We heard something this afternoon about trivial offences. Apparently, in the eyes of my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, it is only a trivial matter, worthy of only passing notice, that two deputy returning officers and their poll clerk should go into that northern country, should pretend to hold a poll, should violate their oath of office, should violate every provision of the Election Act, should sit in the wilderness and write in 150 names of fictitious persons, should place 150 false ballots in the ballot box, should sign and swear to false returns as to the poll having been held, and should bring all these statements back as if that poll had been actually held in good faith under the election law. I do not know one provision of the election law that they did not violate, in addition to which as I have already said, they have been guilty of forgery and perjury. There does not seem to be any dispute about the facts. They were brought out not only in court, but as I understand, before the legislature of the province of Saskatchewan. Now, what is the position of Mr. Perry with regard to this? I will not go over the letters; they have been read over and over again. I just want to refer to one or two passages. A letter of October 4, 1906, from Mr. Perry to one of these men who were absent in the United States:

I would suggest extreme caution; I shall try to keep you advised.

The 'Standard' here last night published a story that, if the case went against Sinclair, he was going to squeal, but I don't believe that, as he would never do anything to help the Tories; he is too sore on them.

Indicating a distinct knowledge on the part of the man who wrote that letter, not only that these crimes had been committed with which they had been charged, but that there were other crimes as to which there was a danger that Mr. Sinclair might speak. A letter of June 10:

I have heard it said that the missing deputies would be as well to keep out of sight. I think this is undoubtedly correct.

Further on, in a letter of the next day:

Prudence would, I should judge, suggest to the absent deputies that their safety lies in remaining away.

Another letter, which does not appear to have been actually from Perry, but from a gentleman who was associated with him in bringing aid and comfort to them:

Everybody is prepared to stand by their guns and do what is right by you, and what I ask is that you hold steady for a while longer until all can be arranged.

What does that mean? That means that these men have been sent away to the United States by the connivance and with the money of some person or persons. It means that these men have been kept in the United States at the suggestion and by means of the money of certain persons. Further on this letter says:

See Mark, and he will fix things up with you.

Who is Mark? If you turn to the first letter here, you will find who he is. He is Mr. Mark Sands of the firm of Sands and Scott, to whom letters intended for these gentlemen were sent in order that their address might not be known to any one in Prince Albert. What further does this gentleman say? He says:—

See Mark, and he will fix things up with you. Thought best to send it that way.

What is the meaning of 'it'? 'It,' as I understand, is the wherewithal which enabled these men to remain in the United States when the hand of criminal justice

should have fastened on them in Canada long before. These were the lawyers in Chicago to whom letters were sent intended for these absconding and criminal deputies in order that the whereabouts of the absconders might be kept secret. But these were trivial offences and trivial matters which impressed themselves so little upon the Minister of Agriculture that although he heard them referred to at length at least twice in this House, he has entirely forgotten them this afternoon and apparently never heard of them before. Were these transactions so much in the ordinary course of affairs that my hon. friend was not impressed by them? Let me tell him the position which Perry occupied in this connection. Has my hon. friend never heard of such a thing as an accessory after the fact. Here is a definition in the Criminal Code, section 71:—

An accessory after the fact to an offence is one who receives, comforts or assists anybody who has been a party to such an offence in order to enable him to escape, knowing him to be a party thereto.

I say that if these letters are genuine—and if they are not genuine this man has had his remedy for a year or more in the public courts of this country—in my opinion Mr. Perry was an accessory after the fact to the crimes that those men had committed and as to their participation in which there can be no reasonable doubt. When we find the virtual appointment of the census renumerators in Manitoba committed to that gentleman under those circumstances, I think it is more than right that my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) should have risen to vindicate common honesty and decency in this country by moving the motion which he has made and which I shall be most happy to support.

Mr. FIELDING. Much has been said of matters important in themselves but not really relating to the census, so that there is danger of our losing sight of the real circumstances and methods under which the census has to be taken. There are two classes of census officials. There are the commissioners, who have charge of the different counties or electoral districts, one to each district. Numbers of the commissioners have been appointed, but throughout this debate no attempt has been made to show that any one has been chosen who is not worthy and qualified to perform the service. Then we have the enumerators, a much more numerous class, because each enumerator has charge of a comparatively small subdivision. These run into the thousands and have been in many cases already appointed or are in course of being appointed from day to day. Throughout all this discussion it has not been charged that any man has been chosen as enumerator who is not qualified for the work, who is not respectable and reputable in every sense of the word.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). We do not know them yet.

Mr. FIELDING. Then my hon. friend should not be so ungenerous as to cast any reflection upon them. He should wait until he finds some reason to criticise the appointments of the commissioners or enumerators.

Mr. CROTHERS. Might I put a question? If it be true, as charged in the newspapers, that the commissioner appointed for the city of London, handed the names of the applicants into the hands of Mr. Reid to decide who should be appointed, does the hon. minister think the commissioner who would do this was a worthy man to hold the position.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not aware of the circumstances, but generally speaking if any commissioner should put his list of the names into the hands of anybody and give him any control in the appointment, I would not consider he was acting wisely or properly. I do not, however, know anything more about this than my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Crothers) knows himself, but I want to call attention to these essential facts. Mr. Perry is a commissioner or enumerator and has no official connection whatever with the government or with the taking of the census, and, therefore, the outcry raised concerning him has no bearing on the question as to whether we are appointing reputable men to be commissioners or census enumerators.

Mr. STAPLES. Does the hon. minister know that Mr. Perry according to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture, has been recommending enumerators to those positions?

Mr. FIELDING. I can assure the hon. gentleman in all sincerity that I know no more about it than what I have heard in this debate to day. As to the question of recommendations, I shall come to that in a moment. But I want again to emphasize the fact that the commissioners and the enumerators are the only people who have to do with the census. The Minister of Agriculture must take the responsibility of those appointments. When he has to appoint thousands of men all over Canada, no doubt among them he may appoint some whom our hon. friends opposite will find reason to criticise, but there is so far no allegation that any commissioner or any enumerator has been improperly appointed. That being the case, how can hon. gentleman opposite hope to influence public opinion by reviving the old story

of the Prince Albert election; I am not referring to that as a trivial matter. It was a grave and serious matter, and I do not complain if hon. gentlemen offer any condemnation of what occurred at that time. When we come to the question of recommendation, hon. gentlemen opposite lay down the proposition that it is the duty of the government to declare on whose representation any one has been appointed to a public office. But on reflection they must see that such a theory is preposterous. Take the appointment of a lieutenant governor of a province, will any hon. gentleman opposite contend that he has the right to demand in this House and to know on whose recommendation such an appointment was made? Every member of this House has of course the right to put a question, but must be guided by reason and propriety, and would it be reasonable and proper to ask on whose recommendation the appointment of a lieutenant governor of any province was made? Take the appointment of a judge. Could anything be more ridiculous than to insist on knowing who recommended his appointment? Will the hon. member for Jacques Cartier stand up and say that he has the right to know who made the recommendation?

Mr. MONK. I never put forth such an absurd proposition. What I said was that the nomination of such officers as enumerators could only be made upon recommendation as a basis, and it was the right of every member to know what that basis was.

Mr. FIELDING. And the nomination of a lieutenant governor could only be made upon a basis. There is no difference in principle between the appointment of a high officer and the nomination of an officer of a lower grade. If it was a governor, he would not ask who recommended him. If it was a judge, he would not do anything so preposterous as to insist upon knowing who recommended him. Well, if he is a census commissioner who is appointed, would it be less preposterous for him to ask who recommended him?

Mr. MONK. Why you appointed him?

Mr. FIELDING. Because we needed a man for the office and our information was that he was a suitable man. And that is the reason why we appointed the Governor —because we needed a man for the office and our information was that he was a suitable man. And that is just the reason why we appoint a judge—because the place had to be filled and our information was that the gentleman in question was well qualified by his legal attainments to fill the office. Hon. gentlemen opposite cannot be serious in advancing the argument that it is the right of the House to be informed what are our grounds for——

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). What harm will it do?

Mr. FIELDING. But the hon. gentleman must permit us to be the judges. The House has rights, and these rights we do not question. But hon. members opposite have an unhappy faculty of speaking of what the House demands when what they mean is what they themselves ask. Nobody in this House would question for a moment the right of the House to demand information in the proper way. But when an hon. member stands up in the House and insists upon the right to obtain certain information, I think it does not necessarily follow that he has that right in the sense in which he uses the word.

Now, much has been said throughout this discussion of nominations by political committees. I am bound to say that, while I do not think the political committee is the best way of doing the thing, and while I do not like it myself and would discourage it, I am not prepared to admit that there is anything wrong in having a political committee make a recommendation to any minister in regard to an appointment in which the members of that committee may be interested. They cannot be denied the right to make a recommendation in a public matter. The field of party patronage is, I am glad to say, being somewhat narrowed, there is less of it under this government than there ever was under any of its predecessors.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. There is less room for the exercise of party patronage to-day than there was in any previous time in the history of Canada. But, so long as we have party government—and, with all its evils it seems to be about the best system that can be devised,—it is inevitable that there will be more or less of what is called party patronage; there will be a human desire on the part of every government to give the preference to their friends. Just at present, the census being about to be taken, my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture has a right to make a selection of the officers to take that census, getting the best information that he can. And, twenty years hence, we will concede to hon. gentlemen opposite a similar privilege. And those of us who are here then may question and may find fault in other respects, but will not deny their right to appoint their own friends to office, always with the qualification that the men appointed must be reputable men and able to fulfil the duties for which they are appointed. Even if the committee was used, it would not be a reasonable ground for criticism, although I confess I do not like the system

Hon. gentlemen opposite complain that, in making appointments in counties represented by hon. members on this side, we turn to the member for advice in the matter. As to counties represented by hon. gentlemen opposite with whatever gravity they try to discuss this question, they cannot expect us to go and ask their advice. Well, if we have to get information in reference to an appointment in a county represented by an hon. member sitting on that side of the House, surely the minister in charge of the department concerned must be left to exercise his own judgment and discretion as to the manner in which he will get that information; and, for the judgment he shall exercise he is accountable to the House and the country

Mr. MONK. In the case of the enumerator in the county referred to or in the appointment of an excise officer, is not the sitting member entitled to know on whose recommendation he is appointed, since he is not consulted?

Mr. FIELDING. According to the conception of government that I have—which, I think, is that held by every government that has ever held office in this country—my hon. friend would not have the right to ask that. It would make no difference who recommends it, the minister must be responsible, and if the persons appointed by the minister prove to be improper persons and unfit for their duty, the minister would have to bear the responsibility, and his colleagues would have to share it with him. And I do not think, that on reflection, hon. gentlemen opposite will gravely adhere to the view that it is the duty of the minister to tell at a given moment on what recommendation any officer of the census, or judge or governor is appointed to office.

Mr. MONK. There is just the difference. In the case just referred to, the member on the government side gets that knowledge, whereas a member on this side of the House he does not know, and the public is not entitled to know, and therefore there is nobody known to be responsible for the recommendation.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, the minister who makes the appointment is responsible and the government that endorse it is responsible.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) himself has given the strongest argument and the best reason why the principle laid down by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) ought to govern appointments of this nature. He himself has stated that it is utterly impossible for the Minister of Agriculture, making such a large number of appointments all over the Dominion, to personally know the individual character of his appointee. And that was the basis of the argument of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier that the House has a right to know the basis on which appointments are made, in order that we may thereby judge the character of the appointments. And the whole argument on this side this afternoon is based exactly on that principle. I think the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) had the right to bring the question into the House, and his right is based on that very principle. I think it was argued rightly by the Minister of Finance that if there was no connection between the letters read here and the appointments made, our case falls to the ground. But the hon. member for Macdonald laid the foundations for his argument carefully and well. He started out by reading a document which, I think, the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has made very clear, was an official document; he has shown that it was a circular, not an individual letter, issued by an irresponsible person, on an official letterhead and bearing the title of an official organization. There were blank spaces left for filling in essential particulars, and these had been filled in the letter submitted. I will call your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the fact that, if further evidence were wanting that this was an official document recognized not only by the government but directly by the Minister of Agriculture it was given in the admission made by the Minister of Agriculture himself during this debate. He stated in answer to the question put from this side that he had acted on the recommendation of this Mr. Perry and in some cases had appointed enumerators on the recommendation of that gentleman.

He did not tell us how many he had appointed on his recommendation, but the whole inference of the letters, and the written evidence produced in the House makes it a prima facie case that he has been acting generally in an official manner in making these various recommendations. I was glad to know that the Minister of Finance himself said that he did not look upon that as a very trifling matter, that it was a very serious charge that had been made against these gentlemen. He admitted they had been guilty of certain criminal offences, and I think the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has clearly demonstrated that the man who is making these appointments or on whose recommendations the appointments were made, and who has undertaken officially to notify these men of their appointments, of their duties, the amount they are to receive, and the particular territory over which they would have jurisdiction, has been acting semi-officially. The leader of

the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has clearly shown that the man was accessory after the fact to the crimes committed at that time. That being the case, we have a right to bring up this question in order that the country at large may know the basis on which these various appointments are made, and how much confidence we should place in enumerators or officials acting on behalf of this government who are gathering statistics which are of vital importance to this country. The census will cost about $1,000,000, but apart from the mere financial cost, the importance of the data we are supposed to secure by the taking of this census, which is of vital importance to the Dominion of Canada, amply justifies the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples) when the information came to him, in bringing it before the House; in fact, it was his bounden duty to do so. I am amazed that the principle should be laid down by the minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) that he is not prepared to consider evidence of that nature, that he feels he is not bound by his office to give the information to the House to which I think we are entitled. That is the argument, and the position taken by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and by every member on this side. We are not asking for the individual recommendations that come to hon. members of the government from time to time, but we are asking on what basis or principle appointments of this kind are made, or on what principle the minister judges the recommendations that come to him. These recommendations could not possibly come to the minister in a private way. For instance, if the minister were to resign to-morrow, no man would continue to send in recommendations to him to make appointments for offices of this kind. Therefore, it is wholly and solely in his official position as a minister of the government that these recommendations come to him, and so they are the public property of the people of Canada, they should be placed upon the public files, and should be at all times at the disposal of this House. He is laying down a wrong principle when he undertakes to say that that is purely a private matter between him and the persons making these recommendations. He has a very wrong conception of his position, and his duty in regard to that question. But it is like many other principles that we constantly find laid down from that side of the House in regard to what they consider the constitutional method of government. I am prepared on the evidence that has been adduced this afternoon, to earnestly support the motion of the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples). I had heard nothing of this case previously, but I consider the hon. member has made out a most complete case, and that it is the duty of this government to accept the recommendation, and produce letters of this kind. We must accept the minister's word that he has not officially authorized Mr. Perry to send out these circulars, but there is not the slightest doubt that he has received these instructions and authority from some governmental source. The minister shakes his head. Supposing I or any other private citizen to-morrow issued circulars throughout Canada signed personally, to all the enumerators, stating that they had been recommended to the position of enumerators, and that they had certain jurisdiction, giving them the amount of remuneration for their work and asking them to report to me within ten days, would he take cognizance of that, or would he immediately take steps to see, in some way that I was prevented sending out circulars of that kind.

Mr. FISHER. I would take no notice of it whatever.

Mr. GOODEVE. That is an amazing statement of the minister that any private citizen could send out in a case of this kind involving the appointment of thousands of officials to be paid for by public money, circulars stating what the duties and remuneration of these officials are to be, and asking them to report in ten days; the minister says he would take no notice of it. It is an amazing statement and one which I scarcely think any business man or any man realizing the responsibility he has in connection with the office he holds, would make.

It is in the context that we find the sting of that circular. Mr. Perry says in a postscript: If you are in the city within a short time, drop in. Why? To talk over with him the good cause, because he signs himself: Yours in the good cause. Every sentence of that carefully worded circular goes to show that it is issued in order to bring political influence to bear. The wording of the circular is such as to impress on the minds of those receiving it that they have received their appointments through the influence of the Liberal association, whose printed official statement is on the head of the paper on which the letter is written. So before we commence to take the census at all, we find held out to the people of Canada that it is to be purely a political institution used for political purposes, and I ask in the face of that how are the people of this country to have confidence in a census taken in that manner?

Mr. CROSBY. I did not intend saying anything in regard to this question, but

when the Minister of Finance lectured this side of the House on the question and said that hon. members had not proven that a single criminal had been appointed a commissioner, I was surprised. That is very true, but we have proved that the enumerators had been and are nominated by criminals. That is what we proved and that is what we are trying to impress the minister with. But, it seems there is no impression to be made on him to-night. On Friday he was very easily impressed by the hon. member for Macdonald. He jumped up from his seat on that occasion like a trout jumping at a fly in the springtime. But to-night he is perfectly satisfied to sit in his seat and have nothing to say to him. He is prepared to take it all. He has not even the Minister of Finance to help him. The Minister of Finance says that not one of the enumerators is a criminal. We say that Mr. Perry, who has recommended the enumerators in Manitoba, has been proven beyond a shadow of a doubt to be a criminal. His recommendation has been accepted because we have the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that he has appointed some enumerators on the recommendation of Mr. Perry. We also have the statement that the names of the 105 applicants for appointment as enumerators in the city of London have been submitted to Mr. Reid, a noted criminal, for selection. It is not the enumerators that we are worried about but our suspicion is aroused by the manner in which they are appointed. We do not know these men, we do not know what they are going to do, but we do know that if we accept the recommendations of men of this character we are going to get into a bad condition with regard to the census. It was a very nice thing for the Minister of Finance to get up and tell us that when they appoint a Lieutenant Governor they do not tell us who recommended him We can easily find that out whenever Lieutenant Governors are appointed. Anybody who can see any distance at all can tell why a Lieutenant Governor or a member of the Supreme Court bench has been appointed, and who has recommended him. But, in the case of enumerators, with Perry and Reid and men of that character how can we tell? The Minister of Agriculture cannot tell himself; he admits that he does not know anything about them. All the knowledge he has of the enumerators is what he has obtained from men of this character. It is little wonder that we are suspicious. We are suspicious first of the Minister of Agriculture anyway. But he creates further suspicion by the selection of the men whose advice he takes in the important matter of the census. It has been proved to-night that two of the men who have been the advisers of the Minister of Agriculture in the selection of these enumerators have been criminals. He said at one time that it did not make any difference what was said about any man as long as it was not proved in court. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition brought Perry before the court and settled him right here, and then my hon. friend from Elgin (Mr. Crothers) settled the other man Reid by pointing out that he had been in court, and that the court had settled him. Yet we have not been able to settle the Minister of Agriculture. He sits in the same position—

An hon. MEMBER. He has turned halfway round.

Mr. CROSBY. Yes, he has turned half way round, and I hope he will come all the way round. It is an indication that he is about to turn. Somebody says that he is on the wrong side. There has been very little argument on the other side of the House. The only argument was that of the hon. gentleman from Moosejaw—or is it Long Jaw?

An hon. MEMBER. Moosejaw.

Mr. CROSBY. Thanks, very much: I thought it was Long Jaw from the nature of the argument to which he treated us this evening. He is the only gentleman who pretended to present anything in the nature of an argument. He threw his hands around his head, held his waist as if he was wearing corsets, and kept us about an hour and a half, but I do not think that any hon. member of the House will be able to understand any one point that he made until he reads 'Hansard' to-morrow, because I do not think anybody in this House could follow what he was endeavouring to demonstrate. He was of very little use in helping out the Minister of Agriculture. I intend to vote for the motion of my hon. friend for Macdonald for the reason that it has been proven beyond the shadow of a doubt that the men from whom the minister has been taking advice are criminals. If they have been proven to be criminals I am naturally suspicious of the kind of men they will recommend. They will not recommend men better than themselves and therefore I intend to vote for the amendment of my hon. friend.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Staples).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Armstrong,	Macdonell,
Arthurs,	Magrath,
Barker,	Middlebro,
Best,	Monk,
Blain,	Northrup,
Borden (Halifax),	Owen,
Bradbury,	Paquet,

Broder,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Cowan,
Crosby,
Crothers,
Daniel,
Doherty,
Donnelly,
Elson,
Fraser,
Gilbert,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Henderson,
Herron,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lake,
Lennox,
Perley,
Reid (Grenville),
Rhodes,
Roche,
Sexsmith,
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thornton,
Wallace,
White (Renfrew),
Wilcox,
Wilson (Lennox and Addington),
and Wright.—51.

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Allard,
Allen,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),
Boyer,
Carvell,
Champagne,
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Demers,
Devlin,
Douglas,
Dubeau,
Ecrément,
Emmerson,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
Gladu,
Hodgins,
King,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lafortune,
Lanctot (Laprairie-N ville),
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Law,
LeBlanc,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Macdonald,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCraney,
McGiverin,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McMillan,
Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Martin (Wellington),
Meigs,
Michaud,
Miller,
Murphy,
Nesbitt,
Oliver,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Rivet,
Robb,
Ross (Middlesex),
Ross (Rimouski),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Sealey,
Seguin,
Sinclair,
Smith (Middlesex),
Smith (Nanaimo),
Smith (Stormont),
Sperry,
Talbot,
Templeman,
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turgeon,
Turriff,
Verville,
Warburton and
Wilson (Laval).—84.

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

Ministerial,	Opposition.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Hughes,
Borden (Sir F.),	Sproule,
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Graham,	Crocket,
Lemieux,	Worthington,
Bureau,	Chisholm (Huron),
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,	Beattie,
Hunt,	Boyce,
Clark (Red Deer),	Bristol,
McLean (Sunbury),	McCarthy,
Martin (Regina),	Ames,
Guthrie,	Foster,
Marcile,	Nantel,
Gervais,	Osler,
Conmee,	Porter,
German,	Lancaster,
Brown,	Lortie,
Delisle,	Schaffner,
Ethier,	Marshall,
Bickerdike,	Forget,
Harty,	Lalor,
Gordon (Kent),	Lewis,
McColl,	Stewart,
Black,	Barnard,
Beauparlant,	Price,
Mayrand,	Thoburn,
Major,	Maddin,
Proulx,	McCall,
Chisholm (Antigonish)	Currie (Simcoe),
Cash,	Meighen,
Schell,	Clare,
McCoig,	Blondin,
Molloy,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Carrier,	Edwards,
Papineau.	Russell.

Amendment (Mr. Staples) negatived.

WESTERN COAL STRIKE.

Mr. JOHN HERRON (Macleod). I beg to call the attention of the Minister of Labour to the following which appeared in this day's Montreal 'Gazette':

WESTERN COAL STRIKE.

Conciliation Board can't Agree and Adjourns.

Fernie, B.C., May 13.—The Dominion Conciliation Board, which is trying to settle the strike of ten thousand western miners, has declared that nothing can be done at present, as the members are so divided in their views, and the Board has adjourned sine die.

The people of the Dominion generally, and of the western provinces in particular will be interested to hear what information the Minister of Labour has to give in connection with this news item. I will be glad if the minister can assure us that the announcement in the Montreal 'Gazette' is not true, but as that journal is usually well informed on public questions I fear that the dispatch may be correct. I trust the Minister of Labour will not desist from his efforts at this stage, but that he will try to have the board continue, and if possible bring about a settlement honourable and just to both parties.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). The last statement in the news paragraph; that the board has adjourned is correct, but I think the rest of the paragraph is misleading. On Friday last I

received a telegram from Mr. Gordon, the chairman of the board in which he states:

Board temporarily adjourned to-day. Feel that delay will materially help the situation. Letter follows.

(Sgd.) CHARLES W. GORDON.

I have not as yet received the letter referred to, but I believe it is felt that in the light of the evidence already brought out, both parties should be given an opportunity of conferring together before further evidence is taken. There may have been other reasons for the adjournment. I believe that possibly the chairman returned to Winnipeg, because when he accepted the appointment he intimated that if the investigation lasted longer than two weeks it might be necessary for him to ask for a slight adjournment. There is no intention on the part of the board to discontinue its efforts to effect a settlement. The reports I have received up to the present indicate that good progress has been made. I have every hope that before long the board will be able to terminate its work, having accomplished a satisfactory result.

TRAVELLING EXPENSES—PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Has the Minister of Public Works completed the return as to the expenses of himself and his officials?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I gave directions to have the return hurried.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). They are about two months making up that small return.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is not correct in that statement. The return had to be prepared in their order, and a good many have been brought down since this return was asked for.

DISTRIBUTION OF SPEECHES THROUGH MAILS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I regret the Postmaster General is not present, but I ask the acting Prime Minister to ascertain whether there is truth in the report that comes to me on reliable authority that copies of the speeches delivered by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance, are being sent out in bundles to postmasters all over the country, and that the postmasters are asked to deliver them, without being addressed, to persons who come to the post office on business. This is making use of the mails of this country for distributing literature that ought not to be read by the people of Canada, because I think such literature does not educate our people in the best interests of the country. Anyway, the government has no business to use the portmasters for political purposes.

Mr. FIELDING. I can well understand the unwillingness of my hon. friend to have the literature read. I will mention the matter to the Postmaster General.

MILITARY ADVISER TO THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (Hamilton). I call the attention of the leader of the House to a letter from the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Mr. Hughes) which appeared in the Ottawa papers of last Friday, May 12. The letter is long, it concerns a police court matter, and I shall only read a part of one sentence which deals with a question of public interest. The words I call the attention of the leader of the House to are these:

I am leaving to-morrow for England as military adviser to the Imperial Conference.

The House is entitled to know whether such an appointment has been made to the knowledge of the government, and by whom. I would infer from the words of the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) that such an appointment if made at all would have been made by the imperial government. It could hardly have been made by the conference as the conference has not convened.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was probably made by the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) himself.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to ask the acting Prime Minister whether such an appointment has been made, and if so what the object of the appointment, what the functions of a military adviser to the imperial conference, the duration of the appointment——

An hon. MEMBER. And the emolument.

Mr. BARKER. Everything connected with it. The matter is very specifically put forward in the letter which has appeared in the newspapers, and I think the leader of the House should make a statement with regard to it.

Mr. FIELDING. No such appointment has been made by this government, nor have we any knowledge that any such appointment has been made by anybody.

THE CHRISTIAN GUARDIAN AND RECIPROCITY.

Mr. C. J. THORNTON (Durham). Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the House to the fact that the report is being industriously circulated by certain news-

papers that the opposition is pursuing a course of obstructive tactics in this House in connection with the debate on reciprocity, and that the effect will be to prevent the Prime Minister from attending the imperial conference. That the report is without a shadow of foundation is well known to every member of this House, and to every newspaper reporter in the press gallery. Notwithstanding this, respectable and even religious newspapers industriously circulated the falsity. One of the offenders in this respect is the 'Christian Guardian,' the organ of the great Methodist church. If this were its first offence it might be overlooked, but unfortunately for the paper, and the church it represents, it is continuously misrepresenting the facts. Editorially it makes the following statement in its issue of May 3:

CANADA AND THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Just now one of the livest questions at Ottawa is whether Canada shall be represented at the Imperial Conference by Sir Wilfrid Laurier or not. The Conservative tactics in opposing the reciprocity pact are such as to greatly delay the passing of the measure, and there seems not to be any too good reason to hope that there will be a change in the situation. The Conservatives are determined that the reciprocity pact shall not be ratified without a general election; and the Liberals are determined it shall, if at all possible. Our rules of procedure, fortunately or unfortunately, allow what we may call obstructionist tactics to be carried to a very great length, and the Conservatives are determined to fight every step of the way. Unfortunately, however, this is Coronation year, and also the year of the Imperial Conference, and if the fight over the reciprocity pact is continued it will be impossible for Canada to be properly represented at either. From every standpoint this would seem to be most unfortunate. For Canada, the greatest British colony, to be unrepresented or inadequately represented, at either the conference or the Coronation, would appear little less than unseemly. Both parties realize this, and yet neither is willing to yield a jot to its opponent. We cannot but hope, however, that the cooler and wiser heads in the two parties will succeed in reaching some way out of the difficulty. It will not be complimentary to our Canadian parliament if they do not.

When the reciprocity proposition was introduced in this House, the statement was made by the Prime Minister and by the Finance Minister that the fullest time and opportunity would be given to discuss the question in this House. The Finance Minister was most emphatic in this. On February 9, 1911, page 3358, he said:

There will be abundant opportunity for the members of this House and the people of this country to carefully consider the arrangement to which the government asks them to give their approval.

On page 3360 the Finance Minister said:

But we propose to proceed with this measure not rashly but in due order.

On March 8, 1911, on page 4947, he said:

We desire that this matter shall be discussed, as I stated in the earlier stages of the debate, not hastily, not in a rush, not unduly; we desire that every member of the House shall have abundant opportunity to form and express his views.

Thus it will be seen that there was to be ample time for a very full discussion of the subject. Members on both sides of the House have presented their views. Those on the government side have taken their full share of the time that has up to the present been occupied in the debate. No obstructive tactics of any kind have been introduced by the opposition. On the contrary, Mr. Borden, the opposition leader, has made it plain that there will be no obstacle thrown in the way of the Prime Minister's attendance at the Coronation and the imperial conference.

In order that there may be no mistake in this matter, I will read what the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) said on the floor of the House on the 28th day of April, which was five days before the article was published which I have read from the 'Christian Guardian',:

I am very happy indeed to concur in the hope which he has expressed that he may be enabled to attend the approaching Imperial Conference.

Now, there are three courses which would permit the Prime Minister to attend the approaching Imperial Conference. If the present session of parliament should not have come to a conclusion at the time when it will be necessary for him to leave, he could proceed to the conference, leaving his colleagues in charge of the business of the House; that is one alternative as to the desirability or expediency of which I am not so good a judge as the Prime Minister himself. I frankly concede that that is a matter upon which it is his right, his duty, to exercise his own judgment. In the second place, he can bring the session to an end, leaving some of these very important matters unfinished and letting them stand over to another session. It has already been intimated to us that the Bank Act will not be pressed at the present session. If that is to stand over to another session, there can be no particular reason why the proposals for closer trade relations with the United States should not also stand over until another session. I do not want to enter into any controversial observations with regard to that, I only mention it as another alternative which is open to the Prime Minister in that regard. Then in the third place, he can adjourn this session of parliament for two or three months, or whatever length of time may be sufficient to enable him to attend the Imperial Conference and the Coronation. After the Coronation and after the conference, the session can be resumed; and I desire to say now that for the purpose of facilitating

public business we would be prepared to give interim supply to such an extent as the public interest would demand, in case the Prime Minister should see fit to follow that course.

Every member on this side of the House is willing and anxious that the Prime Minister should attend the Coronation and the Imperial Conference, and are willing to make any sacrifice to this end. As yet not one-half the members on the Conservative side of the House have had an opportunity to express their views on the reciprocity pact. Nearly all of those who have not yet spoken have made preparation so to do, but are willing that the House should adjourn in order that Canada may be properly represented by the Prime Minister at the Imperial Conference. In view of these facts, which the editor of the 'Christian Guardian' must have known, it seems very much out of place that he should have penned the article he did, which appeared in the issue of that journal, of May 3. I have waited for several days, hoping that the editor in last week's issue might make a correction, but he has not done so. I regret very much that the 'Guardian' should be made the organ of misrepresentation, and I hope that the editor may be honest enough to correct the wrong he has done in his next issue.

INQUIRIES ABOUT PAPERS.

Mr. MONK. I would like to ask the government how soon we may expect the printed French edition of the representations of the Fruit Growers and Vegetable Growers. The House ordered these to be printed. They were printed and circulated on the 27th of March last. They have been translated, and I am told that the translation has been for some time in the hands of the printer. There is a considerable demand for the document in the province of Quebec.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is aware that these printing matters are not in the hands of the government. They are in the hands of the officers of the House, and I can only make inquiry of them, just as my hon. friend himself can.

Mr. MONK. I ask that the government should make that inquiry, and press the printing.

Mr. FIELDING. Why should not my hon. friend do that himself?

Mr. MONK. Because I fancy, as the discussion to-night shows, that it would have more effect if it came from my hon. friend.

Mr. FIELDING. This is a case in which we would accept my hon. friends' recommendation.

Mr. MONK. I am afraid not.

Mr. THORNTON.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I wish to ask the Minister of the Interior when I may expect that the papers in regard to the Aylwin irrigation grant will be brought down. On the last day I asked for them he said that he would perhaps be in a position to tell me on the following day, but on that day he was somewhat mixed up himself, and perhaps for that reason did not tell me. I would like some definite answer as to when I may expect these papers.

Mr. OLIVER. I laid the papers in question on the table some time last week.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I sent to the official quarters to-day, and could not get them.

JAPANESE TREATY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the Minister of Finance whether it is contemplated to take any action regarding the Japanese treaty before the reassembling of parliament after the adjournment?

Mr. FIELDING. A notice of motion is already in the hands of the clerk, and will appear in the Votes and Proceedings to-morrow morning. It is to give the Governor in Council power to continue to Japan the tariff privileges which she now enjoys, Canada to receive similar privileges, for a period not exceeding two years. In all other respects the treaty is permitted to lapse. The two years is fixed to allow time to negotiate a special treaty, should one be deemed advisable.

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

SUPPLY.

Mr. FIELDING. When the Committee of Supply last sat a little difficulty arose owing to the fact that there were certain items which the committee had passed or were quite willing to pass, but which unfortunately were merged with others as to which further discussion was required. The desire was to report the items passed, but we did not think they could be reported separately from the others. The clerk has looked into the practice, and I understand there is a custom which will warrant our reporting these particular items which have been passed and leaving the others. My proposal, therefore, is that the items in any group which the committee has dealt with should be reported separately.

Exhibitions, $150,000.

Mr. STAPLES. I would like to ask if the minister has given any further consideration to the Selkirk Centennial. I understand that a delegation interviewed the government a short time ago, and would like to know what satisfaction they received. I would like to ask who the delegates were

and what satisfaction they got from the minister when they were here a few days ago. Also I would like to know whether the government is still considering the matter, or whether they intend to give an appropriation such as it was proposed to give to the undertakers of this great exhibition?

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid I have to say that the government has come to no conclusion yet in the matter. Since it was brought up in the House before we have had some slight discussion of it, but without reaching a conclusion.

Mr. STAPLES. That does not answer my question in full. I asked if there was a further delegation here to interview the government in regard to the matter. I understand that there was such a delegation a very short time ago—within the last week or so—to find out whether the government were prepared to carry out the proposition they at one time made to the undertakers of the celebration that if they would secure $2,500,000 the government would supplement it with a like amount.

Mr. FISHER. I am not aware of any delegation having been here since the matter was up in the House before. If there was, they must have seen only the Prime Minister, not the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) nor myself nor any other minister present. I do not think that any delegation came.

Mr. CAMPBELL. An answer was given in this House more than a year ago by the Prime Minister that he could not give a definite answer to the question until he had consulted the Minister of Finance. Now, he has had an opportunity to consult the Minister of Finance with regard to the matter. The success of an affair of this kind is a matter of great consideration to the people of the west, and the people of all Canada. The day of the expiry of the time when the subscribers can be called upon to implement their promises is getting very close—I think it is within a few days. It seems to me a fair proposition to ask the government, as my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) has done, what they intend to do. Two years they have had to make up their mind whether they are going to do it or whether they are not. I do not think we in the west now care very much whether they do or not, but we would like to have a definite straightforward answer. If they are not going to do it, let them say so; if they are going to do it, let them say so. I think that that is a fair proposition.

Mr. FISHER. I am afraid I cannot give any more definite answer than I have already given. I will try to have it taken up and decided as soon as possible.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I did not particularly want an answer from the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher). I intended my remarks more particularly for the Minister of Finance on whose shoulders the Prime Minister has laid the burden by saying that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) came back renewed in health and strength—as we know he is to-day—he would be in a position to discuss it with him, and the people of the country could depend on getting a final answer. I am not advancing it for party purposes by any means, because, as the Finance Minister knows and the government understands, the people who are most interested, the private citizens who have offered to spend more money than any others, are gentlemen of the same stripe of politics as themselves.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I cannot add anything to what has been said by the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) I quite realize the importance of the matter. If it has been two years since the matter was mooted, perhaps the hon. member can find in the public records other matters that have been pending for much more than two years. The very magnitude of an enterprise sometimes causes delay. I think it possible that gentlemen in the province primarily affected have some reason to complain that there has not been a definite answer. But to be frank with the hon. member I cannot give a definite answer at this stage.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can the hon. minister give me some idea of the probability of an answer in the next two years?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I think I can go as far as that.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can we get an answer within the next year?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not want to be too exact.

Mr. CAMPBELL. In the next year, can I expect a definite answer?

Mr. FIELDING. I want to encourage the hon. gentleman, I hope to give an answer in much less time, but one does not like to tie himself up.

Mr. CAMPBELL. You are tied up badly now.

Mr. FIELDING. We tnink not.

Mr. BLAIN. We should have some explanation from the Minister of Agriculture concerning this vote

Mr. FISHER. I gave a pretty full explanation when a supplementary vote for the last fiscal year was taken. I ex-

plained that we were participating in the exhibition called 'The Festival of Empire,' in the Crystal Palace which was opened, I think on Friday last, by His Majesty the King. The Canadian Pavilion has been built and we are now in the position of owing for the building.

Mr. BLAIN. What will be the total cost?

Mr. FISHER. About $225,000; between that and $250,000. That covers the total organization of the exhibition, the work of taking down and removing the exhibits —the usual thing from one year to the other. I asked for $250,000 in this vote, and I have asked for $75,000 in the supplementaries for this year which, I trust, will enable me to close up everything absolutely, making the expenditure $225,000. There was a little expenditure from the vote last year.

Mr. BLAIN. Will there be any special appointments by the minister or his department?

Mr. FISHER. None except the permanent staff—there have been none and will be none.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I know that to a very large extent, the grain exhibit comes from the west. Are the provinces generally well represented in their own products in such exhibitions as the minister has described?

Mr. FISHER. Each province is represented in the products which it yields best. We do not discriminate, provided the products come from Canada we try to get the best of every kind. We have, in London this year, I believe, the most magnificent display of fruit, that has ever been collected at any exhibition. Most of it came from the province of Ontario, but a considerable quantity from British Columbia, and also some from Quebec and some from Nova Scotia. We have also a very fine collection of minerals coming from all over the Dominion. Asbestos which is produced in Quebec, I believe, is exhibited from that province. The silver ore comes largely from Ontario, the nickel from Ontario and the coal from various provinces. The grain exhibit also comes from nearly all the provinces, although wheat naturally comes largely from the Northwest and Ontario. The forestry exhibit comes from the different provinces; we make no discrimination between the provinces, the exhibits are shown as Canadian, without reference to the places from which they come, although the names of the exhibitors and the places from which they come are on the exhibits.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I have heard the suggestion that Ontario grain was not represented as fully or displayed as attractively as it might be.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think there was any ground for that complaint. All the winter wheat comes from Ontario, nearly all the barley and corn, and the oats are from nearly all over the Dominion.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Having met at 11 o'clock, does the Minister of Finance not think that 12 would be a good hour to adjourn?

Mr. FIELDING. When we get into Committee of Supply at 11 o'clock, would not 12 o'clock, be too early to adjourn?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I think there was an understanding that certain items named should be put through, but I did not understand that this was one.

Mr. FISHER. This was one.

Mr BORDEN (Halifax). I do not remember it being mentioned, but I am subject to correction. The Prime Minister said:

> There are, however, some items of supply which must be voted in full, independent of such agreements. There is the vote for the military and Northwest Mounted Police contingents, which are to attend the coronation, and with respect to them a partial vote would not be sufficient. There is also in this category the vote for the Festival of Empire, which, although a private enterprise——

Mr. FISHER. This is the exhibition at the Festival of Empire.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood it was a separate item. What is the amount of the item?

Mr. FISHER. $150,000 in the main estimates and $75,000 in the supplementaries.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the contract let for the building?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, part of the expenditure on this exhibition was taken from the vote of last year.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the minister let the contract for the building, costing a great deal of money, before the money was voted by parliament?

Mr. FISHER. The money is not voted yet.

Mr. BLAIN. Then my hon. friend and his government take it upon themselves to enter into a large contract for the expenditure of money without consulting parliament or having a vote for that purpose.

Mr. FISHER. I explained all that at the time I took the supplementary vote in the earlier part of the session. We could not delay. If we had done so we could not have taken any part, and the government decided

on its responsibility, having charge of the affairs of the country, to take part, on the invitation of the committee in London under the presidency of Lord Plymouth and under the patronage of His Majesty.

Mr. BLAIN. Without consulting parliament.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. What was the cost of the building?

Mr. FISHER. About $100,000; it is a copy of this building.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount has been expended up to date?

Mr. FISHER. We have contracted obligations of about $135,000.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend has undertaken, without consulting parliament, to enter into contracts for the construction of a building costing upwards of $130,000. That is one of the complaints we have against my hon. friend's government that they are doing too much by order in council, that they do not take parliament into their confidence, and when a discussion comes up in the House in connection with expenditure, the government say: Oh the opposition are as much responsible as the government because they were in the House when the item was passed. I have heard my hon. friend's colleagues make that statement.

Mr. FIELDING. Not if you never voted for it.

Mr. BLAIN. But the Minister of Finance must remember that his colleagues said that there has been no vote.

Mr. FIELDING. And therefore we do not blame you if there has not been.

Mr. BLAIN. No, because I do not see how you can blame the opposition.

Mr. FIELDING. That is fair.

Mr. BLAIN. Does my hon. friend think that it is a fair policy that any minister should have the power to enter into expenditures and make contracts for $125,000 or $130,000 without consulting parliament and then come along and ask parliament to vote after the money has been practically expended or the contracts made for the expenditure? Is that to be the policy of my hon. friend?

Mr. FISHER. No, except where it is impossible to wait and where you cannot do it in any other way I think it is justifiable for the government to take that responsibility in the interests of the country. The government has to take that responsibility on certain occasions and when it does take that responsibility it is accountable to the House. The House need not vote the money if it does not see fit.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister has already stated that this was not an unexpected proposition.

Mr. FISHER. The hon. gentleman must not put words in my mouth. The Festival of Empire last year was an affair for which we had a vote of parliament. The festival was postponed until this year, it was very much magnified, it was made a very great affair in conjunction with the coronation and the imperial conference and increased enormously in magnitude and importance. The question was whether we would still take a part in it commensurate with the importance of Canada and the empire or whether we should delay and not be able to take part. We believed that it was in the interest of Canada and the empire that we should take part, we assumed the responsibility of taking part and we now ask parliament to vote the necessary funds to enable us to do so.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Do I understand the minister to say that this sum of $150,000 and the sum of $75,000 in the supplementary estimates are both required for the Festival of Empire?

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Is the money to be all spent for that or is part of it to be spent on other exhibitions?

Mr. FISHER. No, there is no other exhibition.

Mr. PERLEY. When was this contract given out?

Mr. FISHER. About the end of November or in December.

Mr. PERLEY. I would like to ask the minister whether he does not think that there is something in the comments of my hon. friend from Peel. I have seen special votes brought before this House and the government asked for them to be passed immediately by parliament. I remember that the vote in connection with the San Francisco disaster was passed in that way. Even in a case of this kind, if it comes in the recess and the House is not in session, I can understand the argument of the minister that the government must decide in this peremptory way that it will go on with the work and ask parliament to vote the money afterwards. But I do not see how that argument can apply when parliament is in session. This is an imperial matter in which we all take an interest. I do not think there is a member of this House but would be glad to give his assistance in passing a vote in order that Canada should take part in this festival. What right has the minister or the government to undertake an expenditure of $150,000 for a building without coming here and asking for a vote while parliament is in session? The

vote could be asked for specially. It does not need to be left to come up in the ordinary course in the estimates. I would like the minister explain why he did not come here and get a vote last fall.

Mr. FISHER. In a measure my hon. friend is quite correct. The government, however, were committed to this festival long before the House met. We had to announce whether we would take part in it or not and make the necessary arrangements. My hon. friend is in a measure certainly correct in what he says. Last November the House was sitting, or about to sit, these estimates were laid on the table soon afterwards and I might then have urged that the House should take up the estimate and pass it before proceeding further. I confess that has not been our practice. When these estimates were laid on the table the country, or the government, was committed to this enterprise and we judged that the House would support the enterprise. I think my hon. friend is correct that the whole country was satisfied that we should take part in this celebration and the only question is whether we should have immediately stopped all other proceedings and taken up this item at that early stage of the session.

Mr. PERLEY. The reason I mention the thing is because this has not been the practice. I may be very old fashioned, but it seems to me that there is far more government by order in council in this country than there is any need of. The reason I have gone into this question somewhat fully is because I feel very strongly on the subject. It is not fair to the House, or the country to have so many things done by the government by which the country is committed. Then, they come to parliament to have their action confirmed, and the money voted. Of course, all the Liberal members will vote for the government. It is perfectly natural that they should do so even if they do not think it is a right and proper thing. They cannot object to it; they must vote for the government in order to sustain their leader. There have been many similar cases. I remember very well, with regard to the Grand Trunk hotel, that, although parliament was in session at the time, this government actually made a contract with the Grand Trunk Railway Company to sell them a piece of land, and after it was put through they submitted it to this House, and asked to have the contract confirmed. I know as a matter of fact that there were many Liberal members in this House who felt that it was a mistake to put the hotel where it is. It is in the middle of the government grounds, and we should have kept all the Dominion government property intact by itself. The Minister of Public Works proposes to build a large new departmental block on Sussex street, and the ordinary person walking on the street will be unable to see the new departmental building until he gets right up to it by reason of the fact that this Grand Trunk hotel has been located where it is. There were a lot of Liberal members who did not approve of that location, and the government deliberately, during the session of parliament, made a contract, and then came here to have it confirmed. I really think that there is more of that sort of thing done than there is any need of. They are doing altogether too many things without consulting parliament. I am not prepared to say that of everything the government does off its own bat, but I do think they are doing other things that there is no need of. I will ask the Minister of Agriculture whether the government might not have saved themselves and the country a great deal of trouble if they had not passed a contract with President Taft at Washington this year without bringing it to parliament for consideration, and whether he thinks that two ministers of the Crown ought to go down to Washington and then come back to this parliament and say that we must pass it because the honour of Canada has been pledged. The honour of Canada is said to be pledged because two ministers of the Crown bind the government of the day, who in turn bind the Liberal members, and who in their turn profess to bind the whole country. Well, while there are many things a government reasonably may do without coming to the House, I do not believe they should, under the strict spirit of the constitution, do so many important acts of government without consulting parliament.

Mr. FIELDING. In connection with the reciprocity arrangement my hon. friend seems to be unaware of certain important facts. There is no difference between the method of negotiating this agreement and the method of negotiating any other agreement that was ever made with any foreign government with respect to a similar transaction. The agreement was made confidentially—hon. gentlemen opposite say secretly—but every treaty is negotiated confidentially and secretly. It was brought down here and submitted to the House with the suggestion that it could not be changed. It was exactly the same in that respect as the Washington treaty of 1871, as the treaty made by Sir Charles Tupper in 1888 and exactly the same as every other treaty in which an agreement has been made on behalf of Canada with any foreign country. According to the custom, such an agreement had to be negotiated confidentially and when completed

it was submitted to this parliament precisely the same as in every other case.

Mr. BLAIN. Notwithstanding that the House was in session after the government had decided to take part in the Brussels exhibition, the Minister of Agriculture did not ask for a vote but got a Governor General's warrant to remove the exhibit from Seattle to Brussels, so that this is an old habit with him. He should be more careful to consult the representatives of the people.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there any further explanation as to the withdrawal of the proposal to celebrate the battle of Chateauguay in connection with the Festival of Empire?

Mr. FISHER. I have not cabled to England for information, but I expect to get a report with regard to the matter by letter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Our friends on the other side of the line are not nearly so much concerned about such matters as we seem to be. The Minister of Agriculture will have observed that Admiral Perry's victory on Lake Erie in 1813 is to be celebrated in very impressive and flamboyant style. Large sums of money have been contributed by a number of states; one of the ships sunk in that fight is to be raised; there is to be a great naval demonstration, and a magnificent permanent memorial is to be erected at Put-in Bay. No one on this side of the line has the slightest feeling about that. It is entirely within the right of the American people to celebrate that victory and no one here thinks twice about it. What I wonder is that any one could have been so exceedingly foolish as to imagine that the American people would have had any ill-feeling if the Battle of Chateauguay were celebrated at this Festival of the Empire? Why is it that we seem to be so exceedingly supersensitive about offending our neighbours in such matters when we do not see any spirit of the same kind on their part, because they realize that we are big enough not to be oppressed with a feeling of resentment on any such account. It is a very great pity that in connection with this Festival of the Empire to which Canada has contributed a large sum of money, the celebration of that battle should have been omitted for the reason given. It was a very gallant exploit; it has been called the Thermopylæ of Canada; a few French Canadian volunteers in command of De Salaberry, assisted by some Glengarry men under Col. Macdonell, put to route eight or ten times their number of American troops who were invading Canada. I really believe we are paying no compliment to our friends on the other side of the line when it is imagined that their feelings would be hurt by a celebration of that noble event.

Mr. FISHER. I sympathize with every word uttered by the leader of the opposition, and had we been consulted I would most emphatically have expressed that opinion to the English authorities. I most sincerely believe that no feeling would have arisen in the United States had the battle of Chateauguay been celebrated at the Festival of Empire. Our neighbours are too big to be offended by such a thing. No doubt, the arrangement was made with the best intentions and without any idea of wounding us, but I regret that we were not consulted. I cannot say more on that point. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has said with regard to the Battle of Chateauguay is perfectly true and the Canadian people are justly proud of that exploit. I have been waiting for a report as to the reasons which actuated those who had control of the matter, and I trust it will be a better reason than has yet been given.

Mr. BLAIN. When was the government first invited to take part in the Festival of Empire?

Mr. FISHER. About eighteen months ago, I was in England immediately after the death of King Edward, when the question of the postponement of the first proposed festival came up on account of the King's death. It was decided to proceed with the festival this year. I was spoken to by various people who were interested in it, and they then expressed the intention and expectation of proceeding with it this year. I came back here about the 1st of July, and it was not until after that that I received the official positive declaration that they were going to proceed. I then at once laid the matter before my colleagues, and we were asked at once to accept the invitation or let them know what we were going to do. A few weeks after that we decided to accept the invitation, and I then instructed the commissioner of exhibitions, who was at Brussels, to go to London and meet the committee there and find out what recommendations they would make as to our participation. Later on the suggestion was made that the Canadian building should take the form of a replica or copy of this one. I understand that Australia is putting up a replica of a part at any rate of the buildings at Melbourne. I am not quite sure whether New Zealand is doing the same, but I think so. Then the commissioner went on with the work and made the arrangements. I think the contract for the building was made some time in November last.

Mr. BLAIN. I may say that at the last session of parliament my hon. friend made this statement, at page 5728:

Lately we have been invited and strongly urged by a very influential committee in London to take part in what is known as the Festival of Empire at the Crystal Palace, and the government has decided that it would be very unfortunate if at such a celebration as that Canada was not represented.

That was on March 18. My hon. friend had abundant opportunity to consult the House and submit an estimate.

Mr. FISHER. That was the celebration of last year.

Mr. BLAIN. The same one.

Mr. FISHER. The same one, but postponed to this year on a different scale.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If any portion of this vote is being devoted to the historical representation, I wish to ask if the minister could not make representations that the battle of Chateauguay be not omitted.

Mr. FISHER. We have contributed some $10,000 to the general expenses of the festival. I do not know whether any portion of the money goes to the pageant or not.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Could not the minister on that ground have made some representations to the authorities that it would be greatly regretted if the battle of Chateauguay were omitted from the representation.

Mr. FISHER. I have asked for information on the matter. I thought I would not do anything until I got that information.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Of what material is the proposed building to be constructed?

Mr. FISHER. I think it is a steel structure, with staff covering, as all these exhibition buildings are.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Who has the contract for building it?

Mr. FISHER. Messrs. Humphreys of London, who have been constructing our exhibition buildings for many years. They have made that a specialty. We have invited tenders from others, but they have always been the lowest, and lately we have been giving them the contract without competition, based on their figures.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What becomes of the building after the exhibition is over?

Mr. FISHER. They have to take it down as part of the contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Were tenders invited in Canada for the construction of this building?

Mr. FISHER. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Why not?

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it possible that Canadian contracting firms go to London and erect a building at anything like the figure of the London firm, which has all the necessary labour and materials there.

Mr. BLAIN. Would it not have been a very good advertisement for Canada if the steel structure could have been made here and transported to England, so that not only the exhibits, but the building itself, would have been made in Canada? Besides, a goodly portion of the money would have been expended in Canada and to our own workmen.

Mr. FISHER. I do not think it would have been a feasible proposition at all.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend may say that off-hand, but he has not given any consideration to it. Would he say that the firms engaged in putting up large buildings in Ottawa and elsewhere in Canada would not be able to construct such a building as has been referred to? Surely not.

Mr. JAMESON. I understand that almost a quarter of a million dollars is to be expended as a contribution to the Imperial authorities for this purpose. It seems to me a most unfortunate thing that the representation in regard to the Battle of Chateauguay has been omitted. I do not think it can yet be too late for the government to make representations on the subject to the Imperial authorities. It seems to me that it is a duty that we owe to our own national dignity to have that battle represented there, and in my judgment it is incumbent upon the government to make at least a fair attempt to have arrangements made for a proper representation in that regard. I believe that the people of Canada will feel that they are not being fairly dealt with if there is not a representation of that most historic battle, and I trust that the government will take measures to see that a fair opportunity is given for a representation.

Mr. FISHER. I may say that I was waiting for information to make representations that the omission of that battle was not received with favour in Canada, and that if the committee could see their way to retain the representations, it would certainly be in accordance with my own views.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Did I understand the minister to say that the Humphreys Company had been erecting exhibition buildings for this government in the past? If so, where?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, they have put up buildings at Brussels, Dublin, and I think Milan, and one in London in 1908.

Mr. CAMPBELL. If it is a fact that this London company have been putting up exhibition buildings for Canada in foreign

countries, I think the opportunity should have been offered to Canadian firms to erect the requisite building for this Festival of Empire, to employ Canadian workmen and Canadian materials. If a London firm can go to Milan or to Brussels and make a business success of a building, why should not a Canadian firm be in a position to enter into an enterprise of that kind and make it a success? It was up to this government to give the opportunity at least to Canadians to show their enterprise. It seems to me that our people could perhaps do this work to greater advantage.

Mr. FISHER. When we had an exhibition in St. Louis, we advertised for tenders, and no Canadian offered. When we exhibited in Seattle not long ago, no Canadian contractors put in a tender. This business is a speciality, and the firm of Humphrey's do most of the building in all the exhibitions of Europe. The firm that put up our buildings in St. Louis, erected them in Seattle. These contractors put up the buildings and take them down again, and use the material in other exhibition buildings.

Dominion exhibition, five-sixths of $50,000.

Mr. FISHER. This is a grant we give to each province in turn. This year it goes to Saskatchewan, and the exhibition will take place in Regina in the month of August, and they will be wanting the grant before the House meets again.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under the circumstances, I see no objection in passing this.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.33 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, May 16, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUEBEC SAVINGS BANK ACT.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 219) to amend the Quebec Savings Bank Act. He said: The purpose is to extend the terms of these two savings banks in Quebec for another year just as we are doing with the General Banking Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

FIRST READING.

Bill (No. 218) for the relief of George Mackay Sutherland.

THE ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. HERRON. Before the orders of the day are called, would the hon. the Minister of Finance tell the House definitely when parliament is going to adjourn? I ask this because it is sometimes very difficult to get Pullman accommodation at this time of the year, and it takes a week's notice to secure Pullman passage from here to the west. The distance is too far to travel without sleepers and the government should be prepared to give some intimation as to when the House will adjourn.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite appreciate the reason given by my hon. friend for desiring to know more definitely when the adjournment will take place. The date fixed, as stated by my right hon. friend the Prime Minister, was the 23rd, but the wish was generally expressed that we might possibly adjourn on Friday, the 19th, rather than on Tuesday, the 23rd. I would be very glad, and so would my colleagues, to facilitate adjournment on the 19th, but there are some matters of urgency which we ought to get through before adjournment. We still hope to be able to adjourn on the 19th provided we can have the co-operation of hon. gentlemen opposite in bringing about such a desirable result.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What are the matters of urgency?

Mr. FIELDING. There are various matters on the Order Paper which had better be disposed of before recess, and we ought to make some further progress in Supply.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The answer concerning matters of urgency is exceedingly vague. Will the hon. gentlemen kindly tell the opposition what measures the government wish the House to deal with as matters of urgency?

Mr. FIELDING. I am very unfortunate in not being able to satisfy my hon. friend. We indicated yesterday some things which we desire to bring on to-day, and to-morrow I shall make another statement as to what we wish to forward as quickly as possible.

THE 'NIOBE' AND 'RAINBOW'.

Mr. CROSBY. Will the hon. minister give the names of the officers of the 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' who have been selected to attend the coronation?

Mr. FIELDING. When the Minister of the Naval Department is present I shall call his attention to the hon. gentleman's question and endeavour to have him furnish the information.

PETAWAWA MILITARY CAMP.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Has the government any information regarding the ex-

tent of damage caused by the fire at Petawawa a few days ago, and is it the intention to proceed immediately with the reconstruction of the buildings which were damaged?

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot give the information at the moment, but will give it later on when the acting minister is present.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY.

Mr. PUGSLEY moved second reading of Bill (No. 36) relating to the establishment and expenses of the International and Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty of January 11, 1909. He said: This matter was so fully discussed when the resolution was under consideration by the House in Committee of the Whole that I do not think it necessary at present to go at any lengh into the subject. Hon. gentlemen will find the discussion in 'Hansard' on pages 890 to 945, 6th of December last.

After the Bill was introduced it was thought desirable, after consultation with the Minister of Justice, that provision should be made in it for the summoning of witnesses and also for giving the subjects of the United States the right to bring actions in Canadian courts for the recovery of damages, the United States giving the same right to British subjects. In the United States it has not been deemed necessary to pass legislation upon the subject because under its constitution a treaty becomes the supreme law and supersedes all state laws. But in Canada the constitution is different, and in the opinion of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Justice, it is desirable that provision should be made so as to make it clear beyond doubt that our courts will have power to summon witnesses to give evidence under oath, and also that the right of action shall be clearly granted.

Mr. SPROULE. As I understand it, this is a federal law. Do not the several states still claim to exercise their right on boundary waters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not where they are subject to a treaty. Under the constitution of the United States a treaty precedes all statutes of either Congress or of the several states.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Which clause of the constitution?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I read the clause when the resolution was before the committee; hon. members will see it in the 'Hansard' report of the remarks I made on that occasion and to which I have already referred. Therefore, I propose, when the House goes into committee on the Bill, to amend it as shown by the printed amended Bill which I have had distributed among some hon. members who are taking more special interest in this matter. Other hon. members who desire copies can, of course, obtain them by sending to the proper office. I propose asking the committee to add five sections——

Mr. FOSTER. Before the minister (Mr. Pugsley) goes on I would like to be sure with reference to his general statement that in all cases a United States treaty overrides state rights. It seems to me that that is not the genius of the United States constitution. I am not an authority on that document, but there is one case which, as I recollect it, seems to me in point. Difficulties arose in California over the school rights and privileges of the Japanese in that state. Japan contended that the treaty guaranteed to the subjects of either country in the other, equality of rights with the subjects of the country. I remember well there was a very strong line of correspondence between President Roosevelt and the authorities in California, occasioned by the fact that a law was contemplated to be passed by the California legislature which, the president contended, would be in contravention of the treaty rights. My recollection of the affair is that California got its back up, and kept it up, and was constitutionally able to keep it up. But milder counsels prevailed and, in some way or other, an arrangement was made. But as I recall the correspondence, President Roosevelt expressed the fear that California, by persistence in its action—which, as I understood, the federal authorities could not control—would render the relations between Japan and the United States otherwise than friendly. I may be wrong, but it seems to me the statement of the Minister of Public Works went too far.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not remember very clearly the controversy to which my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) refers, but I will read the article of the constitution of the United States of which I have spoken, and which hon. gentlemen will find at page 902 of 'Hansard.' It is article 6 of the constitution and it provides as follows:

> That this constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made or which shall be made under the authority of the United States shall be the supreme law of the land and the judges in every state shall be bound thereby, anything in the constitution or laws of any state to the contrary notwithstanding.

I think it would be impossible to find language which more clearly provides that a treaty shall be the supreme law of the land.

Mr. FOSTER. Another case comes to my mind, a case between the United States and the Italian government with reference to redress sought by the government of Italy for citizens of that country of Italy who, in some of the states of the American union, were deprived of their privileges and who claimed damages. Now, the demand made at that time, as I recollect it, was that the United States was not in a position to confirm these privileges of the citizens of Italy because of the powers of the states.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think my hon. friend (Mr. Foster) will not question my construction of this article. I think it is clear beyond any possibility of doubt. That is the view taken by the Attorney General of the United States who has not the slightest doubt upon the point and is acting accordingly. They, by their legislation, are providing for the expenses of the commission. The Attorney General's opinion is, just as, I think, any one reading article 6 of the constitution will see, that there is no question whatever that the treaty has become the supreme law of the land, and that it supersedes all state law bearing upon the subject.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). May I ask the hon. minister (Mr. Pugsley) a question? I understood that another clause of the constitution of the United States modified the clause he has quoted. I have not the document before me, but where the difficulty arises over this question of construction is where treaty rights interfere with private rights. There is a clause in the constitution which says that private rights shall be observed and shall be supreme, and that the United States of America or any of the states cannot perform any confiscatory act without redress. All this trouble over treaty rights has arisen where private rights are affected. Take the case of the Ste. Marie river, for instance. One of the problems in the discussion with reference to this waterway arose out of the private rights of the owners at Sault Ste. Marie. I should think that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) could quote some precedents or judicial expressions of opinion by the United States Supreme Court on this point before asking us to swallow his dictum holus bolus. Because, if I mistake not, the view always taken by the judges of the Supreme Court of the United States is that where matters of private rights are involved they are supreme over treaty rights.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought the hon. gentleman (Mr. Currie) wished to ask me a question. If he purposes going beyond that, I think it would be well to await the conclusion of the very brief statement I wish to make. However, I may just remark with reference to the hon. gentleman's suggestion, there is a clause in the constitution of the United States providing that private rights cannot be taken away except with compensation. But I do not think that affects the matter at all. As to the case of the Ste. Marie river, where the rights of the American citizens at Sault Ste. Marie are concerned, that is a question between the United States government and its own citizens. And the United States, after the passing of this treaty acquired the rights of its citizens, becoming the riparian owner; and, therefore, all questions, so far as private rights in that locality are concerned, have been settled. I cannot see how the question is at all pertinent to the consideration of this Bill. Now, I propose——

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not wish to be asking questions, but I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has an amendment to this Act which gives American citizens the right to sue in Canadian courts for damages sustained through this treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Carrying out the doctrine he has laid down, if there is any damage, the authority which is responsible for that damage should be the United States government, and there should be no occasion for suing in Canadian courts for damages.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The amendments I propose to suggest to the committee are simply for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the treaty. Perhaps, as hon. gentlemen may not have copies of the amendments, it might be well for me to read the five sections which contain the amendments I propose. They are as follows:—

1. The treaty relating to the boundary waters and to questions arising along the boundary between Canada and the United States made between His Majesty and the said United States, signed at Washington the eleventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine, and the protocol of the fifth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and ten, in the Schedule of this Act, are hereby confirmed and sanctioned.

2. The laws of Canada and of the several provinces thereof are hereby amended and altered so as to permit, authorize and sanction the performance of the obligations undertaken by His Majesty in and under the said treaty; and so as to sanction, confer and impose the various rights, duties and disabilities intended by the said treaty to be conferred or imposed or to exist within Canada.

3. Any interference with or diversion from their natural channel of any waters in Canada which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary between Canada and the

United States or into boundary waters (as defined in the said treaty) resulting in any injury on the United States side of the boundary, shall give the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in that part of Canada where such diversion or interference occurs, but this section shall not apply to cases existing on the eleventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine, or to cases expressly covered by special agreement between His Majesty and the government of the United States.

4. The Exchequer Court of Canada shall have jurisdiction at the suit of any injured party or person claiming under this Act in all cases in which it is sought to enforce or determine as against any person any right or obligation arising or claimed under or by virtue of this Act.

5. The International Joint Commission, when appointed and constituted pursuant to the said treaty shall have power, when holding joint sessions in Canada, to take evidence on oath and to compel the attendance of witnesses by application to a judge of a superior court of the province within which such session is held, and such judge is hereby authorized and directed to make all orders and issue all processes necessary and appropriate to that end.

Those five sections are the new sections. The remaining sections of the amended Bill remain the same as they are in the Bill now before the House. If hon. gentlemen will compare these sections with the provisions of the treaty which are to be found in the schedule to the amended Bill, it will be seen that they simply carry out the provisions of the treaty, and are inserted because, in the opinion of the Minister of Justice, they are necessary to enable the courts of Canada to have jurisdiction, and in order that the provisions of the treaty may be effectually carried out.

Mr. EMMERSON. I desire to ask if there are similar provisions in the legislation of the United States giving the same rights to Canadian citizens in reference to wrongs committed by United States citizens?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. I may say to my hon. friend that the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States is, and in that opinion the Minister of Justice concurs, that the treaty iself confers all those rights upon Canadian subjects in the courts of the United States.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. gentleman has referred several times to the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States given on this question. Is that document available to the House?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I hold in my hands a copy of a despatch from the British Ambassador at Washington, which justifies me in making the statement I make to the House. In his despatch of April 21, 1911, addressed to His Excellency the Governor General, he says:—

Mr. PUGSLEY.

My Lord,—I have the honour to transmit herewith that clause of the Appropriation Act passed at the termination of the first congress which provides the legislation required by the last paragraph of Article XII. of the treaty on boundary waters and boundary questions.

It will be observed that the powers conferred on the commission by this legislation are those specified in the article above mentioned. There was at one time some question as to whether legislation would not be required in order to give the Canadian complainants access to the United States courts in injuries inflicted on them in Canadian territory as provided in paragraph 1 of Article 11. But after taking legal opinion it was decided that the treaty was sufficient in itself to effect this.

I assume that the legal opinion would be that of the Attorney General of the United States, who is the legal adviser of the United States government. He proceeds as follows:—

The United States government are, I understand, anxious to arrange for an early convention of the commission as there are several urgent and important questions awaiting reference to it. The appointment of the United States commissioners was recently reported to Your Excellency.

I have the honour to be, My Lord,
Yours most obedient, humble servant
JAMES BRYCE.

His Excellency, The Rt. Hon.
The Earl Grey, G.C.M.G.,
etc., etc., etc.

Now, in that opinion, as I have said, the Minister of Justice concurs. His opinion is that Article 6 of the constitution of the treaty gives effectually all the rights to Canadian subjects which could be conferred by an Act of Congress. I may read Article 2 of the treaty which provides for that:

Each of the High Contracting Parties reserves to itself, or to the several state governments on the one side and the Dominion or provincial governments on the other, as the case may be, subject to any treaty provisions now existing with respect thereto, the exclusive jurisdiction and control over the use and diversion, whether temporary or permanent, of all waters on its own side of the line which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary or into boundary waters; but it is agreed that any interference with or diversion from their natural channel of such waters on either side of the boundary resulting in any injury on the other side of the boundary shall give rise to the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in the country where such diversion or interference occurs; but this provision shall not apply to cases already existing or to cases expressly covered by special agreement between the parties hereto.

It will be seen that the amended sections of this Bill provide exactly in the terms of that article.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does that give jurisdiction in their courts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I need to say anything more at present. I move the second reading of the Bill.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Do the state governments claim the right of jurisdiction with respect to the several matters over which the federal government assumes the right?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not aware that they have made any such claim. I would be surprised to learn that they make any claim that is in contravention of the terms of the treaty, so far as respects boundary waters. I cannot see how it would be possible for them to make such a contention in face of the express provisions of Article 6 of the constitution. I understand that it is well recognized in the United States that a treaty overrides all state laws bearing upon the subject to which the treaty relates.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Just one word more before the hon. gentleman leaves this discussion. I observe that in clause 4 provision is made for the Exchequer Court of Canada to have jurisdiction in cases of this kind. As I understand it, when a foreign citizen desires to bring an action against the government of any British country, he approaches the matter by petition and the authority, either His Excellency the Governor General or the King, or whoever is acting, will issue a fiat and write across that petition 'let justice be done.' The matter is referred to the courts in the ordinary way, so that there is no necessity for this clause 4, in a sense, at all. Provision has always been made under the British constitution for a foreigner to sue for any injury or damages which may have been occasioned by the government or an individual in a British country. But, as far as I can ascertain, there is no remedy or machinery provided in the United States for bringing an action of this kind. In all civil matters, as I understand, the states have jurisdiction and the states have refused to allow a foreigner the right to sue for any damages caused either by the United States government or by a corporation within their jurisdiction. If an injury occurs to a person in the state of New York, a foreign citizen, unless he has property within the state, has no right to any recourse by way of suit. A case arose not very long ago where a young lady was killed on the Lehigh Valley railway in the state of Pennsylvania. Action was brought and when the action had proceeded a certain length the railway company took refuge behind a claim that the party injured had no property within the state and consequently had no right to sue. There was no recourse and the case was dismissed by the United States court. Is the hon. gentleman assured that machinery is provided and if so, what is the machinery provided, under the authority of the federal courts whereby a citizen of Canada can sue? We ought to know that. Machinery is already provided by us even without passing this clause. What machinery is provided in the United States? It is all well enough to say that by the treaty you can do a certain thing, but although you had the treaty you might not have the machinery of the courts provided in order to carry out your treaty. You might find yourself damaged in the United States, you might go into the United States and try to bring suit but you would find there was no court before which you could bring suit. You would find that there is no means by which you could approach the court by petition or in any other way to bring this suit, and there is no court provided to give justice except perhaps a state court and a state court will take the most narrow and restricted view possible in your case. I think the minister in charge of the Bill should clearly explain to the House what procedure a citizen of this country can follow in carrying out this clause of the Act, or under this treaty. Suppose a citizen of Canada has land flooded by the action of the American government or an American corporation, and he desires to bring suit in the United States courts. Let the minister in charge of the Bill clearly explain to the House whether proper machinery is provided whereby an action can be brought and sustained in the courts of the United States. I think it is necessary that the House should know what that machinery is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend's statement certainly surprises me, and I am sure it would surprise every lawyer in the House when he says that if a party in one of the United States suffers injury that party can have no redress in the courts of the state in which he happens to own property.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I said a foreign citizen. Do not let the hon. gentleman put any words into my mouth that are not true.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A foreign citizen. I am satisfied that there is no such law.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I am satisfied that there is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And until my hon. friend calls my attention to the statute which so declares I am sure he will forgive me if I hesitate to accept his statement. Possibly he might have to do just as foreigners have to do in this country; he might have to give security for the payment of costs in case he should lose his suit.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That suit must be brought by the executors or trustees of

the party's estate, or by himself, and if he has no property he must be represented by a trust company.

Mr. EMMERSON. He could not hold property in the state of New York if he were a foreign citizen.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). You mean real property?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am speaking of real property.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). But he must have property of some kind; he must either have money or be represented by a trust company.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think these details had better be discussed in committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, Mr. Speaker, it would be better. I was just going to say a word in answer to my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie). The words of the treaty are that in case of any injury caused by diversion of waters from their natural channel on either side of the boundary resulting in any injury on the other side of the boundary this shall give rise to the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if the injury took place in the country where such diversion or interference occurs. In case that injury took place in one of the United States, the party whose property was injured would have a legal remedy. He would have the right to go into the courts of the state and recover damages.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The state courts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The state courts.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Not the federal courts?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Possibly not the federal courts. I am not sure as to the line of distinction between them, but it does not make any difference, because that there is a legal remedy under the treaty is beyond question. What this treaty does is to give to a Canadian subject who has suffered injury upon this side of the boundary line the same rights and remedies as if his property were on the American side of the boundary, and as if it were injured by the act of the United States government or of an American citizen.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Suppose the consent of the Interstate Commission was given to the erection of the work that had caused the damage, would he then have any right of action?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, he would still have the same right of action.

Mr. REID (Grenville). With reference to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) that a treaty made by the federal government in the United States would supersede any rights of the state legislature, I may say that the minister knows that there was a treaty made between Great Britain and the United States commonly known as the Ashburton treaty with reference to certain rights in boundary waters between the two countries. The state of New York does not agree with the statement made by the Minister of Public Works. The state of New York claims that it has the right to build a dam across the St. Lawrence river irrespective of the Ashburton treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not to interfere with navigation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They only admit that the federal government are to say what interferes with navigation or something of that kind. The Ashburton treaty stipulates that nothing shall be done to interfere with the natural flow of the river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The words of the treaty are that the subjects of each country shall have the same right of navigation as the subjects of the other country. In other words it shall be equally free and open to navigation to the citizens of both countries.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It means that the river was to remain free and open. In the evidence taken in the United States the representative of this great corporation said:

> My position is that the people of the state of New York through their legislative body and government in the passage of this Bill have passed upon the question absolutely as to whether it is in the interests of navigation or not.

The representative in the state legislature claims the right to dispose of half the power irrespective of the federal government, notwithstanding that it is boundary waters. You can see that a different view is taken of the treaty than that taken by the Minister of Public Works. I agree that there should be a commission of some kind to look after our interests, but I want to see everything done that can be done to protect our rights not only on the St. Lawrence but in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hear, hear.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have prepared a clause which I think will have the effect of safeguarding our rights, and which will leave any future question of damming the St. Lawrence with this parliament, where the Prime Minister promised it should be left. My amendment reads.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would it not be better to bring it up in committee?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Very well, we can discuss the matter then.

Mr. C. A. MAGRATH (Medicine Hat). Early in December the Minister of Public Works had a resolution before this House bearing on the treaty recently entered into between the United States and Canada dealing with international waters and now known as the Waterways Treaty. That resolution was the forerunner of this Bill, and although I believe I made my position perfectly clear on that occasion in connection with the matter, I shall take this opportunity to discuss some features of that treaty. The treaty consists of two main features, first, it undertakes to divide between the two countries certain specific boundary waters as well as certain waters which flow across the boundary; and, second, it provides machinery for the investigation of future water questions which may arise along the boundary and in the settlement of which it enunciates at least one principle. The Minister of Public Works on the occasion to which I have referred was most insistent that the settlement which has been made as to the division of certain boundary waters is eminently fair to this country, and, he was equally positive that the principle which is to be applied in future cases was sound and just. It does not require any stretch of imagination to see that if we have an eminently sound settlement it can only be obtained through the application of sound and just principles and I purpose showing to this House that we have in that treaty the enunciation of a sound and just and fair principle and side by side with it a settlement provided in article 6 of the treaty which undertakes to divide the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers and their tributaries between Montana and Alberta, a settlement I repeat in which that principle was over-ridden in a roughshod manner. In May, 1909, I undertook to discuss some features of this treaty. I do not now purpose going over the same ground in detail, but I shall recite some of my findings on that occasion and then pass on to other features of the treaty. We know that in June, 1902, the Congress of the United States invited Canada, through Great Britain, to participate in the investigation of our international waters; we know that this country was somewhat tardy in accepting that invitation, but finally decided in April of the following year to accept it; we know that the United States selected the three members of the then proposed International Joint Waterways Commission in October, 1903. We also know that this country did not complete the Canadian section until practically two years thereafter, and there, it seems to me, the United States scored point number one. We know that President Roosevelt in going afield to secure two engineers to act upon the American section obtained the services of men who had previous technical training in water questions, men who had actually been engaged in investigating work on the Great Lakes which supply the water that creates Niagara Falls; the division of its waters being one of the principal questions that was afterwards dealt with by the Joint Commission. Now, while I have nothing to say against the character or ability of the two engineers first selected by our government, I do say that there is not an atom of evidence that can be produced to show that these men had any large experience in that branch of their profession in which they were to be engaged in looking after the interests of the people of this country. It appears to me that in that respect—and I state that without any desire to belittle the ability of these men—the United States again scored. But probably the feature that is most astonishing in connection with the completion of the Canadian section is the appointment of Mr. Mabee who was selected in May, 1905, and to use the language of the right hon. gentleman was 'elevated' to the bench in November of that year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hold the doctrine that water is the most valuable asset this country possesses, and holding that doctrine I cannot conceive it is possible to 'elevate' any man from the position then held by Mr. Mabee to any other in the gift of the people or of the government.

I claim that the government had no proper conception of the character of the work that was to be conducted by the Joint Commission, and that it had no conception of the great services the Canadian section would be called upon to render this country, and I claim that the proof of that is in the government's method of procedure in using a seat on the Canadian section as a resting place on the road to the judiciary. I am aware that Judge Mabee has since rendered signal service to this country; that he is engaged in very important work at the present time in the interests of the people, but I claim that it cannot be of the same character of importance as that in which he was first selected by our government.

It is true that the full importance of work in connection with our international waters may not be recognized by the present generation, but the time will come, in my judgment, when our people will properly measure, and appreciate our asset in those waters.

The correspondence which both sections had with the respective governments, justifies me in stating that as soon as the Canadian section was completed, its colleague, the American section, brought forward the Niagara river situation, and pressed it into reaching an early conclusion as to the division of waters at that point. I claim that the Canadian section had to rely upon the American engineering data. I do not, for an instant, suggest that that information was not correct in every detail, but I do say that intelligent people in this age do not go into questions of such great importance without securing their own technical information to guide them in reaching their conclusions. I claim that the division of water at Niagara Falls is a division practically suggested by the American section. I, therefore, think the foregoing summary of facts, which were presented to the House by me in May, 1909, fully justifies the charge that our government utterly failed in its duty to the people at that time.

Turning now to article 6 of the treaty, which undertakes to divide the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers, between Canada and the United States, to the detriment of this country, and especially with great injury to my constituency, here again, I claim, the division is one that was practically suggested by American representatives. What is the use of carrying on negotiations if one side is to do all the negotiating?

As I am intimately familiar with the features of the controversy over the waters in question, I propose dealing with the matter at considerable length. It will, therefore, be necessary to give a brief synopsis of the situation. The St. Mary's lakes, two in number, of a total length of 22 miles, are to be found within the eastern base of the Rocky mountains in Montana. Out of them flows the St. Mary's river in a northerly direction, reaching our boundary at a distance of about nine miles. The stream continues its northward course, and becomes part of the Saskatchewan river system, and its waters eventually discharge into Hudson bay. It is an important mountain stream.

The Milk river, likewise, arises in Montana, out in the foot hills, about twenty-five miles east of the St. Mary's river. It crosses over into Canada, and for over one hundred miles flows eastward through my constituency, then, returning to Montana, its waters become part of the Mississippi river system, and empty into the Gulf of Mexico. It is an unimportant stream.

At the time the negotiations were on between the two countries regarding the division of the waters of those streams, what were the commitments against them? In other words, what were their responsibilities? Turning first to the St. Mary's river, within its nine mile course in Montana, it is walled in by two prominent foot-hill ridges which extend practically up to the Canadian border, and within the valley so formed, there is practically not an acre susceptible to development by irrigation. There is no settlement in the valley outside of two or three ranches which front along the stream. In other words, it practically was, and still is a foot-hill wilderness. The situation, however, changes as the stream enters Canada. The valley broadens out, and there are several hundred thousand acres of land capable of developing by irrigation from the waters of that river. As early as 1894, the Canadian government conducted investigations, looking to the development of irrigation from the St. Mary's river, and in 1897, a company was formed with that object in view. The first question that arose was as to the feasibility of diverting water from the stream in Montana, and the decision reached was, that it would not be commercially practicable to do so. Of course no one thought the United States would ask Canada for the use of the Milk river channel, down which it would carry water diverted from St. Mary's river. The Canadian company received authority from this government to carry on its development work, it received authority to divert all the available low water flow of St. Mary's river, and up to two thousand cubic feet per second of high water, and under the irrigation laws of this country was given by our government fifteen or seventeen years within which to carry out its plans. At the time negotiations were in progress, it had developed its canal system to take care of some 800 cubic feet per second.

Turning now to Milk river, I am aware that for some years the total normal available flow was in use for the irrigation of certain areas within the valley of the stream in eastern Montana, to be more exact, in the neighbourhood of Harlem, on the Great Northern railway, where a large quantity of hay is grown by means of irrigation. It has been stated that the rights of the various users of water in eastern Montana were adjudicated upon, and those total rights fixed at somewhere about 350 cubic feet per second. Whether that statement is correct or not, I am prepared to admit that the total normal flow during the summer was appropriated, and was being used. I am also aware of the fact that 350 cubic feet is a great deal more water than the stream carries, except at certain periods in the spring. I have seen the stream carrying not more than ten to fifteen feet per second in the month of August.

Turning briefly to the policy of the United States government for the reclamation of

its arid lands, an Act of Congress was passed in 1902 wherein it was provided that lands capable of development by irrigation could be set apart; that the government would provide the necessary moneys to construct the irrigation system, and that the lands would be sold at a figure which would recoup the government its expenditure in connection with the work of bringing the water to the land. That Act brought into existence a corps of engineers, known as the Reclamation Service, and those engineers, in going through Montana, located about 200,000 acres of land within the Milk River valley in eastern Montana which could be easily irrigated from the stream, provided there was sufficient water available for the purpose. They found, however, that the available water was fully appropriated so they had to look elsewhere for water with which to reclaim the lands three methods of taking water from the St. Mary's River valley and made extensive surveys. The result of these indicated three methods of taking water from the St. Mary's river in Montana for the use of the reserved lands. Two of those schemes involved immense outlays in building canal systems entirely in Montana, but owing to the great cost, they were impracticable. The third scheme was to throw the water into the Milk river in Montana by a diversion canal some 25 miles in length and to allow the water to run down through Canada for one hundred miles within the St. Mary's river channel and upon its return to that state to carry it to the reserved lands.

Now, what is the settlement that is provided in article six of the treaty? Namely that two streams running in opposite directions, the important one having its waters discharged in Hudson bay, the other running southward to the Gulf of Mexico, are to be considered as one stream. That is a very excellent declaration so far as our neighbours are concerned, as it allows them to break through a sound principle affecting important streams, that principle being that waters diverted from such streams for irrigation or power purposes should be allowed to return to the same stream in order to permit it to fulfil to the fullest extent its functions or the functions which it may be called upon to fulfill as the country settles up through which the stream flows. The principal function to which I refer is that of navigation. The importance of that declaration, so far as our neighbours are concerned, is fully realized, when we understand that half the waters of St. Mary's river—the important stream—which has for ages past been flowing into Hudson bay will upon the completion of the United States Diversion canal, be carried into the Milk river to supplement the Mississippi river system, and aid in development work in the United States.

The next feature of the article is that the waters of the two streams are to be equally divided. With a prior right, during certain summer months, to Canada of 500 cubic feet per second or so much of such an amount as constitutes three-quarters of the natural flow of St. Mary's river and a similar right in favour of the United States for a similar period as against the flow of the Milk river. There, then is how Canada with about 600,000 acres capable of development, with important vested rights equal to 2,000 feet (cubic) per second against the principal stream—the St. Mary's river are offsetted by vested rights in Montana against the Milk river, which I understand have been adjudicated upon and fixed at 350 cubic feet per second. There then is how Canada's rights, amounting to 2,000 cubic feet per second, and with a canal system capable of taking care of 800 cubic feet per second, are to a considerable extent being destroyed, not for the protection of any vested rights against the St. Mary's river in Montana, but for the creation of rights in an entirely different water system and fully three hundred miles from the source of supply. And now comes the feature of that article which makes the project of the United States feasible. Canada is to allow the undisturbed right of use of the Milk river channel, for over one hundred miles in Canada down which the United States government will transport its half share of the St. Mary's river for use in eastern Montana. That feature has brought the American project out of the clouds of visionary imagination down into the realm of a practical project.

Now about that principle, which is referred to in my opening remarks, and which is to be applied in dealing with future water questions along our boundary, we find that article 2 of the treaty dealing with streams flowing across the boundary consists of four features. 1st. It provides that each government shall absolutely control the waters within its own boundaries, notwithstanding the fact that they may flow into or from the adjoining country. 2nd. That interests which may be injured on one side of the boundary through the diversion of a stream on the other, that the injured interests may cross over into the other country and seek redress in its courts. In short, that vested rights on one side must be honoured on the other. That is the opinion of the Minister of Public Works, who in dealing with this resolution stated page 898 of the unrevised 'Hansard':

Mr. MAGRATH. One more question. I understood the minister's opinion is that under that article, vested rights against a stream on one side of the boundary must be honoured on the other side?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Exactly, that is the spirit of the treaty, that is what it is intended to provide, and it is giving an absolutely new right to subjects of the two countries.

Now it appears to me that that is a fair and just principle which will permit vested rights to seek redress in the country where the damage has been done. The underlying principles of irrigation in the appropriation of water for irrigation is the same in all countries. In Canada a right was obtained under the irrigation laws of this country to take from St. Mary's river certain specific waters. That right still exists and the Canadian company which has the right has been developing its canal system with due diligence. Yet that right, a right which would be honoured under the irrigation laws of Montana was, to a large extent, destroyed by the settlement arrived at in article 6.

I cannot understand the view point of the honourable Minister of Public Works who on the occasion referred to, page 894, unrevised 'Hansard,' said:

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is provided that the people of Alberta shall have the same right to proceed in the courts of the United States as they would have to proceed in the courts of Alberta if the diversion had taken place in Alberta, that is to say, the United States will have a perfect right to divert the water, yet that diversion must be subject to the right of the person lower down the stream, whether in the United States or in Canada, to the same right of action against the other riparian proprietor as if those people were subjects of the same country.

If the hon. minister's statement, as quoted above, is correct, then there is nothing more to be said, as Canadian rights, as soon as they are disturbed by American interests in the United States, can at once seek redress in the courts of that country. The minister appears, however, to have overlooked the third feature of article 2, which clearly states that the principle of allowing vested interests to cross over into the other country is not to apply in existing cases, or cases which can be settled by special arrangement, and the existing case, the only one—namely, the controversy over the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers were settled as provided in article 6 of the treaty. Now, if it is fair and just to allow vested interests that may hereafter be disturbed to protect themselves by going into the courts of the other country, I say, if that is a fair and just principle to be applied in cases that may arise in the future, surely, it was a fair method of settling the existing case, especially between friendly people, who claim that they only wish to be fair to each other. If the Canadian commissioners, who negotiated the treaty, had any idea that we might have in the future a great number of cases of disturbances of waters flowing across the boundary, from one country to the other, then, possibly, there might be some justification for allowing those who negotiated for the United States to insist upon this single case being dealt with by 'special arrangement.' There might be some excuse for doing it, that is, they might have felt it desirable to give way on this occasion in order to have a settled plan on a fair and just basis, whereby future cases might be dealt with. I venture to suggest, however, that the government has no evidence to offer to show that the Canadian commissioners attempted to estimate to what extent this principle might be applied in the future. As a matter of fact, in all human probability, the principle can never be applied, as I cannot see how it is possible that any other cases may arise in the future. In fact, that is the view point of the hon. Minister of Public Works, as will be found on page 901 of the unrevised 'Hansard':

All that this treaty does is to provide an equitable mode for the people of each country to obtain compensation from the people of the other country in case their rights are in any way affected. I am sure the committee will realize that there are very few cases. Perhaps there never would be a case where this question would arise except in the case of waters which are used for the purpose of irrigation. The question might arise between the inhabitants of Montana, Alberta and Saskatchewan, because a person or company in Montana might divert certain waters which flow to the northwest and use these waters for the purposes of irrigation. The result might be to deprive a Canadian living lower down the stream upon the Canadian side of the boundary of water which would be very necessary for the purpose of irrigation. Before this treaty, that could be done and he could not say a word, but under this treaty he can complain through this government.

It is only necessary to consider the international boundary for a moment in order to see that the minister's views in that respect are correct. For instance, from the southeast corner of Manitoba down to the neighbourhood of Montreal, the boundary is a water boundary, across which streams cannot flow. Then the short portion between Quebec, New Brunswick and the state of Maine, the diversion of water can only be for power purposes, and in that case the water will immediately be allowed to return to the parent stream. The same remarks apply to the boundary south of British Columbia. Then along the southern boundary of Manitoba, there are two streams, the Red and Souris rivers, the former is navigable and cannot be disturbed the latter is of no importance for irrigation purposes, in my judgment, can not even be used for power purposes. In the remaining portion of the boundary extending eastward from the base of the Rocky

Mountains—the territory within which irrigation is practised—the only streams that cross the boundary are the St. Mary's and Milk rivers, and their tributaries, and the division of those waters is absolutely settled in article 6 of the treaty. I, therefore, repeat that in all human probability, the only opportunity wherein that fair and sound principal of allowing vested interests to protect their rights, regardless of the boundary, is the one case which existed at the time the treaty was being negotiated and which our neighbours were clever enough to insist upon being settled by special arrangement.

Mr. FOSTER. Then, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Magrath) contends that there are no other instances outside the Milk and St. Mary's rivers which physically allow the principle to be applied?

Mr. MAGRATH. I do. I say that in any other streams that cross the international boundary that, in all human probability there will not be an instance in which the interests on one side can be injured through the diversion of the stream on the other side.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to understand. The hon. gentleman's argument is that a perfectly fair and just principle is laid down?

Mr. MAGRATH. Certainly.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then, in respect of the largest, indeed the only cases to which that principle would be applicable, the principle is entirely departed from by an exception engrafted on the treaty?

Mr. MAGRATH. Yes. I say I cannot conceive how the Canadian representatives could have failed to recognize the true situation. I repeat that if we wish to deal fairly with our neighbours and to be dealt fairly with by them, there is no reason why Alberta interests in Canada could not have been permitted to take advantage of the principle that is to apply in future cases. If this were done there would be no criticism from me. Now, I previously stated—or intended to state—that this settlement is a settlement suggested by the American representatives. If hon. members will look at a return brought down at the instance of the leader of the opposition they will find there a copy of the letter addressed by Secretary of State Root to the then British Ambassador at Washington, dated January 15, 1907, in which a suggestion is made as to the division of the waters and that suggestion is substantially the settlement arranged in article 6 of the treaty. That is, the suggestion was made by Mr. Root two years before the treaty was negotiated. I stated also in explaining article 2 of the treaty that the fourth feature deals with navigable streams. I have seen steamers operating on the south Saskatchewan river; I have seen steamers operating on the Missouri. They are not to be found on either stream to-day. But that is no reason why they should not be found there in the future. I am aware that the South Saskatchewan river is near the vanishing point in regard to navigation. I believe that by the withdrawal of half the waters of the St. Mary's river which enters that stream, that stream will pass out of the class of navigable streams into that of unnavigable streams. I would like to know to what extent the Canadian Commissioners considered that feature, because if they did, and if my contention is right, then the St. Mary's river should not be disturbed, because it is one of the principal sources of supply of a stream which is today navigable. Now, the right hon. gentleman is not here. In discussing this matter in May, 1909, he spoke at considerable length, and I am quoting from him now at greater length, on account of his absence, than I really require to do in order to avoid any charge of attempting to garble his statements. On 'Hansard' 6640 of 1909, we find the right hon. gentleman saying:

> The St. Mary's river is not a large stream comparatively, but is much larger than the Milk river. This treaty, if it comes into force, will join them, that is, power is given under the treaty to join the two rivers into one steam which will flow together in the bed of the Milk river and enter the United States. My hon. friend (Mr. Magrath) has asked why we should have agreed to such a disposition as that, why we should have permitted a stream that flows into Canada to be made to flow into the United States? The reason is such that I am surprised that my hon. friend does not appreciate it; I was more than surprised, was more than sorry, I was even astonished at the criticism he made of that disposition.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that those remarks require any statement from me. As a sample of rhetoric they appear all right; otherwise they are absolutely wrong. The right hon. gentleman went on to say:

> The United States reclamation service have undertaken large works upon these waters, and they contemplate still larger works. They contemplate first to tap St. Mary's lake through which the St. Mary's river flows and to divert it into their own country. If this had been to the injury of a river flowing into Canada we would have protested against anything of the kind being undertaken.

Well, it appears this is the psychological moment for me to express some surprise and regret that any one should be found in this country possessed of so little appreciation of the value of water as to suggest that by the withdrawal of one half the

water from the St. Mary's river, which has been flowing into Canada for all past ages, the same would not be to the injury of the river and of the interests along it in this country. The right hon. gentleman went on to say:

Whether we would have protested successfully is a matter as to which I am not quite sure, because the United States claim that they have the right to divert any river, even if the river flows into Canada or into a foreign country, so long as they tap it within their own territory. They assert that their sovereignty with regard to a flowing stream is absolute, even though that stream flows into a neighbouring country. I am not quite sure that as a matter of international law the position is well taken. My view, on the contrary, is that the principle of civil law would apply to international law, and that there is a strong authority for that contention, but whilst it is a contention, the Americans have held to a different construction, and they assert that they have the right to exercise sovereign power so long as the work in question is within their own territory, even though the water flows to a foreign country. There was a source of difficulty.

Well, I was pleased to hear the right hon. gentleman state that he felt that we had some rights under international law. It would have been much more agreeable to me if we had some evidence that he had called in the services of legal experts who have been dealing with inter-state water questions, and a great number have existed in the western states. I am also aware of the claim made by some of our American friends to their sovereign power over waters within their own territories. I know this, that we have sovereign rights over the St. Mary's river in Canada, and we need not give them up unless we get what we think is fair and reasonable compensation. The right hon. gentleman continued:

But, putting that aside, the Americans contemplate establishing at the head of these streams large reclamation works, that is to say, putting up an immense reservoir to store the waters and keep them for the whole season. Under the present conditions my hon. friend stated this afternoon that with a committment of two thousand feet of water they never could develop more than eight hundred.

I fear the right hon. gentleman misunderstood me, because that is not what I intended to say. I intended to say what I have said to-day, that the Canadian company, while having a right to two thousand cubic feet of water at the time the negotiations were in progress, it developed its right to the extent of 800 cubic feet per second. The right hon. gentleman further said:

Why? I speak under correction, because I have to get my information from other sources, and I am not familiar with the country. But I understand that in a very short time in that section of the country the spring waters are exhausted, and that in the summer they have a very small amount of water, whereas, if they had these immense reclamation works which are contemplated by the American reclamation service the water would be stored and would be available during the whole summer, and, therefore, my hon. friend from Alberta and his constituents would have the benefit of the storage of that water all summer. I know that I speak with absolute certainty when I say that the reclamation service cannot join these two streams into one, as contemplated under this treaty, unless they construct these immense reclamation works which are now proposed. Therefore, these reclamation works being established, Canadians will have the benefit of them, and will have a store of water to draw from all the long summer, whereas at the present time they can only have it in the spring and fall months.

I draw attention to the next clause:

That is the reason we have agreed to this diversion of the St. Mary's river into the Milk river.

There then is the price that this country was to pay to the United States for performing certain services for us. That country was to establish immense reclamation works in Montana so as to conserve the total flow of the St. Mary's river; to hold back the winter flow, and to control the spring freshets, and allow Canada's share of water so stored up to pass down, in the language of the right hon. gentleman: 'to my constituents during the long summer months.' Now I come to an astonishing letter which is disclosed in the return laid on the table of this House.

Mr. FOSTER. Would the hon. gentleman make a little more clear the position taken by the Prime Minister, that is, as to its lack of basis.

Mr. MAGRATH. I will later on. I will quote an extract from a letter from Mr. Knox, Secretary of State, dated Washington, January 10, 1910, and addressed to the Right Hon. James Bryce:

Dear Mr. Bryce,—Referring to your note of the 25th ulto. and the memorandum inclosed therewith relative to the Boundary Waterway's Treaty of January 11, 1909, which is now awaiting ratification, there seems to have been some misunderstanding on the part of the Canadian government as to the purposes for which the United States intends to construct the dam at the outlet of St. Mary's lake and the canal between that lake and Milk river in Northern Montana in connection with the use of the waters apportioned between the United States and Canada under the provision of article 6 of the treaty. An examination of that article will show that it provides merely for an equal division between the two countries of the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers, with certain prior appropriations of the natural flow apportioned to each side. There is no requirement that the United States shall store any waters for the use of Canada, in fact, no mention is made of the storage of waters, and

the waters which the United States proposes to store are to be taken from its half share of the natural flow, and are intended for use on its own side of the boundary. The proposed storage of waters, therefore, by the United States will in no way diminish or interfere with the half share of the natural flow to which Canada is entitled under the treaty * *.

Here, we have a statement from the Secretary of the Interior of the United States, clearly showing that no such intention existed, that the language of the treaty does not attempt to bear out the view point of our government, and that it is not the intention of the United States to do any storage of waters in the St. Mary's lakes that would be of any service to my constituents during the long summer months. I say, it is a most astonishing situation, and evidently is indicative of the character of the work which we performed in connection with the negotiation of that treaty. I say it is enough to make any Canadian blush to think that we so signally failed to look after the interests of our own people. The Minister of Public Works understood the situation very well, though he has since recanted, and has told us that the treaty is quite fair to this country. I am not placing any particular significance upon his change of front, but we find in the correspondence a letter from the Minister of Public Works to the right hon. the leader of the government, dated January 20, 1910, from which the following extracts have been taken:

There seems to be a misapprehension on the part of the United States authorities in reference to the mode in which Canada would expect to derive any advantage from the construction of such storage works.

I have not yet discovered that there was any misapprehension on the part of the United States. It appears to have been on our part.

The principal benefit which would be derived by Canada from the construction of these works would be the securing of an increased and regular supply of water for irrigation purposes by means of the St. Mary's river. . . .

The hon. gentleman goes on to say:

—but this object would be defeated if the dam were so constructed as to only provide for carrying the water stored thereby to the Milk river by means of the proposed canal. For this reason, I regard it as essential to an equally beneficial division of the waters of both rivers that provision should be made for a due proportion of the stored waters of the St. Mary's river being allowed, under direction of the commissioners, to pass down the St. Mary's river into Canadian territory, instead of all stored waters being diverted to the Milk river.

If the United States authorities take this view and give an assurance that in the construction of the dam, provision will be made for the passing of the stored waters down both the St. Mary's and the Milk rivers, in order that they, as well as the natural flow, may be divided in accordance with the spirit of the treaty, I am of the opinion that such assurance will be satisfactory, and remove a ground for serious criticism which would otherwise be made against the treaty by those interested in irrigation projects upon and in the vicinity of the St. Mary's river in Alberta.

Well, the United States certainly did not give any assurance along the lines suggested by the Minister of Public Works. The treaty was accepted in March, 1910, without the change of one line in the document as it was before this House in May, 1909. I am not here to criticise it on behalf of any special interest in Alberta. I am here to criticise it in behalf of the people I represent in this House, people who realize the value of water, who realize that they require every drop of water for development purposes in that country, and it is astonishing to think that our government should treat this matter in such a haphazard way as to yield such unfortunate results to us. The treaty professes to recognize prior rights both in Canada and the United States. It is a mere profession so far as this country is concerned. Under conditions which might arise at any time during a dry season in southern Alberta, there are men to-day who are using water and doing it beneficially who will find themselves deprived of some of that water on account of its having been given to the United States for the benefit of lands that are absolutely unsettled at this moment. We must realize that any impairment of the authority granted under the laws of this country, which would stand good under the laws of any other country, where irrigation is in operation that any impairment of the authority granted to a Canadian company, for the diversion of water for development purposes in southern Alberta especially, if that impairment has been aided and abetted by this government which granted that authority, is in effect a breach of faith with the Canadian company and is a wilful disregard of the interests of the people I represent in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend speaks of it being a breach of faith with the Canadian company. Is he aware that the Canadian company has recommended the agreement with respect to this treaty?

Mr. MAGRATH. No, I was not at all aware of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman will see on the file a letter from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy and another from Mr. Dennis both recommending it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They did not understand the situation.

Mr. MAGRATH. I would now like to trace the evolution in the plans of the United States Reclamation Service for the diversion of water from the St. Mary's river. The Annual Report of the Reclamation Service for 1902 submits complete plans in detail. It was the intention of that service at that time to build a dam fifty feet in height across the St. Mary's river, a short distance below the point where it leaves the lakes. The report, a copy of which is to be found in the library of parliament, shows that a number of borings were taken at various points across the valley of the river to determine the character of the foundations of the dam, and the borings so obtained justified those reputable engineers who have been investing millions of money elsewhere in the United States in connection with similar works, justified them in suggesting a dam of the height named, and which would impound in the reservoir so created in the St. Mary's lakes about 25,000 acre of water. The American canal was to be taken out of the reservoir at practically the river level, or about the bottom of the dam. I am aware from personal observation, that that proposed canal encountered some very heavy side hill cutting during the first seven miles in getting away from the St. Mary's river valley. I am aware that the Reclamation officers were most insistent in those days that that was the only proper way to conserve the waters of St. Mary's river. That they were positive in their statements that Canada had no such opportunities to conserve the total flow of the stream. And, in that I believe they were absolutely correct, because there are no lake areas through which the river flows on the Canadian side and which might be converted into reservoirs.

Possibly, through indifference on the part of our government, the United States became less ambitious to do all the conserving of the waters of the St. Mary's river, and concluded to look after No. 1 only. They changed their plans. They decided to raise the level of their canal some twenty-five feet in order to escape the heavy side hill cutting to which I have just referred. That would necessitate that building of a dam twenty-five feet high in order to raise the level of the river to their canal. They then, evidently, concluded to store half the waters of the St. Mary's river, which necessitated carrying their dam some fifteen feet higher; those are the plans so far as they are known at the present time.

Then the Reclamation officers set about to demonstrate that Canada had excellent opportunities to store water within her territory. We find on page 72 of the Return the following extract in a letter from Secretary Ballinger, dated Washington, February 9, 1910:

The natural conditions north of the International boundary in Canada are more favourable for water storage at reduced cost and with great assurance of permanency and safety of the structure.

It is regrettable to think that Canada did not appear to have any one sufficiently acquainted with this matter to have pointed out to our American friends the position taken by their own reputable engineers a few years previously, and I say that it is humiliating to be told by a prominent engineer in the United States, an engineer who has not been in any way connected with the Canadian government case, that the trouble with Canada in this controversy was, that she had no one connected with the case who had any knowledge of irrigation. The engineer who made that statement to me did not know that Mr. G. G. Anderson had been called in, and to whom, I propose referring very briefly in a few moments.

Why did our government not insist upon the price being paid which the Right Honourable gentleman referred to in addressing the House in May, 1909? He told us that when we were giving the use of the Milk river channel through Canada to the United States which made the American project feasible, we were given that right because we were going to have immense reclamation works established by the United States which would be a benefit to my constituents during the long summer months. Evidently some reason appeared in the horizon of the government between May, 1909, and that well known month of March, 1910, when the American surtax was likely to be put into effect against this country on the 31st day of that month, and all on account of some treaty-making jaunts to Europe wherein some European countries have special privileges in trading in toilet soaps in Canada. We all remember how our friends opposite appeared so pleased when the Honourable Minister of Finance reached a settlement with the executive of the United States in connection with the matter. When it was announced that commercial interests of this country were not to be penalized in the markets of the United States because the Honourable Minister of Finance gave that country some privileges in the matter of trading in peanuts and a few other minor articles in this country. I am disposed to think that we were told on that occasion that the slate had better be cleaned and the outstanding questions between the two countries settled. If my view is right in that respect, I am disposed to think that Southern Alberta is paying pretty dearly for the privileges that Canada has of securing cheap European soap. Now, as to the methods pursued by our government in this

matter, the return that has been brought down to this House makes most interesting reading. It shows that the government secured the services of George G. Anderson, a prominent Consulting Irrigation Engineer of Denver, Colorado. The government is to be commended for that because Mr. Anderson is one of the first men in the irrigation profession in America. That, I am aware, is a mere statement, but it can be verified by any one who wishes to write to any financial institution in the State of Colorado. Mr. Anderson was well qualified to deal with the matter because he had been the consulting engineer of the three large Canadian Irrigation enterprises, first, the Alberta Irrigation Company, second, the Canadian Pacific railway irrigation project, and lastly, with the Southern Alberta Land Company, which is operating in the neighbourhood of Medicine Hat. The Return shows that Mr. Anderson submitted an extensive and valuable report, dated 22nd April, 1908, giving in detail the history of the questions involved in reference to the division of the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers, and suggested a division that would yield the greatest good to the greatest area, regardless of the International boundary, a principle that I believe should be applied between friendly people and we have heard considerable recently of how friendly we are with our neighbour in this and other questions. We have no evidence that his views were in any way put forward before the American representatives. Then the Treaty was negotiated in the following January, and we had a discussion in this House in May, 1909. It had to pass into the Senate of the United States and a representative of the people there felt that the interests of the people he represented were not being properly protected, and he had a rider attached to the treaty which necessitated its being sent to our government for acceptance. For some reason, not disclosed in the correspondence, Mr. Anderson's services were again brought into commission, and we find a report from him, dated at Denver, 18th September, 1909, in which he criticises the settlement as arranged in article 6. The opening paragraph of his report is as follows:

Thorough and careful consideration of the provisions of the treaty.

It is a pity, Sir, that our representative did not treat the subject in the same way.

Thorough and careful consideration of the treaty with the United States relating to boundary waters and questions arising along the boundary between Canada and the United States signed at Washington, January 11, 1909, so far as the provisions affect the waters of the St. Mary and Milk rivers and their tributaries compels the conviction that they are greatly unjust to the interests of Canada, and for the following reasons.

Now, I do not propose to indulge in any technical discussion of this subject, nor to follow Mr. Anderson in his report beyond making a couple of references thereto.

Mr. FOSTER. Are these reasons lengthy?

Mr. MAGRATH. Oh, yes, they cover many pages. The return shows an extraordinary situation for which I question if any parallel is to be found in any business organization. Here, we had secured the services of an expert in irrigation to deal with a purely irrigation question, and that expert submitted a lengthy and able report. In the return which has been brought down we find an undated memorandum addressed to the Minister of the Interior by a representative of our government, evidently prepared between the end of 1909 and March, 1910, and in this undated memorandum, Mr. Anderson's views are pulled to pieces by the people who employed him as an expert, instead of throwing Mr. Anderson's opinions and views up against those on the other side of the controversy and following them up by sound argument of our own. I repeat that I question if it is possible to find a parallel for action of that character in any business institution in the wide world It might not be out of place to state here, that the negotiations so far as the United States is concerned, were either conducted by the Technical Officers of the Reclamation Service who were familiar with every foot of the ground, through which these streams run, or when not conducted by them, one or more of those men were at the elbow of those who were in charge of the negotiations. I challenge the government to produce any evidence to show that that was the situation so far as Canada is concerned. Why there was not an expert within one thousand miles of the gentlemen who conducted the negotiations for us. It is true that the Minister of Public Works, when his resolution was before the House, undertook to certify two gentlemen as Irrigation Experts. I am aware that those gentlemen are experts in certain lines, but they would be the last to say that they were in any way expert in water questions, and the minister in attempting to manufacture them into Irrigation Experts simply exposed the weakness of this feature of the case, which I have been largely criticising, and instead of elevating the gentlemen in question into the sphere of Irrigation Experts, he had shown to the country at large his methods of looking after the interests of the people of this country.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. MAGRATH. Mr. Speaker, before resuming my argument which was broken off

owing to the House adjourning for lunch, I would like to revert for a moment to a feature that I may not have made absolutely clear this morning, and that is that while article two enunciates that sound principle that in the case of streams flowing across the boundary, vested rights on one side must be honoured on the other; that owing to the rider which does not allow that feature to be applied in the only existing case, that case had to be settled by special arrangement, and which was done in article six. I merely wish to point out how that sound principle was totally disregarded by the negotiators in article six, wherein the Canadian company, with a canal taking 800 cubic feet per second from the St. Mary's river, with legal rights up to 2,000 cubic feet per second, was only given a prior right of 500 cubic feet per second against the St. Mary's river, and not even that, because when the stream falls so that three-fourths of it will not produce 500 feet, then the Canadian canal will only be entitled to what that three-fourths of the stream amounts to. On the other hand, the charges against the Milk river in Montana, adjudicated at 350 cubic feet, are given a prior right of 500 cubic feet per second against that stream, though, of course, I know it is not capable of producing that amount in normal years during the irrigation season.

Returning now to that undated memorandum which I was dealing with when the House adjourned, the only question which Mr. Anderson raised which appears to have been seriously considered by our government, was his criticism that the United States need not build immense reclamation works whereby Canada would be served therefrom; but our representative disposes of even that view on page 80 of the return, in which he says:

> Therefore, it will not be necessary for the United States, Mr. Anderson says, to provide any storage on St. Mary's river. The flaw in this argument is in the fact that Mr. Anderson deals with average flows.

And elsewhere on page 82, he says:

> It is probable, therefore, that the dam will be built.

I think Secretary Ballinger's letter, of which a portion already has been read, indicates that there was not very much flaw in Mr. Anderson's argument. Elsewhere, it appears that Mr. Anderson referred to a very important feature which appeared in a communication made by the late John Hay, then Secretary of State, to the British ambassador, dated at Washington, February, 8, 1903, as follows:

> It is proposed to deal with this matter in strict conformity with the laws concerning the right to the use of water as recognized by the courts of the arid region, both on this side of the international boundary and on the other. The principle may be stated in the language of section 8 of the Reclamation Act: that the right to use of water shall be appurtenant to the lands, irrigated and beneficial use shall be the basis, the measure and limit of the right.

Mr. Anderson pointed out that that statement substantially meant that the Canadian company should be protected in its legal appropriation against the St. Mary's river. That statement of Secretary Hay is the sound and just principle of allowing vested rights to be protected, but our government's representative, in criticism on that point on page 75 of the return, uses the followinig language:

> I do not think there is much force in this argument. The United States would probably say in reply that if they are bound by Mr. Hay's words they are bound only in the sense in which he personally intended them.

It is rather an astonishing admission that Mr. Hay's own views were not used against his country in discussing this question. It appears to me that it would be more in the interest of Canada if we had theorized less, and had dealt in a practical way with a practical question, which, however, of course could only have been done by practical men. Finally, on page 83 of the return, we find the following statement from our representative:

> It is suggested in the note that storage on the Canadian side of the boundary could be secured at less cost and with greater assurance of permanence than at the outlake of the St. Mary's lake. This is corroborated by Mr. J. S. Dennis of the Canadian Pacific railway, who has a thorough knowledge of the engineering questions involved. While in the government service about fifteen years ago, he surveyed the whole of that region for the very purpose of ascertaining the possibilities of irrigation by water diverted from St. Mary's river. His view is that by utilizing the storage facilities of the northern slope of Milk river ridge, Canada can store all her share of the water, and that the storage in the basin of the St. Mary's lake would be of little or no service to her.

There are three features in the foregoing statement worthy of some attention. First, we have the statement of American authorities endorsed, namely: that storage facilities in Canada are better than in the United States. It is not a question of permanence of structures, because the United States is committed to the construction of a dam some forty feet in height, which will probably hold behind it 200,000 feet of water. It is a question of putting two holes in the bottom of that dam, one for the use of Canada, the other for the use of the United States. That of course, would involve the building of the American canal as originally located, and involve

that country in greater expense. Instead of that, however, there is to be one hole in that dam twenty-five feet above the river level, out of which the American share of the water will be taken, and the Canadian share of the water will go down the valley uncontrolled.

Then, we have the opinion of Mr. Dennis, that by using the storage facilities of the northern slope of the Milk river, Canada can store all her share of water. That statement is absolutely incorrect. The storage facilities of Canada are situated many miles from the St. Mary's river. They can only be connected by earthen canals with the river. Those canals can only be operated in normal years, about seven months in each year. We must realize that earthen canals must be closed down in order to allow them to dry out, so that teams can be placed in them to do the necessary repairs before the frost sets in. Any child in these northern latitudes knows that water cannot be carried in such canals during the winter months. Then, what happens to the flow of the stream for what, I may term, the five winter months? It is true that water will run longer than seven months, but I have already explained that the canals have to be closed down, and my experience in operating canals, is that they have never operated more than about seven months per year. So that at once disposes of that question. Then the other statement is that the storage in the basin of the St. Mary's lake would be of little or no service to Canada. All I have to say in connection with that is that the storage in the basin of the St. Mary's lake, is good enough for the United States, and, looking carefully over the entire treaty, and the success which has attended the efforts of the United States in its negotiations. I am disposed to think that what is good enough for that country, should be good enough for this.

Sir, when this question was before the House in May, 1909, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) criticised me rather severely for importing, as he said, political bias into this debate. I absolutely deny the charge, Sir. I was not sent here to throw platitudes at any one in this House. I came here to look after what I regard as the interests of the people of this country. I went into the western country over thirty years ago, without any very great appreciation of the value of either water or timber. I settled on the plains of western Canada, and it gradually came to me the great value of these two natural advantages. I was connected with development work in southern Alberta, and I say that any man who has an interest in this country should be glad to take part in making two blades of grass grow where one grew before I realize the necessity, as the people in that country to-day realize the necessity of every drop of water we are entitled to. We know that we have not sufficient water for our needs; and when the government allows water to be taken from us to which we are legally entitled, I have every right to come here to criticise the government. More than that, Sir, we are not doing what I consider we should do in the development of the water resources of that country. We have vast bodies of water going down towards Hudson bay, and doing little or no good. The government should carry on careful investigations to see to what extent the water can be put to beneficial use. Nothing is now being done in that direction beyond the measurement of some streams. But, before we can attempt the development of our water resources other things need to be done. We have certain gentlemen north of Lethbridge asking that water should be taken out of the Belly river for use in that country. They are not in a position to say whether that is or is not feasible from an engineering point of view. The government ought to go to their aid and tell them to what extent it is feasible.

Now, a few words dealing more closely with the Bill before us—that is in reference to the appointment of the three gentlemen who will be associated with the three appointees of the United States for operating the Waterways Treaty. I understand that the three representatives of the United States were selected several weeks ago and that ex-Senator Carter, of Montana, is one of them. Senator Carter was most active and aggressive in pushing forward Montana's claims during negotiation of the treaty.

I consider that our government has a great opportunity to render a signal service to Canada in the selection of the three Canadian representatives. In my opinion, it is not a question of obtaining gentlemen with legal lore, as the questions which will be involved are engineering questions. We know that continental Europe has been forced through circumstances to reduce transportation to a science. She has been forced to bring her water routes—the very cheapest—to the highest point of development. She has developed energy for industrial purposes in the same way, and in doing so, has made use of electricity for the transmission of power produced from water. Irrigation with her has likewise been brought to the highest point of efficiency, therefore, her engineers have had greater opportunity than has yet been offered in young America, but America is being forced in the same direction, through keen competition. Then, it appears to me that this is

the time for Canada to hunt for a man who stands pre-eminent in that branch of the engineering profession, which this commission will be called upon to deal with, namely, water questions. Let us get that man, regardless of price or where he comes from, as we need a man with such a reputation that when he speaks he will be listened to throughout Europe as well as America. Having secured such a man, let our government place a copy of the treaty in his hands with instructions to carry on investigations along the international boundary, so that when the five-year period for which the treaty was made comes to an end, he will be able to point out all the weak places so far as Canada is concerned. Place before him a map of Canada and draw his attention to the vast bodies of water possessed by this country, with streams flowing in almost every direction; point out to him the strategic position this country possesses in the world of commerce, and the vast quantities of raw materials we possess. Tell him to study Canada's problems of industrial development so as to be able to lay down a policy of water-power development and water transportation that will permit this country to get its products into the markets of the world at the lowest possible figure. Then, Sir, every link that we lay down in our transportation system will be a link in that enlarged plan of our ultimate aim in the matter of transportation which will enable Canada to be a great country with a prosperous people.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I am sure the House has listened very attentively to my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath). No member of the House is better qualified to speak on the general question of the rights to water and the uses of water, and nobody is better qualified to speak on the question dealt with in article 6 of the treaty, than is my hon. friend. Therefore, it is right, first that he should give every attention to the matter, and next that the House should give every attention to him. He has marshalled his arguments and his facts very well. The only criticism that I would have to offer is that my hon. friend has proved too much. He has proved, in his opinion, that the government has been absolutely derelict in its duty, has paid no attention to the rights of the people, has ignored the facts, and generally has thrown away an opportunity to protect the interests particularly of the constituency he represents. I am sure the House will forgive me if I do not agree in that extreme view. I shall not endeavour to follow my hon. friend through the technicalities of the subject, and I have no fault to find with the way in which he has presented the facts. What I criticise is his deductions from these facts, and I think I can show the House, from the hon. gentleman's own figures, that his deductions are not by any means warranted.

The position with regard to the matters dealt with in article six is exactly as he has stated. There are two rivers which take their rise in the United States, and flow into Canada. The smaller flows out of Canada back into the United States, and the larger remains in Canada, and flows into Hudson bay. The arrangement whereby Canada has granted three-quarters of the flow of these rivers in low water and one-half in high water, he condemns as an improvident one. I admit at once that, as compared with an arrangement which would secure to Canada the whole flow of both streams, it would be an improvident arrangement. But that was not the alternative. Let me put the alternative as I understand it, and as the House will understand it from what my hon. friend has said. The alternative was not between securing one-half of the water of the two streams and all the water, but between securing one-half of the water of the two and none of it, speaking of their low water flow. If the House has followed my hon. friend's statement, it will recollect that the proposition of the United States government, and the Reclamation Commission was to divert the whole of the low water flow, and some part of the high water flow of the St. Mary's river from its natural channel, out of its own drainage basin, into the drainage basin of the Milk river.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). But what right had they to do anything of the kind? That is an international stream, taking its rise in the United States and flowing through Canadian territory into Hudson bay. I have yet to find any authority for the proposition that the United States had the right to do anything of the kind.

Mr. OLIVER. I take exactly the same view as my hon. friend, but I think he will agree with me that, if they had not the right, beyond question they had the power to do it, and that was what was in question.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). My hon. friend says they have the power to do it. They have diverted the St. Mary's river into the Milk river south of the boundary line.

Mr. OLIVER. They have not done so, but propose doing so.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Well, there is nothing to prevent this government diverting the water of the Milk river into the St. Mary's.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand the hon. minister to say that undoubtedly the Unit-

ed States had not the right to divert this water.

Mr. OLIVER. In my opinion they had not.

Mr. LENNOX. But they had the power. In what way had they the power? Was it by force?

Mr. OLIVER. They had the power because the water originated within their territory and they were able to make a diversion of it within their own territory; and as a sovereign power, not governed at that time by any treaty, there is no doubt that whatever the right may be, the power absolutely lay with them to make that diversion and take the whole low water flow of the St. Mary's out of the drainage basin of the St. Mary's, and thereby leave all my hon. friend's constituents high and dry, so far as the low water flow of the St. Mary's was concerned, he will not dispute that statement.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Why did you not offer a counter proposition?

Mr. OLIVER. This is a counter proposition, but I wish to deal further with the suggestion of my hon. friend from North Simcoe. The proposition of the United States government was to divert the water of the St. Mary's into the Milk river, and then use the Milk river as a channel whereby that water could be taken around to Montana, and then used on the lands contiguous to the Milk river.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That would pass through miles of Canadian territory.

Mr. OLIVER. Precisely, we all agree as to the facts. This Milk river passes for 100 miles through Canadian territory, and the level was such that it was possible for Canada to tap that Milk river within Canadian territory and thereby take from it the water that would be taken out of the St. Mary's. As a matter of fact a ditch was dug for that purpose, but it would not take the water onto the land owned by the settlers in whose behalf my hon. friend (Mr. Magrath) was speaking.

Mr. MAGRATH. Yes, it would. The hon. minister will pardon me for contradicting him. I gave the contract for the portion of the Milk river ditch, and must know something about it. The water could be brought to Raymond and northward.

Mr. OLIVER. I would not care to enter into a controversy with my hon. friend on an engineering question.

Mr. MAGRATH. The hon. minister will find in his department plans which show that the water taken from the Milk river in Canada can be carried out into the other canal system on to the lands that are being supplied direct from the St. Mary's river.

Mr. OLIVER. Could it be secured to the town named after my hon. friend?

Mr. MAGRATH. No, there is very little water distributed there.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend says that, so far as a large part of the lands occupied by his constituents is concerned, this water could be taken out of the Milk river and distributed along that land, but to a part of that land it could not. My excuse for assuming that the water could not be brought from the Milk river into the St. Mary's direct is because at present it flows from the St. Mary's direct into the Milk river. While the possibility exists to take out of the Milk river what might have been taken out of the St. Mary's, and put into it by the United States, there is the further possibility that the United States did not need to do that. They could have carried the water of the St. Mary's river past the Milk river into another river which did not flow through Canada, and could thereby have defeated the purpose that was in the mind of the hon. member for Simcoe when he said that if they put the water into the Milk river we could take it out again. They did not need to put the water into the Milk river, they could have put it into another river, and could have used the water of that river. True, that would not have been an economical proposition, it would have cost more than it was worth. But it is an engineering fact that it could have been done, and it is a financial fact that the United States has money enough to do it. Speaking from my place in parliament, I would not like to go further and suggest that sometimes it has appeared to me that the United States is not always governed by economical considerations in dealing with a neighbouring country. At any rate, I have placed the situation before the House. The choice was not between getting half the water and all the water, it was between getting half the water and none at all, therefore, the government of Canada took the course that is laid down in the treaty as being in the best interests of the people concerned. We were not in a position absolutely to protect their interests, therefore, we believe that we were well advised in protecting them as far as we were able. That this action of ours was well taken I am convinced from the fact that we have an assurance from the head of the responsible company which to-day owns the irrigation rights that my hon. friend has spoken about, that is to say, the residuary rights which have not yet been disposed

of, and the head of this company advised the government that the company was satisfied with the arrangement that was then about to be made. Under these circumstances, while I am free to admit that the arrangement was not such as we would have liked to make, and that perhaps we might have made a more favourable arrangement with our neighbours, still it was such an arrangement as commended itself, under all the circumstances, to the people who were most directly financially interested, as well as to the government, in dealing with what was a very, very difficult question. I just wish to say that I think my hon. friend was not justified in the conclusions that he drew from the very accurate statement of facts that he made. I do not think the government have slighted the interests of the people affected, and are not to be blamed, but rather they are entitled to credit for having done all that could have been done, under the difficult circumstances, to protect those interests.

Mr. C. J. DOHERTY (Montreal, St. Anne). In this Bill there seems to be a very material change from the provisions of the Bill when it was originally introduced. The Minister of Public Works told us this morning, if I followed him correctly, that he had introduced some new sections for the purpose of making it clear that there should be a jurisdiction in the courts of this country to try actions contemplated by the treaty brought by persons residing in the United States. It seems to me that the first section of this amended Act modifies materially the case, and puts this House, as towards this Bill, in a very different position from that which it occupied at the time the Bill was originally introduced. By the first section of the amended Act this Bill purports to confirm, and sanction the treaty that was made. Now if I understand the situation, when the Bill was originally introduced, the treaty was considered as being absolutely in force and binding upon us, and what parliament was asked to do was to provide for the officers to be named under the treaty, for their appointment, and for their fees. The Bill now seems to proceed upon the principle that the treaty requires some confirmation, or some sanction from this House; because I do not suppose that the government is asking us to go through a performance which is absolutely unnecessary, which can have no effect. It would appear now that the government must be under some impression that this parliament has power to deal with the treaty in the shape of ratifying it, and I suppose that if we can ratify we would likewise have the right to refuse our ratification. Perhaps the minister will say whether he understands by this clause of the Bill that a confirmation of this treaty by parliament is necessary.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought I had made it clear that it is the opinion of the Department of Justice that, in order to give authority to a court to subpoena witnesses and to have them sworn before giving their testimony, an Act of this parliament is necessary; also, that legislation is required in order to give a right to American citizens to proceed in the courts of this country pursuant to the terms of the treaty. That is the object of introducing the legislation. Of course, in doing that it is desirable that we should ratify the whole treaty, because these clauses are essential parts of it.

Mr. DOHERTY. I can understand that the sections following section 1 do make provisions for the machinery to enforce the rights that are created under the treaty. But section 1 purports purely, and simply to sanction and confirm the treaty. Now it seems to me that one of two things must be true ; either the treaty requires a sanction and ratification by this parliament, and we have power to sanction and ratify it, which also implies that we have power to refuse to sanction or ratify it; or the treaty requires no sanction or confirmation on our part, and we have no power to confirm or to refuse to confirm. Now, if the latter is the case, the government is asking this parliament to put itself into a position where it subjects itself to the criticism that it is undertaking to deal with a matter with which it has no possible concern.

What would be the effect upon this treaty if parliament refused to pass this Bill? Surely the first inference would be that the treaty was not binding upon it, and it seems to me that we ought to be very careful before we undertake to break into a matter with which we have no right to deal. I have understood up to the present that the position that the government took was that this treaty was completely binding upon us as soon as it was passed, and that we had no further power in the matter than to provide machinery to carry it out. The introduction of this section raises a very important question. If I understand it rightly, the treaty-making power is vested in the Crown, and it seems to me that if this be a treaty which can be made by the Crown without any intervention of any other authority, it is nothing short of a piece of impertinence on our part to take it upon ourselves to sanction or confirm it. If, on the other hand, this be a treaty which can only become binding upon its ratification by parliament, then I entirely fail to see how this parliament comes to be the proper body which ought to pronounce that ratification. I do not want to go into a discussion of this matter in detail of whether ratifica-

tion is necessary or not, but it seems to me that if it be a case where ratification is necessary this parliament is without power to deal with this question of ratification. I understand there are treaties which are recognized as requiring legislative action to make them perfectly and completely binding, and that among treaties of that kind are those which have the effect of modifying or altering the private rights of individuals which require legislative action to make them binding upon those individuals. But, in that view, so long as the treaty-making power is exercised by His Majesty, not as forming any part of the parliament of Canada, but His Majesty as being the King of Great Britain and Ireland, and, therefore, Sovereign of the empire, it seems to me that the only legislative body, which, under these circumstances if we assume ratification to be necessary to this treaty, could take upon itself, or would be the body, to exercise that power would be the imperial parliament and not this parliament here at all. I do not know that the British North America Act gives us any treaty-making power of any kind, and if ratification is essential to this treaty then the pronouncement of the ratification is a part of the making of the treaty. I quite understand that it might have been a part of the treaty that it should be subject to ratification by this parliament, and if that had been so then I quite understand that it would be within the purview of this parliament to pronounce upon it and say whether it would confirm and ratify it or not. But, there is nothing of the kind in the treaty; so that, it seems to me that by this first section the government is asking parliament to do a something which it has absolutely no power, or no quality, or no function to do. I do not know whether the answer would be that even if it is none of our business it would not do any harm if we should do this. I do not think that is a very conclusive answer because I do think that this parliament ought to guard itself against laying itself open to the accusation of stepping in where it has no power to ratify or refuse to ratify what His Majesty, in the exercise of his prerogative powers, has done, because stepping in to ratify does imply that it lies with us, if we choose, to refuse to ratify this treaty. Now, if it be assumed—and I suppose we must assume it, inasmuch as the government asks us to ratify this treaty—that we have some power in the matter, and that it is open to us to refuse to ratify this treaty if we choose, then, it seems to me the question arises—and I believe it is a very important question—as to whether we ought to ratify this treaty. I think that my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) made out a strong case this morning in regard to one feature indicating that we should refuse to ratify the treaty. An important clause of the Bill is that which purports to grant the right of action against individuals in this country for damages resulting from diversions of streams running through this country, and that ultimately pass into the United States. In that regard it seems to me that the government, by this treaty, has undertaken to create rights of action against individuals in the different provinces and then, because it has taken upon itself to create these rights of action, follows it up in this measure by withdrawing the individuals who may be responsible for such diversions, and who are consequently subjected to the rights of action the treaty purports to create, from their natural jurisdiction before the provincial courts and making them amenable to the Exchequer Court and liable to be brought away from their homes and the jurisdiction of their courts which are constitutionally charged with the administration of the civil law to answer for what after all is on their part a violation of the civil law, or the common law, as the case may be, giving rise to action in damages on the part of persons who have suffered by it. The provision of the treaty is this. It is agreed that:

> Any interference with or diversion from their natural channel of any waters in Canada, which in their natural channels would flow across the boundary between Canada and the United States or into boundary waters (as defined in the said treaty) resulting in any injury on the United States side of the boundary, shall give the same rights and entitle the injured parties to the same legal remedies as if such injury took place in that part of Canada where such diversion or interference occurs, but this section shall not apply to cases existing on the eleventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine, or to cases expressly covered by special agreement between His Majesty and the government of the United States.

I understand that the purpose of this article is to give to persons in the United States suffering from the diversions of streams that take place in this country the same right of action which a person living in this country would have against a person who is responsible for the diversion. If that is correct, the right of action that is created or recognized in favour of this outsider is a right of action that is governed by the law of the province in which the diversion takes place. It does not appear to be intended to give an outsider any greater right of action than exists already in the country in which the diversion takes place as between the person responsible for that diversion and the person who has suffered damage. The right of action, therefore, is a right of action which results from the common law or the civil law, as the case may be, in the particular province in which the

diversion took place. The right of action which existed on behalf of a person within a province against another would be the subject matter of litigation before the courts of that province, and the party defendant in a case of that kind in which he had to meet a demand or claim made by a person resident within a province would be entitled to be summoned before his natural court, the court of his domicile, and have the matter threshed out there.

This treaty or rather the Bill purports to give a different right as regards the court to an outsider than would be given to a resident within the province, and because the injury happened to occur to a person resident in the United States it purposes to make a resident within the province subject to the jurisdiction of a court which, generally speaking, has no jurisdiction in matters of that kind. You are giving a special jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court over persons in actions resulting from violations of a civil law, a law that governs them in the exercise of their rights of property within the province, and you are doing that because the person injured happens to be a stranger. I would not like to pronounce myself absolutely upon that, but it does not seem to be very clear, that, without this treaty, if a person within one of the provinces diverted a stream—take a person living on the boundary line—that was running through his property and into his neighbour's on the other side,and failed to hand it over to him in the condition in which he had received it, that person would not have an action against him in the courts of the particular province merely because he lived outside. It is quite true that the damage suffered may have occurred in the outside territory, but the act in violation of law which was done by the person responsible for it was done within the particular province. I think that apart from the treaty itself, those provisions of the Bill which undertake to make an individual, who may become liable for the diversion of a stream, subject to the jurisdiction of a particular court outside of the province when the damage happens upon a stream that runs into another country and damages a person in that other country, whereas for a precisely similar act as regards a fellow citizen he would be within the jurisdiction exclusively of the provincial court is susceptible to very serious objection. It may subject the person against whom the action may be brought to very serious practical inconvenience and damage because he will be withdrawn from the court of his own domicile and forced to go before a court that may sit at a place remote from where he resides. At all events, it is supposable that there may be cases where the witnesses may be persons coming from a long distance. It seems to me that there is no necessity, even if this right of action required a treaty to create it, for giving jurisdiction for the determination of these cases to courts other than the provincial courts that would deal with a similar liability on the part of the person if the injury resulting from his act happened to an individual within the country. There are other objections which might very properly be urged against this legislation. Some of them perhaps have more to do with particular sections and will come up more properly in committee. It seems to me the principal objection to this Bill is that, by submitting the Bill to us, the government is asking this parliament to ratify a treaty with regard to which I entirely fail to see that there is power in this parliament either to ratify or to refuse to ratify. Either this treaty is complete as being the exercise of the power of the Crown itself or it is not, and if it is not in the absence of any provision in the treaty itself, making it subject to the ratification of this parliament, if any need for ratification, results from the general principles which provide for the cases in which treaties made ought to be subject to ratification by parliament, I entirely fail to see that there is any other parliament that could give that ratification than the imperial parliament itself.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One or two words before the treaty passes. In the first place I desire to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Medicine Hat for the very able and lucid address he has given to the House to-day, in which he has set forth very distinctly the practical effect of this treaty, from his standpoint, upon the conditions in the province of Alberta and more particularly in connection with the waters of the St. Mary's river and the Milk river. The hon. member (Mr. Magrath) has gone into the matter with very great thoroughness. He has reviewed the situation from beginning to end in a very fair and convincing manner and in my opinion he has demonstrated very completely that the government, in negotiating this treaty, have not taken the best means of safeguarding the interests of the people of Canada, and have not adequately safeguarded these interests. I would like to say to the Minister of Public Works who has charge of the Bill, that during the period which has intervened between the signing of this treaty and the present time the situation has been to some extent altered if we may judge by what has recently been to the fore in the way of negotiations between the government of Great Britain and the government of the United States for a general arbitration treaty.

I do not think that the President of the United States can be too highly commended

for the position he has taken in that respect, and I would like to quote to the House the language he used in what has been called his inspired deliverance before the peace and arbitration society in New York on the 22nd March, 1910. He said:

Personally I do not see any more reason why matters of national honour should not be referred to a court of arbitration than matters of property or of national proprietorship. I know that is going farther than most men are willing to go, but I do not see why questions of honour may not be submitted to a tribunal composed of men of honour who understand questions of national honour, to abide by their decision as well as any other question of difference arising between nations.

We all know that up to the present time treaties of arbitration between the nations of the earth have excepted matters which concern the national honour, or the vital interests of either country. President Taft took a memorable step in advance when he used these words I have cited. The policy which he then expressed himself as willing to follow will make his presidency memorable in the history of the United States, and in the history of the world. But he did something more than that. On the 17th day of December, 1910, he delivered an address at the banquet of the American Society for the Judicial Settlement of International Disputes. There are a great many peace societies in the United States, and the society which I have just named is one which has done most excellent work in the cause of peace throughout the world. In the course of his address on that occasion President Taft went one step further. He said this:

If, now, we can negotiate and put through a positive agreement with some great nation to abide the ajudication of an international arbitral court in every issue which can not be settled by negotiation, no matter what it involves, whether honour, territory or money, we shall have made a long step forward by demonstrating that it is possible for two nations at least to establish as between them the same system of due process of law that exists between individuals under a government.

After the two speeches of Mr. Taft, from which I have briefly quoted, it was generally recognized, I think, throughout the world, that the address delivered by him on December 17 last, was practically an invitation or suggestion to Great Britain that the United States would be willing to enter into a treaty of arbitration along those lines with the British Empire.

On the 28th day of April last, a notable gathering assembled at the Guildhall, when the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the Right Hon. A. J. Balfour, the leader of the opposition in the imperial House of Commons, both spoke on this question. I do not intend to quote from them at any length. Just one or two words from the address of Mr. Asquith on that occasion:

Arbitration for the settlement of disputes between nations is already familiar to us, but hitherto points of national honour of vital importance have been reserved and have not been referred to courts of arbitration. Now, whatever the magnitude of the interest may be, whatever poignancy of feeling may be involved, war will be absolutely abandoned.

Then he went on to say further:

It is the privilege of great nations as well as of great men not only to follow but to acknowledge precedents. If the United States and Great Britain make this compact it will be an immeasurable step in the progress of humanity.

Mr. Balfour spoke entirely along the same lines, and in precisely the same spirit.

It is understood that negotiations have been going on for some time between the government of the United States, and the government of His Britannic Majesty along these lines. Of course, it is yet a diplomatic secret as to how far these negotiations may have been advanced. But if they are in good progress, and we have every reason to believe that such is the case, may they not in effect supersede a treaty of this kind, which deals with only one kind of possible dispute between the United States, and a portion of the British Empire alone. I do not, of course, deny that the tribunal would be differently constituted. There would be a greater and a stronger tribunal under the general arbitration treaty now contemplated than the tribunal constituted by this commission; but we have nothing to fear, I hope, from that. Therefore, it would be well for us to pause for a moment to consider whether everything that this treaty accomplishes, and a great deal more besides, may not be accomplished by the arbitration treaty that we hope will be consummated before very long. Besides, something can be said for the position that it would be better for Canada to stand in line with the rest of the empire in respect of such a matter than to have its own particular arbitration treaty dealing with its special differences with the United States. It would seem to me that there could not be any possible objection on the part of the United States to that outcome, and certainly there ought not to be any objection on the part of Canada.

My hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) has spoken of the complete change in this Bill. It is completely changed from the form in which it was presented to parliament in the first instance, because it is now proposed by the first section to ratify the treaty, and by the second sec-

tion to alter and amend the laws of Canada, and of the several provinces of Canada, so far as may be necessary to carry out and perform the obligations of this treaty. In speaking upon this question in this House on the 14th day of May, 1909, I argued, and I have seen no reason since to change my views, that this treaty should have been made subject to ratification by the Canadian parliament. After examining this question, as discussed in the most recent and authoritative text books I arrived at the conclusion that treaties of the following character should be made subject to the approval of parliament: First, those imposing any burden on the people; second, those involving any change in the law of the land; third, those requiring legislative action to make them effective, or which affect the free exercise of the legislative power; fourth, those affecting territorial rights. I pointed out also that Anson, in his work upon the British constitution, referred in the edition of 1896 to the Heligoland Treaty between Great Britain and Germany as creating an unfortunate precedent. In that case Great Britain, having ceded the Island of Heligoland, subject to the approval of parliament, came to parliament for ratification of the treaty. It was at that time apparently the view of the British government that any treaty involving the cession of territory ought to be made subject to the approval of parliament. Anson, in his edition of 1896, criticised this as an unfortunate precedent. In his edition of 1908 he withdraws that criticism and says this:

> We seem to be drawn to this conclusion, that apart from precedents relating to Indian territory, it has of recent years been thought desirable, if not necessary, that the consent of parliament should be given to the cession of territory in time of peace.

I pointed out also that Lowell, in his recent work on the government of England, at page 22 of volume 1, used this language:

> The Crown has power to declare war, make peace and conclude treaties, save that, without the sanction of parliament, a treaty cannot impose a charge upon the people or change the law of the land, and it is doubtful how far without that sanction private rights can be sacrificed or territory ceded.

Then there are a great many recent treaties between Great Britain and foreign countries which have been made subject to the ratification of the British parliament. I need not go over these again. It appears now that the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), according to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), has come to the conclusion that this treaty must be ratified by parliament. That is perfectly obvious, as I pointed out most distinctly in May, 1909, but could not then find any one on the treasury benches willing to agree with me. I then said:

> This treaty must have the effect of altering the law of the land if carried into effect. You must have new laws in regard to actions brought by people in Canada against people residing in the United States, or by people in the United States against people domiciled in Canada.

And I argued, as I claim to-day, that it cannot be carried into effect without the ratification of parliament. My hon. friend the member for St. Anne division (Mr. Doherty), has shown the singular situation into which the matter has been brought by the action of the government. They did not make this treaty subject to the ratification of any parliament. They took the ground, contrary to all British precedents in the last twenty years, that this treaty need not be made subject to the ratification of parliament, but still they come to-day, and ask parliament to ratify it. In taking that step they are, therefore, departing from the position they took in the first instance. Inasmuch as this treaty was not made subject to the ratification of any parliament, what has this parliament to do with ratifying it to-day? In the absence of any provision in the treaty itself, there is strong ground for the argument which my hon. friend from St. Anne has presented, that the proper parliament to ratify it is the British parliament. That the Crown has the right to make a treaty and insert in it a stipulation that it shall not go into effect until ratified by the parliament of Canada, of that there can be no doubt. But if the Crown sees fit to make a treaty without inserting any such stipulation, there is strong ground for the argument of the hon. member for St. Anne that the proper, the only parliament which has the right to say it shall or shall not be ratified, is the parliament of Great Britain. That is the position in which the government finds itself to-day.

This treaty goes on, in the second place, to amend in a general, and comprehensive way, the laws of Canada, and of every province in Canada. It provides, as my hon. friend from St. Anne division (Mr. Doherty), has pointed out, a new tribunal for the determination of questions, which, according to my view, would have been determined formerly by the courts of the various provinces. That brings me to the point which my hon. friend, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), made, namely that we were absolutely in the power of the United States with respect to this matter. I shall not go into the argument made by my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath), except to this extent, that I do not at all agree with the view which the Minister of the Interior has put forward. What was the minister's

argument? He said that he agreed entirely in the position which I advanced, and fortified by authority when this matter was discussed on the 6th of December last, namely, that it was not competent, under the principles of international law for the United States to divert within its own territory the waters of a river which ran through the territory into Canada. I shall not quote in full the authorities which I read in December last upon that point. I took a text book recognized as an authority upon this question. The author is Professor Oppenheim. This gentleman is lecturer in Public International Law at the London School of Economies and Political Science (University of London), and a member of the Faculty of Economics and Political Science of the University of London, and he was formerly Professor Ordinarius of Law in the University of Basle, Switzerland. He is a well recognized authority in international law. In the preface of the work which I quoted, the author says:

> I have nearly always taken pains to put other opinions, if any, before my readers. I have been careful to avoid pronouncing rules as established which are not yet settled. My book is intended to present international law as it is, not as it ought to be.

And this opinion, expressed in a few words, is as follows:

> A state is, in spite of its territorial supremacy, not allowed to alter the natural condition of its own territory to the disadvantage of the natural condition of a neighbouring state, for instance, to stop or divert the flow of a river which runs from its own territory into a neighbouring territory.

We could not have anything more directly to the point than that statement of international law. But what is the position taken by the Minister of the Interior? It is that we were absolutely within the power of the United States, because the United States were capable of authorizing within their own territory the erection of works which would divert that river. He might just as well have said that, because the United States might pass a law authorizing its officers to confiscate all British shipping that came within its ports, we were absolutely within the power of the United States in that regard. That would be just as reasonable a conclusion to draw. But we were not within the power of the United States, because they could not divert the waters of this river, according to the principle of international law, except at the risk of committing an unfriendly act against a friendly power, an act which would be quite as unjustifiable, in my opinion, as the act of confiscation to which I have just alluded. My hon. friend might as well say that if the United States came and occupied 30 or 40 miles of the territory of Alberta or Saskatchewan, they were entitled to do so, because they had the power, and, therefore, we should make the best of the situation, bad as it was.

We were, I submit, entitled to have our rights determined according to the principles of international law, and I deny absolutely, that we were in the power of the United States. Under these circumstances the government made a treaty which in this particular respect, will have the consequences pointed out by my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath). Under the conditions which he has outlined, and with the results he has pointed out, is this a good or a bad treaty from the Canadian standpoint? I have no hesitation in coming to the conclusion that it is not an advantageous treaty to Canada, and that if the government had been properly advised, if they had taken advantage of the opinion of the experts whom they employed, if they had gone into this question with the care, and thoroughness which marked every step taken by the United States, we either would not have had a treaty at all, or a treaty very much more to our advantage. I regret, therefore, that a treaty has been entered into which will have the consequences we have pointed out. I regret that the government have seen fit to depart from the view which the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley), expressed in the letter over his own hand, which has been quoted to-day. I regret that the government has seen fit to disregard the views of the only expert, and a very able expert, I believe, he was, whom they employed on this matter.

In speaking in that way I do not wish to cast any discredit upon Mr. King or any of the other gentlemen who were concerned in this matter. But Mr. King has not had the experience in these matters which would justify us in calling him an expert in the same sense of the word that he would call Mr. Anderson an expert. He is not an expert of the same class as those who surround the men who were negotiating on the part of the United States. The only answer to all this seems to be the reply already made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver)—that the manager of the great irrigation company which is controlled by the Canadian Pacific is satisfied with the treaty so far as his company is concerned, and the Canadian Pacific, which controls that irrigation company, is also satisfied with the treaty so far as it is concerned. Still, that does not by any means settle the question so far as the people of Canada are concerned. The treaty may be satisfactory to these gentlemen, but these gentlemen may be deceived. But, even if they are not deceived, it does not necessarily follow that everything that is in the

interest of this great irrigation company would be absolutely in the interest of the people of Canada. There are the rates for water to be charged to the people in the future which we must consider; there are a dozen different considerations to which we must have regard. And I respectfully decline to be governed in my appreciation of the conditions and the results by the argument which has been made in that regard by the Minister of the Interior.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If no other hon. gentleman desires to speak on this subject, I would like to make a few observations in reply to some remarks made by my hon. friend from Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath), and by some other hon. gentlemen who have spoken. In the first place, I think the Minister of the Interior put the matter very fairly when he said that he personally would very much have preferred to have an arrangement by which Canada could have got all the water of the St. Mary's river and the Milk river. But it was not a question of getting all the water or half of it, but a question of getting even half the water or the possibility of being deprived of all of it. I think the remark of my hon. friend from Medicine Hat that the water of the Milk river could be diverted to Raymond, which is a flourishing town in the province of Alberta, and distributed over a considerable stretch of country there is a very important point in that connection, because it indicates very clearly that, as a result of this treaty, when these commissioners are appointed to distribute the water of these two rivers equally to both countries, they may be able to allow a portion of that extra water which is turned into the Milk river and which for a hundred miles will then flow through Canadian territory, and will be available for the irrigation of that vast section of Alberta, to be diverted to the north and used for irrigating the large section of the country of which the town of Raymond is the centre. At the present time, as has been forcibly said, there is not a large flow of water in the Milk river. But when the stored waters of the St. Mary's river are turned into the Milk river there will be water available not only for a large portion of Montana upon the eastern waters of the Milk river, but a considerable quantity of water will be available which can be turned to the north and can be used, as I have stated, to irrigate a considerable section of country around Raymond. My hon. friend from Medicine Hat has said—and in this he has been followed by the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax)—that it is not a fair treaty so far as the distribution of the waters of these two rivers is concerned. But has he shown you, Mr. Speaker, in what respect it is not fair? He starts out with the theory that the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company has a vested right in 2,000 cubic inches of water per second. Who gave them that vested right? The government of the United States? Not at all. The only vested right they have is a license from the government of this country to utilize water if it is available, up to 2,000 cubic feet per second. That is not a vested right against the government and people of the United States. The hon. gentleman said also that this company have a canal system which enables them to utilize at least 800 cubic feet of water per second. Well, that gives them no vested right. The theory of this right, so far as irrigation purposes are concerned, is a right as between different subjects of the same country, who in the courts of that country can enforce their rights. But, as between the citizens of Canada and the citizens of the United States, there can be no vested right unless that right is given by treaty. If my hon. friend had been correct in his statement that the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company had a vested right as against the United States to 2,000 cubic inches per second there might have been force in his argument. But, as I have said they have no such right.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I desire to ask a question just for information. The hon. minister stated a moment ago that the people of Canada would be entitled to a large quantity of water from the Milk river, that is to say, water diverted from the St. Mary's river.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not read the treaty that way, and I do not think the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) can have read it. It states that the United States can use the Milk river as the channel for conveyance of their water, but that does not say that they are going to convey any water for our purpose, and I distinctly understood the hon. member from Medicine Hat to state that we could look at that water but we could not use any of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is wrong in that. It rests entirely with the commissioners to treat all the flow of these two rivers as one, and to apportion the waters of the two rivers equally between the inhabitants of the two countries, giving more of the water of one river and less of the other to one country, or vice versa, as they deem most advantageous to the people of both countries. That is the duty imposed upon the commissioners; and, if, for the purposes of irrigation they found it desirable to give more of the St. Mary's river to Canada than to the people of the United States, they could do so. In that case they

would give less of the flow of the Milk river, and vice versa, always keeping in mind that the total flow of these two rivers is to be distributed equally between the people of the two countries. There is another important fact which my hon. friend from Medicine Hat forgot. As you go eastward beyond the point where the Milk river turns again into Montana there are a large number of tributaries rising in Canadian territory, and the waters of which all flow down into the Milk river, upon the United States side of the boundary. The commissioners will be obliged to take the waters of these tributaries into consideration, and when they come to the United States, as they necessarily will, then, in the exercise of the power and in the performance of the duty vested in them by this treaty, they must keep in mind the waters of the various tributaries flowing from Canadian territory into the United States, and make allowance for them in the division of the total flow.

Mr. MAGRATH. Might I ask a question? Will not these streams which the hon. gentleman referred to—which after all will not use much water—be divided now equally between the two countries? Whereas now we get all that water.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They will form part of the whole. These waters flowing into the Milk river in American territory must be deducted from the whole water of the St. Mary's and the Milk, and in that way we shall be entitled to a larger flow of the water that comes from the westward, and so the people of Canada will secure a greater advantage. Now, as I have said, the whole argument of my hon. friend from Medicine Hat rests upon the theory that the people of Alberta, and more particularly the irrigation company and other citizens out there, cannot be interfered with in their rights to the extent implied by the granting of this license. They have no right which can be enforced as a legal right ordinarily can be enforced. If the citizens of the United States, or the United States government, were to divert every inch of the water of the St. Mary's river, and every inch of the water of the Milk river before it comes into Canadian territory, neither could this company nor the people of Alberta bring any suit against anybody for doing that. There is no court into which they could go. They might appeal to the government of the United States; but what has been the attitude of that government in the past? My hon. friend the leader of the opposition speaks of the principles of international law. What are they, Mr. Speaker? They are those principles that govern nations in their dealings with each other. You can have no principle of international law unless it is recognized by the nations of the world as being a correct principle which is binding upon the nations of the world. Now, when you find the predominant sovereign country on this hemisphere taking an entirely different view, claiming as it does claim, that each nation is sovereign within its own country, claiming to divert waters for the purposes of irrigation and for domestic purposes just as it pleases, and no other nation has the right to question its doing so, can you say that it is within the principles of international law that should refuse to allow any such diversion of water within their own country?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). When did they enunciate that doctrine?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a notable instance in which the United States government has taken the ground that within its own territory it has the sovereign right to do as it pleases so far as the streams in its own country are concerned. It is true that the principles of navigation enter into the question with regard to large rivers; and it is possible, I am inclined to think it is the case, that Professor Oppenheim was referring to a navigable river in the article which the leader of the opposition has quoted. But we can learn the attitude of the United States by referring to what they did in a dispute with Mexico which came up for consideration as late as 1895.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Before the hon. gentleman reads that—did not this water commission decide that according to international law and custom the tributary waters of the Rainy river which flow down to the boundary could not be diverted southward to Duluth?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was proposed on that occasion was to divert a portion of a river which flows into the Rainy river into another stream which flows down into Lake Superior to the southward of Duluth. It was alleged that that would interfere with the navigation of the Rainy river. But let me say to my hon. friend that since that time the United States Minister of War has granted a license to a company to divert the waters of that stream, to take them out of their natural flow into the Rainy river, and to divert them southward, always of course providing that the interests of navigation shall not be affected. Well, so far as the report of the commissioners is concerned, my hon. friend surely is aware that Secretary Root declined to accept that ruling of the commissioners, and as I have said, subsequent to that, a license was issued by the Minister of War to a company to divert that stream. The Minister of Justice informs me that it was put distinctly on the ground that a refusal to allow that diversion would be inconsistent

with the sovereign right of the States. Now the case to which I referred a moment ago, which arose in 1895, was a case between Mexico and the United States. A large and very fertile section of country in the vicinity of El Paso on the Rio Grande had been irrigated by waters from that river, and a very fertile country had been developed. For its fertility and development the waters of the Rio Grande were absolutely essential for irrigation. Further up the river in the United States, irrigation works were constructed and ditches were dug out, the effect of which was to divert a large portion of the river for the purposes of irrigation for the benefit of United States citizens, and the result was to render absolutely arid a large section in Mexico, and to bring great distress upon the people in that section of Mexico. The Mexican government appealed to the government of the United States alleging that they had the right, under the principles of international law, to have that river flow down into their own country where it might be utilized by them. The question was submitted to the Attorney General for his opinion. My hon. friend will find his opinion in volume 21 of the Opinions of the Attorney's General of the United States, beginning on page 281 from which I will quote:

> The fundamental principle of international law is the absolute sovereignty of every nation, as against all others, within its own territory. Of the nature and scope of sovereignty with respect to judicial jurisdiction, which is one of its elements, Chief Justice Marshall said (Schooner Exchange v. McFaddon, 7 Cranch, p. 136):

I may say that Chief Justice Marshall was, as my hon. friend knows, one of the most distinguished lawyers who ever occupied a seat upon the bench of the United States, or even upon the bench of any country.

> The jurisdiction of the nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself. Any restriction upon it, deriving validity from an external source, would imply a diminution of its sovereignty to the extent of the restriction, and an investment of that sovereignty to the same extent in that power which could impose such restriction. All exceptions, therefore, to the full and complete power of a nation within its own territories must be traced up to the consent of the nation itself. They can flow from no other legitimate source.

So in order to settle this question according to the principle of international law, as my hon. friend desires, he must have the United States, which, as I have said, is the dominant sovereignty upon the American continent, recognize that as a principle of international law, but which they have refused to recognize.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How far does the hon. gentleman think that principle of Chief Justice Marshall would extend?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would extend to the right to legislate with respect to everything that is within its own country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course the point involved is whether the United States or any other country has the right to do something within its own territory which would be an absolute and positive detriment to the adjoining country. If you divert the water of a stream why cannot you discharge cannon from the territory of another country on the principle enunciated by Chief Justice Marshall that a country has an absolute right of sovereignty to do within its own territory whatever it sees fit?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think my hon. friend would even persuade himself that he would be very successful in combating the opinions of Chief Justice Marshall on questions of international law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not combatting them, and I do not want the minister to misrepresent me. I am pointing out that Chief Justice Marshall could not have had any such idea in his mind when he used that language.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then the Attorney General proceeds:

> It would be entirely useless to multiply authorities. So strongly is the principle of general and absolute sovereignty maintained that it has even been asserted by high authority that admitted international servitudes cease when they conflict with the necessities of the servient state. (Bluntschli, p. 212; see criticism by Creasy, p. 258). Whether this be true or not, its assertion serves to emphasize the truth that self-preservation is one of the first laws of nations. No believer in the doctrine of natural servitudes has ever suggested one which would interfere with the enjoyment by a nation within its own territory of whatever was necessary to the development of its resources or the comfort of its people.
>
> The immediate as well as the possible consequences of the right asserted by Mexico show that its recognition is entirely inconsistent with the sovereignty of the United States over its national domain. Apart from the sum demanded by way of indemnity for the past, the claim involves not only the arrest of further settlement and development of large regions of country, but the abandonment, in great measure at least, of what has already been accomplished.
>
> It is well known that the clearing and settlement of a wooded country affects the flow of streams, making it not only generally less, but also subjecting it to more sudden fluctuations between greater extremes, thereby exposing inhabitants on their banks

to increase of the double danger of drought and flood. The principle now asserted might lead to consequences in other cases which need only be suggested.

That was the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States, and the opinion upon which that government acted in the case of Mexico, although the circumstances there were certainly very hard upon a large number of people in Mexico.

Mr. FOSTER. Did Mexico get any redress?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mexico got no redress so far as I am aware.

Mr. FOSTER. Because she was the weaker power.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is the view which Great Britain takes of the rights of a country to deal with waters in its own territory? I have only to call attention to what took place in my own province some forty or fifty years ago. There was a river called the Allegash flowing from a lake called Chamberlain lake through a portion of the United States into the river St. John. About forty years ago the people in the state of Maine under the authority of the legislature of that state erected a dam at the foot of Chamberlain lake the result of which was to turn back the waters of the watershed from the St. John river to the Penobscot, and so send the waters down through the state of Maine into the Atlantic ocean in the vicinity I think, of Bangor. The result of that was to enable the lumbermen of that section of country, instead of sending the logs down the Allegash to the St. John and thereby to the city of St. John and other towns on the river St. John for manufacturing, to turn them down the Penobscot, an American river entirely, and manufacture them in their own country. The government of New Brunswick sent a protest through the British Ambassador to the British government. We protested year after year. Some of those interested in lumbering on the upper waters of the Allegash, and I think that upon one occasion they blew up the dam, but it was restored again by those who had erected it. There came pretty nearly being bloodshed as the result of what was deemed to be an infringement of the rights of the people along the St. John river. After confederation protests were again made.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Is any part of the Allegash in our territory?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It is all in Maine?

Mr. PUGSLEY. All in the United States, but it flows into the St. John river, which is a boundary river between the two countries. The water of the Allegash, in a state of nature, flows first into the St. John where it is the boundary, and a certain distance below that it is wholly within New Brunswick territory. Therefore, it was water which, in its natural state, flowed into Canadian waters. After confederation protests were again put in by the New Brunswick government. These protests were sent to His Excellency the Governor General here who transmitted them to the British Ambassador at Washington, and they were transmitted by the British Ambassador to the British government. Although these complaints had been made, and although these protests were vigorously supported during the long time which has elapsed, forty years, the British government have never felt that this was a case in which they could take issue with the United States, but they have recognized that the government of the state of Maine, with the permission of the federal government, were exercising the right of sovereignty within their own country.

Mr. FOSTER. They are our neighbours.

Mr. LENNOX.. Yes, they are our dearest friends.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the British government, for whose opinions, or course of action, we have the greatest possible respect acquiesced in that view of the sovereign rights of the people of the United States I am inclined to think that we would hesitate before we would be inclined to say that they were wrong.

Mr. FOSTER. Have they acquiesced?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly, because they have allowed that to be done for forty years without taking any effective measures to prevent them from continuing it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Have the British government ever made any protest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As far as I am aware, no. The diversion still continues just as it was created forty or fifty years ago. In that case it might be urged too, that it has interfered with the driving of logs which, of course, is a species of navigation, so that it would be a stronger case than the diversion of water merely for the purpose of irrigation or domestic use. I might also say, I think fairly, that not only have the British government acquiesced, but the Canadian government, during all these years have acquiesced. We felt in the province of New Brunswick that the Dominion government, during all the time that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) was a member of that government, acquiesced, because we could get no redress. Our representations, in so far as we

could understand, were simply pigeonholed. I cannot remember any reply being received except a mere acknowledgment of our protests, and no effective steps were taken to prevent this diversion from being continued.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Dominion government did not acquiesce if it sent the protests forward to the British government, and asked that the protests be given effect to, as my hon. friend said was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot imagine any more effective acquiescence than to send a protest forward, and then let the matter slumber for years and years until another protest comes from New Brunswick, then to send that protest forward and allow the question to slumber for years and years again.

Mr. LENNOX. What about the present administration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The present administration has been no more successful than its predecessor.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Have you tried?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, we have tried, representations have been sent forward, but that is the end of it. My own view is that the British government acquiesce in the view of the American government that the United States were simply exercising their sovereign rights in their own country when they allowed this diversion to take place.

Mr. FOSTER. At what date did the present Dominion government forward the protest with reference to the Allegash river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When I was Attorney General of New Brunswick I forwarded my protest to this government, and I believe there was no result.

Mr. LENNOX. They acquiesced and sent it forward.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did you insist on it going forward again since you became a minister here?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am inclined to think, judging from the action of the British government, that it is not much use to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. And you are now arguing that that is the correct thing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am stating that the argument of the United States is that in the exercise of their sovereign rights they can do this, and they have already done it with the acquiescence of the British government, and I am inclined to think that the British government takes the same view that they do. In the course of the duty I had to perform in connection with this treaty, I would necessarily be brought somewhat in contact with the British ambassador, and I know that his view was that the British government would not be likely to dispute the allegation on the part of the United States that if they diverted water for irrigation purposes they would be acting in the exercise of their right of sovereignty. Let me ask my hon. friends what would have been the result in all human probability if we refused to enter into this arrangement for the diversion of these waters? In the case of the waters which arise wholly in the neighbouring country and which would be required for irrigation, an agreement under which these waters should be equally divided between the people of the two countries, would seem to the ordinary mind to be a very equitable arrangement, and that is the way it was viewed by the government of the United States. Suppose we had refused to enter into negatiations on that basis, do you think that the United States government, requiring a portion of those waters in eastern Montana for irrigation, would have hesitated very long to have built a canal to draw the waters of the St. Mary's lake wholly through their own country down to the Marias river and thence on by the Missouri river system to where the water was required for irrigation. The hon. member (Mr. Magrath) says it would not be commercially a profitable undertaking.

Mr. MAGRATH. Does the minister know the height of the dam they would have to build to get to the Marias river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not suppose it would be higher than the dam they have to build now.

Mr. MAGRATH. It would be 180 feet high according to the reports of their own engineers.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend may be right in that, but the estimated cost is three or four million dollars, and if a government so powerful and so wealthy as that of the United States felt that they were not being treated as a friendly nation ought to treat them I do not think they would hesitate to spend that sum of money to build an irrigation ditch to carry these waters down the Marias river to where they were needed for irrigation. And had they done that, what could we do? My hon. friend (Mr. Magrath) says they would be taking away our legal rights, but how would he propose to enforce these alleged legal rights? It would be by representations to the British government, and in view of their attitude in respect to the Allegash river, they would be very apt to say: We think the United States have a perfect right to do what they have done. They would certainly say, I should think: The United States made you a very fair offer under which you can have half the waters of these rivers, to be divided under the direction of a commission and we are

not disposed to interfere and make trouble with the United States. That would have been the answer of the British government, and I would like to know what comfort it would have been to the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company and to the people whose very existence depends on a regular supply of water during the dry season, to be told that we would be able to protest year after year to the British government, and that we would have a grievance against the government of the United States. That would be but poor satisfaction to the company whose shareholders would have been ruined and to the people who were living in what was formerly a fertile country, but which had been rendered barren by reason of the source of its fertility. We took these matters into consideration, and we came to the conclusion that it would be better to make this arrangement in order to avoid these difficulties which had been rising between the two governments in that western country, and which were likely to be a source of very great irritation in the future. The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) says we did not take the advice of Mr. Anderson. Well, we did not act wholly upon Mr. Anderson's advice; I am not sure that we acted upon it at all, but I can say to my hon. friend that we gave it the most careful consideration; we submitted it to our own experts. We submitted it to Dr. King, who, although he is not specially engaged in irrigation work, is a gentleman of great ability and large experience and one who has made a special study of that western country in connection with the settlement of that question. We conferred with Mr. Campbell of the Interior Department, who is in charge of the Forestry Branch, and I think the Irrigation Branch also. I was called upon on two occasions to go to Washington in connection with the question, and Mr. Campbell and Mr. King were present, and we gave the question the closest study possible. I think my hon. friend from Medicine Hat will agree that Mr. Anderson was speaking upon the theory that the waters of the river were to be divided, and that no prior right was being secured to the people of Canada. I regard that as of great importance, and I fear the importance of it was overlooked by my hon. friend (Mr. Magrath).

Mr. MAGRATH. When Mr. Anderson made his report the treaty was as it is today. That is to say, he was called in after the treaty had been signed at Washington, so that it has not been altered through any suggestion made by him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I thought Mr. Anderson made the report in 1908 when this provision was not in article 6.

Mr. MAGRATH. That is quite correct. I thought the minister was referring to Mr. Anderson's criticism of the treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was referring to his report of 1908. We have secured by article 6 what I think is of the greatest possible importance to the people of that section of Alberta. We provide that, during the dry season when the people want the water, our people shall have a prior right to the extent of 500 cubic inches per second if it is not more than three-fourths of the flow, but at all events, during the dry season, at least three-fourths of the entire flow of the St. Mary's river is allotted to us, and that is a matter of great importance. In the flood season the waters flow in vast quantities, and can be stored if our people want to store them. But in the dry season the United States government must not hold back the water so as to prevent our people getting the 500 cubic feet per second, or at least three-fourths of the whole natural flow of the St. Mary's river. These are the words of the treaty, which I think are of extreme importance, and their importance has been overlooked by my hon. friend. Article 6 is as follows:

> The high contracting parties agree that the St. Mary's and Milk rivers and their tributaries (in the state of Montana and the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan) are to be treated as one stream for the purposes of irrigation and power, and the waters thereof shall be apportioned equally between the two countries, but in making such equal apportionment more than half may be taken from one river and less than half from the other by either country so as to afford a more beneficial use to each. It is further agreed that in the division of such waters during the irrigation season, between the 1st of April and 31st of October inclusive, annually, the United States is entitled to a prior appropriation of 500 cubic feet per second of the waters of the Milk river, or so much of such amount as constitutes three-fourths of its natural flow, and that Canada is entitled to a prior appropriation of 500 cubic feet per second of the flow of St. Mary's river, or so much of such amount as constitutes three-fourths of its natural flow.

Now, can you conceive of a better arrangement for the people of Alberta, who are interested in this irrigation question, than is made in that provision? That provision was not in the suggestion of the American government made by Secretary Root. It was put into the treaty after lengthy negotiations, after our representatives and myself had urged upon those representing the United States, that it would not be fair to our people unless we could secure a prior right to appropriate a certain quantity of the water of the St. Mary's river; and after these negotiations the United States agreed to this demand, which is of infinite value to the people

of that section of the province of Alberta. And yet my hon. friend deals with the matter just as if this provision were of no importance. I say it is of enormous importance, because no matter whether the flow of water is great or small, no matter whether the season is exceptionally dry or not, no matter whether little water may be left to the United States or not, we during the irrigation season have up to 500 cubic feet per second, or at least up to three-fourths of the natural flow of the St. Mary's river.

Mr. MAGRATH. Did I understand the hon. minister to say some time ago that Canada could have the use of some of the diverted waters of the St. Mary's river after they had been turned into the channel of the Milk river?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was this: that is a matter that rests wholly with the commissioners. It is the duty and power of the commissioners to divide all the waters of both rivers, and of all their tributaries equally between the people of the two countries. They can give more of one river to one country and vice versa in respect of the other river; and if in the judgment of the commissioners it would be better to give to the people of Canada a greater portion of the flow of the Milk river, and less of the St. Mary's river, they would have a perfect right to do that. The treaty imposes upon them the duty of dividing the waters of both rivers, treating them as one stream, equally between the people of the two countries, and gives them the power of so distributing the waters as to make the distribution as beneficial as possible to the people of both countries.

Something has been said by my hon. friend with reference to a letter which I wrote to the Prime Minister to be forwarded to Washington, urging that the United States government should undertake to build a dam upon the St. Mary's river for the joint benefit of both countries. I am free to admit that when I wrote that letter I was strongly impressed with the desirability of securing some such arrangement if I could do so. I do not think it will be improperly disclosing any secret if I say that the Canadian government were prepared to pay a portion of the cost of erecting that dam upon American territory; but the government of the United States said, and we cannot perhaps wonder at their saying so, that they would hesitate to accept a contribution from another government for the erection of works in their country, even though they might be irrigation works that would be for the benefit of both countries. But the strong argument they made, as will appear from the correspondence, was that until they had erected a dam, and had some experience whether or not it would stand in the bed of the St. Mary's river, it would not be desirable to enter into such an arrangement. It will also appear from the correspondence that they argued that it was not practicable to take water from the bed of the river, but that it would have to be taken from a height of about 30 feet above the bed, and therefore, it would not be possible to store more than one-half the water of the river. That was their view. We were not able to make an answer to that, and after careful inquiry we came to the conclusion that on the Canadian side of the line there were opportunities to store the water of St. Mary's river as good as, if not superior, to those on the American side. We gave a great deal of thought to this question of article 6. A good many months intervened before we finally agreed to the treaty, even after it had been ratified by the United States Senate. We were making inquiry with regard to the effect of article 6, looking at it from every possible standpoint, and conferring with those who had a knowledge of the subject. As a result of all this inquiry, we came to the conclusion that it would be in the interest of Canada to sign this treaty, and that on the whole article 6 would be just to the people of Alberta. We did not act upon the judgment of our own experts alone. My hon. friend has stated that the making of this treaty was a breach of faith with the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company. He made a strong point of that. Well, Sir, when I tell you that the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company, through Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, the president of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, which controls more than 60 per cent of the stock of that irrigation company, approved and expressed to us their approval of the execution of this treaty, I think you will hardly be disposed to agree with my hon. friend from Medicine Hat that there was any breach of faith towards that company. They expressly advised us that it would be not only in the interest of that portion of the western country, but in their own interest, because they were anxious to have permanence in the supply of water for their irrigation works, and they thought it would be better to have a certain quantity secured to them than to have the matter remain in the unsettled state in which it had been for years. We conferred not only with Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, but with Mr. J. S. Dennis of the irrigation department of the Canadian Pacific railway, a gentleman of large experience in irrigation work. I doubt if there is a man in Canada, or in America, whose judgment might be better relied upon in irrigation matters than that of Mr. J. S. Dennis.

Mr. REID (Grenville). How do you know?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I know because Mr. Dennis has had charge of the expenditure of many millions of dollars for the Canadian Pacific railway on irrigation works on the eastern slope of the Rocky mountains, and these works are exceedingly successful. The reputation of Mr. Dennis throughout our western country is of the very highest.

Mr. CROCKET. Does that view agree with Mr. Anderson's?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Dennis' views agrees with our view, that it is a good arrangement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does it agree with Mr. Anderson's view?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Mr. Dennis' view is that it would be better to agree to this equal division such as we propose. I had verbal interviews with Mr. Dennis, went into the matter very fully with him, and he was clearly of the opinion that it would be in the interests, not only of their company, but in the interests of western Canada that this treaty should go into effect. I have a letter from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy which appears in the return under date of March 4, 1910. It is as follows:

Canadian Pacific Railway Company,
Montreal, March 4, 1910.

Dear Mr. Pugsley,—Mr. J. S. Dennis, who is our Superintendent of Irrigation, wrote me from Ottawa, February 16, as follows:

With reference to the interview had this morning with the honourable Mr. Pugsley and Dr. King, Boundary Commissioner, regarding the matter of diversion of international waters, and to my telephonic communication to you through Mr. Beatty, I send you herewith a copy of article 6 of the treaty, together with map of Alberta and a portion of Montana.

As you are aware, I know the local situation very thoroughly, not only on our own side of the line, but also on the other, and after very full and careful consideration of the subject, I am quite decided that the division of the waters of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers, provided for by article 6 of the treaty is perfectly fair and amply protects Canadian interests, as a whole and the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company particularly . . . and that we are in a position to store at suitable points in the St. Mary's river ridge such portion of the high water and flood and flood discharge of the St. Mary's and Milk rivers as must be passed to us by the American authorities under the provisions of section 6 of the treaty.

There is no question whatever in my mind, that the treaty provides for a division of the waters of these two streams on a thoroughly equitable basis, and amply protects our interests in as far as they are concerned with the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.

Mr. Pugsley asked that I would write him a letter to that effect, but I said that I would of course, desire to consult you before doing so. I am now advising him that he will hear from you direct with reference to the matter, or through Mr. Creelman.

It is probable that Mr Dennis intended to refer to the Milk river ridge instead of the St. Mary's ridge, but I am giving the exact language of his letter.

Personally, I am not sufficiently familiar with the situation, nor have I the requisite technical knowledge, to confirm Mr. Dennis' report, but I would accept it without hesitation if it were made with direct reference to any irrigation work or water supply in which this company was interested.

Yours very truly,
(Sgd.) T. G. SHAUGHNESSY,
President.

Honourable Wm. Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend had that letter before him, because it is in the return from which he quoted, and yet in face of that positive statement on behalf of the railway and irrigation company he makes a strong plea that the agreeing to this treaty is a breach of faith with the irrigation company, which company says that the provision of the agreement with respect to the division of the waters is on a fair, and equitable basis, and that it would be better that we should enter into it not only in the interests of the people of that section of the country, but in the interests of the irrigation company as well.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that I can now very well pass away from the St. Mary's and Milk rivers, and I will make one or two remarks with regard to what was said by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), with reference to the Bill itself. He says that he is inclined to think that we have no right to ask this House to confirm and sanction, as section 1 proposes to do, the treaty which has been entered into. I think that we have a clear right to do so. That right is contained in article 12 of the treaty which provides that:

The commission shall have power to administer oaths to witnesses and to take evidence on oath whenever deemed necessary in any proceeding or inquiry, or matter within the jurisdiction under this treaty, and all parties interested therein shall be given convenient opportunity to be heard, and the high contracting parties agree to adopt such legislation as may be appropriate and necessary to give the commission the powers above mentioned on each side of the boundary, and to provide for the issue of subpœnas and for compelling the attendance of witnesses in proceedings before the commission.

I am sure that the hon. member for Montreal, St. Anne, could not have been aware of that provision in article 12. That provision gives us power, and this is the only legislature by which that power can be given to make provision as required by the treaty for the purpose of compelling the attendance of witnesses, and of having

them sworn before giving their evidence. Also, it gives us power to make this provision with regard to a citizen of the United States claiming redress in the courts of our own country for any wrong which he may have suffered by reason of the diversion of water where the injury takes place upon the other side of the line. Therefore, it is clear that it is not only the right, but it is our duty to make those provisions which are contained in the first five paragraphs of the amended Bill. Hon. gentlemen might say that when I introduced the Bill in the first place I should have thought of these things, and had the sections in. I am quite prepared to say that if I had had an opportunity of conferring personally with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), before the Bill was introduced, and talking the matter over with him, it is not at all unlikely that the Bill as introduced would have contained these sections which we are now asking to be placed in the Bill. But, it is absolutely clear that it is our duty to put them in the Bill in order to give complete effect to the treaty, in so far as the enforcement of rights, and the granting of remedies is concerned as well as the subpœnaing and swearing of witnesses.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I apologize for taking up so much of the time of the House. The matter is one of a good deal of importance, and I thought it not undesirable that I should reply to the observations which have been made in criticism of this treaty, which I think is one which is not only just to the people whose interests are affected by the treaty, and more particularly to those who are living in the province of Alberta, but which is a great step forward in the establishment of permanent peace between Great Britain and the United States. My hon. friend, the leader of the opposition, has referred to the proposed general treaty of arbitration which is now pending between the United States and Great Britain. We all sincerely trust that that treaty will be signed, and will become effective and that for all time to come it will ensure peace between these great nations, but I desire to say that in a smaller way the treaty that this House is now called upon to consider is a great step forward in that direction. When we entered upon these negotiations there were irritating questions especially between the people of the west with regard to boundary waters. In our western country people living in the vicinity of the town of Raymond connected with the irrigation company had started upon the construction of some works for the diversion of the waters of the Milk river. The United States government had started in upon certain works for the diversion of the waters of the St. Mary's river. There was ground for ill-

feeling, and it is difficult to say what might have been the result if these negotiations had not been entered upon. This treaty makes provision for all questions relating to boundary waters, all questions arising along the boundary, and all questions of whatever kind, and description which may arise between the government of Canada and the government of the United States being referred to a commission. When the larger treaty goes into force it is possible that it may supersede, and take the place of the present one, but this treaty is for five years, and only for five years, subject, of course, to its being continued, and we trust it will be continued for all time, unless it be superseded by the larger arbitration treaty between the two countries. If that treaty should come into effect, and should take the place of this one no harm can possibly be done by enacting the present treaty. It is necessary that it shall be brought into force, and brought into force at as early a date as possible. There are many questions which are arising from day to day, and which ought to come before a tribunal such as this will be.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time on division, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With the consent of the committee, I would suggest that the amended Bill be taken up and read by the Chairman. The present Bill consists of the last two.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Is it the desire of the committee to take the Bill as proposed to be amended into consideration?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Has it been distributed?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say the Bills were printed on Saturday. I asked the law clerk if it had been distributed, and he said they were ready for distribution. I do not know why they were not distributed. I sent half a dozen to some hon. members on the other side. I will let my hon. friend (Mr. Haggart, Lanark) have my copy, if he desires.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). No, thanks.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 1 of the Bill as in the members' hands, reads as follows:

The International Joint Commission, when appointed and constituted pursuant to the treaty of January the eleventh, nineteen hundred and nine, between His Majesty and the United States of America, shall have power, when holding joint sessions in Canada, to compel the attendance of witnesses by application to a judge of a superior court of the province within which such session is held, and such judge is hereby authorized and directed to make all orders and issue

all processes necessary and appropriate to that end.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood the Minister of Public Works to say, Mr. Chairman, that you were going to take the amended Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I proposed to read the amended Bill, but unless I get authority——

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The objection taken that this Bill has not been distributed should have force. The best thing we can do is to have the committee rise, have the Bill distributed, and then bring it up again. This is not the time to distribute a Bill of this character for immediate consideration. There are a number of members of the House who are not here this afternoon, and they might desire to say something about it. This Bill touches many interests, both public and private, from one end of the country to the other, and involves many propositions which are of a vital character to the country. I think it only fair and right——

Mr. PUGSLEY. May I be allowed to state that the amended Bill has been distributed. The hon. gentleman will find it on his file. I find that it is on mine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must have been distributed certainly early yesterday morning. It was printed either Friday or Saturday.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know, but——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The page tells me that it was distributed this morning.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Unless some intimation is given that these amendments are proposed, the Bill might be on one's file a long time before we would know about it. I confess I was taken entirely by surprise by the amendments the minister proposes. It was a very wise precaution for the minister to have them printed and to give us as long notice as possible before we go into committee. But one can easily see the consequences to which this method of procedure might lead. A Bill might be introduced with very innocent provisions, pass its first reading, and then, just as we are going into committee, after it has been read a second time, exceedingly important amendments in printed form might be put into our hands and we would be told that this is the real Bill——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. member (Mr. Borden, Halifax) pardon me a moment? How would it do to begin with section 5 of the new Bill, which was section 1 of the old Bill?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). But it is so absurd to ask this House to consider this Bill now, for it is entirely different from the former Bill. Of course, some things contained in the original Bill are contained in this one, but this Bill as it stands now actually never had its first reading. A Bill has just been read the second time, but I think we are establishing a very bad precedent. As the leader of the opposition has said, it leaves it open for the government to bring in a Bill at any time, a Bill of a very simple character, and then, at the tail end of the session, bring in an amended Bill in an empty House and try to force it through. I cannot see, since the objection is raised, how we can go on. I understand that, under the rules, a Bill must be distributed in plenty of time for every member to have an opportunity to see it. I do not—

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is only one Bill before the committee, and in the hands of the Chairman, and that is Bill (No. 36) which has passed its first and second readings. The proposed amendments can only be considered as they are moved from time to time, as amendments to the original Bill.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. With regard to this section and the second section of the Bill, as it is now proposed for consideration before the committee, it occurs to me to point out the reasons, or some of the reasons, which led to the clauses being drafted in the language in which they now appear. The treaty, of course, had become entirely operative by the interchange of ratifications and formal ratification of it nearly a year before this——

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman (Sir Allen Aylesworth) is speaking to matters which are not before this committee, as you, Mr. Chairman, ruled a moment ago.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I shall have to rule that the only Bill that is before the committee is the Bill as originally printed. I cannot accept the Bill as it is proposed to be amended as the one that I am to submit to the committee. Any changes in the original Bill may be moved, and the Bill may ultimately be changed into exactly the form of the proposed Bill.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I move that the present section 1 of this Bill be made section 5 and that section 1 be as follows:

1. The treaty relating to the boundary waters and to questions arising along the boundary between Canada and the United States made between His Majesty and the said United States, signed at Washington the eleventh day of January, one thousand nine hundred and nine, and the protocol of the fifth day of May, one thousand nine hundred and ten, in the schedule to this Act are hereby confirmed and sanctioned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think I can accept that motion.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. With reference to this section which it is proposed shall be section 1 of the Bill, I was about to say that it is not framed with any idea that the treaty was not thoroughly effective without it. The treaty had been ratified practically a year before this clause had been put on paper and was entirely operative so far as constituting a treaty obligation is concerned, and it needed no ratification or sanction from this House, because it was a compact of the King constitutionally entered into, binding upon this country as a part of the British Empire. The whole object and purpose of framing sections such as appear here in the section which it is proposed to make section 1 of this Bill and in the second section beside it, was in order to effect any necessary changes in our statute or unwritten law which the obligations of this treaty would necessitate. Under the British North America Act, the jurisdiction is conferred upon this parliament to legislate in the way of carrying out the treaty obligations that this country may be under.

Now, a treaty had been entered into in May, 1910, by which certain changes are made in the existing laws with reference to the water courses of, probably, every province of the Dominion which borders upon the United States. This parliament has, under the provision of the British North America Act, power to alter these laws accordingly, although those laws are laws of the various provinces upon matters ordinarily within the exclusive jurisdiction of the province. It is proposed to provide in what will be asked to be the second section of this Bill, that the laws of Canada and of the several provinces thereof be amended and altered so as to permit the authorization, sanction and performance of the obligations of this treaty, and to found such a section, and with the object of making the provisions of this treaty of statutory effect within Canada exactly as though they had been in the first place embodied in a statute of this parliament, the first section is framed in form taking the shape of this parliament confirming and sanctioning the treaty. The words used are, I think, apt to effect the purpose intended; certainly they conduce to convenience in putting into our statute-book in the shape of a schedule to this Act, in a place where it will be of ready reference, this so important treaty between the two countries. Now to illustrate what I mean, let me point out that there are, in perhaps nearly every clause of this treaty, provisions in the nature of changes or declarations of law which otherwise would not appear upon the statute-book. Take, for instance, this provision as to the order of precedence which is to be observed in deciding before the Board of Railway Commissioners the various uses to which the boundary waters may be put, giving precedence to the use of water for domestic and sanitary purposes, and arranging in their order the various uses which may be made of such waters. Then there is a provision with regard to the diversion of waters, and the consequence of such diversion, in reality conferring a new right of action which, while in the United States, under the provision of their constitution, is completely conferred by the making of a treaty which becomes at once thereby the law of the whole country and of every state in the country, is not made effective by any similar provision in this country. While it is no more binding upon us because it is sanctioned and confirmed by Act of this parliament, while such sanction and confirmation was in no respect necessary for the validity of the treaty, and while the treaty receives no support from the action of this parliament in that regard, the action of parliament in making the treaty practically a statute of this Dominion is one which is in furtherance of its objects, and seemed to us a highly convenient course to take, to which there could be no practical objection.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe). This treaty which we have before us is a portion of a matter that has been subject to negotiations and treaty-making on previous occasions. The principle laid down by the Canadian negotiators for many years was that in making treaties with the United States of America, all questions should be included within the walls of one treaty; that is to say, that questions involving navigation, fisheries, waterways and trade were dealt with in one treaty. By dealing with all these questions in one treaty, the negotiators were able to set off one thing against another, enabling this country, as for instance in the treaty of Washington, to secure something as a set-off against things that were demanded by the United States. Unfortunately for this country, we have now an ambassador at Washington who is very strongly pro-American. This country suffered at one time very severely from another ambassador who was pro-American, I refer to Lord Ashburton, previously Mr. Baring, who was the British ambassador in the negotiations that resulted in the famous Ashburton treaty. Now the house of Baring had large pecuniary connections in the United States. It must be evident now to any one reading cold history, that the associations and connections by marriage, and business, and otherwise, which Mr. Baring, or Lord Ashburton, had at that time with the United States, must largely have influenced

him in his actions. It was indeed a dangerous thing to have appointed him as ambassador to make a treaty between Great Britain and the United States respecting Canada. We all know how this country has suffered from the Ashburton treaty; and without question those of us who have given the matter any study, even the school children in Canada, now ascribe that treaty and the troubles we have had under it, to the fact that Lord Ashburton had large American connections and was more American than British. We have now at Washington another ambassador who is also, I may say, tainted to a large extent in the same way. We know that Mr. Bryce, who has negotiated this treaty, and who seems intent upon negotiating a treaty at every turn of the road, and on every day in the week, is the great historian of the United States, and his book on the American Commonwealth is a text book in nearly all the universities of that country. It has a very large sale in the United States, and therefore he is dependent on the goodwill of the Americans both for his fame and for his profits. Now by a very skilful diplomatic process, within recent years we find that the points upon which there has been any difficulty between the United States and Great Britain have been separated, and a distinct treaty has been negotiated to meet each case. We have had a separate treaty dealing with the fisheries, with some other things; we have had a separate treaty dealing with trade. Now a strange thing has occurred with reference to this treaty and that is the fact, as pointed out by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), that this treaty requires to be ratified by this House.

To my mind every treaty made for and on behalf of Canada should be submitted to this House before it is ratified or confirmed. The question is a very serious one, and one which has been debated in the mother of parliaments whether the government have the right to make a treaty of this kind, and to come to this House and say: We have pledged the honour of the country, the House must accept this treaty, or whether they have the power to make a treaty without any ratification by parliament whatsoever, which is the principle enunciated by the Minister of Public Works here to-day. It was the original intention to pass this treaty without any reference to parliament whatsoever in the matter. The reference was simply to be made to this House to provide the money for these commissioners, and no such thing as the ratification of the treaty was deemed necessary. But, a change has come over the spirit of their dream, and the treaty is submitted to this House in the form of a schedule. Let us see what has occurred, and what is the practice. In the early days, in the history of the mother country, previous to the discovery of America, the rule was, when kings were absolute and parliament had not attained to any strength or power, such as it has to-day, that the king made all the treaties and that these treaties had the force of law. The question was fought out on several occasions, but after the revolution a different rule obtained and from the time of William III. on until the early part of this century, no treaty was undertaken by the government of Great Britain without first receiving the sanction of parliament. It has been held by the most eminent authorities that it is a sound constitutional rule that all treaties should be first passed upon by parliament before they become law. If such were the case, Mr. Chairman, we would not have the spectacle here of the Minister of Finance coming to this House and declaring that the agreement that he made, with the United States, which is purely a convention, has the absolute force of law, that the honour of this House is pledged and that it must become law whether this parliament so desires or not. Mr. Bagehot, who is a well-known constitutional authority, takes the trouble to discuss this question of treaty making in one of his books, and he says this:

> Treaties are quite as important as most laws, and to require the elaborate assent of representative assemblies to every word of the law, and not to consult them even as to the essence of the treaty is prima facie ludicrous. In the older forms of the English constitution this may have been quite right; the power was then really lodged in the Crown, and because parliament met very seldom, and for other reasons, it was then necessary that, on a multitude of points, the Crown should have much more power than is amply sufficient for it at present. But now the real power is not in the Sovereign, it is in the Prime Minister and in the cabinet—that is, in the hands of a committee appointed by parliament, and of the chairman of that committee. Now, beforehand, no one would have ventured to suggest that a committee of parliament on foreign relations should be able to commit the country to the greatest international obligations without consulting either parliament or the country. No other select committee has any comparable power; and considering how carefully we have fettered and limited the powers of all other subordinate authorities, our allowing so much discretionary power on matters peculiarly dangerous and peculiarly delicate to rest in the sole charge of one secret committee is exceedingly strange. No doubt it may be beneficial; many seeming anomalies are so, but at first sight it does not look right.

Proceeding, he goes on to say:

> It certainly would be in many ways advantageous to change it. If we require that in some the assent of parliament shall be given to such treaties, we should have a real dis-

cussion prior to the making of such treaties. We should have the reasons for the treaty plainly stated, and also the reasons against it. At present, as we have seen, the discussion is unreal. The thing is done and cannot be altered; and what is said often ought not to be said, because it is captious, and what is not said ought as often to be said because it is material. We should have a manlier and plainer way of dealing with foreign policy, if ministers were obliged to explain clearly their foreign contracts before they were valid, just as they have to explain their domestic proposals before they can become laws.

That is the opinion of Mr. Bagehot. I claim that this parliament has no power to ratify or confirm this treaty, that the power to ratify and confirm this treaty rests in the parliament of Great Britain. Then, to come to another point, which is a very strange and a very technical constitutional point; this treaty deals with personal rights, it deals with navigation and it deals, to some extent, with taxation. If you establish a joint High Commission some person must provide the money to pay for the commission. You give this commission the power to deal with private rights involving damages to persons, and as the treaty involves taxation in some form to carry out its provisions, it of necessity should be confirmed by the parliament of the mother country. The treaty itself states that it is a treaty on behalf of the government of the United Kingdom, not on behalf of the government of Canada. This country simply provides the money for the joint high commission. Great Britain recommends the appointment of the commission and we have to pay for it. For that reason the treaty should first have been passed and ratified by the parliament of the United Kingdom. If the cabinet of this country and the cabinet of Great Britain are going to be continually taking the power unto themselves to make treaties with foreign countries involving the rights of the colonies there is sure to be trouble. More especially is there sure to be trouble in so far as this country is concerned. If we are going to give absolute, Czar-like power to two or three men to bind the people, where the ratification of these treaties in parliament is only a mere matter of form, we are introducing a principle that is vicious in itself, and that is contrary to the spirit of British institutions, that is going to lead this country into trouble with foreign nations, and is going to make the people virtually the slaves of three or four men, of possibly one man, who is dominant and who rules in the cabinet.

I object to the measure, because upon the face of it it bears evidence that it was the intention to pass it without reference to anybody excepting the contracting parties, namely the Ambassador to the United States, and the President of the United States. But, under the constitution of the United States, it could not become a treaty until it is consented to by the United States Senate, and the schedule points out that the treaty was approved by that body on the 3rd of March, 1909. Let me cite authority for the statement I have made that the making of treaties without first consulting parliament is contrary to the constitution, and to the practice which prevailed in the British parliament, at all events, until the year 1815. Lord Campbell, one of the greatest constitutional lawyers of his age, discussed the question in the House of Lords in March, 1873, and I cannot do better than quote his words:

What the public absolutely wants is to guard itself against the errors and miscarriages of which the late negotiation with America was fertile.

Strange to say this speech of Lord Campbell would apply with very great force to a certain convention that has recently been made by this government:

That such treaties should be laid on the table of the two Houses a sufficient time before ratification to admit of their being examined and debated may be an inadequate security. It may be urged that to lay treaties on the table is but a decent ceremonial;——

Just as we are told by this government that the honour of the country is pledged to what the negotiators do, and that this parliament is nothing but a rubber stamp to place its imprint on the treaty, a syllable of which we cannot change.

—that in the recent treaty the faith of the Crown was irrevocably pledged before ratification; that a noble and learned Lord explained that doctrine when the House was on the verge of a proceeding to control the treaty; that the doctrine was accepted, and the proceeding stifled or relinquished by your Lordships. These facts, which occurred in the session before last upon the motion of Lord Russell have not at all escaped me. The only answer is, that when parliament had made up its mind to exercise a certain power over treaties, sharp practice of the kind—and sharp practice it would be in that event—could hardly be resorted to by governments. The objection that the executive may still find a method of overruling parliament and of defrauding the community is one I cannot expect to hear to-night from those who form it at this moment.

Every word of this speech applies to certain things that have occurred in this House with reference to treaties:

The misgivings some may have to the effect that prerogative would suffer by bringing treaties before parliament with greater regularity, which, as it is, are brought before it stealthily and hastily, does not bear examination. The prerogative as vested in the Crown of negotiating, of signing and of ratifying treaties, would be perfectly inviolate. Parlia-

ment would not be competent to give rise to any treaty whatsoever. The Earl, the Secretary of State, must at some time have been familiar with the debate between Mirabeau and Barnave, in the French Assembly, soon after 1789, as to where the power of making treaties should be vested. Mirabeau, on that point, an advocate of monarchy, contended that the power should be vested in the Sovereign. Barnave—the organ of the more popular idea—that it should be consigned to the Assembly. Mirabeau prevailed; the power resided in the Crown; but the veto of the legislative body was universally admitted—the initiative of the Crown and the veto of the legislative body were seen at once to be compatible. The prerogative would only suffer if treaties were allowed to emanate from any other origin. But it is just to go beyond that statement. When questions are irrevocably settled by negotiators at a blow, Sovereigns can have no voice in their conclusion.

Now, Sir, treaties of this kind are made purely by the negotiators, but these men are always ready to invoke the sovereign power, the royal prerogative, and while ordinary every-day ministers making the treaty they are always prepared to throw the cloak of royalty around their shoulders and thus protect themselves from the consequences of their errors and failures.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 158) to incorporate the Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—Mr. Devlin.

On section 10,

Mr. FIELDING. I think the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) suggested that this clause should stand over for consideration. I understand that the solicitor of the company has seen that hon. gentleman, and that the amended clause as prepared by the law clerk of the House is satisfactory to him.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Does he say that there is no objection to directors voting by proxy?

Mr. FIELDING. This is practically a foreign company, the chief controllers of which will be in France. The case is exceptional, and in this case, according to those who have studied the Bill, there is no objection.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). It is an unheard-of principle of law in any portion of the British Empire to allow a director to vote by proxy. A director is a trustee for the shareholders, and, if so, how can he delegate his trusteeship to another? The thing is absurd. I think the Bill had better stand.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The solicitor of the company explained the matter to me, and unless this authority is given the actual owners of the company would have no voice in its management. They live in Paris, and they carry on a very large business in many parts of the world. While this provision is exceptional, the circumstances are exceptional, and I cannot see that any harm would come from giving them this power, because they are the shareholders as well as constituting two of the directors.

Mr. SPROULE. I think that the chief objection is that it would be establishing a bad precedent. Probably next session some one or more companies will come and ask the same thing, and you cannot well deny it to them when you have given it to another. It is by such unfortunate means that we get into our awkward plights in regard to the powers that we give to companies.

Mr. HENDERSON. I am afraid that it might be taken as a precedent; yet it might be very convenient at times for members of parliament who are directors of companies to be able to send a proxy to a friend to vote at meetings of directors. I could never make up my mind that it was regular. I think we had better have the opinion of some men who are better informed than we are, than I am at least, as to the legality of it, and as to the propriety of it. Can any precedent be furnished? I do not like it myself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no question about the legality of it if we choose to make it legal.

Mr. HENDERSON. Possibly I may be wrong in questioning the legality of it, because what the Dominion parliament says is law, even though it should be a reciprocity pact; but it is not always right. I would like to have a little more light on this.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member in charge of this Bill, in some observations yesterday, stated with regard to this clause:

> We have tried to follow as closely as possible the wording of section 9 of the Act to incorporate the Alberta Railway and Coal Company.

I would infer from that remark that he had a precedent for it. However, the hon. gentleman is not here, and I have no desire to see the Bill pressed if there is any doubt about it.

Mr. HENDERSON. I think it would be well to let the Bill stand over. It will come

up again on Friday, and in the meantime let some one look up that Bill and see if that is the case.

Mr. FIELDING. There are naturally objections to directors voting by proxy. The other side of the question is that in an exceptional case like this, if it is desirable to encourage foreign capital, we must sometimes adapt ourselves to the conditions under which it is offered. Of course, an exceptional case would have to be shown to justify exceptional treatment.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). My objection is that if we continue this, we may have the Standard Oil Company coming here asking for a charter to be allowed to carry on their business over long-distance phone, and that sort of thing. This company is not entitled to any privileges more than any other company. It is simply a great big fur combine, and it chooses to do business in Canada, but it is not any more entitled to do business in Canada than any ordinary trader. The business it carries on in Canada it carries on in competition with Canadians. It carries on a general grocery and dry goods and every other kind of business in opposition to Canadians. If this company wants to do business in this country, let them come here and do it.

Progress reported.

SAULT ST. LOUIS LIGHT AND POWER COMPANY.

House went into committee on Bill (No. 214) respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—Mr. Bickerdike.

On section 1,

Mr. BICKERDIKE. This is simply the extension of a charter granted years ago. There was some doubt as to whether the money expended on engineering entitled the company to be still in existence, and we are asking to have its powers continued another term.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Are they operating under a public franchise?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. No, they have not started yet. They get their water-power from the Lachine rapids. They cannot begin work until the Governor in Council approves their plans.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Nobody is seized with the facts connected with this Bill. It seems to be an important measure, and we should have an opportunity to look into it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The only thing we ask is to continue the old charter.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It may not be in the public interest to continue the old charter on the same conditions?

Mr. HENDERSON

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The Bill came from the Senate, and was on the Order Paper yesterday, and the day before. At this late day, my hon. friend should not try to block it. It was threshed out in the Senate the last two weeks, and he has had ample time to examine it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Does this Bill go from this committee to the Private Bills Committee?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. It has been through that stage.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I have no desire to block it, but want some information. I would like to see the original Act. If my point is well taken, I desire to object to the Bill being proceeded with, because it is not on to-day's Order Paper.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. By order of the House we are in committee on the Bill and consequently the point is taken too late.

Mr. SPROULE. A motion was made that it be put on the orders to-day, as recommended by the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. FIELDING. That is exactly how the matter stands.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I would like to have the Bill assented to before we leave on Friday.

Mr. HENDERSON. Are we going to leave on Friday?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I cannot answer for the leader of the House, but I hope so.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Was any objection taken to the Bill before the Senate committee, or the Committee of the House by any one?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. It passed unanimously without amendment anywhere.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have the statute of 1903 and I think that section 7 is the important section, because it is the one that gives the powers to the company. It is as follows:

7. The company may:

(a) Manufacture, use, supply and dispose of electricity, water and gas, and water, hydraulic, compressed air, or other power, by means of poles, wires, cables, pipes, conduits, machinery or other appliances; and construct, maintain and operate works, machinery and plant for the production, sale and distribution thereof, and for the purposes aforesaid may acquire lands by purchase, lease or otherwise; construct, acquire, use, maintain and operate canals, water-courses, raceways and water-powers in or adjacent to the Lachine rapids, in and upon Ile au Heron, Ile au Diable, and adjacent islands in the St. Lawrence river; and construct dams, wing-dams, sluices, conduits and buildings in connection therewith; and connect by bridge or bridges the island

known as Ile au Heron with the north and south shores of the St. Lawrence river and Ile au Diable with the south shore of the said river: Provided, that the works hereby authorized shall not be commenced until the plans thereof have first been submitted to and approved of by the Governor in Council.

Now I think that my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) ought to inform the committee as to the location of 'Ile au Héron and Ile au Diable and adjacent islands in the St. Lawrence,' and what would be involved in the power to construct dams in that locality. I am not sufficiently familiar with the St. Lawrence at that point to know the facts.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) can explain the Bill better than any of us. Ile au Héron is a small island near the north shore near the channel where the Lachine power is at the present time. The same company owns the island, and they simply want to construct works there. Also they have taken power to build a bridge subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. This is in the Lachine rapids on the north shore and does not interfere in any way with the channel.

Mr. MONK. I am sorry I am here, because I would like for my part to advance a Bill that is in the hands of my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike). But I must confess that I am not very favourably impressed with what I have just heard read. This is the most valuable water-power within a short distance of Montreal, as my hon. friend knows, and this charter is one without conditions, with none of the safeguards which within the last few years we have found it necessary to provide. There is nothing about rates, but there are powers to build dams there; and what I heard the minister read from the statute is very, very grave indeed. I really would like to ask my hon. friend to delay this Bill so that we may take cognizance of these powers that we are renewing. For my part it seems to me that the interests of the city of Montreal in this matter are sufficiently great that we should examine carefully every section of this Bill before we pass it.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. The reason I mentioned the name of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) is that he scrutinized the sections very closely when the Bill was going through, and raised quite a number of objections, and every one was struck out. He must remember the circumstance.

Mr. MONK. In 1903?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. And the question here is merely whether the company should get an extension of powers. We are giving it every day to other companies. The company is not asking for new powers.

Mr TAYLOR (Leeds). Perhaps you got too many as it is?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Then, why give them to anybody else?

Mr. MONK. In that connection, the powers that this parliament granted to the Lachine Hydraulic Company whose works are on this side of the island were altogether exorbitant. They would not be listened to for five minutes in the House to-day. I do not know when that charter was granted. I believe it was under the previous government. But we have progressed since then. At the last sitting of the Conservation Commission in Quebec we sanctioned certain principles which, I think, would meet with the approval of the House if we could get to the Bill which consecrates the principle. But we, in this instance, are asked to place in a private Bill what amounts to a violation of the principles enunciated by the Conservation Commission and almost, one might say, sanctioned by the government. I have no idea of blocking the Bill or of interfering with my hon. friend (Mr. Bickerdike) as he knows. But here we are in Montreal threatened with a great electric monopoly. We welcome a company such as the hon. gentleman is trying to bring into existence, but we cannot surround the prolongation of the powers of this company with too much care. We must act with the greatest care if we do not want to make Montreal the most expensive city electrically in Canada, notwithstanding that we are surrounded with water-powers on all sides.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I do not think the promoter of this Bill should proceed with it without referring it back to the Standing Committee to have the usual safeguard inserted. The Bill is not on the Order Paper to-day and consequently escaped the attention of hon. members. It is a very dangerous Bill. Clause 1 repeals section 14 of the existing Act, and section 14 sets a time limit within which the works must be completed. The effect of this repeal would be to give the company a perpetual charter. It is a most dangerous piece of legislation, yet it would have gone through the House in two or three minutes had not members on this side taken objection. I have my views as to whether the House should grant such a charter or renew the rights under the Act. If they have not proceeded with the work in time, they should forfeit their rights and this water-power should revert to the public. But, in any case the usual safeguards should be put in the Bill for the protection of the public. I would suggest that the promoter should ask that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, that the Bill may be referred to the Standing Committee. It is a most remarkable thing that the Minister of Public

Works has not had cognizance of these matters, for, as I understand, this will interfere with navigation and that surely should be brought to his attention. He should not allow a Bill of this kind to reach this stage without at least the ordinary safeguards.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I have no objection to the Bill being left over, but I want to say to my hon. friend (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) that there is no navigation any where near the place referred to in this Bill.

Mr. LENNOX. The navigation is in getting the Bill through.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. Yes. As the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) has asked it, I have no objection to allowing the Bill to stand over. I do not want anything that is not given to others. At the same time, I do not think that hon. members should pick on this Bill, simply because I am introducing it, and try to block it. Everybody else can come here and get extensions of time—which we give them every day, and the hon. member (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) knows it and supports it. I move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand the location, the purpose is to run a dam from one island to another, and probably to the main shore. The government, of course, control the water. Will the company be subject to any charge by the government for the use of the water-power?

Mr. BICKERDIKE. This parliament has no rights there. The Quebec legislature has control of what is known as the water rights, and we shall have to buy from the Quebec government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood from the Minister of Public Works in a previous discussion that the bed of the river belonged to the province, but that the water belonged to the government; they control the waters of the St. Lawrence river. Does the Minister of Public Works admit that the Quebec government control both the bed of the river and the water that runs in it in the province of Quebec?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think under our present legislation known as the Navigable Waters Protection Act, before any works can be constructed in any part of the St. Lawrence river the plans must be filed with the Minister of Public Works and approval of them be obtained. I do not think, because there happens to be a rapid in a navigable river, which is navigable water both above and below the rapid, that just at that particular point the river ceases to be navigable water. I think under the Navigable Waters Protection Act this government would have control. But these are matters which might very well be considered in committee. I understand that the promoter of the Bill intends, when Mr. Speaker is in the Chair, to move that it be referred to the Committee on Private Bills.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Is it the policy of the government to allow important water-rights to be alienated without some compensation, some charge for the use of the horse-power? This is practically reviving an old charter. Our conception of these rights has entirely changed the last few years, and surely a company should not receive important rights of this kind to develop an enormous horse-power for the purpose of merchandise, without compensating the government, as they do in the United States. Has the government any policy in connection with this matter?

Mr. NESBITT. I do not like to interfere in the discussion, but there is a motion that the committee rise and report progress.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. I move that the Bill be referred to the Private Bills Committee for further consideration.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I move in amendment that it be referred to the Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines. This Bill really deals with waters that are involved in canal privileges, and in my opinion a Bill of this nature, dealing with a public franchise in water, should go to the Railway Committee.

Mr. BICKERDIKE. If it is the desire of the House that it should go to the Railway Committee I have no objection, but it came from the Private Bills Committee. I move that it be referred to the Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Motion agreed to.

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 215) for the relief of Wm. Francis Currie.—Mr. Pardee.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS TREATY

House resumed consideration of Bill (No. 36) relating to the establishment and expenses of the International Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty of January 11, 1909.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). When the House rose at six o'clock I was engaged in reading some remarks by Lord Campbell on the question whether treaties should be laid before parliament before they are ratified by the ambassadors. Unfortunately it is rather dull for the House to listen to extracts of this kind, but in order to support my argument I think it essential that these should

be placed upon 'Hansard,' as we may have occasion to discuss this matter again. I will now continue:

So long as they are forced to wait for parliamentary adhesion, a salutary influence may often be asserted by a Sovereign, informed on foreign policy and anxious for the honour of the country. By what goes on at present, courts and parliaments are simultaneously mocked. The last fear of scruple, it may be, perhaps, essential to remove, is connected with a view that flagrant innovation is demanded. Innovation as to detail there might be; but there would not, in point of fact, be any as to principle. The principle was long ago conceded. There is no class of treaties which it is more critical and delicate to expose to parliamentary discussion than those by which a war is ended. They give rise to passions the most various, and debates the most entangled. It may become necessary, with a view to justify the terms, to explain the decline of credit, the dissipation of resources, the misconduct of allies, the rottenness of vessels, and bring forward many other topics which prudence would avoid, and dignity, in some degree, recoil from. Much stronger argument may be advanced against parliamentary revision of treaties which lead to peace, than of those which pave the way for arbitration. But on treaties which conclude a war, since 1688, what has been the method usually adopted? As regards the first, that of Ryswick, the records are too scanty to determine. On that of Utrecht, which succeeds, materials are only too abundant. Lord Bolingbrooke, its celebrated author, has left undying pages on the subject. Preliminary articles were brought before both Houses, and so important was it deemed to gain the concurrence of this House that a dozen Peers were called into existence to secure it—this part of history can scarcely have escaped Her Majesty's government. The Peace of 1748 does not appear to have been conducted in this manner. Complaints were made in parliament about it. It was allowed to be the ignominious end of an unnecessary contest. The peace which followed the Seven Years' War in 1761-2, was brought with every possible solemnity before the Houses of that period. Lord Chatham, at that time Mr. Pitt, who had resigned, left a sick bed on purpose to oppose it. He took that course, it may be well supposed, not to execute a medical injunction, or to raise his credit as an orator, but, in the midst of pain and risk, to induce the House of Commons, if he could, to reject the preliminary articles. The Peace of 1783, which closed the struggle with America, was no less formally submitted to the legislature. Not only did debates occur—not only were they followed by divisions, but the government of Lord Shelburne was outvoted, and another set of public men required to negotiate. The beginning of the century was marked by the Peace of Amiens. Preliminary articles were brought before the Houses, against which Mr. Windham took the opportunity of delivering a speech, with which his face is, in a great degree, identified. The same process was repeated in 1814 and 1815. I am forced to hurry over it, that I may not exhaust the patience of the House. But the abilities of such men as Sir James MacKintosh and Mr. Hormer were brought to bear on criticism of the treaties before, not after they were sanctioned. In 1856, after the Crimean War, I readily admit that parliament was not consulted in that method, but that circumstance can hardly be accepted as an argument against the present motion. It merely indicates a tendency to overlook and to encroach on the authority which parliament enjoyed down to 1815, and which your Lordships are invited to restore as regards the class of treaties most in want of vigilant solicitude at present.

About the same time a motion was brought forward by Mr. Sinclair Aytoun in the House of Commons as follows:

In the opinion of this House, all treaties with foreign powers ought to be made conditionally on the approval of parliament, as was done in the case of the commercial treaty with France in 1860.

Mr. Aytoun then proceeds to discuss the question, and asked what is the practice. I may say that this applies to this government now that this government has undertaken to make treaties, the line of action outlined in Mr. Aytoun's speech is the identical line followed by our government here. Mr. Aytoun said:

What was the practice always followed by the government in making a treaty? No information was given to the House with regard to these treaty obligations until after they were settled. When a question was asked in the House, they were told that they should wait until the treaty was concluded, and then express their opinion as to the conduct of the government. In accordance with this practice, the Under Secretary for the Colonies declined, a session or so ago, to lay on the table a treaty with Holland before it had been ratified. Then, however, it was too late either to reject a treaty or to obtain any modification of its terms. He maintained that this practice was inconsistent with one of the well-ascertained rights of the people of this country. One of the best known provisions of the Bill of Rights was that all taxation by prerogative was illegal; and it followed that the practice which allowed the government to enter into engagements which would have the effect of imposing an immense amount of taxation on people must be unconstitutional. They were told that the House did maintain its control over foreign treaties, because the ministers were responsible to it; but cases might occur in which it would be impossible for the House to interfere until after a treaty was concluded and ratified. A government which had a large majority in parliament on a domestic question, might not be in harmony with the opinion of the country on questions of foreign policy. They had also had cases where a government did not actually possess a majority of the House; and it was, therefore, possible for a government not having a majority and not supported by the public, to enter into engagements during the recess of the gravest character. The safeguard of ministerial responsibility was perfectly illusory. They were told that the effect of such a change as that which he proposed would be

to take the conduct of foreign negotiations out of the hands of Her Majesty's government.

I might add in this connection a schedule of the treaties since that period. The following treaties between Great Britain and foreign powers since 1815, contained articles, the execution of which was made contingent upon their confirmation by the British parliament: On May 19, 1815, a treaty with Russia relating to payment of dividend of Russian-Dutch loan; November 17, 1823, a convention with Austria about loan; November 16, 1831, a convention with Russia about Russian-Dutch loan—continuance of payment; May 7, 1832, the convention with France and Russia relating to Greek loan; August 2, 1839, a convention with France dealing with channel fisheries; May 28, 1852, a convention with France about extradition; January 25, 1855, convention with Sardinia about loan guarantee; June 27, 1855, convention with France and Turkey, relative to guarantee raised by the Sultan; June 3, 1855, a convention with Sardinia relating to loan; January 14, 1857, convention with France about Newfoundland fisheries; March 5, 1864, convention with Prussia relating to the subject of extradition; March 29, 1864, a treaty with France, Russia and Greece relating to Greek loan and pension to the King of the Hellenes; April 30, 1868, convention of Austria, Italy, Turkey, Prussia and France to guarantee loan to complete works on the Danube. There was no special article in the treaty of March 29, 1864, stating the sanction of parliament would be required for its execution, but an Act was passed for that purpose; and in the cases of the convention of May 28, 1852, the convention with France in January, 1857, and the convention with Russia in 1864, parliament exercised its powers and rejected the provisions which were submitted to it.

You will see that in all cases where there is involved a question of territory or war, or the guaranteeing of money, or anything in which taxation is involved in any shape, that very article is always inserted in the treaty, namely, that it requires the affirmation of parliament or parliamentary sanction. In this case we have no such articles, and I think with my hon. leader (Mr. Borden, Halifax), that this treaty, instead of being ratified by the Dominion parliament, should first be ratified by the imperial parliament.

I cannot leave this subject without touching upon another one which, to my mind, is of very serious import. In the old country, in the mother of parliaments, the idea underlying treaty making is altogether different from that which underlies treaty making in any other country. For instance Great Britain has nothing to give in the way of trade privileges or rights,

and everything to obtain. Consequently when she asks a treaty, she desires to get all the concessions possible whilst she has none to give, because of her free trade policy.

The idea underlying the principles of parliamentary government in the mother of parliaments, is that parliament does not represent the people; the people have the privilege of sending representatives to parliament, but the principle of representative government does not hold in Britain, and it is entirely an American idea. It is the principle on which the American revolution was fought, and I may say that it prevails in Canada, where we have fought elections on the principle of representative government. In view of the principle of representative government which prevails in Canada, the government of the day have violated that great principle when they sent ambassadors recently to Washington to bring about a trade treaty with the United States. Not only that, but the very men who violated that principle had the hardihood to come into this House and maintain that when they made that treaty they were invested with the royal prerogative and could pledge not only the honour of the cabinet but the honour of the country, and the honour of the British Crown to what they did. They told the House that not a line, or letter or figure in that treaty could be changed.

Mr. KING. What treaty has the hon. gentleman reference to?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I am dealing with treaties generally, and I am pointing out that this government on every occasion it has taken part in treaty-making, especially with the United States, not only violated the principles of representative government, but betrayed the interests of the people.

Mr. KING. I was wondering whether the hon. gentleman was referring to the recent trade agreement as a treaty, or whether he was speaking of something else.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). What is the difference between a treaty and a convention?

Mr. KING. If the hon. gentleman is referring to the recent trade agreement as a treaty, he is entirely mistaken, and he knows it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The recent trade agreement is a treaty in every sense of the term. It was made subject to concurrent legislation; it was negotiated between representatives of both countries; the President of the United States signed it on behalf of the United States, and I say it is most shameful that this parliament should be wasting its time——

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe)—Yes, wasting its time because the two ministers that were sent to Washington did not know anything about treaty-making, and they were humbugged by the President of the United States and buncoed into making a treaty which is no good and which they do not intend to put through, and which is making them the laughing stock of the whole country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We are now discussing the Waterways Treaty, and I would ask you, Mr. Chairman, to confine the hon. gentleman to that question.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. If the hon. gentleman was referring to the trade agreement and the matter of reciprocity as an illustratioin of the principle of making treaties it was in order, but I would ask the hon. gentleman not to carry it further than that.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I am illustrating the manner in which the business of this country has been conducted by our treaty negotiators. In this treaty before us the Hon. Mr. Bryce was the negotiator, and the Minister of Public Works told us that he represented this country as its attorney. There has not been a single occasion when these treaties with the United States come up but what the fear was paramount in the mind of the Canadian negotiators, as one of them said this afternoon, that the United States was the dominant power on this continent. When did the United States become the dominant power on this continent? I tell these gentlemen opposite that the United States never was the dominant power on this continent, and that Great Britain has as many rights on this continent as the United States has.

Mr. MACDONALD (Pictou). The hon. gentleman who used that expression spoke of the dominant sovereignty of the United States in this matter.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The United States is not a sovereignty, but a republic, and they would be the first to repudiate that they are a sovereignty. He said that the United States were the dominant power on this continent, and he said they could do anything they liked here, and he intimated that they could force an unjust principle upon us, and the leader of the House sat there and listened to him. If ever there was an example of members of the Canadian government holding a brief for a foreign country it was to be seen in the House this afternoon. The leader of the government sat silent when that statement was made, and he clearly showed the views of the members of this government that when they go into treaty making with the United States they go in with fear and trembling, they think that Canada is only a small, isolated power and that at any moment the United States can come in and capture this country the same as they are endeavouring to do with Mexico this very minute. I repudiate this idea. Canada is a part of the British Empire, and Britain has ever been ready to take part in her defence as occasion demanded. Great Britain is always ready to see that justice will be done between Canada and the United States or any other country. I said that when these two gentlemen went to Washington to make this trade treaty their knees were shaking under them. When they went down to Albany last spring, and the big stick was held up by the President of the United States, and he threatened the surtax against us, then it was that this Waterways Treaty was forced upon us, and that the rights of Canadian citizens were violated. I claim that this treaty is a violation of the rights of Canadians. Why should not the same just rule prevail as to water rights between two countries side by side, as would prevail as between two private individuals? But here we have gentlemen opposite rising in their seats to-night, evidently holding a brief for the United States in relation to every international question that comes up in this House, and asserting that we have to give away our rights in this matter. Objection was taken to the diversion of the waters of the Rainy river, and the minister interrupted, and said that the commission refused to divert that water, but that the Secretary of War of the United States had given permission to divert all the waters on the American side flowing into the Rainy river, and keep them in American territory. There you have an example of what can be done by the United States. If firm ground had been taken by the Canadian government; if they placed their confidence in the mother country as they should have done, instead of continually endeavouring to break up the confederation of this country, as the leader of the government to-day in this House has done on every occasion, we would have less giving away of Canadian rights. Why, in a few years a Canadian dare not eat his breakfast unless he consults a joint international commission. Every sovereign right which Canada has on this continent will be invaded through the treaty making mania of hon. gentlemen opposite and especially the proxy premier who is the chief offender, and who leads the House to-night.

He is the leading man in trying to get the United States to edge into our affairs. We have a joint commission on waterways, and a joint commission on fisheries; we shall soon have a joint commission on railways. The next thing will be a joint commission on farming, and no one will be able to grow wheat in the Northwest

unless he gets the permission of that joint commission. For the first time in a British country, a foreign country has been allowed to interfere with our rights of taxation. Pitt laid down the principle that if you allow a foreign parliament to interfere with your rights of taxation you have allowed it to enter the citadel, and all hope of your country is gone. We have allowed the United States to dictate to us in matters of taxation, and we are allowing it to dictate to us in regard to our water-powers. The Niagara river is dealt with here. At one time the only thing about the Niagara Falls was the scenery and some land, and when a division was made under the old treaty, the United States took all they could take, which was the land. They took all the islands in the river that were worth anything, and they left to us the Horseshoe Fall, which they did not think was valuable; but just as the water becomes valuable, we find them seeking to put this treaty through so that they will get more than their fair share of the water. The House will understand that the Niagara Falls were surveyed by their surveyor, named Hunter, and then they had the gall to come to this commission and say, we have not been able to find that old survey, so we will make a new survey, and we will try to divide the water equally so that we will get more of it than we have now. They first got the islands and the land, and now they want the water as well. You find them acting in the same way in regard to everything. The Americans have never made a treaty with any country that they have kept unless it has been to their advantage. Where did the name reciprocity first occur? They made a treaty with France in the early part of the last century with reference to trading rights in Louisiana, and no sooner had they made it than they tried to hedge and not carry out its provisions. Take the Bulwer-Clayton treaty with regard to ships on the lakes—they are not keeping that. Another treaty said that they could not fortify the Panama canal, and they are not keeping that, but are going to fortify the canal. As a man of war I am a great believer in peace. Every one who knows anything about war must recognize its terrible horrors. None of the gentlemen have ever encountered war or seen anything of its horrors. But, whenever I see any country beginning to preach peace, I have a very strong idea that before long that country is going to be engaged in a great war. Who was the first and principal mover in founding the peace establishment at the Hague? The Czar of Russia; and inside of a year he was involved in the greatest and most sanguinary war in the history of the world—the war with Japan.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I rise to a point of order, but before stating the point, I would like to know whether it would be easier to let the hon. gentleman go on or to stop him. I think he should come down to a discussion of this Bill. Our time is precious, we are approaching the time when we want to adjourn, and the hon. gentleman will surely see the propriety of discussing the merits of this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The section before the House is to confirm a certain treaty which is in the schedule. I think the hon. gentleman's remarks, while very broad, are entirely along the line of the treaty and treaty-making, and I have not felt that he has transgressed the rule.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Of course, this is not a matter that the Minister of Public Works likes to have any reference made to; but I was referring to the subject of peace in order to point out that the United States at the present moment, while talking of a peace treaty with every other country, has a large army on the borders of Mexico ready to jump the line on ten minutes' notice; and I have no hesitation in saying that if the circumstances do not change in the next few months, there will be a great war between the United States and Mexico, perhaps the greatest war that has ever taken place on this continent. Hon. gentlemen opposite, in making their treaty, have shown themselves afraid of the United States, the dominant power. They know that the United States can take all these water-powers from them. They have gone down on their knees on every occasion when they have had a treaty to make with that country. On every occasion that they have had anything to give away to the United States, they have given it away. If they go on making treaties very much longer, we shall not have any of this country left. Some fine morning we may be told that negotiators have gone to Washington, and have turned over Canada or some of its provinces to the United States, and according to the principle laid down by the government of the day, they have a right to do that, and then come down to this House and say, we have made this treaty, we have given away Alberta and Saskatchewan and Manitoba to the United States, and you have no right to question that, because your ambassadors have pledged the honour of the country that that should be done, and this parliament of Canada has no right to change a letter in that agreement; the only thing it can do is put the government out of office. Carrying out what I said in my opening remarks, I think that before any treaty or bargain of any kind is made with the United States, preliminary articles relative to what is intended to be done should be

laid on the table of this House, so that the members of this parliament could discuss them, and give the government of the day the advantage of the knowledge of how it will affect the various constituencies represented here, in order that when the treaty is made, it can be brought to this House, and there will be no objection or opposition to it. I claim that in the pact recently made this country has been betrayed again and again in that respect. Parliament has been made the laughing stock of this whole country. We are kept here for months discussing a treaty of which there is no possible solution. It is a bargain which the Americans, judging by the action of their Senate, have no apparent intention of carrying through. If this government desired to act in a dignified manner, they would have told the United States government that before this country proceeded with any treaty of that character it would be necessary for Congress first to adopt it. We have a precedent in this very treaty, which the United States Congress has already passed before it is submitted to us. For that reason I think this tariff treaty should be dealt with in a similar manner.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. I think the hon. gentleman is now referring to the tariff treaty in a manner not warranted by the circumstances. He may draw an illustration from the tariff arrangement and apply it to this section, but I think he is now reversing that.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I have no intention to transgress the rules, but I wish merely to point out that this treaty, which we are now asked to pass, was passed by the United States Senate and Congress, as will be seen on page 11 of the Bill:

> The above treaty was approved by the United States Senate on the 3rd March, 1909, with the following resolution:
>
> Resolved, that the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of the treaty between the United States and Great Britain, providing for the settlement of international differences between the United States and Canada, signed on the 11th day of January, 1909.

I claim that that should have been taken as a precedent, and that this House should not have wasted three or four months uselessly discussing a reciprocity treaty which I do not think the United States have any intention of passing. Whenever we go to make any treaties with the United States again, I would suggest that this procedure be followed. If the government desires to maintain its dignity, and the honour of this country, it should proceed at once to withdraw this proposed reciprocity treaty, and follow the procedure given in this Bill.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman is again using an argument which I ruled out of order. He has no right to discuss the reciprocity pact on this measure.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Then I shall reverse the argument and say that we are wrong in carrying out this treaty now, that it should not be brought before the House in this manner, but that it should have been passed by this House before it was submitted to the United States Congress. That shows the absurdity of the whole thing. This House, and the whole of Canada has been made a laughing stock by the United States government in order to advance the interests of a vote-seeking President, and a political party whose cause seems to be pretty nearly lost.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I was very much surprised when this Bill was presented by the hon. the Minister of Pubic Works (Mr. Pugsley). If I remember rightly, when the matter was up before in this House, the hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) who is now leading the House, took the ground that it was not necessary for this House to ratify this treaty. I see him smiling. I suppose he has changed his mind.

Mr. FIELDING. Will my hon. friend be good enough to quote the passage.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I shall look it up in a few minutes. The Minister of Finance has a bad memory sometimes when it suits him. Who made this treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman can have all the information he can desire about this treaty from my hon. colleague the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Finance who is leading the House should give more information.

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Finance takes a different view.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is rather strange that the moment we ask for any information from the Minister of Finance, who is leading the House, he gets wrathy. I ask him who made this treaty? Surely some Canadian representative made it? Was it the hon. minister?

Mr. FIELDING. The Minister of Public Works is dealiing with this treaty and will be very happy to answer any questions of a proper character.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The leader of the House should answer these questions.

Mr. FIELDING. He thinks differently.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why does my hon. friend not want to ask me?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have no objection since the Minister of Finance will not

reply. I would like to know what minister of the government had charge of this treaty when it was being negotiated at Washington.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The interests of the Canadian government were looked after by Mr. Gibbons, the chairman of the International Waterways Commission, who was constantly in conference with the British ambassador, and who was assisted by Dr. King and Mr. Campbell, both of the Department of the Interior. On different occasions I went to Washington to render what assistance I could, and the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) also went to render assistance at one stage in the negotiations.

Mr. REID (Grenville). So that the negotiations were practically in the hands of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend wants to draw that inference, he is at liberty to do so.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I want to understand what took place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have stated exactly what took place.

Mr. REID (Grenville). As I understand it, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice are really the two government representatives who had charge of this Bill at Washington. There must have been some one to assume the responsibility because the International Waterways Commission surely would not have the power to negotiate a treaty. If they did negotiate it up to a certain point, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice assumed the responsibility. Am I right?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have stated exactly what took place.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I think that the attitude of these two gentlemen is most unfair; and if they want this Bill to go through they will have to change their tactics.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How could I make the matter plainer? I stated who negotiated the treaty, I made reference to the services of the British ambassador in that connection, I stated the part the Minister of Justice and I performed. That is all the information I can give my hon. friend, and on reflection he will see that is all he could ask me to give. I intended no discourtesy, but answered fully and frankly.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Did the government as a whole delegate the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice to negotiate this treaty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Justice, when he went to Washington, and I, when I went there, went with the authority of the government.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then the negotiation of this treaty was practically delegated to the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice on behalf of Canada, and they are responsible for the treaty being in its present shape.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The whole government is responsible.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The government assumed the work done by these two gentlemen. What I was trying to find out was whether this treaty, as it now stands, is in the same form as was arranged between the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Justice on behalf of the Canadian government. Will the Minister of Public Works reply?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think I can give my hon. friend any more information.

Mr. REID (Grenville) What I am surprised at is this: This Bill has been before the House some time. I think the original Bill was Bill (No. 36) with only three clauses in it, and at that time the point was raised as to whether the commission would have power to decide certain questions regarding water-powers on the St. Lawrence. There was also a question as to the ratification of this treaty by parliament. The ground was then taken that the treaty did not require to be ratified by this parliament; yet to-day, just when the minister wishes to pass this Bill, down it comes in a different shape altogether. There are men not now in this House who were here a few days ago and very anxious about this Bill, but they took it for granted that the Bill submitted originally was the only one that would come before this House. They have no opportunity of studying this Bill, and the effect of the changes that have been made in it. This is practically a new Bill, and the government ought not to ask this parliament to ratify it without giving the members an opportunity of seeing what effect these changes will have. I think the Minister of Public Works took the ground that the United States, if they wished, could divert a stream through their own territory into another channel altogether, and we could not interfere.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Always excepting any diversion which would interfere with the navigability of a river.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Take the point at the Long Sault rapids, what effect would it have, supposing they dammed the St. Lawrence river on American territory?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say that this treaty would give no authority whatever to dam the St. Lawrence at the Long Sault

or anywhere else. The words of this treaty are simply prohibitory, they are not permissive; and in addition to getting the authority of this parliament to construct a dam in the river, the plans would also have to be approved by the Boundary Waters Commission. It does not take away the necessity of first obtaining the authority of parliament.

Mr. REID (Grenville). On the American side they take a different view. The Bill was up in Congress during the last session when the representative of the New York legislature claimed that the New York legislature had the right to dam the St. Lawrence. The House of Representatives passed the Bill, and if it had not been so late in the session the chances are that the Senate would have passed it too. Now what confidence can we have that the United States government will keep faith with Canada in regard to this treaty? If the Bill had passed, how could we have prevented them going on and building the dam on the St. Lawrence? There would have been a Bill passed by the New York legislature, who own the bed of the river and they would have got the Washington Congress to pass a Bill of the same nature. If they had started to build that dam we could not have prevented it unless we had gone to war. Now, what confidence can we have that Washington will keep faith when we make treaties with them? As my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie), has shown, they have violated treaties in other cases. As I mentioned the other night, they have violated a treaty in placing war vessels on the Great Lakes, and when there was trouble they simply got the consent of the State government to allow them to go through the canals. This government never objected. During all these years the United States have compelled vessels going from Ottawa to New York to unload on the frontier, while vessels from New York could come right straight through to Ottawa. But as soon as this reciprocity agreement came up, and the fisheries treaty, and the waterways treaty, then the United States government allowed these vessels to go through the canals. I mention these facts to show that the United States government have not in the past kept good faith with us. Now, this treaty, when it is passed, will be entirely in their favour, and Canada will get the worst of it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In what respect is it in their favour?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Why, it is in their favour if they can dam the St. Lawrence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a big 'if' in your suggestion.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works was the first man to give it to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, he was not.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works stated in this House that he was considering it, and that he would protect Canada's interest by charging some rate, and that the New York State government was to charge $35,000 per annum.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said nothing of the kind.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works knows he did refer to the way he was safe-guarding Canada's interests.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He did not state at all what the hon. gentleman has just said.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works was considering the advisability of letting this great work go through. Why is the Minister of Public Works so awfully anxious to protect navigation from the Long Sault rapids? The whole navigation east of that is in Canada, there is no part of the St. Lawrence river on the American side from the Long Sault rapids down, it is all in Canada. Now if this treaty goes through, it only requires one of our Canadian commissioners to agree with three American commissioners in order to carry through any proposition that is made in these great waters between Canada and the United States. I have consulted lawyers on this question, and they differ from the Minister of Public Works.

They say they believe that, if this treaty goes through, this International Waterways Commission will have the right to decide. All I want to do is to protect Canadian interests so that they will be beyond dispute. Let us see the position we should be in if they assumed the right and this work went on. In the first place, if a dam were built at the Long Sault rapids, these commissioners agreeing to it, the private corporation would have absolute control of that great work. They build locks there. It is true, they are willing to put in a Bill that the government can control these locks. But then the United States government and the Canadian government jointly control them. If trouble should arise between Canada and the United States, or between Great Britain and the United States, the treaty comes to an end, and, as the locks are on the American side of the river we should not have the control of the navigation that we now have. Or if the dam should break or anything of that kind occur, our canal system would not be in proper shape to take vessels through, because the effect of damming the St. Law-

rence would be to raise the water at the head of the Cornwall canal and so our canal system would have to be changed to meet the new conditions. I object to this work going on at the Long Sault rapids because I believe it is going to divert trade to American seaports. For instance, you place the foot of navigation for the Americans down at the Long Sault or at Massena. The distance to Portland is not very great, so that grain trade and other trade could be diverted from Montreal. Again, I object to the whole water-power that might be developed there getting into the hands of a private corporation and practically into the United States. For vested interests will arise, and once these privileges have been given we cannot possibly destroy them. If this treaty were sufficiently protected, if nothing could be done there without this parliament having to agree to it—that is so far as placing any obstruction or dam across the St. Lawrence or alter it in any way—it would certainly remove my objection to the treaty to a very great extent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I may say to my hon. friend, he may not take my word for it—that it is made absolutely clear by the treaty that it must be by consent of the Dominion of Canada, and that means the parliament of Canada. Read article 3.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is the one I had in mind:

It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural flow level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So, you must have the double approval, first of the Dominion of Canada and then of the commission.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I have had two or three leading lawyers examine that clause, and they tell me that it might be construed directly opposite to what the Minister of Public Works says.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How did they say it might be construed?

Mr. REID (Grenville). That the commission could decide that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But does it not say: 'The Dominion of Canada'? That does not mean the commission. It adds 'and the commission.'

Mr. REID (Grenville). It does not say that the sanction shall be of this parliament, but of the Dominion of Canada, and this commission that we are appointing will represent the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Oh, no.

Mr. REID (Grenville). In other words, it will represent the minister. Certainly I would like to see the clause a little plainer. My attention is called to this clause which reads: 'Shall not be made except by the authorities of the United States or the Dominion of Canada.' The minister said we would have to have the consent of the United States, and the Dominion of Canada. But it says 'or,' and not 'and.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. 'Within their respective jurisdictions.'

Mr. REID (Grenville). But this is practically all in the United States. If you have the consent of one or the other——

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will pardon me I may be able to make clear my own view. I think it is absolutely clear that the United States cannot do anything which will alter the actual level or flow of boundary waters on the Canadian side except with the authority of the Dominion of Canada, and the approval of the Joint Commission; and Canada can do nothing to alter the actual level or flow of boundary waters on the United States side without the consent of the United States, and of the commission also. So that, so far as the countries are concerned, you must have the two things—you must have the consent of that country and you must have the approval of the Joint Commission.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I will have to leave that to be argued by some person who is better qualified than I am, or by some lawyer who would understand the cause better, but I have heard it argued by lawyers who express a different opinion from that of the Minister of Public Works and who claim that the clause is not clear and that if the Joint Commission did agree to this it would be impossible for us to dispute it. If the minister wishes this to be thoroughly understood, to protect the rights of Canada, and to carry out the promise made by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works himself that they would guarantee that this work would not be carried out without first coming to parliament, then I would suggest that he put in another clause——

Mr. PUGSLEY. What is that?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Something like this:

Nothing in this Act nor in the appointment of the commissioners to be appointed by His Majesty pursuant to the said treaty and under

this Act shall empower or be interpreted as empowering the commissioners so to be appointed, or the said commission to assent to authorize or approve of the erection or maintenance of any dams, locks or other obstructions in any or all of the channels of the St. Lawrence river mentioned in section 7 of the treaty made between Great Britain and the United States, dated August 9, A.D. 1842, upon either side of the boundary line for any purpose whatsoever, nor shall the said commissioners or said commission be empowered to pass upon or determine nor pass upon or determine the question as to whether or not any proposed dams or locks or other obstructions at said place will or will not either impair or improve navigation.

The minister can see the object of that section.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I regret that I cannot see it in face of the express words of the treaty.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This would be a clause in this Bill. It does not alter the treaty but it expressly tells the commission that in so far as that clause in the Ashburton treaty is concerned, there shall be no misunderstanding between this parliament and these men that we are now appointing. We cannot change the treaty here without going back to Washington. They would have to agree to any change that is made in the wording of the treaty, but this would place beyond doubt what the wishes of parliament are if such a case should come before the commission. Where you find a difference of opinion between leading lawyers in Canada, in so far as the construction which can be placed upon clause 3 is concerned, I cannot see why the Minister of Public Works should object to something being placed in the Bill on the lines I suggest in order to keep this matter perfectly right, and in order that the promise that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Public Works made to this House should be carried out. This question may not come up before the commission within a few months, or if, at any future time, there was a change in the positions of the gentlemen who have given us this promise, this project might go through and we could have no recourse. At all events, I cannot see why the Minister of Public Works should object to placing this parliament in a position that there can be no possible chance of a misunderstanding of that kind occurring. This great work at the Long Sault rapids is not being done for the improvement of navigation. That issue was raised at Washington and those who are proposing this work state that water-power is the first consideration, not navigation. That being the case, why should we interfere with navigation or place it in a secondary position? There is no doubt that the trip down the St. Lawrence and through the rapids is a very important part of our navigation system. It attracts a great many persons, we like to see them and it advertises Canada. In so far as it being necessary to furnish power for the frontier is concerned, I may say that has been taken up by the Hydro-Electric Commission and, as I understand, they are offering a very cheap rate for power along the frontier. Therefore, I think that the objection from the frontier is being overcome.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend know where they are going to get the power?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I understood from the minister who has charge of the Power Commission that there are two, I think three sources. There is one power company that, I think, could supply Kingston at any time and they are trying to negotiate with them now. That is the Seymour Power Company of Trenton. I think that they would come down further if there was a sufficient consumption of power to guarantee the enterprise. There is another large power about to be developed at a place called Calabogie back of Kingston.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have seen something in the papers about getting power from Waddington.

Mr. REID (Grenville). There is that source too.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What would be the effect on the canals of the development of power there?

Mr. REID (Grenville). None whatever. It would not affect the river at all.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member from Dundas (Mr. Broder) asked me two or three weeks ago to lay on the table of the House a report which had been ordered some weeks before with regard to this matter. In my absence it was laid on the table of the House, and I have only had an opportunity of casually looking it over, but the opinion seemed to be very strong that it would affect the Morrisburg canal very much if they developed as much power there as they are talking about.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of course, the Minister of Railways and Canals knows that section well. The only way it could affect it, I suppose, would be that it would make more water.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It would increase the discharge and draw more water away from the other part of the river.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I would like to know how it could affect it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I remember discussing this question with the engineer. He calculates that it would reduce the water on the sill at the head of the Morrisburg canal

one inch for every thousand horse-power developed at Waddington. It is a low head and they would have to make their dams in a way that would draw off a great volume of water from the main channel into the little river in order to develop power and this would decrease the depth on the sill. I do not know anything about it personally.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who is the principal owner of the power at Waddington?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Allison.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He is the gentleman who appeared in New York in opposition to the other one?

Mr. REID (Grenville). He is the gentleman who appeared in New York. I was under the impression it would raise the water at the head of the canal because it would dam it back. However, I am not going to argue against the engineer.

Mr. GRAHAM. Look at the report; I do not know anything about it personally.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But it strikes me that it would have a very decided effect. That being so, if the dam were built at the Long Sault rapids it would take the water away from the Cornwall canal altogether.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It depends altogether on your flume and upon the depth to which you can draw the water.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If it acts that way at Waddington it will have the same effect at the Cornwall canal and draw the water from the head of that canal, and our canal system at Cornwall, on which we spent so much money, will be spoiled. We can now run a steamer from Kingston to Montreal altogether in Canadian waters, but if these locks are built we will be going through the American lock, and while there is no objection to that so long as everything is all right, yet you cannot tell when something will happen, and then there will be trouble. I urge strongly that the consent of parliament shall be obtained before anything is done in this matter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the law now; no such plan can be approved without the authority of parliament.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When other gentlemen of high legal repute give an opinion to the contrary, is it not well to make it sure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What legal gentleman has given a contrary opinion?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I do not wish to mention names, but there are able lawyers in Canada who hold that the clause is not clear, and that if the commission decided to place a dam there it would be difficult for the government to interfere. I do not belittle the opinion of the Minister of Justice or the Minister of Public Works, but lawyers, like doctors, differ. What objection can there be to the clause I suggest?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman send it over to me?

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the opinion of the Minister of Public Works is right, the insertion of this clause can do no harm, and it will remove any doubt there may arise in the mind of the commission. The promoters of this great scheme will no doubt be back here for legislation, and it is this parliament which should decide whether they will proceed with the work or not. This clause simply gives effect to the understanding announced by the Prime Minister and by the Minister of Public Works in this House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to oblige my hon. friend, but I would not like to put ourselves on record as doing a very foolish and very unnecessary thing.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You do that often.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The less we do of it the better.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You do it so often that really it does not make much difference.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The clause my hon. friend wants inserted is as follows:

> Nothing in this Act nor in the appointment of the commissioners to be appointed by His Majesty pursuant to the said treaty and under this Act shall empower or be interpreted as empowering the commissioners so to be appointed, or the said commission to assent to authorize or approve of the erection or maintenance of any dams, locks or other obstructions in any or all of the channels of the St. Lawrence river mentioned in section 7 of the treaty made between Great Britain and the United States, dated August 9, A.D. 1842, upon either side of the boundary line for any purpose whatsoever, nor shall the said commissioners or said commission be empowered to pass upon or determine nor pass upon or determine the question as to whether or not any proposed dams or locks or other obstructions at said place will or will not either impair or improve navigation.

If the latter part of that clause were adopted the commissioners would be absolutely powerless to approve or disapprove even if parliament had granted the necessary authority to erect any works in boundary water. Anyway the clause is entirely unnecessary because at last session of parliament, to make assurance doubly sure, even after the Prime Minister had made the statement that the government would not consent to any plans for the obstruction of the St. Lawrence river by erecting a dam

therein without first having the approval of parliament, section 12, chapter 166, 1910, was enacted.

Mr. DOHERTY. That is exclusively with regard to the authorizing of works upon our side of the river. It has nothing to do with works upon the American side.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so. As to works on the American side of the river, we have, of course, no authority outside of the authority given by this treaty, and in this treaty is the safeguard.

Mr. DOHERTY. What in the opinion of the hon. minister is the safeguard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as Canada is concerned, we have the absolute provision that no works by way of dams, or other obstructions shall be erected in the St. Lawrence without the plans being first submitted to, and approved of by parliament. As to anything that may be done on the American side of the line, as it might affect the rights of the other country, article 3 provides:

It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions and with the approval, as hereinafter provided, of a joint commission, to be known as the International Joint Commission.

I cannot conceive of language which would be more prohibitory than that. In other words, these two countries agree that there shall be no obstructions of any kind or description placed in these boundary waters which will affect the natural level, or flow of the water upon the other side of the line without the consent of the country in which such natural level or flow would be affected, or without the approval of this International Joint Commission. Under these circumstances, I could not ask the committee, with any reason, to accept the amendment which my hon. friend proposes. It is not necessary, as all interests are safeguarded by the treaty.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). I think there can be no two opinions as to the meaning of article 3. The effect of it and of the whole treaty, as I interpret it, is this. The boundary waters are waters in common. The waters that flow on the American side of the boundary line are in American territory, and those that flow on the Canadian side are in Canadian territory. Each party has an easement in the waters of the other for the treaty purposes. What article 3 says is simply this: no uses, obstructions or diversions of water shall take place on either side of the river without the consent, first, of the country in which such uses, obstructions or diversions are to be created, or without also the consent of the commission. According to the minister's interpretation, it would not be necessary to get the consent of the country in which the use or obstruction or diversion takes place.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Article 3 proceeds on the theory that each country, so far as its own territory is concerned, can legislate, but it also expressly provides that neither country shall authorize the construction of works in its territory which would alter the flow or level of the water in the adjoining country without the consent of that country, or without the consent also of the International Joint Commission. That is clear. He who runs may read and understand that and there cannot be any doubt.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). It is quite obvious that article (3) does not require the consent of both countries, the consent of one is sufficient provided the commission also gives its consent. Suppose an obstruction be created on the American side——

Mr. PUGSLEY. It must be a work authorized by that country.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Then the consent of that country is the only consent needed, since article (3) only requires the consent of one country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You get the consent of the country in which the water level is being altered.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). You must have the authority of the United States or of the Dominion of Canada and the consent of the commission, so that if the minister be right, the consent of the country on whose side the obstruction is to be created would not require to be secured. That is obviously absurd. There is no provision requiring the consent of both countries. If the minister be right in saying that you must have the consent of the country on whose side the water is raised, you do not require the consent of the country on whose side the obstruction is being created.

Mr. DOHERTY. There is absolutely no doubt that the interpretation of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) is the only one possible of this section. I feel perfectly warranted in saying this because I can cite the express declaration of a lawyer for whose opinion, I am sure, the Minister of Public Works will have much greater respect than he can possibly have

for mine or that of my hon. friend, I refer to the Minister of Justice. On the 2nd of February, page 2970, the Minister of Justice said:

Surely both can well stand together, the Ashburton treaty securing equal freedom for purposes of navigation—that is, freedom equally to the inhabitants of one country and those of the other country—in the river which constitutes the boundary, and the recent treaty providing that no new obstruction shall be put anywhere along that river on either side of the line which will have the effect of raising the level on the other side of the line, except: First, with the authority of the government of the country in which the obstruction is to be placed, and, second, with the approval of the International Joint Commission. Now, that language, I say, implies that the government of each country has the right to authorize, if it sees fit, such an obstruction as will alter the level on the other side of the line, and that obstruction, when it has been authorized by the proper government, must also receive the approval of the International Joint Commission before it can be permitted —the two things must concur. The language implies that there is a right, without any infraction of treaty obligations, on the part of either Canada or the United States to authorize such obstruction as may affect the level on the other side of the boundary if, in the judgment of the legislature of Canada or the United States, such obstruction is desirable. Now, we have a proposition in the Congress of the United States to authorize such an obstruction. It is entirely within their legal right; they are not infringing upon any treaty obligation by entertaining that proposition. But, if they see fit to authorize it, then, if it will affect the level on the Canadian side of the boundary, it must receive the approval of the International Joint Commission before it can be permitted. That is an additional safeguard which we have secured by entering into this recent treaty.

I asked the Minister of Public Works what was the safeguard which the treaty gave us, and I understood him to say our safeguard was that our parliament had to authorize the creation of an obstruction on the American side. Evidently he and the Minister of Justice do not agree. The only safeguard we can have is that which the treaty gives us, and I do not think it gives us that which the Minister of Public Works says it does. The only safeguard it does give, in cases where it does apply, is the consent of the International Commission which must be obtained after the country on whose side the obstruction is created authorizes that obstruction. So that the country on whose side the level of the water is altered by the obstruction created on the opposite side has no voice in the matter but has to depend on the ruling of the Joint Commission. If anything more is wanted than the words of the first paragraph of the section, we need only read the second paragraph which makes it clear that if there be no interference with the flow of water on the other side, either country may go on and construct whatever works it thinks necessary for the improvement of navigation or other purposes mentioned in that section without the consent of the commission. The Joint Commission therefore has only warrant to interfere in cases when the obstruction created on the one side alters the level of the water on the other. But there is absolutely nothing to entitle the parliament of Canada to be consulted and required to authorize works to be built on the American side. The wording of the section leaves no possible doubt:

It is agreed that, in addition to the uses, obstructions, and diversions heretofore permitted or hereafter provided for by special agreement between the parties hereto, no further or other uses or obstructions or diversions, whether temporary or permanent, of boundary waters on either side of the line, affecting the natural level or flow of boundary waters on the other side of the line, shall be made except by authority of the United States or the Dominion of Canada within their respective jurisdictions.

That is to say, if you are going to make any use or obstruction, the United States must authorize those that are made within its jurisdiction and Canada must authorize those that are made within its jurisdiction. That is, the agreement of the United States with Canada is that it shall be made by the United States and not by the state of New York or any other authority. We undertake on our side that nothing shall be done by any authority other than that of the Dominion of Canada. And the protection of either party so far as the level of the water is concerned, is in the Joint Commission. But, if there be any possible doubt as to what the first paragraph means, the second paragraph makes it absolutely clear:

The foregoing provisions are not intended to limit or interfere with the existing rights of the government of the United States, on the one side, and the government of the Dominion of Canada, on the other, to undertake and carry on governmental works in boundary waters for the deepening of channels, the construction of breakwaters, the improvement of harbours, and other governmental works for the benefit of commerce and navigation, provided that such works are wholly on its own side of the line and do not materially affect the level or flow of the boundary waters on the other, nor are such provisions intended to interfere with the ordinary use of such waters for domestic and sanitary purposes.

It seems to me that makes it absolutely clear that, as regards this question of damming the channels at the Long Sault, in the first place it is absolutely untenable to say that that clause has one word which requires authorization by this parliament of constructions in any of these portions of the channels that are on the American side—and the two channels which are governed

by the Ashburton treaty are practically entirely on the American side;—and, in the second place, that it is absolutely untenable to say that this Waterways Commission has one word to say about it unless the level of the water on our side is affected, but that if that water could be dammed in these two channels and these two channels blocked without altering the level of the water on the Canadian side, not even the commission would have a word to say about it, and, so far as this treaty is concerned, the American government might do just as it pleased. But, as I understand him, the hon. minister contends that this treaty requires both the assent of our parliament and the assent of the Waterways Commission, and provides that with these two things this damming operation could be carried on lawfully by the United States. It seems to me that, even if that interpretation be erroneous, as I think with all due respect it is in so far as attributing any right in our parliament to speak in opposition to doing that, and even if it be not sound to say that in that case apart from the question of affecting the level of the water, the consent of the Waterways Commission would be required, and, being given, would be sufficient,—yet because that interpretation is put upon it, it behooves this parliament which is called upon to ratify this treaty, to say whether or not it is willing to enact the legislation without repudiating that interpretation—Now I understand, the minister says, that the enactment of this amendment may be a useless and foolish thing. There might be a great deal of force in that if the minister were not asking us if that interpretation be clearly right or clearly wrong to do the useless and foolish thing of ratifying the treaty, over which we have no power. The treaty is in force, and has been in force for two years, as the Minister of Justice told us; and yet parliament is seriously sitting here to-night to ratify, sanction and approve it. It seems to me that that is at least as foolish and useless a thing as putting in this proviso, which is only useless and foolish if it has no effect. Now, to my mind, this treaty does not give to the Waterways Commission, which is created under it, any powers whatever to consent to the damming of these two channels. The government which is presenting this Bill to us tells us that it does, and we are asked to ratify and confirm it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Surely my hon. friend is in error. I never made such a statement, that the treaty gives the commission power to authorize the obstruction of the river. I said it must be by the authority of parliament and the commission.

Mr. DOHERTY. If the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) should happen to be wrong and the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) should happen to be right——

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. member will pardon me: The minister and my hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) both, I think, agree that, at all events, so far as the Canadian side is concerned as to any obstructions being placed in the river, that must be with the consent of parliament.

Mr. DOHERTY. Undoubtedly. But we are not in danger, at present at all events, of obstruction on our side of the river. That is not the question which presents itself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is the question brought up by the member for Grenville (Mr. Reid).

Mr. DOHERTY. I understood that hon. member to say that what he was anxious about was the proposed damming of the two channels referred to in the Ashburton treaty; and the amendment makes that clear, because it provides that nothing in this Act or in the appointment of these men, shall be interpreted as affecting the rights of Canada under the Ashburton Treaty. The rights of Canada under the Ashburton Treaty are rights in channels on the American side—we do not need the Ashburton treaty to give us rights on our own side. What we want to preserve is the rights, such as they may be, which we have in these two channels, and what the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) seeks to do by his amendment is to make it absolutely clear, that, at all events so far as this legislation is concerned, it is not intended to modify those rights nor affect them in any way. Now, one of two things is true: Either this new waterways treaty has wiped out our rights under the Ashburton treaty and substituted these provisions for the Ashburton treaty, or it has not produced that effect. If it does produce that effect, and if under this treaty the assent of the commission is sufficient to authorize and make binding on Canada works constructed by the authority of the American government in these channels, of course we cannot alter the situation, and the amendment of the hon. member for Grenville does not undertake to alter that. But what it undertakes to do is to provide that this legislation which we are passing now, shall not alter that situation.

Now, I think, in view of the interpretation put upon the treaty by the minister, of Justice the desirability of that amendment becomes perfectly clear, unless parliament wishes by this legislation to enact that the commission should have power to bind Canada, by recognizing the right of the American government to authorize the blocking of these two channels, so far as they are in American waters, and they are practically

altogether in American waters. The purpose of the amendment is to guard against the effect being attributed to our ratification of this treaty, and our ratification of this treaty coming on top of the opinion of the Minister of Justice, that under this treaty the proposed damming of these two channels, if assented to by this Waterways Commission, would be binding on Canada. It is to guard ourselves against the effect of such an interpretation as given by the Minister of Justice. We have ratified the treaty but we do not intend that this ratification should be invoked in support of the contention that that is a proper interpretation, and that these commissioners have this authority. The purpose of the amendment is to make perfectly clear that the power of the commissioners should be just exactly what it would be under the treaty, but nothing additional should come to them by reason of the enactment of this statute. It is a measure of precaution. But at the same time, the interpretation that has been put upon the treaty, and our proceeding in face of that interpretation, without a word of explanation, to ratify it, would put a strong argument in the mouth of those who would have an interest in urging that by this legislation, and by the appointment of the commissioners to be made under it, we were confiding to them in toto all the voice that Canada may ever have with regard to damming these two channels. If the interpretation of the minister should happen to be wrong, the amendment will at least serve this purpose, it will make clear that parliament, in enacting this ratification, does not intend to adopt the opinion of the Minister of Justice and give it statutory effect, and is not handing over this particular matter to this commission, and giving them the whole power to speak for Canada. If the opinion of the Minister of Justice be the correct interpretation, notwithstanding that amendment to the statute, these gentlemen will have that power under the treaty. For my part it does not seem to me that the treaty itself gives to these gentlemen of the commission any power to deal with the question of the obstruction of these two channels. The purpose of the control that is given to these gentlemen is to put them in a position to prevent works on one side of the river which raise the level of water on the other side; that is their entire function. What is in view in conferring this power, I think, is the protection of the country on the side of the river opposite to that where the obstructions are made, from alterations in the level of the water. There is no purpose of protecting the rights of the country on the other side in the navigation of the channels. Manifestly the power of the commissioners is limited

to judging cases where the level of the water opposite the side where the obstruction has been created, is altered, and does not extend to determining to what extent the rights of navigation on the part of one party may be affected by the construction made upon the other side. This is made clear by the preamble of this treaty which says what the purpose of the treaty itself is. The purpose of the treaty is clearly not to alter any situations which are settled and fixed by previous treaties. I need not say that there is no safer guide to correct interpretation than that which is set forth in the preamble of the Bill. What is the purpose of this treaty? The preamble tells us that.

> His Majesty, the King and the United States of America, being equally desirous to prevent disputes regarding the use of boundary waters and to settle all questions which are now pending between the United States and the Dominion of Canada involving the rights, obligations, or interests of either in relation to the other or to the inhabitants of the other along their common frontier, and to make provision for the adjustment and settlement of all such questions as may hereafter arise, have resolved to conclude a treaty in furtherance of these ends.

That is to regulate the uses of the water and to determine all questions which are now pending between the two countries. It cannot be contended that at the time of the enactment of this treaty there was any pending question with regard to the free and open navigation of these two channels. That question had been absolutely settled and concluded by the terms of the Ashburton treaty which dealt expressly and specifically with these two particular channels and created the rights of Canada in them. So, I say it is clear that there are limitations put upon the power of these commissioners under which that power is to be exercised only in cases where the flow of water is affected and clear, from the purposes for which this treaty was entered into, that the treaty was not intended to and does not alter the express provisions in the Ashburton treaty in regard to navigation; and not so altering them it clearly does not place the determination of any questions arising under the Ashburton treaty under the jurisdiction of these commissioners.

There is another reason which I think can be advanced in support of my proposition. I do not think I am making any mistake in saying that in interpreting these treaties and determining the effect of them, one upon the other, we are perfectly justified in applying the rules that are applied as regards the interpretation of laws and the effect of one upon another when it is a question of how far a subsequent law repeals a previous one. We

would be justified, when construing these two treaties between these countries, in applying the rules that govern the interpretation of contracts. I urge without fear of serious contradiction that it cannot be denied that when you have made a special, particular and specific law to deal with one particular specific instance, the subsequent enactment of general provisions does not override that law. In the system under which I was brought up that simple rule as expressed, declared that throughout the whole law 'in toto jure' the special rule derogates from the general rule.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think anybody will deny that.

Mr. DOHERTY. Here then we have the determination of a specific case by the Ashburton treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does my hon. friend want the amendment of my hon. friend from Grenville for?

Mr. DOHERTY. I want it because this government stands before this parliament interpreting this treaty as governing this case and giving power to these commissioners to assent to any works which the American government might erect on that side, and because, if we pass this legislation in the face of that authoritative interpretation and without any reserve or qualification, we will be furnishing a very powerful argument to our adversaries in this matter which they will not fail to invoke when they come to claim that because they have the assent of these commissioners our parliament has absolutely nothing to do with it. I am free to confess that our position has been far from ameliorated by the terms of this treaty as expressed, but I want to, at least, as far as it is in my power, bring about the result that this particular legislation shall not make our position worse than it is from my point of view. Perhaps the Minister of Public Works, seeing that the Minister of Justice has disagreed with him in the interpretation, that I have not been able to agree entirely with either of them, and that the hon. member for South Toronto is in the same position, will at least admit that there may be room for doubt as to the interpretation of this clause. If that be the case surely it is not intended that this legislation should be enacted for the purposes of serving as a means of enabling an interpretation to be put upon this treaty. If we pass it purely and simply we are building up a very strong argument in support of the interpretation put upon this treaty by the Minister of Justice, and we are placing our adversaries, if we should come to have adversaries, or if we should come to take an adverse position to that of the government of the United States and it was to their interest to say that all they had to do was to get the assent of the commissioners under this treaty in order to bind Canada, in possession of an additional argument in favour of such a contention. I have no very great hope of producing conviction in the mind of the Minister of Public Works, but I must say that it does seem to me that I am arguing in support of a most eminently reasonable position, because, if the view of those who desire to propose this amendment to this section in respect to which there are disputed interpretations should prove to be wrong, then the amendment will have done absolutely no harm; whereas, if, in the face of this clause, susceptible of different interpretations, the amendment should be accepted, it will do this much good that it will leave that section absolutely to be interpreted as it ought to be interpreted according to the proper rules of interpretation without that interpretation being affected in the slightest degree by this legislation. Unless it is intended by this legislation that parliament should intervene for the purpose of interpreting this treaty and interpreting it in a sense favourable towards those with whom we made this bargain, unless it is desired that we should add to this treaty and to its terms an authoritative interpretation favourable to the persons with whom we are dealing in the event of there coming up a difference of opinion between us, it seems to me that there can be no reasonable objection to adopting this amendment proposed by my hon. friend from Grenville, and which, I think, is a valuable section as, at all events, insuring this country against the action we are taking now being interpreted as impairing in any way its rights such as they actually are under this treaty, or as, I believe, they are under the Ashburton treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would not for a moment think of setting up my views against the opinion of the Minister of Justice which no doubt is the correct one. On the point that this treaty does not give any right to the commissioner to interfere with navigation, there is no doubt. My hon. friend (Mr. Doherty) who has made a very able argument takes that ground.

Mr. DOHERTY. The minister does not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not understand the Minister of Justice to argue that this treaty in any way interferes with the Ashburton treaty. Article 1 of this treaty clearly preserves the right of navigation in substantially the language of the Ashburton treaty. Either country can make improvements, but these improvements

must always be aids and improvements to navigation, and the commissioners would have no power to give any consent to any obstruction which would interfere with the free navigation of that part of the St. Lawrence. This makes it absolutely clear that the amendment of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) is not required. Then in section 12 of the Act of last session it is provided that no plans, no proposition, no application to the British government even to alter the terms of the Ashburton treaty can be made without the approval of the parliament of Canada. The amendment of the hon. gentleman could not safeguard the rights of our people better than they are safeguarded now.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works stated that the language of this treaty was exactly the same as the language of the Ashburton treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I said it was substantially the same.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Article 7 of the Ashburton treaty says that channels in the River St. Lawrence on both sides of the Long Sault and Barnhart Island shall be equally free to the ships of both nations.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And this says boundary waters.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The clause in this treaty means free passage through the canals when they are built.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is not that the same as the Ashburton treaty?

Mr. REID (Grenville). If this dam is built there will be only one channel where there are two now, because the north channel which is the main channel now on the downward route, will be spoiled. When this Bill was before Congress there was strong opposition to that feature, from amongst others the city of Montreal, the Board of Trade, the Chambre de Commerce, the Harbour Commissioners, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Citizens' Association, the Canadian Shipping Federation, the Montreal Transportation Company, the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company, the town of Morrisburg and the city of Toronto. Here we have able lawyers disagreeing on the construction of that clause and yet the Minister of Public Works refuses to insert a clause which makes the meaning plain beyond doubt.

If the Minister of Public Works wants to protect the interests of the people of Canada, he will surely put in that clause. This whole scheme with regard to the Long Sault is sure to come up again, and I think it is dangerous to leave it where there is a possible chance of doubt. I think he should not object to that clause being added, and then the Bill would go along, and we would be able to hurry the business through. Surely the minister cannot think that in asking that there is any obstruction; the object is simply to make plain the clause. On the other side of the line, when this Bill was before Congress, Mr. Maltby, the gentleman acting for the company that was trying to get the Bill through, was asked at the end of the hearing by Chairman Burton of the special committee, if it was contemplated to go on with the construction of the dam without the consent of the government of Canada, and he admitted that it was. So evidently they do not intend to carry out the treaty, and I think the minister should consider that. Now, I want to correct one thing that the minister stated in the early part of this discussion, when he denied that he had said that he would protect Canada by collecting from the company $30,000 or $35,000 a year for the privilege. Here is what happened, on page 917 of 'Hansard':

Mr. REID (Grenville). When we raised the question of damming the St. Lawrence the hon. minister made the statement that he was protecting the interests of Canada because we were going to get $30,000 a year of revenue from that, similar to what the United States was getting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I stated was that if parliament should hereafter grant any authority to dam the St. Lawrence and I were Minister of Public Works at the time, I would see that any company getting the power would pay as much as was to be paid to the state of New York, which I understood was to be $30,000 a year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is, if parliament was hereafter to grant the right. What the hon. gentleman said was that I was in favour of granting the right subject to a rental of so much a year. I said that I had made no such statement, and what the hon. gentleman has read absolutely confirms what I said.

Mr. GOODEVE. I would like to ask, for information, if we pass this Bill confirming the treaty, could a company or an individual, under Article 3, get the right from the United States government to dam the St. Lawrence, and then only require to get the consent of this Joint Commission to go on with the work, regardless of whether it altered the level of the water or not? If we pass this Bill, then under clause (3) of the treaty any company or individual getting the right from the United States government to dam the St. Lawrence could go on and do so, and if that dam altered the level of the water on the other side, the consent of the Joint Commission would have to be obtained.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As regards the construction of works on the United States

side which would in any way affect the level of the waters on the Canadian side, this treaty does not apply at all. In respect of the St. Lawrence, the Ashburton treaty still exists; and it is provided by that treaty and also by article (1) of this treaty that there must be free navigation preserved to the people of both countries.

Mr. GOODEVE. I only use the St. Lawrence as an illustration. I want the interpretation of the government on clause (3). As I understand that clause, parties desiring to construct works in either country must get the consent of the parliament of the country in which the works are to be constructed; but if the work affects the boundary waters in the other country, the parties must get in addition the consent of the Joint Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. GOODEVE. And no further consent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If they affect navigation, the works could not be constructed at all under article (1). That article provides that navigation of all boundary waters must be kept free.

Mr. GOODEVE. But if a company got the consent of its own government to construct a dam which might interfere with the flow of water on the other side of the boundary, they would have to get this consent of the Joint Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. You mean on the other side of the line?

Mr. GOODEVE. Suppose a company desires to construct a dam on the American side, they would naturally get the consent of their own government. But if that dam would affect the level of the water on our side, they would have also to get the consent of the Joint Commission, and that would be all they would require.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Subject always to article (1) which provides that all boundary waters shall be kept open to navigation freely to the people of both countries.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). The treaty and more especially the Bill deal very largely with the public domain of the provinces, especially of Ontario, and the provincial laws are to be apparently abrogated or overridden wherever they interfere with the operation of this treaty. Has the government conferred in any way with the province of Ontario, both as regards the appropriation of public waterways and the overriding of provincial laws, and has the province of Ontario given its consent to this measure? As has been pointed out to-night, although this Bill has been on the Order Paper for a considerable length of time, the treaty has been over two years in operation. Only the other day a Bill was brought down by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) for the purpose of putting into operation this treaty and providing machinery including a very large expenditure of ways and means. That Bill went to the public but it has since been very largely amended.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All those sections remain just as they were.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). As regards the overriding of provincial laws, I think that section of the Bill is entirely new, and I do not know if the provinces are aware of this change.

Mr. PUGSLEY. None of the provinces were consulted in the framing of the treaty. All that section (2) of the Bill provides is that, so far as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of the treaty, all Dominion and provincial laws shall be altered. The only respect in which they can be altered would be as to the remedies given to people in the adjoining country to bring actions in the Exchequer Court for damages on account of injuries sustained by reason of the diversion of the water. Provision is made for the issuing of subpœna and the taking of evidence under oath. Any effect which this Bill would have upon provincial laws would be only such as is necessary to put in force the provisions of this treaty. The limitation is contained in clause (2).

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). That contains no limit whatever.

The section is as follows:

The laws of Canada and of the several provinces thereof are hereby amended and altered so as to permit, authorize and sanction the performance of the obligations undertaken by His Majesty in and under the said treaty; and so as to sanction, confer and impose the various rights, duties and disabilities intended by the said treaty to be conferred or imposed or to exist within Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Limited wholly to the necessary connection with the treaty.

Mr. MACDONELL. At one fell swoop it is proposed to amend all the laws of all the provinces so as to permit this treaty to have full operation and effect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is so.

Mr. MACDONELL. Having regard to the public domain, surely the minister does not consider that because waters are international or boundary waters, they cease to be provincial waters. I do not think there is legal authority for any such proposition. In as much as this treaty proposes not only to deal with international or boundary waters, but to extend its operation to waters very remote from the boundary or international waters—waters that are notoriously

provincial waters—it seems to me that when we come to the wide power given by section 2, you simply propose (if you have the right to pass that section 2) that for treaty purposes and Dominion purposes, the domain of the various provinces where it comes in contact with this treaty, shall be included under the Act. I will just point out the far-reaching effect of the language used. Take, for instance, article 1. Therein we find these waters defined, and they not only include boundary waters but waters connected with boundary waters, and also, by the preliminary article, 'all bays, arms and inlets thereof, &c.' So, we take the boundary waters of the Great Lakes and by the operation of the preliminary article and article 1 you include in boundary waters all the bays, arms and inlets of the boundary waters which are tributary to or form part of the Great Lakes. This would include the Georgian bay and all the waters tributary to it. I believe the Minister of Public Works himself was authority for the statement this afternoon that because a river in Maine, flowing entirely in the state of Maine, entered the St. John river, it also was a boundary water, and included in the treaty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not a boundary water, but one that flows into a boundary water.

Mr. MACDONELL. Yes, and therefore comes under the operation of the treaty. If that be so, having reference to the geographical aspect of the watershed of the Great Lakes and the watershed of the Georgian bay, all the streams that flow into the Great Lakes and Georgian Bay from the north—and almost all that flow into the Great Lakes, except the Rainy river, flow in from the north, that, from Canadian territory—according to this definition, at one fell swoop——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has not read it. It expressly excludes all tributary waters.

Mr. MACDONELL. Then, why did the minister include the river of which he spoke?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is different. I was speaking with reference to what was done as to the Allegash.

Mr. MACDONELL. Then, it either is or is not a boundary water. And take section 2 of article 1. It extends not only to natural bodies of water, but 'to all canals connecting boundary waters and now existing or which may hereafter be constructed on either side of the line.' The effect of this—speaking subject to correction and simply as a matter of common reading of English—that if we construct the Georgian Bay canal, forming part of the Ottawa river, that tributary for 300 or 400 miles will be held under the treaty in common. So, by this joint commission we submit to the joint supervision of the United States and ourselves all the inland waters and canals belonging to the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where did the hon. gentleman find that in the treaty, it must be a canal connecting boundary waters.

Mr. MACDONELL. I am glad the hon. gentleman has mentioned that. Lake Huron is a boundary water, and Georgian bay, by the preliminary article, is a part of a boundary water, because it is a bay that is included in 'all bays, arms and inlets thereof.' So the Georgian bay canal, which goes to the Georgian bay, which is part of the boundary waters——

Mr. PUGSLEY. And joins the St. Lawrence where it has ceased to be boundary water.

Mr. MACDONELL. It flows from boundary waters, and it joins boundary waters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it joins the St. Lawrence below where it is a boundary water.

Mr. MACDONELL. The St. Lawrence is a boundary stream.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only to a certain point.

Mr. MACDONELL. You will find that our American friends will claim the whole length.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. MACDONELL. There is the fact staring you in the face. It seems to me that the rights of the provinces have been overlooked, and that there has been no attempt to safeguard those rights or consult the provinces in the confiscation or disposal of their rights. The minister is well aware of the decision in the fishery case in the Privy Council. It is common knowledge that it was decided that the Dominion government has no right in the waters except where they have been improved in rivers, harbours, or canals, but that public waters and land under public waters, in the old province of Canada, belong either to the province of Ontario or to the province of Quebec. And you will find nowhere in the British North America Act any authority to divest the province of Ontario of its domain in these waters or under them. Yet this measure proposes to deal with them without even consulting the provinces. Then you have the additional feature that, as I have said, at one fell swoop, you wipe out provincial legislation that is in conflict with the operation of this treaty. Every lawyer knows—the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), is not here, but if he were here I am sure he would agree with me—

that of all legislation, legislation by inference or reference is the most obnoxious. To declare generally that all law in conflict with what is here laid down shall be amended, altered, or repealed, is the most objectionable kind of legislation, because you have to go to court every time you want to find out what the rights of the individual are, and to what extent these laws are altered, amended, or require to be altered, amended, or repealed, to be in conformity with the treaty. So, both the contents of the Bill, and the manner in which it is brought down—without consultation with the parties vitally interested—are objectionable. It does seem to me that the objection raised by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid), has been well taken. The amendment can do no harm if inserted. I might point out here that in the case before the committee of the Senate of the United States with regard to the erection of an obstruction in the St. Lawrence it was there openly stated that the effect of allowing that legislation to go through would be to entirely abrogate those clauses in the Ashburton treaty which require the River St. Lawrence to be forever free and clear. If the Minister of Public Works should accept the amendment of the member for Grenville, as I have said, its presence in the Bill would do no harm, whereas it would wonderfully safeguard the rights of the people of this country, and make plain, and unequivocal the position which we all, the minister included, agree should be taken, namely, that it is not in any way intended or desired to interfere with the freedom of the river which has been guaranteed by the provisions of the Ashburton treaty. I think the minister would do well to consider whether he should not accept that amendment. The minister has made some remarks about not making headway with the Bill. That is his own fault in not bringing down this important measure until practically on the eve of adjournment. If this Bill had been brought down long ago, it could have had more consideration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have delayed it frequently at the special request of hon. gentlemen opposite who were desirous of being present. However, I do not complain.

Mr. MACDONELL. This treaty has been in operation now for more than two years. The provision for financing the commission is a matter that can go on. In answer to a question I put the government, I was informed that the government has spent already $218,329 on the Waterways Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not this commission, that is under the old treaty.

Mr. MACDONELL. It is the same men and the same work. However, there has been a large amount expended already. If this Bill were not passed the expenditure could go on. In the meantime the minister would do well to let this measure stand for further mature consideration until after the adjournment. We find the Minister of Public Works holding one view, and the Minister of Justice another view, but the Bill goes on all the same. I think it would be in the interests of the country to let this measure stand, and let the government consult with the provinces who are affected by it. The rights of the provinces are being impaired by this Bill, both in regard to their public domain, and to their public law. It would be better for the government to wait awhile, and come to some arrangement with the provinces for taking joint action.

Mr. REID (Grenville). If the Americans got a Bill through at Washington giving them power to dam the South Sault, then all they would want would be the consent of the Joint Commission. Would the Minister of Public Works take that position?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I have said already is that this treaty gives no right whatever to dam the St. Lawrence river, or any other river; on the contrary, it preserves every right of navigation. Article 1 declares that the navigation of all navigable boundary waters shall forever continue free and open for the purpose of commerce to the inhabitants of both countries, safeguarding to the fullest extent the right of navigation. In the case my hon. friend put of the United States Congress giving authority to place a dam upon their own side of the boundary, this treaty gives no such power. That is a power which they have at the present time, but this treaty contains a prohibitive clause which says that they shall not do that, if the effect is to raise the water level upon the Canadian side, without the consent of the International Joint Commission. While Canada might erect works on its own side, if the effect was to alter the level of the water on the other side of the boundary, there must be the consent of the International Joint Commission. This treaty gives no power to place an obstruction of any kind or description in a boundary water; on the contrary, it limits the right which exists at the present time. It preserves every right of navigation, and provides also that if the parliament of either country should authorize the construction of any works, they must be subject to every right of navigation, and must always be subject to the approval of the International Joint Commission, if the level of the water on the other side of the boundary is affected.

Mr. SPROULE. This treaty has been in operation for over a year, and why is it that we have had so much trouble this winter trying to prevent the Long Sault Company from interfering with the St. Lawrence? We have made representations from this House over and over again, the city of Montreal has been much exercised over it, and representations have been made to Washington, and the attention of the commission has been drawn to it, notwithstanding the fact that under this treaty they could not interfere with it in any way.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister knows that at Washington they have been fighting all winter, and Congress did not hesitate to say they had the right. But, as I understand it from what the Minister of Public Works said, they can erect a dam in the South Sault, and all they want is the consent of the Joint Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before this treaty was negotiated Congress could authorize, the same as the Canadian parliament could authorize works, each upon its own side of the boundary. This treaty limits that right because it makes all subject to free navigation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). They probably could if it had not been for the Ashburton treaty which provides that the channels on both sides, the Long Sault and Barnhart Island, should remain free and open. These are the two channels mentioned there.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not my hon. friend understand clearly, as the hon. member for Montreal, Ste. Anne said, that the Ashburton treaty is in no way affected by this treaty. It remains as it is and as it will always remain providing for the free and unobstructed navigation of these channels. This treaty goes even farther and says that in all the boundary waters there shall be that free right of navigation.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I cannot see it in that light.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If my hon. friend will not take my view he might take the view of the hon. member for Montreal, Ste. Anne.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister made the statement a few minutes ago that he had delayed this Bill at the request of members on this side of the House and he said that on one occasion I asked him to hold it over from Friday to Monday. I plead guilty to that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would be very glad to hold it over at any time for hon. members.

Mr. REID (Grenville). That is the only time that I remember.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member for Medicine Hat (Mr. Magrath) also requested me to hold it over.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This Bill in its changed form was only handed around this morning and I would ask the minister if he would allow it to stand over until tomorrow in order that we may really understand it and then it can go through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. members clearly understand the Bill.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am not quite sure of that. I think it is only fair to ask that it be allowed to stand over. There are other members who have not been here and who have not seen this Bill. They should have an opportunity of seeing it and the minister should not desire to force it through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These new clauses are all unimportant.

Mr. MAGRATH. It is not a matter of any consequence, but I would like to know from the minister when I asked him to hold this Bill over.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think my hon. friend did it personally but an hon. member of the House said that the hon. member for Medicine Hat was desirous of speaking on the Bill.

Mr. MAGRATH. I wished to know when it was coming up.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think the hon. member was away.

Mr. MACDONELL. Can the minister tell us to what extent the Chicago Drainage canal will reduce the depth of water in the lakes? There is an enlargement and it is said to be drawing more water from Lake Michigan at 10,000 cubic feet per second, which was supposed to be the amount they should be allowed to take under the arrangement made by the commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not able to give my hon. friend definite information on that point. I understood they had the right to draw 10,000 cubic feet per second. I have not heard that that has been increased.

Mr. MAGRATH. Has that been settled by any treaty arrangement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is by an understanding. Of course, all the cities bordering on the lakes are just as much interested in it as we are. There is no clause relating to this in the treaty.

Mr. MAGRATH. They cannot take more than 10,000 cubic feet per second without the consent of the commission provided for in this treaty?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not prepared to say that.

Mr. MACDONELL. Can the minister inform the committee whether it is intended to make a further abstraction of water from Lake Erie by the enlargement of the Erie canal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not heard of anything of the kind. Of course, there is work going on now with the view of deepening the Erie canal. I may say to my hon. friend that the water that is used for filling a canal is not very likely to appreciably alter the level of the great lakes. We should not raise that question at all events. What might more seriously alter the levels would be the deepening of the canal through the St. Clair Flats, although that is for the joint benefit of both countries.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Suppose the Long Sault were to be dammed what effect would it have on the lakes on the eastern side of it? The River St. Lawrence goes into a lake east of the town of Cornwall; and what would be the result if this commission should grant power to dam the St. Lawrence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This commission cannot grant power to dam the St. Lawrence.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Well there is a difference of opinion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This treaty does not give power to dam the St. Lawrence.

On section 4: Exchequer Court jurisdiction.

Mr. DOHERTY. I would like to ask the minister why it is considered necessary to give this jurisdiction to the Exchequer Court? In our own province of Quebec, if a man diverted the waters of a stream running in the province of Quebec, and crossing the boundary, and thereby did damage to a man in the state of Maine, he would, under the treaty, become liable towards that man in the state of Maine just precisely to the same extent as he would under the law of the province of Quebec be liable to his next door neighbour for a like diversion of the same stream. In other words the liability of the party guilty of the offence which gives rise to the damage is to be governed by the law of the province of Quebec. The province has created courts for the administration of justice, and I can see no reason why you should take the party defendant before a court which as a general rule has no jurisdiction to administer the law of the province. I am not attempting to reflect in the slightest degree upon the gentleman who is now judge of the Exchequer Court, but in the province of Quebec it is known that we have a distinct system of law, under which the obligations of the man who diverts the stream as well as the rights of the man injured will be governed. The provincial courts are especially created for the administration of that law, are presided over by men trained in that law, and you will draw these cases from their jurisdiction and give them to a tribunal which as a rule is not concerned with the administration of that law. Then in that province you will very probably have the language question. I am not now making any personal reference, but it will likely happen that the judge of the Exchequer Court will not be familiar with the French and English languages, and in Quebec the two languages are official, and the people attach considerable importance to their right to be heard in their own tongue. Apart from sentimental consideration those who have experience in these courts know how exceedingly important it is in the interests of justice that the witnesses should be heard by a judge who understands both languages. In the province of Quebec, in nine cases out of every ten, the bulk of the cases are in the French language, and it is rare to have a case in which both parties, and the counsel, and the witnesses speak only English. I am at a loss to see why you should create this exceptional jurisdiction to deal with cases of this kind which affect civil rights that belong to the jurisdiction of the province. I urge upon the consideration of the government that justice would probably be much more satisfactorily attained by leaving the adjudication of these cases to the courts to which they naturally belong.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think it is of very great importance what court a suppliant may enter in order to get redress, the important thing being to let him know what court he has a right to go to, and be assured that that court has jurisdiction. I suppose that one reason for providing the Exchequer Court would be that all actions taken under this treaty would be of the same character, and it would be desirable that one tribunal should deal with them.

Mr. DOHERTY. If the liability for diverting a stream should be different in one province under the law of that province from what it would be in another province, the cases would not be of the same kind or under the same law.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At all events, they will all be cases of damages in relation to watercourses and boundary waters. In the province of Quebec, I imagine, there will not be many cases, and the present judge of the Exchequer Court speaks both languages, as I apprehend any judge would who would be likely to be appointed. I know that Mr. Justice Burbidge spoke French very well, having studied it after he became a judge, and Mr. Justice Cassels speaks French

very well. The judge of the Exchequer Court travels about from one place to another, and would be willing to go to any town or city where the parties lived to try the cases. The Exchequer Court would perhaps be the best court to which to give jurisdiction in the cases provided for under this treaty. If after practical experience it is found desirable to make a change, it can be made in the future. I trust that my hon. friend will not press for a change, but allow the section to go through as it is.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not wish to press unduly; but while section 132 of the British North America Act makes it clear that this parliament has power to pass any law to give effect in any province to any rights created under the treaty, it seems to me that in the exercise of that power we ought to try to interfere as little as possible with the rights of the provinces. This is a part of the administration of justice in the provinces, even though it results from a law that we pass. It is not the treaty that makes the law of Quebec what previously was not the law of Quebec, but it is in virtue of this enactment that it becomes law. Why depart from the application of the general rule that the administration of justice belongs to the province? As a matter of principle, it seems to me that we ought, under section 132 of the British North America Act, to confine ourselves to doing what it provides we shall do, that is, enact the laws which are necessary to give effect to these rights that we create, and then leave the administration of those laws to the provinces. It is not at all necessary, in order to give effect to these rights, that we should create a special court for this privileged class of plaintiffs. I accept the statement of the hon. member in regard to the two judges of the Exchequer Court speaking both languages; I do not want to make any personal observations about any judge, past or present; but I think lawyers from the province of Quebec will bear me out in saying that there have been cases in which it was the subject of serious complaint that before the tribunal mentioned the parties were not in a position to be heard in their own language. When you have an entirely organized system that meets a desire, and a not unreasonable desire, on the part of persons speaking a particular language to be given a court where their language would be official, a court which would without doubt be qualified to hear and understand testimony if it should be given in that language, it is at least remarkable that you should provide a court which may possibly be in a position where it would be necessary to interpret all this testimony. Moreover, the procedure in these cases will be governed by the Code of Civil Procedure in the province of Quebec. I see no provision to the contrary in the Bill. It does seem to me that all these considerations ought to weigh against something which is a departure from general rules, and in support of which I have not heard any very substantial reasons. It seems to me that if we say to the foreigner, you shall have the same recourse as any citizen of Canada, and have it before the same court, we shall be implementing our obligations under the treaty to the full, and leaving him in no doubt as to what court he should go before.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This section was drafted by the Justice Department, and the matter does not seem to me to be of sufficient importance to make a change in it.

Mr. DOHERTY. Perhaps I might take the liberty of asking the Solicitor General whether these considerations which I have ventured to offer were thought of before this was enacted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It came from the Deputy Minister of Justice.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not know that it would be any reflection on the department to suggest that possibly these matters nad not been thought of, and it would be more satisfactory if when one has grounds for suggesting a change he should have the gratification of feeling that the author of the Act had given them some consideration. It is an unfortunate condition, when one urges reasons before the minister who is responsible for the Bill, to be told that this has been decided by somebody else who is not here to listen to you and to whom possibly these considerations did not occur.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I would like to ask the minister whether the commission to be appointed under this Act will have any jurisdiction on the St. Lawrence from the boundary line at Cornwall down to Montreal?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think not. That is wholly in Canadian waters, and the commission is limited to boundary waters.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Then we have the sole jurisdiction over the canal from the Georgian bay to Montreal, and the United States would not be entitled to the user?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Although they have the right to navigate the St. Lawrence by treaty, that only applies from boundary waters to boundary waters?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Perfectly correct.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This only gives power to navigate jointly as far as Cornwall?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This treaty is confined to boundary waters.

On section 5,

The International Joint Commission, when appointed and constituted pursuant to the said treaty, shall have power, when holding joint sessions in Canada, to take evidence on oath and to compel the attendance of witnesses by application to a judge of a superior court of the province within which such session is held, and such judge is hereby authorized and directed to make all orders and issue all processes necessary and appropriate to that end.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is there provision made for the payment of fees to witnesses?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, these would be included in the expenses of the commission.

On section 6,

The Governor in Council may appropriate annually, out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, a sum not exceeding seventy-five thousand dollars, toward the payment of the salaries of the commissioners to be appointed by His Majesty on the recommendation of the Governor in Council, as well as the salaries of the secretary and other officers and employees, and also all other expenses which may be incurred by such commissioners with the approval of the Minister of Public Works, together with one-half share of all reasonable and necessary joint expenses of the said commission incurred by it and, under the terms of the said treaty, required to be paid in equal moieties by the High Contracting Parties.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). It seems to me that we are doing many things which are not correct. Our salary list is subject every year to discussion in Committee of Supply, and we have no right to fix the salaries in a Bill of this kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the case of the Board of Railway Commissioners, their salaries are fixed by statute. In appointing gentlemen to a very important position such as this, particularly when the treaty runs for a term of years they would naturally want to know what their salaries would be. I thought that parliament would prefer that a limit should be put on the salaries.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). This parliament has no right to bind another parliament. The principle that obtains in matters of that kind is for parliament from year to year to fix the expenditure.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The judges' salaries are fixed by statute, and not by vote from year to year.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It may be reasonble to fix the judges' salaries, but it is a wrong principle to embody in a statute payments that ought to be voted by this House.

On section 7,

Each of the said commissioners who is appointed by His Majesty shall receive as compensation for his services an amount to be fixed by the Governor in Council but not in excess of the sum paid by the government of the United States to each of its commissioners, and not in any case to exceed the sum of seventy-five hundred dollars per annum. The secretary appointed by the Canadian section of the commission under the provisions of the said treaty shall receive as compensation for his services a sum not exceeding three thousand dollars per annum.

Mr. JAMESON. I think that these words, 'not in excess of the sum paid by the government of the United States' should be struck out. I can see no reason why the salaries of these commissioners should be governed by any allowances the United States may make. We ought to be able to determine ourselves what their services are worth, and we should pay what they are worth.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the appropriation Act passed at Washington, it is provided that the salaries to be paid the commissioners in the United States shall not be greater than those paid by the government of Canada. It is very desirable that both countries should pay the same salaries as these commissioners are sitting together and doing the same work. The idea is that the commissioners on both sides be paid the same salaries.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). When do the governments of the two countries get together to fix what the sum is to be?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When this statute is passed, in the ordinary course we would get together and fix the salaries.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Are the ministers going to have another mission to Washington to get that settled? I suppose it will be arranged that the Canadian Commissioner is to have the same bill of fare as the American.

Mr. GRAHAM. Ought to have better.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). How would the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) like to have the same rule applied to his department? If it were applied he would be giving the chief of the management of the Intercolonial railway $50,000 a year.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a comparison of salaries, one paid by a private company and the other by a government road, but in this other case both are working for governments.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That is a nice way to put it. It seems to me that the governments take the position: 'After you

my dear Alfonse,' 'After you my dear Gaston.' The result will be that you will have to have another Joint Commission to fix the salaries of these gentlemen. I think it is childish to put such a provision in a Bill dealing with an international question.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). This is a very serious innovation. The reason a statutory allowance is given the judges is to provide against their removal except by impeachment. If you could stop a judge's salary you would in effect dismiss him from office without impeaching him. But statutory allowances are only given to judges, railway commissioners and a few others who are appointed during good behaviour and cannot be removed except for good reason.

Mr. BUREAU. What about the penitentiary officials. Their salaries are regulated by statute. You cannot exceed the amount mentioned in the statute.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). But their salaries as I understand, are voted every year. The principle applies only to parties who are removable by impeachment. The minister (Mr. Pugsley) refers to the United States. But the United States will never commit the folly of passing a statute fixing the salaries of these parties; they will vote the salaries every year. Why do not we do the same, so that the House of Commons can control them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am willing to take the suggestion of my hon. friend from Digby (Mr. Jameson), and strike out the words 'but not in excess of the sum paid by the government of the United States.' I move that these words be struck out.

Mr. JAMESON. Will the commissioners be expected to devote their whole time to the service of the commission?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has not yet been decided. My own opinion is that if they receive the maximum salary provided for in the section, they ought to devote their whole time to the work of the commission. Of course, it may be desirable to engage the services of some gentleman who might have other work to do, and who would be paid by the day or paid a smaller sum than that fixed by this Bill. But, in case the salary should be the same, or nearly the same as is provided in the Bill, I think they should give their whole time to the work of the commission.

Mr. JAMESON. What are the salaries now paid to the commissioners?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The chairman gets $50 a day, and the other commissioners $25 a day, for the time actually engaged in the work of the commission.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think that the point raised by the hon. member for Lanark (Mr. Haggart) is well taken. The minister knows that there are two kinds of appointments under the Crown, one continuing as long as the appointee's conduct is proper. Such appointee is not removable except by impeachment, really at the bar of this House. But other appointments are during pleasure, and I understand that the salaries of these appointees simply appear in the Supply Bill. I do not think the principle here proposed should be embodied in legislation pertaining to a treaty. It is only for five years; it is not a life appointment. The whole thing could be adjusted without such an enactment. It involves a vicious principle.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The amount is not fixed, and the Governor in Council is to fix it. But once he exercises that power I doubt very much if he can reduce it—it becomes a statutory enactment under which they are entitled to their pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think undoubtedly that is so.

Amendment (Mr. Pugsley) agreed to, and section 7 as amended agreed to.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Next we come to the schedule and protocols. I think every hon. member has read this because it has been before parliament——

Mr. REID (Grenville). Before that is taken up, I wish to move as section 8 the amendment which I submitted before.

Amendment negatived.

Bill reported, read the third time, and passed.

PENNY BANKS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend chapter 31, Revised Statutes, The Penny Bank Act, and by such amendment authorize the Minister of Finance to fix and determine the rate of interest that shall be allowed and credited half-yearly on the amounts from time to time at the credit of the accounts of penny banks, incorporated under the provisions of that Act, in the government savings bank or post office savings bank, the rate so fixed and determined not to exceed one per centum in advance of the rate then payable to depositors in the government savings bank or post office savings bank.

He said: This resolution is to enable us to increase the allowance to Penny Banks by one-half per cent. Several public spirited gentlemen in Toronto, a few years ago, initiated a movement for the encouragement of thrift by establishing what is

called the Penny Bank. Since that time another bank of similar character has been established at Chicoutimi in the province of Quebec. All the money that is collected is placed in the government savings bank, except a very small amount as working capital which remains in the hands of the Penny Bank. We have been allowing them three and a half per cent, while they allow the depositors three per cent. In order to assist them with the expenses of management we propose to increase the allowance to one per cent above the savings bank rate instead of a half per cent. At present it represents an increased allowance of about $780 per annum. It is to help them with the expenses of management. At the beginning the expenses were borne by some public spirited citizens, but since then some of these have dropped off. As we think the movement is deserving of encouragement, we propose to give them one per cent instead of a half per cent.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). This work for the Penny Banks is done largely by the school teachers of the city of Toronto. They do not get anything for that work.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I do not think the school teachers get anything. Experience has shown that it is a very desirable thing. The gentlemen who are promoting it are public spirited citizens who put their own money into it to a considerable degree.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee on the Resolution.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 221) to amend the Penny Bank Act.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee, reported, read the third time, and passed.

BANK ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. FIELDING moved the second reading of Bill (No. 213) to amend the Bank Act. He said: This is a Bill which continues the bank charters for one year. The schedule attached to the Bill includes the names not only of all the banks that are actually engaged in business, but also includes the names of several banks which are going out of business, for the reason that, acting upon the advice of the Department of Justice, it has been thought well to include them all in the schedule for the coming year.

Mr. LENNOX. Does this include banks which have actually failed?

Mr. FIELDING. It includes them only for the purpose of their being closed up. It does not give them any new powers.

Mr. LENNOX. I understand it does include some banks which have actually failed.

Mr. FIELDING. It does include them for the purpose of their being wound up.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 2,

Mr. DOHERTY. I notice that this Bill does not deal with the saving banks in Quebec.

Mr. FIELDING. I have a separate Bill in relation to those, which is now passing through the House, and I will be very happy to move it to-morrow.

On the preamble,

Mr. HENDERSON. If the minister will agree to allow the third reading to stand over—I have no objection to this Bill, but I want an opportunity of reading it.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite content to accept my hon. friend's suggestion.

Bill reported.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF BONDS.

Bill (No. 211) respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway—Mr. Graham—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Bill is identical with the resolution that we discussed the other day, and to which we made one amendment at the suggestion of the hon. leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax). In a Bill of this kind there cannot be much diversion from the original resolution. I do not want to press it unduly, but it is identical in its terms with the resolution we passed the other day. If we could take a few minutes and go through a portion of it, we would be able to give it to the Senate before they adjourn.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The minister was to give some explanation of the securities on that part of the road from Montreal to the Niagara river.

Mr. GRAHAM. My information is that they are allowed to issue $30,000 a mile, With respect to the securities between Montreal and a point opposite Hawkesbury there was a subsidy voted by this parliament, but it has not as yet been paid or earned. There was a land grant asked for from the province of Quebec, and I think voted, but the time lapsed, and it will have to be voted again if they ever get it. The branches in Ontario that have

been acquired by the Canadian Northern will come under the second mortgage, but they will remain branch lines. That piece of road which will form part of the main line is to be reconstructed up to standard.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). This Bill has been advanced an important stage to-night and in the absence of the leader of the opposition, I move that the committee rise.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no need to move that. I said that if any one objected when we got to the second reading we would not proceed. It is an important Bill, but if we are going to get through as hon. gentlemen want, we will have to work hard, and sit late.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). We have been fourteen hours at it to-day, and the Minister of Labour is trying to get through an eight hour Bill.

Progress reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. PERLEY. What business will be taken up at the next sitting?

Mr. FIELDING. The Canadian Northern Bill, the Railway Act, the resolutions respecting trade with Japan, and we would like to have the Grain Bill advanced a stage.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is that all, do you want the whole Order Paper?

Mr. FIELDING. I would not like to except anything on the Order Paper, but if we make reasonable progress with these Bills we would like to go into Committee of Supply for the purpose of voting items that are of an urgent character. Irrespective of the proportion of Supply which will be taken later, there are some items which apply to services for which the entire vote is needed at an early stage, and we expect to deal with these items to-morrow, if possible.

Mr. HAGGART. What items?

Mr. FIELDING. We will select the urgent items from the various departments.

Mr. PERLEY. Would the minister give the leader of the oppositon a list of these items?

Mr. FIELDING. I am now speaking only for to-morrow's business, and I think the programme I have mentioned ought to make a fair day's work.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is it the intention to continue Supply right along or is it the intention to conclude before Friday?

Mr. FIELDING. If all goes well, we will plan our programme with the hope of adjourning on Friday, though I cannot speak more definitely than that at present. We will ask votes for the whole year for the particular items which for reasons that will be explained, we think should, with advantage to the public service, be voted. Then, later, we will ask for the proportionate vote according to agreement. We hope to reach the Supply for the particular services I have mentioned to-morrow after the measures I have referred to are dealt with.

Mr. PERLEY. I referred to the special votes which the government is desirous of obtaining for the whole year, and I wish that a list of them should be sent to the leader of the opposition.

Mr. FIELDING. I will endeavour to see if we cannot arrange about that some time during the day to-morrow.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). A list of the Bills to be dealt with might also be furnished so that we will not waste the whole day with a Bill like we had to-day.

Some hon. MEMBERS. That is your fault.

Mr. FIELDING. The items I have mentioned will, I think, make a fair day's work for to-morrow, and some time during the day we will make a statement as to the balance of the business.

Mr. HENDERSON. I hope the minister does not expect to get the Grain Bill through before adjournment.

Mr. FIELDING. We would like to.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is a very important Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but I was given to understand it was not controversial.

Mr. HENDERSON. I remember attending eleven sittings on one Grain Act and I fear this will be the same.

Mr. FIELDING. It ought to be in perfect condition if so much time was spent over it.

Mr. HENDERSON. This was years ago, about another Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House adjourned at 1.05 a.m., Wednesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

WEDNESDAY, May 17, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

ALBERT AND MONCTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmoreland). Bill (No. 220) to incorporate the Albert and

Moncton Railway Company, was read the first time last night. With the leave of the House I propose that it be now read the second time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not know why this kind of thing has to happen so frequently. We are not going home to stay at home for ever; we are coming back in a couple of months, and, unless there is some special reason for it, I do not think this ought to happen. I think we should all observe the ordinary procedure and not being everlastingly breaking our own rules.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite appreciate the fact that if any hon. member objects this cannot go through, but I would urge that consideration be given to this Bill. It is connected with a large enterprise in the county of Albert, involving the development of the shale interests in that section of the province and, expedition is necessary in order to further the objects in view. That is the only reason I would urge upon my hon. friend (Mr. Lennox) to give his consent, and other hon. members to raise no objection.

Mr. LENNOX. I only wanted the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson) to give some reason for his motion. I do not propose to jump on his Bill in particular; a gentleman for whom I have very great respect —but I do not like this procedure as a rule, and I wanted some reason given.

Mr. EMMERSON. I quite agree.

Mr. SPROULE. I heard this shale argument advanced about twenty years ago. I am afraid it comes now a little late in the day.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is a new thing there.

Mr. SPROULE. I can hardly imagine that the question of the Bill going through a few weeks later or a few weeks earlier would make much difference to that great interest in that county.

Mr. EMMERSON. I may explain that English capitalists have taken hold of the matter now, and if there is delay here that will delay their movements in connection with the development of what is hoped to be a very great industry. As my hon. friend has said the shales have lain dormant for many years, and we cannot hasten their development now with too great speed.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the second time.

COMMITTEE ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I move:

That leave be granted to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines to sit during the time the House is in session in accordance with the recommendation contained in the 21st report of the said committee.

Mr. SPROULE. I think this is entirely unnecessary. There is very little to come before that committee, and if the committee would meet, as it did to-day, half an hour before the time of the sitting of the House, there would be plenty of time for it to pass all the Bills that come before the committee. We have granted this leave in the case of two committees this session, when, in my judgment, there was no need for it. When the House was in session, most of the members desire to be here and possibly to take part in the debates that go on. But if the committee is sitting at the same time as the House, a member of the committee must make a choice which he shall attend. What is the reason for asking that this committee be allowed to sit while the House is in session?

Mr. EMMERSON. I believe it has been in contemplation on the part of many members that it would be desirable to adjourn the House on the 19th instant, instead of waiting until the 23rd. I may say that I am particularly anxious that the committee should have this leave, because I wish to expedite the Bill, which has just been read the second time. But, if this House remains in session until Tuesday next, or even Monday, there will be opportunity for me to have this Bill brought to the consideration of the Railway Committee in ordinary course. I would urge that in the public interest, and in the special interest of the section I represent, this committee should be allowed to meet as proposed by the chairman (Mr. Guthrie) and take into consideration, as they very well can, this Bill, and any others that may properly come before them.

Mr. SPROULE. That is simply a scare signal thrown up. There is plenty of time for the committee without their meeting when the House is in session. I for one am opposed on principle to a committee doing business while the House is in session. If there were a rush of business I could understand it; but I imagine there are very few Bills to come before the committee, and those of such a nature that they need take up very little time.

Mr. HENDERSON. I desire to add my protest against the meeting of the Railway Committee while the House is in ses-

sion. A few days ago twenty or twenty-five of us were called up stairs to attend a committee meeting while the House was in session, and while the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) was explaining a long resolution he had with reference to the Canadian Northern railway. I regret very much that I had not the opportunity to listen to his explanation, and I have no doubt there are other members in the same position. Besides, I think there is no real excuse for this procedure. The House has been in session for six months. Why did not these gentlemen bring forward their Bill and have it passed in the regular way.

Mr. EMMERSON. It comes from the Senate.

Mr. HENDERSON. Somebody is responsible for not having that Bill brought forward either in the Senate or this House. I for one, do not intend to put a premium on delays of that kind—simply holding legislation back with the hope that it will be rushed through without notice in the dying hours of the session, or just prior to adjournment. I do not know whether this motion requires notice or not, but if it does, then I do not consent to it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Important legislation is coming before this House constantly now, that we are on the eve of adjournment, and it is very desirable that every member should be in his place, and pay attention to the proceedings. One Bill that the Railway Committee desires to deal with is the Water-power Bill, that was before the House last night. This Bill came before the Private Bills Committee when there were only four members present; but the chairman with enlarged vision saw a quorum and reported the Bill unanimously, and the House started to deal with it last night, notwithstanding that it was not on the Order Paper.

This Bill is not of such urgent importance that it should be rushed through the House at this end of the session. It is a very important Bill, and while the Railway Committee desires time for its consideration, it is desirable we should all be here and pay attention to the legislation going through the House. I think it would be a mistake to pass the motion presented by the chairman of the Railway Committee. The rights under the old Bill of 1903 have been forfeited, and the object of this legislation is to renew the rights granted in 1903, and which were forfeited three years ago. Why the urgent necessity, when they have not asked for a renewal for three years, and why should we seek now to rush the Bill through the House in the course of two or three days?

Mr. GUTHRIE. We had a meeting of the Railway Committee this morning called at half past ten. There are one or two Bills now before the Railway Committee; both of them are Senate Bills, one the Bill which has just passed its second reading, and the other the Bill referred to by the member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe). I understand there is some urgency in respect of both of them, and there was a general disposition on the part of the committee this morning that leave should be granted to sit while the House is in session in order to expedite these two measures. I do not think it is unreasonable; I do not think it will take a great length of time. It is a custom that has been followed every session since I have been in the House.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I do not approve of the practice of the various committees sitting while the House is in session. The Railway Committee is composed of nearly every member of this House; therefore, if we are to be in our places in this House we cannot be in the Railway Committee. If we are not on the Railway Committee, we do not save any time, because when the Bill comes back to the House again we will have to go over the whole procedure and obtain in the House all the information afresh. So we are not going to save any time by holding meetings of the Railway Committee during the sessions of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. If the committee has considered the matter and desires to have the rule suspended to enable them to meet, I should be individually willing to support the motion. At the same time I doubt whether they would make any progress in the matter, because, if the Bill is not fully considered in the Railway Committee, it will certainly be resisted here. As I presume the committee has talked the matter over and desire to be permitted to meet, I should be glad to join them in their motion, but I doubt whether they will make much progress by it.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). This motion asking for a suspension of a rule of the House must stand as a notice of motion, and cannot be passed now.

Mr. SPEAKER. Under rule 41, I am afraid it cannot be put except with the consent of the House. That rule requires notice being given.

Mr. EMMERSON. Does any one object?

Mr. SPEAKER. I understand that objection is taken, and the motion cannot be put except by consent of the House.

NATIONAL BATTLEFIELDS AT QUEBEC.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 222) respecting the Na-

tional Battlefields at Quebec. He said: As the House is aware, some years ago a commission was appointed composed of Sir George Garneau, then mayor of Quebec, Sir Edmund Walker, Mr. Dennison, the Hon. Mr. Taschereau, Minister of Public Works of Quebec, Mr. Turgeon, president of the Legislative Council of Quebec, and the late Sir George Drummond. Upon the death of Sir George Drummond, the hon. member for St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) was appointed to replace him on that commission. The object of the commission was to implement what had already been done towards nationalizing what is known as the Plains of Abraham of Quebec. The House is aware that some legislation was passed a few years ago empowering that commission to acquire certain lands and farms around the Plains of Abraham, and near the other battlefield of Ste. Foy. The commission went to work very diligently, and has so far done splendid work. It has acquired practically all the buildings and lands which naturally come under the scope of the commission. There remains, however, a few lands and a few properties to be acquired, and the object of this Bill is to give the commission the power to expropriate these properties. The various estates and lands are mentioned in the first clause of the Bill. The second clause requires a little more explanation. I may say that the commission has been unanimous in reporting in favour of the acquisition of those properties. Some of them belong to the federal government, and some of them belong either to the Dominion government or to the local government. For instance, the observatory building on the Plains of Abraham is one in regard to which we do not yet know whether it belongs to the federal government or the local government, but that will be ascertained. It is also desired to acquire one of the old Martello towers on the edge of the St. Charles valley. This old tower is decaying, and it was thought that, being an old relic of the past, it should pass into the hands of the Quebec Battlefields Commission. The next clause also requires some explanation. The commission has obtained the service of the well-known landscape architect, Mr. Todd, who was employed, I think, for the embellishment of the environs of Ottawa. They have decided, under the supervision of Mr. Todd, to open an avenue from the battlefields on the Plains of Abraham to the other battlefield on the Ste. Foy road facing the monument, as the Monument des Braves is on the Ste. Foy road. The first decision of the commission was to open and widen an already existing avenue known as the Belvedere. But that avenue was not in a straight line between the battlefields on the Plains of Abraham and the Ste. Foy battlefield; so they have decided to open another avenue which will be in direct line between the Monument des Braves and the Plains of Abraham. It will add to the spectacular effect of the park when it is completed. The first project would have cost the commission a sum amounting to $19,000. By the second project which is now submitted to the consideration of the House, the town of Montcalm, one of the suburbs of the city of Quebec, has agreed to give the commission the lands necessary for the opening of that avenue. The town of Montcalm asks in return to be loaned a sum of $15,000 for a period of thirty years, at which time the town will reimburse the commission with interest at the rate of three per cent per annum. This amount will be loaned by the commission to the town of Montcalm in order that the town itself may acquire the necessary estates and lands for the construction of that road.

Mr. SPROULE. Does not the hon. gentleman think that this Bill should be introduced by resolution, since it contemplates a charge upon the revenue?

Mr. LEMIEUX. This is not money of the government, the money required for the acquisition of these lands is already in the hands of the commission. The fund now in their hands is composed of sums received, not only from various parts of Canada, but from the British Empire at large. In fact subscriptions were received from New Zealand, from Australia, from Great Britain and from all the British colonies, as well as from the various provinces of Canada, and there were private subscriptions in great number. The amount now in the hands of the commission, I am informed by my hon. friend from St. Lawrence division, amounts to from $300,000 to $350,000. It is with this fund that the commission desires to acquire the said properties. But even though the commission desires to acquire these properties with their own fund, yet, according to past legislation, it has to come to the Dominion parliament, because all sales made to the commission must receive the approval of the Governor in Council. Before I take my seat I may be allowed to lay on the table of the House, or to insert in 'Hansard,' the report of the landscape architect, Mr. Todd, on the National Battlefields under the control of the commission. As I said a moment ago, Mr. Todd has been engaged by the commission, and has prepared an outline of the great national park which will be one of the features of our national life. I would like the members of the House to read this report, which is not very long. I will hand it to the 'Hansard,' so that hon. gentlemen may be able to read it to-

morrow. Later on, the commission may come to parliament for further aid, when the members of the House will have an opportunity to appreciate the demands made by the commission. The report is as follows:—

10 Phillips Place,
November 15, 1909.

Sir George Garneau,
Chairman, National Battlefields Commission,
Quebec.

Dear Sir George,—In compliance with your request of last May, I have examined the Plains of Abraham and other property under the control of your commission, and that which you propose to acquire, with a view of presenting to you a general scheme or plan, the gradual development of which would seem to me to insure the restoration and permanent preservation of its impressive grandeur and historic interest, and at the same time make it available for public use and enjoyment.

With a situation unequalled and historical associations almost unparalleled, it is clear that you have in this property, where the fate of Canada and perhaps the whole continent more than once hung in the balance, the making of a park 'par excellence.' There are other parks of magnificent views, and many places in the world over where the memory of past deeds of valour fill the soul of man with high ambitions and patriotism, but it is no exaggeration to say that in no other place can we find such grandeur of proportion, such sublime views combined with such a wealth of historical associations, as in encompassed within this park, which legacy you have the privilege of handing down to future generations, with its grandeur and beauty undespoiled, and its historical interest revived and hallowed with the passing time.

To adequately describe your possessions is impossible. One must see to appreciate the grandeur of the views, one must wander at leisure over these old fields of strife, now so peaceful, and must live over the lives of these great men, who gave up their lives for their country, to begin to appreciate what a priceless gem is this National Battlefields Park. This vast treasure house of the history which is so closely intertwined with that of Canada, with its magnificent panorama of views, you have secured to be dedicated forever to the people of Canada, and the question of how you shall make this available to those who wish to study its history or to gather inspiration from its sublime views, of how you shall plan the necessary artificial features of the drives, walks, and shelters, without injuring its natural beauty or historical associations, is the problem which I have endeavoured to solve in the accompanying plan.

In presenting the plans, I have in several instances given numbers to drives and entrances to aid in describing the plan.

Broadly speaking the park is divided by its geography and topographical features into five distinct parts.

First, That portion from the Citadel to Wolfe's monument, which consists largely of a high undulating plateau, broken by small elevations. This portion of the park I have endeavoured to keep as natural and informal as possible, and at the same time have avoided planting many trees, in order that it may remain as near as possible in the condition in which it was when the historic battles took place. In fact the only planting which is suggested is here and there a group of trees along the drives and walks, to break the monotony, and groups of trees massed along the outskirts of the park in order to screen out what may be inharmonious private property.

Second, We have that large area of comparatively level ground which has been for so long known as the 'Plains of Abraham.' This portion of the park it has seemed desirable to treat in quite a formal manner. It is proposed to locate the new monument at the edge of the slope about opposite the middle of these plains, and this is approached by a formal drive from each side of the park. It is proposed that these drives should be bordered by trees planted at regular distances in contrast with the planting in other portions of the park, which is of an entirely informal character. Thus will be formed a proper setting and dignified approach for this monument, which is to be the crowning feature of the park. At the same time the formal arrangement of this portion of the park preserves an extensive open space, where parades and encampments may be held. In order to produce most satisfactory results, it would be necessary to build up a retaining wall of considerable height to form a terrace on which to place this monument, and as the plains are broken by a small excrescence in the centre, the material might be taken from this elevation and used for building up the terrace for this monument, thus obviating the necessity of obtaining filling from a distance.

Third, We have extending from the edge of this plateau to the escarpment bordering the river a large area of rather steeply sloping ground which is covered by a dense growth of coxspur thorn, and other small-growing native trees and shrubs. This portion of the park it is proposed to keep in perfectly wild and natural condition with walks leading through it in various directions and along the edge of the escarpment. In most places this escarpment is so steep as to be dangerous and when walks are laid out along here, protecting fences will be required in many places.

Fourth, We have a narrow strip of land extending from the plains to the Wolfe Cove road, and from Champlain street to the Merici property. Considered from a landscape point of view this is a charming spot, with its gently undulating topography extending to the steep cliff and open groves of lofty pine and elm, while historically it is of the greatest interest, as it was up this steep cliff in the shelter of the small point of land that General Wolfe and his advance guard climbed and put to flight the small French poste encamped at the head of the road leading up from the cove, thus gaining the key to the plains above.

Fifth, We have a small park on the Ste. Foy road, which although in itself possessing few features of marked beauty except magnificent views, is a point of great historical interest as one of the most fiercely contested positions in the battle of Ste. Foy. The distant views, rather poorly shown in photograph No. 1 accompanying this report, obtained from this park over the St. Charles valley, are entirely

different from those obtained from the other parts of the park, and are equally charming.

It has been rather difficult to design this Ste. Foy park in such a way as to provide a proper setting for the Monument des Braves, and at the same time lay out the park in a pleasing manner. The proposed arrangement, I think does this as well as circumstances will allow. By making two entrances equally distant from the monument, a certain needed formality is given, which could not be secured with one entrance, and below the monument the park is laid out in an irregular manner, which I think will be pleasing, and admit of its best use by the public.

ENTRANCES.

The question of a suitable entrance to your park is one of the greatest importance. There must necessarily be several entrances, but there should be one principal one, so located and constructed as to give some idea of the importance of the park to which it is an entrance, and in so far as possible to be an index to the general character and associations of the park itself. This matter of a proper entrance to a public park is not given the attention in this country that it should. We often see a park with drives and walks well laid out, and with beautiful landscape, while the entrance is entirely unmarked, or else marked by some fantastic gateway entirely out of harmony with the character of the park. We recognize the importance of a well designed entrance to our buildings, and would be shocked to see a large classic public building with merely a hole in the wall for an entrance, or an entrance made out of rustic boulders, nor would any amount of interior beauty dispel from our minds this disagreeable first impression. It is equally important that a park should have a well designed entrance, it may be of the most simple and inexpensive construction, or it may be large and costly, but it should be of harmonious design and of such proportions and construction as will lend dignity to the park itself. This has always been recognized in the old country, as for example the stately entrance to Hyde Park in London. What could be more dignified or show more clearly the character of the park itself? Again take the entrance to the Bois de Boulonge at Paris, or that gem of French parks, Parc de la Tete d'Or at Lyons, and yet these parks, beautiful as they are, have nothing to compare with the grandeur and historic associations of your Quebec Battlefields Park to act as an inspiration for the designing of an entrance.

Entrance No. 1, or Main Entrance.—The logical place for your main entrance is to be found on the left, immediately after passing through the St. Louis gate, at the side of the high Citadel wall. An entrance at this point could be made very characteristic, for you have at the east side of the entrance, the massive time worn wall of the Citadel, and I would suggest making the entrance really form a part of this wall, by building a wing wall slightly lower than that of the Citadel wall and at right angles to it across the west side of the present skating rink. You will see by photograph No. 2 accompanying these plans, that it would be impossible to make any kind of an effective entrance here without removing this skating rink, but by removing it and having an entrance occupy the whole width of this space, it could be made very effective and impressive. I am submitting with this a sketch for an entrance, which carries out in some measure my ideas of what would be effective. This sketch is not to be considered as a proposed plan, but simply as a suggestion to show the effect of such an entrance. One of the most important and effective features of such an entrance would be that the instant you have passed through the gateway you obtain a most striking and impressive view of the Citadel fortifications, which would help greatly to carry out the prevailing idea of the park. Photograph No. 3 gives an idea of what this view would be, although if the rough material which has been dumped near the rear end of the present skating rink were removed, the view would be even more effective than the photograph shows.

Entrance No. 2.—The entrance to your park of next importance would naturally be located near the present Wolfe monument. At this point it seems to me that the present straight drive leading up to the monument should be widened, and that a low entrance should be constructed, with gate piers eight or ten feet in height, conforming in character to the main entrance. As shown by photograph No. 4, the present entrance at this point is very poor, in fact can hardly be called an entrance. The monument itself is distinguished in the distance with an iron railing about it. The street between the entrance and the monument should be re-graded and laid out formally in order to unite it pleasingly with the formal arrangement which I have suggested about the monument itself. I would suggest that sufficient property be taken on either side of the entrance to allow for a double row of trees, as shown on the plan.

Entrance No. 3.—On account of its being necessary to maintain a certain amount of formality in the treatment of this portion of the park, I would suggest that this entrance be made similar to entrance No. 2.

Other Entrances.—There would be several other entrances to the park, viz., at Lansdowne, Tache, and Montcalm streets, and at Wolfe's Hill, Belvidere Road, etc., but these would hardly rank as important entrances, and could be marked by simple stone piers, in harmony with the other entrances.

DRIVES.

In locating the drives, it has been my endeavour to keep before me three important considerations, to place them so that they do not break the pleasing continuity of the park, and disfigure it as little as possible; to make them conform as far as practicable to the natural contour of the ground, so that there will be no bad grades or disfiguring cuts and fills; and to locate them in such a way that a person is brought by the most pleasing and convenient route to the finest view points, and to the places of greatest historical interest.

Drive No. 1.—I have so designated the drive leading from the main entrance as far as Wolfe's monument. After passing through the main gateway, where one is confronted by the impressive view of the Citadel, this drive curves out into the broad valley in the rear of the drill hall, and gradually ascends the

hill, on which are located the martello towers, where a most beautiful view of the entire easterly section of the park is obtained, as shown in photograph No. 5. This view is, of course, at presently badly marred by the Dominion arsenal buildings. It is also somewhat difficult to realize or form a proper appreciation of this view because its proportions and distances are so large, and there is nothing at present to give it scale. A few well placed groups of trees would make a great difference in the view and afford the eye the necessary scale to properly grasp its proportions.

From the martello towers westward, the drive descends into the valley, where occurred the actual battle between the contending forces, and by a gentle curve approaches Wolfe's monument.

The present tower street, leading from Montcalm street to the monument, it would seem better to abandon and locate as shown on the plan. You will notice by referring to photograph No. 6, which is taken from the centre of tower street looking toward the jail, that this is a very poor approach indeed to Wolfe's monument. The street is laid out so that it appears to terminate in the blank wall of the jail, and it is necessary to squeeze by one corner of the jail and then descend by a sharp grade to the monument, whereas, by diverting this drive as shown on the plan, this disagreeable feature is obviated, and a pleasing drive with an easy grade secured with an approach directly on the axis of the monument.

Drive No. 2.—At a short distance from the main entrance this drive branches off from drive No. 1, and ascending gradually the ruins of the covered way forming part of the old fortifications constructed by the English army, reaches the high point known as Cape Diamond. From this point are obtained perhaps the finest and most impressive views of the whole park. The view up the river partially shown in photograph No. 7, is particularly fine. Hundreds of feet below and almost underneath one, winds the historic Champlain street, bordered by its quaint houses cut into the face of the cliff. Flowing by is the majestic St. Lawrence, bearing on its beautiful expanse an everchanging burden of marine craft, while in the distance Wolfe's Cove and the picturesque Sillery church on its high plateau, jutting out into the river, make a picture of rare beauty. At this point the drive should be widened to form a concourse, so that a number of carriages could stand without interfering with others passing, and I would suggest also the building of a shelter at this point. Leaving the extremity of Cape Diamond, the drive should follow for a few hundred feet the old roadway, forming part of these fortifications, and still descending would approach quite close to the Citadel wall at its highest point. Here also the panoramic views are very impressive, but perhaps not as distinctly pleasing as those from Cape Diamond itself. From this point the drive would descend by a fairly easy grade and rejoin drive No. 1.

Drive No. 3.—This is rather a formal drive, extending from entrance No. 2 straight to Wolfe's monument, and then bordering the Plains of Abraham to the terrace on which is located the new monument. The grade of this drive is almost level and will form a good approach to the monument.

Drive No. 4.—Branching from drive No. 1, this would pass through the present location of the arsenal laboratory, and following around the base of the hill would pass below the little hill east of the fulminate of mercury plant, and would then follow along the side of this fairly steep slope below the Martello Tower No. 1, and continuing would pass below the observatory, gradually ascending again to the proposed new monument. In some respects it is to be regretted that this drive cannot be carried more on the upper level and take advantage of the fine views which are to be obtained from such points as those on which are located the Ross rifle factory and the observatory, but as this seems impossible, the drive has been carried for its entire distance along the side slope, and in many ways you will find this an exceedingly pleasing location. The views differ entirely from these to be had from the upper drives, and there is such a thick natural growth of trees and shrubbery that it will make the drive very interesting, especially if the evenness of this present growth is broken up here and there by the planting of higher growing trees. The distance that this drive follows this side slope is almost a mile, and in order to avoid its becoming monotonous, it will require careful treatment in the way of arranging vistas by planting and other means, so that a succession of interesting views will be obtained rather than a continuous panorama. The construction of this drive will be a little more difficult than that of the other drives, as there will be a cut and fill for the greater part of the distance.

Drive No. 5.—This would enter the park at the westerly side of the Plains of Abraham and approach the new monument in a formal manner similar to drive No. 3.

Drive No. 6.—This drive would leave the westerly end of the monument terrace, and descending would pass along the brow of the cliff where Capt. Delaune and his band first ascended, and continuing along the brow of the cliff would join the present road leading up from Wolfe's Cove.

Drive No. 7.—You are particularly fortunate in being able to arrange such a fine approach to Ste. Foy park as that given by this boulevard.

Drive No. 8.—A formal drive enters this park from each side of the monument, and from the centre branches descend to the lower side of the park by pleasing curves and wind along the edge of the escarpment overlooking the St. Charles valley, thus taking advantage of these magnificent views.

WALKS.

By reference to the plan you will see that walks are shown leading to the various points of interest in the park from the different entrances. It has been my endeavour with the walks, as with the drives, so as to locate them, that they would exhibit the various features of the park to best advantage. Some of these walks in the less used portions of the park would be more pleasingly kept in turf until such time as their use makes gravel walks necessary.

MONUMENTS AND SHELTERS.

Cape Diamond Shelter.—On Cape Diamond I have suggested a small shelter, as this is perhaps the finest viewpoint in the whole park, and will undoubtedly be very much frequented by those who wish to enjoy these views. In constructing this shelter, I would suggest that it be designed in such a manner as to harmonize with its surroundings, and it seems to me that the best material to use for its construction would be undressed native stone. The base of the shelter could be built entirely of this, and would practically form part of the cape itself, while if part of the piers supporting the roof were also of rustic stone, and the roof covered with red tile there could be just enough colour to provide a pleasing contrast.

Wolfe's Monument.—I do not know how far you would care to go in making any changes in this monument, shown in photograph No. 8. The shaft itself is pleasing, but the surroundings and setting of the monument are lacking entirely in anything which make it really impressive, or which lend it the dignity such a monument ought to have. Therefore, I would suggest that a formal court or square be laid out about this monument, and that the monument itself be raised and placed on a base of sufficient proportions to render it more impressive, and at the same time of such design as will harmonize with the present shaft.

New Monument and Terrace—The location suggested on the plan for the new monument seems to me to be the best which could be selected in the entire park. There might be some advantages in having this located on Cape Diamond, but it would be very difficult to obtain there the necessary formal surroundings which are required to form a proper setting for such a monument, and situated as proposed, it can be seen to advantage from any part of the Plains of Abraham, and will be a distinctive landmark as seen from the water. The proportions of this park are so large, and especially as viewed from the water, that it will be necessary to have the design of this monument sufficiently grand in its proportions to crown this natural slope, and in order to do this, I think the monument itself should stand on a broad terrace from 400 to 600 feet in length, the masonry of which would rise above the existing slope at least 20 feet or high enough to provide a proper base for the monument as viewed from the river. I have suggested that the monument itself occupy the centre of this terrace, and that the terrace be terminated at either end by a low shelter.

Monument des braves.—This monument, photograph No. 9, forms a most effective termination for the approach drive (No. 7). The base of this is better than that of the Wolfe monument, but I would suggest that here also the surrounding fence be removed, and that a formal entrance be built about the base.

HISTORICAL TABLETS AND MARKS.

This is something which is rather outside the scope of this report, and yet the interest of the park depends so much on its history, that tablets and small monuments properly inscribed should be placed wherever necessary, but in all cases I would suggest that these be kept low, and not intrude unnecessarily into the landscape of the park.

Whenever the jail is removed from its present location, I think it would be a very pleasing feature to restore the Wolfe redoubt which surmounted this hill.

The old English fortifications on Cape Diamond, although not built until a number of years later, are very interesting and would seem to be worthy of being restored and preserved at least as ruins.

The two martello towers, photographs Nos. 10 and 11, situated not far distant from the Ross rifle factory, are objects of considerable historic interest, and particularly the one situated nearest the river, adds much to the character of the park as viewed from the river, and it seems to me a great sacrilege that this tower should be surmounted by the ugly water tank as it is at present, and moreover the walls of this tower are at present apparently being used as a butt to shoot at in testing rifles, and for a considerable area on the northeast side the stone has been broken away by the continual shooting. Certainly these towers are well worth preserving, and should not be used for such purposes.

PLANTING.

I doubt if there is anything in the entire work on your park which will require more care in handling, or which if effectively handled, will do more to enhance the beauty and interest of the park, than the judicious planting of trees. Owing to the fact that the character of this park is so entirely different from that of the ordinary park, and also on account of the desire to retain the features of the topography as historically correct as possible, the amount of planting must be very limited, and must be confined to the borders of the park, with here and there an odd tree to give proper proportions to the views.

I have on this preliminary general plan shown the location of the trees, where it seems to me they should be placed, but before this planting is carried out the whole question should be studied in detail, and the position and variety of trees carefully considered, for the effect of this planting as it reaches maturity will do much to make or mar the appearance of the park. If you could put in the trees just as they are to look when 25 or 50 years old, it would be a comparatively easy matter, but inasmuch as this cannot be done, and the trees have to be put in and allowed to grow to maturity, it is absolutely necessary that they be carefully selected with a full knowledge of what their effect will be in after years.

In planting in the vicinity of the Citadel, I would suggest using largely the pyramidal-growing Lombardy poplar, for no other tree can add interest to the old fortifications as would a few of these characteristic trees. Starting at Entrance No. 1, I would suggest just an odd two or three of these trees between the entrance and Grande Allée. Inside the entrance I would omit the planting against the Citadel wall until you come to the group shown on the plan on the higher ground. This will allow the Citadel wall to be seen to its most striking advantage. Near the entrance I have suggested massing trees and shrubs along the border of the private property, and this planting is continued irre-

gularly along the border of the park wherever it is bordered by such property. Along drive No. 1 are proposed a few scattered trees, which should be largely composed of broad-spreading native trees such as the Sugar maple. Between drive No. 1 and the wooded slope below the martello tower No. 1, I have suggested very little planting, as it seemed to me more effective and more historically correct to leave this entirely open.

Two groups of trees are shown on Cape Diamond, and although it may be fairly questioned whether these would be historically correct or not, they will do so much towards increasing the interest of this portion of the park and in giving proper scale as viewed from a distance, that I think they should be used.

The formal planting of trees along the drive leading to Wolfe's monument, about this court, and along the drives leading to the proposed new monument can be readily understood by reference to the plan, and needs no additional explanation.

The character of the park from the edge of the upper plateau to the edge of the escarpment is and always has been so entirely different, that I have suggested here not only retaining the greater part of the existing growth, but re-enforcing it very considerably with the planting of larger growing trees. The arrangement of the trees along this drive will require careful study in order to properly frame in the different vistas, and in order to provide a liberal amount of shade, which is very much to be desired along this drive on account of its being on the southerly slope and sheltered from prevailing winds.

Below the proposed new monument in particular the planting requires very careful treatment in order to add to and not interfere with its effectiveness.

On that portion of the park between the Merici property and the escarpment, I would suggest using largely the native white pine and cedar, in order to restore this as nearly as possible to the conditions that existed when Wolfe gained the ascent at this point.

The trees along the boulevard should be ordinary street trees, which are suitable for your climate, and of which none is probably better than the hard or sugar maple and elm.

In the planting at Ste. Foy park, the chief object will be to provide a formal setting for the monument and needed shade along the walks and drives, and to screen out the adjacent private property.

LAND REQUIRED.

You have supplied me with a plan drawn by C. E. Gauvin, Esq., dated October 31, 1908, showing lands intended to be acquired by your commission in order to properly carry out your park plans. In addition to the requirements as shown on the plan, it seems to me quite necessary that the following property should be acquired.

As already mentioned in discussing the main entrance, it will be necessary to procure the property of the skating rink shown in photograph No. 1, in order to make an effective entrance.

Between the present Montcalm street and Wolfe monument, it would seem desirable that lots Nos. 4441 and 4442 should be acquired back to the line shown on the accompanying plan. The whole of this area is not absolutely required, but a large portion of it is necessary in order that the drive may properly approach Wolfe's monument, as shown on the plan, and the taking of these lots back to the suggested line makes a much better park boundary than to acquire just enough for the road, and as this entire ground is one of the most important parts of the actual battlefields, and where Wolfe fell mortally wounded, it is of much historic interest.

On both sides of the present entrance to Wolfe's monument it will be necessary to acquire the private property and to tear down the two rather poor houses at present standing here, and shown in photograph No. 4, in order that an effective entrance may be made.

On the Gauvin plan above mentioned, you show a line through the Merici property, the land south of which you intend to take for the purposes of your park. I have been unable to lay out a drive along this escarpment which is entirely satisfactory, without encroaching at some points still further on the Merici property. In order to keep south of the line as now proposed the drive would join the Wolfe's Cove road just where the grade is very bad, and in addition a sharp curve is required. If a small additional piece of the Merici property is taken the drive can be located as shown on the accompanying plan, so that it will form practically a continuation of Gilmore Hill road and escape the greater part of this bad grade. I would, therefore, suggest that the taking the line through the Merici property be changed as shown on the accompanying plan.

If there is anything in this report or on the plans which I have not made clear, about which you wish additional information, kindly let me know.

Respectfully submitted,
(Sgd.) FREDERICK G. TODD.

Mr. SPROULE. Is this money that is put at the disposal of the commission in the hands of the Receiver General or in the hands of the commission?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the hands of the commission.

Mr. SPROULE. How does it come then that parliament is asked to grant power to the commission to spend their own money?

Mr. LEMIEUX. At the time the commission was created it was provided that not a red cent of the money received from the various parts of the empire should be spent without receiving the sanction of the Dominion parliament, and also of the Governor in Council. With this sanction, the people of the country will have confidence that their money is being properly expended.

Mr. SPROULE. Even with the consent of the Governor in Council, if parliament has a right to give authority to use this money for that purpose, it comes under the control of the Crown in such a way as to require the consent of the Governor in Council. Besides that we are either taking or purchasing a highway that, I presume,

will be for all time in the future a charge upon the revenue; it will have to be kept up by the government.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We do not buy it ourselves.

Mr. SPROULE. Though it should come to us by way of gift, we still will be charged with the responsibility of maintaining it for all time. In addition to that, parliament will likely be invited to give an additional amount to that commission to carry out the purposes which they have in view. I think it would be well to take a little time to consider it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have stated that the moneys belong to the commission. The commission was appointed by parliament, and it was resolved then that nothing should be spent towards the acquisition of land or property except it were done under the supervision of the Dominion government. This being a national park, it is well that parliament should have control over the enterprise.

Mr. SPROULE. Will not this money have to be paid out of the consolidated revenue, and will it not be a charge upon the consolidated revenue, if they commence the undertaking now and acquire property that must of necessity compel them to pay out money in the future?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no question but that later on, if the commission comes to parliament to get some further aid towards beautifying or maintaining this park, then such aid will have to be introduced by way of resolution. But in the present case the object is to give legislative sanction to an act of the commission, an act to purchase property with their own funds which they hold in trust.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Does the proposed purchase include the Ross Rifle factory?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. LENNOX. There are a few points which the minister has not explained fully. First, I would like to know why this matter has been delayed until now. In common with many other members, I have very serious objection to matters being rushed through the House when we have not proper time to consider them, and I do not think we have proper time to consider this matter now. I would like to know in the second place what is the urgency for doing it now. Then I would like to know as to the acreage of land it is proposed to acquire, and what is the amount of expense contemplated. I would like a fuller explanation as to the proposal of the town of Montcalm. I understood the minister to say that Montcalm proposed to make a gift, and that in consideration of that gift he wishes to authorize the commission to make a loan to the town of $15,000, without interest for a certain length of time, after which interest will be paid at the rate of three per cent.

I am very doubtful of the right of parliament to sanction anything of that kind; I do not think it was ever contemplated when this trust was created that an adventure of this kind should be entered upon. If the municipality of Montcalm feels disposed to make a gift let them do so, but for us to authorize a loan by this trust would not be a proper thing. Was not a considerable portion of the money now in hand contributed by the Dominion parliament?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall be glad to state the amount in the hands of the commission on the second or third reading of the Bill. I gather from the hon. member for St. Lawrence division, Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike), who is a member of the commission, that they have about $300,000 in cash, perhaps a little more.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to know if any came from the Dominion government?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly. The large portion of that amount came from the various provinces of Canada, but a very large amount from other sections of the empire. As regards the proposed arrangement with the town of Montcalm, I shall read a letter which I have received from Sir George Garneau, president of the commission, who says:

As to the proposed loan of a sum not exceeding $15,000 to the town of Montcalm, the position is as follows:

It was at first intended to connect the two battlefields, of the Plains of Abraham and of Ste. Foy, by widening the present Belvidere road and making it one of the Park avenues and authority to acquire the necessary land on the east side of the Belvidere road for the purpose of widening was granted by 7-8 Edward VII, chapter 58, schedule No. 3. The acquiring of this land would have cost over $19,000. The commissioners now propose to open a new avenue instead of utilizing the Belvidere road, which new avenue will be in line with the Ste. Foy monument and will greatly improve the general scheme of the park. The municipality of the town of Montcalm has agreed to give to the commission the land required for the proposed avenue on condition that the avenue be built and maintained, as a part of the National Battlefields Park, by the commission. As this municipality is called upon at present to make heavy disbursement on capital account for the laying of water and drainage pipes in the rapidly extending parts of the town, which practically absorbs its borrowing powers, the commission has agreed to advance the amount required for the purchase of the right of way from the private holders on the condition that the municipality cede it to the commission and reimburse the amount by annual instalments extending over thirty years with interest at

the rate of 3 per cent, subject to the approval of parliament. This is the power that is prayed for by article 3 of the proposed Bill. The net result as far as the commission (and the public) is concerned is that instead of paying over $19,000 for the land required to widen the Belvidere road it will get the land for the new avenue gratuitously and build and maintain the avenue in either case.

So it is, in my judgment, a good transaction which is being made by the commission. A few days ago I met two of the commissioners, Mr. Denison of Toronto and Sir Edmund Byron Walker. Sir Edmund Walker stated to the Prime Minister, the Finance Minister and myself that he considered this a great improvement on the first scheme to widen the Belvidere road, because it is in a straight line between the Ste. Foye monument and the Plains of Abraham. I do not think any exception should be taken because the commission take the proper precaution of coming before parliament to get the necessary sanction.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What about the urgency?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The tercentenary of Quebec took place in 1908. We are now in 1911. This is the remaining portion of the lands necessary to begin the beautifying, and embellishment of the park. The commission have engaged Mr. Todd, the landscape architect, on the suggestion of the Dominion government, and he has made a very lengthy report which my hon. friend will read in 'Hansard' to-morrow. The people who have subscribed for the acquisition and beautifying of the battlefields naturally wish to know what has been done with their money, and it is time to start vigorously in order that the work may be accomplished without undue loss of time.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The government knew this three months ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This has been before me for some time. The Prime Minister had to introduce the Bill at some time during the session, and I do not think any time has been lost.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It is six months to-day since the House met.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is nothing in this Bill which is controversial.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the minister consider that the proposed arrangement with the village of Montcalm comes within the terms of trust created some years ago?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly, and the very reason that the commission applied to parliament for the sanction of their operations is that they can do by this Act of parliament what they cannot do of their own authority. Any transaction of the commission whether by way of loan or sale or purchase must come before parliament.

Mr. LENNOX. We created a commission for the disbursement of money for specific purposes, and they have no right to go into an extraneous matter. Have they the right to begin to loan money?

Mr. EMMERSON. Is it not one way of acquiring land?

Mr. LEMIEUX. They might acquire the land by loan or by payment of cash. I will explain on the third reading.

Mr. SPROULE. I raise no objection now to the form of procedure, but I shall ask the ruling of Mr. Speaker later on.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

COLLINGWOOD DRY-DOCK.

Mr. PUGSLEY moved: That the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolution.

Resolved, that it is expedient to ratify and confirm an agreement between the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, Limited, and His Majesty, dated the 27th day of July, 1910, respecting the construction of a dry dock at the town of Collingwood, and to authorize the Governor in Council to pay an annual subsidy of three per cent per annum for 20 years upon the sum of $306,965.18 being the cost of the construction of the dry dock.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the subject matter of this resolution recommends it to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—LEASING OF BRANCH LINES.

Mr. GRAHAM moved: That the House do to-morrow go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following proposed resolutions:

Whereas, by chapter 25, of the statutes of 1910, it was provided that the Minister of Railways and Canals might, subject to the terms and conditions therein contained, lease lines of railway connecting with the government railways and operate them as a part of the government railways, but no leases have been made under the said Act: and whereas it is deemed advisable to make the provisions hereinafter contained for the leasing of the undermentioned line of railway. Therefore it is resolved that it is expedient that the Minister of Railways and Canals be authorized, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to lease for a term not exceeding 99 years the following line of railway, namely: —The Vale railway, property of the Acadia

Coal Company, Limited, extending from New Glasgow to Thorburn, in the province of Nova Scotia, a distance of about six miles, upon terms and conditions to be approved of by the government railways managing board; provided, however, that the consideration by way of rental for such line of railway shall be an annual rental of one dollar and the carriage of the traffic of the company, its successors and assigns, upon the line of railway to be leased and upon the government railways, and between points to be designated and at rates not in excess of maximum fixed rates for such carriage between such points, such fixed rates to be subject to a provision for revision of such rates at the end of each period of 10 years during the continuation of the lease.

Such railway so leased shall become and be operated as a part of the government railway.

And the following:

Whereas, by chapter 25, of the statutes of 1910, it was provided that the Minister of Railways and Canals might subject to the terms and conditions therein contained, lease lines of railway connecting with the government railways and operate them as a part of the government railways but no leases have been made under the said Act, and whereas it is deemed advisable to make the provisions hereinafter contained for the leasing of certain of such lines of railway. Therefore it is resolved, that it is expedient that the Minister of Railways and Canals be authorized, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to lease for a term not exceeding 99 years, any of the following lines of railway, namely:

The Quebec Oriental railway, extending from Matapedia to Paspebiac, a distance of about one hundred miles;

The Hampton and St. Martins railway, extending from Hampton to St. Martins, a distance of about thirty miles;

The Albert railway, extending from Salisbury to Albert, a distance of about forty-five miles;

The Moncton and Buctouche railway, extending from Moncton to Buctouche, a distance of about twenty-eight miles;

The Caraquet railway and Gulf Shore railway, together extending from Bathurst to Tracadie, a distance of about eighty-five miles;

The York and Carleton railway, extending from Cross Creek to and beyond Stanley, a distance of about ten miles;

The International railway, extending from Campbellton to the St. John valley at St. Leonards, a distance of about one hundred and thirteen miles;

The Cape Breton railway, extending from Point Tupper to St. Peters, a distance of about thirty miles;

The Temiscouata railway, extending from Rivière du Loup to Connors, a distance of about one hundred and thirteen miles;

The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, extending from Sackville Junction to Cape Tormentine, a distance of about thirty miles;

The Elgin and Havelock railway, extending from Elgin to Havelock, a distance of about twenty-eight miles;

The Kent Northern railway, extending from Kent Junction to Richibucto, a distance of about twenty-seven miles;

Including the company's rolling stock in each case.

Upon terms and conditions to be approved of by the Government Railways Managing Board, provided, however, that the rental to be paid for each such line of railway shall in no case exceed an amount to be determined in the following manner, that is to say, the value of the railway proposed to be leased shall be fixed and determined by the judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, upon the report of the chief engineer of the government railways, based upon the examination of the railway by, and the report of the engineer appointed by the Department of Railways and Canals to inspect such railway during construction, such value also to include interest during construction, the cost of equipping the railway, the cost of terminals and right of way of the railway now in use in the operation of the said railway in any city or incorporated town, (the amount of such interest during construction, the cost of equipping the railway, the cost of terminals and of right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town to be fixed by such judge upon proper and sufficient evidence) and deducting therefrom any aid received from the government of Canada towards the construction of such railway, and also deducting such amount, if any, as may, in the opinion of the said chief engineer, be necessary to put any such line of railway in a safe and efficient condition.

Except that in the case of railways which have, since their construction, either through sale, foreclosure proceedings, transfer of shares of stock or securities, become either wholly or substantially the property of other companies or persons, at a cost less than the original cost thereof with the deduction aforesaid, then the value of such last mentioned railways shall for rental purposes hereunder, be determined by such judge upon evidence of, and shall be based upon the amounts actually paid by the present owners for such line of railway, shares and securities, respectively. Such judge shall, in the case of the railways last above mentioned, make a report showing the amounts paid for such railways and their rolling stock, shares and securities, respectively, and the owners thereof, as of date of April 1, 1911. After receiving the report and finding of such judge, the Minister of Railways may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, lease any of said lines of railway and pay therefor, for the first five years of the term of the lease, an amount as rental not exceeding three per cent per annum on such value so fixed by such judge; for the next five years of the term of the lease an amount not exceeding three and one-half per cent per annum on such value; and thereafter during the term of the lease an amount not exceeding four per cent per annum on such value, such rental to be paid half-yearly.

Nothing herein shall be deemed to require the taking over of any of the said railways if, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, having regard to the convenience of the public or the interests of the Intercolonial railway, the terms and conditions proposed by the company are not fair and reasonable.

Any such line so leased shall become and be operated as part of the government railways.

He said: His Excellency the Governor General having been apprised of the subject matter of these resolutions, recommends them to the favourable consideration of the House.

Motion agreed to.

DALHOUSIE PILOTAGE DUES.

Mr. CROCKET. I am informed that the Marine Department has notified the collector of customs at Dalhousie not to collect pilotage on vessels carrying pulpwood from Dalhousie to Portland. Is the department of opinion that under the terms of the Shipping Act these vessels are exempt from pilotage dues, or, has the department power to exempt from pilotage dues vessels which under the Act are liable to pay?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will make inquiry and give an answer at three o'clock.

CORONATION STAMPS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Has the Postmaster General any announcement to make in reference to the coronation stamps?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is under way at present.

UNITED STATES TAX ON CANADIAN SHIPPING.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.) I call the attention of the government to the following article published in the Victoria 'Daily Colonist' of May 10, 1911:

A Bill aimed at Canadian shipping under which the coasting steamers plying to the United States ports will be called upon to pay a tonnage tax ranging from 10 cents a ton on vessels of the usual coasting type, to 50 cents a ton on steamers from 4,000 to 8,000 tons register has been introduced at Washington. This is one of two Bills introduced and aimed against Canadian and British shipping. The Bill introduced by Mr. Rucker, of Colorado, contains the following clause.

'Every vessel not of the United States that shall arrive direct from her own country, its colony, or possession, in ballast or merchandise produced there, or with passengers in a less portion than one-third of her burden or capacity, for freight or passengers as aforesaid, shall pay a duty on the gross measurement in addition to the regular duty imposed by law, as follows: On all vessels not exceeding 2,000 tons, 10 cents per ton; not exceeding 2,400 tons, 25 cents per ton; between 4,000 and 8,000 tons, 50 cents a ton: between 8,000 and 12,000 tons 75 cents a ton; between 12,000 and 16,000 tons, $1 a ton; between 16,000 and 20,000 tons, $1.25 a ton; exceeding 20,000 tons, $1.25 a ton.'

Under this law, if it comes into effect, the local steamers of the Canadian Pacific railway trading to Seattle would have to pay a tonnage tax of 10 cents a ton, which, in the case of the 'Princess Charlotte' of 1,925 tons register, would be $192.50 per trip, and the 'Princess Victoria' would be mulcted $43.30 a trip. The steamers plying to Alaskan ports would also suffer from this law. The Blue Funnel liners and the Weir liners would suffer, being called upon to pay 75 cents a ton, for they rarely have passengers to the extent of their tonnage. The Japanese liners, by touching at Victoria, would escape under this law, as by making a call at Victoria, they do not go direct from their home country, but the Japanese lines plying to San Francisco from the Orient would suffer.

Another Bill, introduced into the United States senate on April 20 last, by Mr. Gore, provides that, 'on and after July 1st next, all alien immigrants coming to the United States from any foreign country other than an adjacent country shall be required to embark upon a vessel of American register at a seaport of the country of which he is a lawful citizen, or subject, and of which he has been resident for two years.'

Here is another clause of the same Bill: 'Any and all vessels may be entitled to admission to registry in the United States for the purposes of this Act without regard to the place of construction, and without any requirements as to ownership, except that a majority interest of such vessels shall be owned by citizens of the United States.'

This means that no immigrants are in future to be allowed to go to the United States through Canadian ports or by Canadian lines. How immigrants can be brought across the Pacific for the United States under this law is hard to see, for there is but one steamer flying the United States flag in the North Pacific ocean trade, the Minnesota, which makes about five trips a year.

If these measures receive official sanction at Washington, local transportation men are expecting they will be followed up by measures equally prohibitive in Canadian railways doing an international business. A start has already been made by including in the first Act above mentioned a clause exempting from the operation of the interstate commerce commission and the Sherman Anti-Trust Act, freight brought to the United States in American ships.

I would like to ask the government if they have any knowledge of the introduction of these Acts, and if it is their intention to make representations to Washington that they would be, if passed, an undue discrimination against British and Canadian ships?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no information at present in regard to such Acts; but if there is any truth in the statements published by this paper, I am quite sure that the government will make the necessary representations.

THE BRITISH COLUMBIA MILITIA.

Mr. GOODEVE. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to call the attention of the acting Minister of Militia—to some articles which are appearing in some of the western daily papers. The first article is from the Nelson 'Daily News' of April 20, and is headed: 'Go to Kamloops Camp or Resign; Situation of Officers in 102nd Regiment; Allege Neglect by Department.' The article says:

'Go to Kamloops on June 5 or resign,' exactly represents the situation in Nelson as regards the order which has been issued by Colonel Wadmore, D.O.C., to the effect that the 102nd Regiment shall go into camp on that date; and the unanimous decision of the officers of the regiment as far as can be gathered is that the latter is the only step which they can take.

Further on the article says:

Another point over which there is the greatest dissatisfaction is the drill hall. The armoury here was originally built to accommodate but one company. There are now two companies, a Maxim gun section, a stretcher bearer section, a signalling section, a bugle band and all their equipment. Last year a special store room was obtained by the regimental staff, but this, it is claimed, is far too small to accommodate all the equipment which has to be piled in, more or less discriminately, something after the junkshop manner. The regiment contended that the new rooms are needed for the Maxim gun detachment, for the stretcher bearer corps, for the signallers and for armoury purposes for 'C' Company. For over three years efforts have been made to induce the department to make these improvements with the net result that promises have been given and plans approved but nothing more tangible accomplished.

A little further on, under the heading of 'Ludicrous State of Affairs,' the article says:

A ludicrous feature of the neglect with which the regiment is said to be treated, and the general mismanagement at headquarters which is alleged, is that of clothing. It was learned during the past few days that if the regiment turned out to-morrow some of the men would be without coats, others would be without trousers, and others would be without caps. An instance of this mismanagement is that in 1907 the officers of the regiment were told that they were entitled in 1908 to 24 great coats, while none of these promised coats have arrived so far.

But that was a minor matter compared with the trouble that commenced after the general order was issued in September, 1909, that the green uniforms which up to that time were worn by the Canadian militia, were cancelled and that they were to be replaced by khaki clothing.

After several months of patient waiting on the part of the local officers, the clothing began to come along from headquarters in driblets, usually in very small and mixed driblets. For instance, one consignment consisted of four caps, eighteen pairs of trousers and five frocks. This varied assortment, naturally, was just sufficient to furnish four men, though one other might have gone on parade nicely dressed but with a bare head, while 14 others would have made a fine soldierly picture in their undershirts, caps and trousers and without any frocks.

Then, a paper of May 11, just to hand, represents that the dissatisfaction with this state of affairs has reached the climax. Above the article is a picture of Sir Frederick Borden, and it has these headings: 'Headquarters Officers Hand in Resignations; Officers of Other Units of Regiment Expected to Follow Suit; Ottawa Stands by District Officer Commanding.' Then it goes on to say:

The commissioned officers of the 102nd regiment R. M. R., in Nelson, which means all the officers of the headquarters establishment comprising 'B' and 'C' companies, Maxim gun section, stretcher bearer section, signalling section, and regimental staff, are resigning as a body, as a protest against the refusal of the Militia Department to pay the regiment for the drill and training of 1910-11. Many of the officers handed in their resignations yesterday, for transmission to the proper quarter, and it is undertsood that the balance will hand them in to-day. The drill and training of 1910-11 was duly performed, both by the headquarters establishment and by the companies in the other towns, but Colonel Wadmore, the new district officer commanding, both refused to grant the inspection requested and refused to allow pay. While this is not the chief ground on which nearly all units in the regiment have refused to attend the annual drill and training ordered for Kamloops in June, it is one oi the grounds, and it is one of the sorest points with the 102nd.

There are reasons for believing that the officers of the companies at Rossland, Kaslo, Revelstoke and Kamloops are about to resign also, on the same ground that serves the officers of the headquarters establishment.

The article then gives a list of the officers. At the time of the trouble in South Africa, no regiment was more prompt in offering its services than this regiment, and no men did better service than the men from these western contingents, and they seem to have a very just ground of complaint.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman cannot discuss the matter on the orders of the day.

Mr. GOODEVE. I merely wish to ask what action the department intends to take with regard to the resignation of these officers?

Mr. KING. If the hon. gentleman will let me have the clippings which he has read, I will inquire in the department and endeavour to get the information.

PETAWAWA MILITARY CAMP.

Mr. KING. Yesterday the hon. member for North Renfrew (Mr. White) asked a question in regard to the military buildings at the Petawawa camp, which had been destroyed by fire. For his information I beg to say that the buildings were destroyed on the 11th instant. Two buildings at Petawawa camp grounds, the supply and ordnance buildings, were burnt, the fire having originated from lightning. The fire occurred about five o'clock in the

morning, and notwithstanding the fact that within a very short time two streams of water were playing on the buildings, they and their contents were completely burnt, there being a very high wind blowing at the time. The loss by this fire is approximately as follows: Buildings, $6,000; stores $9,000; a total of $15,000. It is the intention of the department to rebuild these buildings, at least one of them, at once, and probably both.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). Was there any insurance?

Mr. KING. The memorandum does not say.

THE FESTIVAL OF EMPIRE.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL. Mr. Speaker, on Monday night, in answer to a question of the hon. leader of the opposition, the hon. Minister of Agriculture said that he had cabled to England and expected to get a report with regard to the withdrawal of the Battle of Chateauguay from the Pageant of the Festival of the Empire. I notice in this morning's paper the following press dispatch:

London, May 16.—Frank Lascelles, master of the Festival of the Empire pageant, in an interview to-day with reference to the strictures in the Canadian parliament because of the omission of the Battle of Chateauguay, said it was a storm in a teacup. The abandonment of the scene, he asserted was not due to fear of American feeling, but the result of the conclusion reached by the Canadian committee that the episode was not typical of Canadian life.

I might say that the day before yesterday I received the following letter on this subject:

St. James Street, S. W.
Royal Societies Club,
5th May, 1911.

My dear Sir,—As the author of the scene 'Chateauguay' which was to have been presented at the Festival of the Empire Pageant, I have read your remarks as I find them reported by cable in the 'Times' with very great interest.

At the same time, I should be extremely obliged to you if you would take some occasion to make it publicly known that Lord Strathcona was no party to the suppression of this most picturesque scene.

Several Canadians on the committee feared that the scene, in which a number of American soldiers were to have been represented, might be exaggerated by the Yellow Press of both countries and thereby cause ill feeling most undesirable in connection with such a Festival. For that reason we withdraw it.

Believe me, dear sir,
Faithfully yours,
BECKLES WILLSON.

I make no comment except to add that I thoroughly sympathize with the views expressed by the leader of the oposition, and can only regret the withdrawal of a feature which should have roused no resentment on anybody's part.

THE VICTORIA MUSEUM.

Mr. OWEN. Some days ago I drew the attention of the Minister of Public Works to the condition of the new museum building in this city, and I notice in the Ottawa 'Citizen' this morning that the crack is still widening. I would like to draw the attention of the Minister of Finance, who is leading the House, to this, and ask him if he considers the building safe.

An hon. MEMBER. How wide is the crack now?

Mr. OWEN. Forty-six feet ten inches.

Mr. FIELDING. No doubt when the period referred to by the 'Citizen' arrives, I expect the Minister of Public Works will be still here to answer the question.

DAM ON THE MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. THOBURN. Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the attention of the acting Minister of Marine (Mr. Lemieux) to a letter I have received from a resident in my riding, complaining about a dam built at a place called Galetta on the Mississippi, which destroys the fishing. The letter is as follows:

Almonte, May 9, 1911.

Dear Sir,—Excuse my liberty to ask would you kindly have fishways looked into and provided from the mouth of the Mississippi river to at least Carleton Place lake you could not provide a much greater blessing for the people of the surrounding country.

I may say that the dam complained of is built near the mouth of the Mississippi river which empties into the Ottawa river about a mile or two from where this dam is located, and it is utterly impossible for fish to come out of the Ottawa and up the Mississippi on account of that dam. That dam is built for power purposes, and for supplying light to the town of Arnprior, and is situated about four miles from the village of Galetta. If the hon. minister will look into that, he will confer a great favour on a large number of people who have the pleasure of living along the Mississippi river.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I understand from my hon. friend (Mr. Thoburn) that the people are willing to have the dam, but now they want to have it tempered by a blessing. While it might be in my power to give a dam, I am not quite so sure that I could give the desired blessing.

DISTRIBUTING SPEECHES BY POSTMASTERS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Might I ask the Postmaster General whether the report, which comes to me on reliable authority, that copies of speeches of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance are being sent out in bundles to post offices, and the postmasters are instructed to distribute them, is well founded. I put this question the other day and would like to have a reply.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Unfortunately I was at a funeral yesterday and did not hear the question.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It was put on Monday.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No such instructions are given postmasters. Hon. members on both sides can send out literature, but the postmasters have no right to distribute it.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). But if they are doing it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Then they are acting contrary to instruction.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). If it be proved that they are doing it, will the Postmaster dismiss them?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would certainly warn any postmaster who did anything of the kind. Some of them may have done it through ignorance. I warn them publicly now that they have no right to distribute for anybody literature sent to them.

Mr. LALOR. Was it due to ignorance on the part of the gentlemen who sent out the speeches of the Prime Minister and the Finance Minister?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It may have been due to ignorance on the part of some postmasters, but they have their instructions and ought to know their duty.

Mr. BLAIN. Would the publisher of a newspaper such as the Toronto 'Globe' have the right to send bundles of that paper to country postmasters and have them placed in the post office boxes without being addressed?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is quite different. A postmaster may receive a list of subscribers from the proprietor of a newspaper and distribute the newspapers according to that list. Some times there is no time to address the newspapers and they are sent in bundles so as to catch the early train, but the usual way is to label each newspaper.

Mr. BLAIN. Can the publisher of a newspaper send a hundred copies to a country postmaster to be distributed by him to people who are not subscribers?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. BLAIN. That was done in the general elections, I think. It was done in my own town with the Toronto 'Globe,' and that is why I asked the question. I understand the Postmaster General to say that no newspaper can send a bundle to a country postmaster to be circulated to people who are not subscribers?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is against the post office regulations. They can only be sent to bona fide subscribers who have paid their subscriptions, and are entered on the list. No postmaster is allowed to distribute bundles of newspapers which are not regularly subscribed for.

Mr. BLAIN. Suppose they call it a sample copy.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A sample copy is allowed, but there are rules governing sample copies. No one has the right to send a bundle of papers to a postmaster to be distributed to people who are not subscribers. The postmaster must be given a bona fide subscription list, otherwise he is not allowed to distribute the newspapers and the proprietor is liable under the law.

Mr. BLAIN. It might be well for the hon. minister to issue a circular to his postmasters notifying them to that effect.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend will find that in black and white in the Post Office guide.

Mr. BLAIN. But the minister might send a little reminder to the public.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I give that reminder now, that it is done.

Mr LENNOX. Is there any regulation by which a newspaper publisher has the right to send a list of his subscribers, and then send a bundle of newspapers not individually addressed, and have the postmaster open that bundle and distribute the newspapers according to the list?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. That is against the regulations.

Mr. LENNOX. I would like to ask another question. The Postmaster General intimated a few moments ago that he knows that this is sometimes done, but not very generally. Does not the minister think it his duty to see that it is not done?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. LENNOX. Will he do it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is not a criminal offence. Take a case in point. Suppose the Ottawa 'Citizen' or the Ottawa 'Free Press,' wishes to serve a place, and to serve it must catch a particular train. When the time comes to

catch that train, they have only 200 or 300 papers printed. I asked the hon. member (Mr. Lennox), would it be human in me to prosecute the 'Citizen' for that when it is done in good faith. This is a regulation for the protection of the department and public, but it must be administered in good faith.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. minister asked me a question, I would like to answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid I cannot allow the debate——

Mr. LENNOX. The minister asks a question.

Mr. SPEAKER. But there must be a stop put to it somewhere.

Mr. LENNOX. May I not answer the question?

Mr. SPEAKER. It is against the rules to continue——

Mr. LEMIEUX. As I put the question I would like the hon. gentleman to have an opportunity to answer it.

Mr. SPEAKER. The only difficulty is that if I grant permission to one member I cannot refuse it to others.

Mr. LENNOX. Very well, I will take it up later.

CANADIAN NORTHERN ONTARIO RAILWAY—GUARANTEE OF BONDS.

House in committee on Bill (No. 211) to grant certain aid towards construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company—Mr. Graham.

On section 1,

1. His Majesty, on behalf of the Dominion of Canada (hereinafter called 'the Government') may aid and assist the construction and completion by the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company (hereinafter called 'the Company') of a line of railway extending from the city of Montreal, in the province of Quebec, to the city of Port Arthur, in the province of Ontario, including the mileage of the line (lying between the said points) already in part constructed by the company and by the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company extending from a point in the province of Quebec opposite the town of Hawkesbury to Rideau Junction, west of Ottawa, in the province of Ontario, and including the line already constructed by the company extending from a point in the township of Capreol, in the province of Ontario, to or near Sellwood Junction, by guaranteeing the principal and interest of the bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities (hereinafter called 'the guaranteed securities') of the company, to the extent of thirty-five thousand dollars per mile of the said line of railway so aided, which guaranteed securities to the extent aforesaid, the company is hereby authorized to create and issue; interest on the guaranteed securities to be at the rate of three and one-half per cent per annum, payable half yearly; the principal to be payable in fifty years from the passing of this Act. The government may, subject to the provisions of this Act, enter into a contract with the company fixing the terms and conditions upon which the guarantee is given and of the security to be taken therefor.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister (Mr. Graham), stated that the route would be given more definitely in the Bill than in the resolution. But that is not the case.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did say to my hon. friend that I thought perhaps it would be more definitely stated. But, in looking over it, I do not see how we can state it more definitely. The route has to be approved by the Railway Department with final approval by the Railway Commission. I gave the route in a general way, and it cannot vary very far from the line I mentioned the other day, and as given in the resolution.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That, I suppose, is more or less a formal matter. You never find the Railway Commission varying very much from the general line of the route proposed.

Mr. GRAHAM. About a mile perhaps—they cannot vary very much.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Therefore, there does not seem to be very much ground in that contention. This is rather important because the preamble of the Bill declares that among other objects this railway is for the purpose of opening up, and developing portions of the country as yet without railway facilities. The Bill states one terminus as being in Port Arthur and the other in Montreal. Rideau Junction is named, and also a line of railway partly constructed. But otherwise the route seems to be entirely indefinite as between Port Arthur, on the west, and Monteral on the east. If the object is to open up and develop the country now without railway facilities, one would suppose that the route would be stated, and that looking at the Bill we could see that the preamble is carried out by the terms of the enactment.

Mr. GRAHAM. The route, as I stated it the other day, is as definite as it could be made until we come to actual location. The charter of the company states where they can build. Beginning at Port Arthur, as I outlined the other day, that part——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister need not go over that again. When we come to deal with the realities of the situation, the company will be bound by the Bill, and not by the minister's speech.

Therefore, his explanation does not put us very much further along. My point is that there should be something in the Bill binding the company as to the route, since the alleged purpose is to give railway facilities to portions of the country that are not yet provided therewith.

Mr. GRAHAM. To fix the route in the Bill would mean, that, if there were engineering difficulties the road could not be built. As a matter of fact the route of this road has to be approved by the Railway Department before the company can start construction, the final location has to be approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners. I do not see how we can describe it more particularly in the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand you cannot point to a single county in Ontario through which the road must run, according to the terms of the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. I presume there is nothing in the statute which says they must run to certain points except that they must go to Ottawa, Hawkesbury, Carillon, Montreal and Port Arthur. The department will certainly locate the line along the most feasible and practicable route. The company intends to run through Renfrew, Nipissing, and all through that country to within sixty miles of Port Arthur, when they get closer to the Canadian Pacific railway.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How near does the road approach the other lines if that intention is carried out?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Canadian Pacific railway skirts the Ottawa river, and this road will cross the Ottawa into the province of Quebec, and will return in the locality of Portage du Fort, and then it will go to the town of Beachburg. There are points where it will be 10 miles from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and other points where it will be 40 or 50 miles away. On the way to Pembroke it will go through territory not touched by the Canadian Pacific Railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Railway Committee would not grant a charter for such an indefinite location as this.

Mr. GRAHAM. They have a charter.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why should not this company, which is heavily subsidized by the people, define more particularly the route, as indicated by the Minister of Railways in his remarks?

Mr. GRAHAM. Even the minister cannot deviate from the charter of the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. We should not involve the credit of the country in helping a railway, the location of which is so indefinite. I do not think we should be asked to pass this Bill until the location is better defined. The Railway Commission can deviate, but they must have something to deviate from, and there is nothing in the Bill to guide them. I would not tie the company to an exact location within a mile or so, but we certainly should say it should pass through certain named parishes, townships or counties.

Mr. GRAHAM. In the old settled country it is easy to do that, but this line will run through territory that has never been opened up, and it is difficult to describe it. You might put something in the Bill that would prevent the building of the road at all if it were restricted in that way, when you come to approve of the route map. There has to be some discretion left to the department in approving of a particular route through such territory, else you may defeat the object we have in mind.

Mr. LENNOX. This line is about 1,000 miles long, between Montreal and Port Arthur, and whilst some of that territory is new, its physical features are fairly well known. We inferred from what the minister said that there have been explorations sufficient to enable the company to know pretty well the cost per mile of building this line, and there appears to be sufficient data to move the government to give a guarantee of $35,000 per mile. The minister should at least have defined in this Act certain points through which it will pass, so that we may know that we are promoting the building of a railway through a country which it is desirable to open up.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let the clause stand and we will see if it can be better defined.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is there anything in the Bill which fixes the outside mileage that we guarantee? Are we sure that the road will not be 1,500 miles instead of 1,000?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a clause in the Bill which says that the decision of the Governor in Council as to the mileage shall be absolute.

Mr. LENNOX. That is only as to the measurement.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does not say so.

Mr. LENNOX. It certainly means that.

Mr. GRAHAM. Possibly it does. However, the approximate distance is one thousand miles and the department would not be so negligent as to let them build all around the country.

Mr. LENNOX. There should be a limit in the Bill saying 'not exceeding' a certain distance.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is rather unusual to ask a guarantee at the rate of so much per mile for an indefinite mileage.

Mr. LANCASTER. You should say not exceeding so many miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. It would be easy enough to do that.

Mr. LENNOX. It is rumoured that instead of being 1,000 miles it was 1,200 miles.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have never heard of that.

Mr. LENNOX. There is a lot of information on this side of the House that you never heard of.

On section 2,

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). How is the security that the government takes to be paid out to the railway company?

Mr. GRAHAM. The proceeds of the sales of the guaranteed stock are placed to the credit of the government and are paid out from time to time upon the certificate of the government engineers.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). That would mean a thorough survey by the government as to the quantities taken out and the estimates. If you fix the price the parties are to get for the material removed you can pay out as the work proceeds, but unless all that is provided for I do not see how you can guard yourselves.

Mr. FIELDING. The guarantee being for so much per mile, all that would be necessary to see to would be that that amount of money was expended on fair and reasonable terms on the mileage as respects which the certificate is given. We have nothing specifically to do with the terms of the contracts, but if the prices were excessive or unreasonable or did not represent a bona fide expenditure, the government engineer would certainly not certify them. I think that is the only check we have. The contracts made between the company and the contractors are not matters directly under our control.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The danger is this: Suppose a construction company is formed by the same parties who own the railway; the railway company enters into an arrangement with the construction company, as nearly every railway company does, for the purpose of getting this road constructed. The prices may be fancy prices. The security of the government may amount to double the actual cost of the work. The amount paid goes into the hands of the construction company. The necessity then arises for the government to have an exact valuation of the work done, and the exact quantities, and to pay out the money on these securities just as they would pay out cash on a contract of their own.

Mr. FIELDING. The government do not pay out securities at all. The securities are sold in the market, and the proceeds are placed to the credit of the government, and are then paid out from time to time on the certificate of the government engineer.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the government exercise any supervision over the payments to contractors? Does it see that the contractors have been paid before it releases the money?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a clause in the contract with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company providing that the material that goes into the road must be paid for. Cases have arisen in which sub-contractors have run bills for materials that did not go into the road, and the government engineers have held up the money until an attempt has been made to have a settlement of these bills. Some of them have been found collectable under the contract and others not.

Mr. LENNOX. Suppose that contractors either for work or for material had a lien on the road for a large amount of money that was owing to them, it would be necessary that the government should take note of all that in releasing this money.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that would be a part of the agreement with the company. If we are paying public money or going security, we ought to know that there would be no lien prior to the government security.

Mr. LANCASTER. That should apply not only to the contractors, but to the workmen. The contractors might get the money and not pay the men.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

On section 3,

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. In the case of a contractor or subcontractor who has not paid for material or labour, and where a lien is filed against the railway, what precaution is taken to see that the lien is discharged?

Mr. GRAHAM. I am informed that workmen cannot enforce a lien against a railway. We protect, however all these interests in our guarantee contract just as we do in our subsidy contract. We insert a clause providing that if claims are made against any of the contractors for material or labour, these must be paid or we retain a certain amount until they are settled.

Mr. EMMERSON. That applies to subcontractors as well?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, it applies to all the labour and material that goes into the work.

Mr. SPROULE. You are only mortgaging the bonds, and I would assume that the company sells the bonds and realizes the money.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. SPROULE. Then the money is in the hands of the company.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, the bonds are sold and the money is deposited with the Receiver General, and is released from time to time as the work progresses on the certificate of the engineer in the Railway Department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There are two matters which should be had in mind. One is that the proceeds of the bonds guaranteed shall be applied to the purpose for which the guarantee was given. These proceeds, I understand, are taken charge of by the Finance Department, and the department pays out the money according to the amount of work performed, upon the report of its own engineer, reserving a certain amount to meet any contingency.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is right.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The other thing necessary is to insure that subcontractors, and contractors under them, and the men employed shall be paid, and that no contractor shall retain money which ought to be paid out for material and work. From what the Minister of Finance has said, I take it that that point is pretty well covered, though I am not quite sure.

Mr. GRAHAM. We make a contract with the company as to this guarantee, and we put in that contract a section which protects the working men and those who supply material either to contractors or subcontractors, and the department reserves the right to retain funds until these demands are settled.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand from the Minister of Finance that his department takes precautions to the end that these moneys shall be applied only to the purposes for which the guarantee is granted.

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is ascertained by the examination and report of the engineer of the Railway Department?

Mr. GRAHAM. Quite so.

On section 10,

Mr. REID (Grenville). Does the government hold all this money until work is commenced, and then pay it out according to the work being done?

Mr. GRAHAM. As the Finance Minister explained a few moments ago, the bonds are disposed of and the money is deposited with the Receiver General and paid out as the work proceeds, on the certificate of the engineer, and the auditing of the books by the auditor.

On section 13,

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is the penalty?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I said the other night, I am still of the same opinion, that we have done the utmost that can be done in order to encourage trade through Canadian ports. I do not think that any penalty you can place there will help the situation in the least.

On section 14,

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that after the words 'Port Arthur' we insert the words 'Ottawa.' That will give us three chief terminals.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you put that in the disjunctive? You say that the company is bound to consent to an order providing for use by the government or by such other railway company 'of the terminals at Port Arthur or Montreal.' It is meant to include both, is it not?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will say 'Port Arthur, Ottawa and Montreal, or either.'

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What are the terminals used for the Intercolonial in Montreal? If I remember rightly, there is a joint ownership between the Grand Trunk railway and the Intercolonial, and the expenses are paid according to the user. Who are the owners of the terminals?

Mr. GRAHAM. The terminals are owned by the Grand Trunk Railway Company. We have a rental arrangement by which we use their lines from Ste. Rosalie to Montreal, and also their terminals. For that we pay $140,000 odd a year. In addition to that we have a traffic arrangement with certain conditions as to the upkeep of the road, and of the terminals.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Do we not get the ownership in some manner, or was that in connection with the bridge, that by a contribution we acquired a joint ownership with the Grand Trunk?

Mr. GRAHAM. The proposed arrangement is not with the Grand Trunk. The Canadian Northern will probably have terminals there, and, as I suggested the other night, the time may come when we will wish to compel the Canadian Northern to connect with the Intercolonial railway, to

hand us its traffic, but it will probably not be through the Grand Trunk terminals.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The object of the section is to provide that if the government, through the default of the company, is obliged to buy in the railway or any part of the railway from Montreal to Port Arthur, it shall also be in a position to acquire the terminals, since otherwise they could not operate the road. This is a paragraph which was put in at my own suggestion after we had discussed the resolution. We were told in very eloquent terms of the great advantage to the country of our obtaining a lease for certain purposes of the Grand Trunk terminals at Montreal. One is never impressed in visiting the terminals there, with the idea that the Intercolonial railway is very much to the fore; it is very difficult to find the headquarters or location of Intercolonial railway at these terminals. I have had occasion sometimes to look it up, and I find it housed in a little cock-loft upstairs, a very absurd looking place and altogether out of keeping with the character of a road which covers 1,600 or 1,700 miles of territory. If one wants very much information about the operations of the Intercolonial railway, it is not always the easiest thing to get it there, it is much easier to get it here.

This agreement looks forward to an interchange of traffic between the Intercolonial railway and this road. How will it be possible to bring that about? We have our terminals in Montreal fixed for the next 90 years. I suppose it might be possible to interchange traffic between the Canadian Northern and the Intercolonial railway in Montreal, even if the terminals were at a considerable distance apart, but I would like to understand what the situation will be. How will this interchange of traffic be arranged? The idea in 1898, and 1899, when this country bought the Drummond County railway and leased a portion of the Grand Trunk railway as well as the terminals, the idea then was to make our traffic arrangements, or, as the minister very graphically expressed it, to hook up, with the Grand Trunk railway. Now, apparently, we are looking forward to the project of unhooking from the Grand Trunk railway and hooking up with the Canadian Northern railway. That will not be quite so simple an operation as it would appear on its face, if I am correct in my appreciations of the conditions, but I do not understand enough about it to be able to form a correct judgment. For that reason, I would like the minister to explain what will be the outcome in that respect.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend is absolutely correct as to its not being a very simple proposition. If it had been quite simple perhaps we would have gone further in this Bill and outlined an agreement about to be made, but the situation with the Grand Trunk railway is as described by my hon. friend. We have a lease with them for 99 years. We have a traffic arrangement with them for the interchange of traffic at Montreal which the government can break by giving notice but which the company has no right to end of its own motion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). You cannot break the lease of the terminals?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it is the traffic arrangement. The Grand Trunk railway are already urging very strongly and so are the Grand Trunk Pacific, their interests being identical, that the traffic arrangement may be brought to a close. We could not afford at present to bring the traffic arrangement to a close because if we did the need for using the terminals at Montreal would be largely diminished as our traffic would be reduced to the extent of $1,500,000 each year. But the Grand Trunk Pacific being constructed down to the eastern provinces, and the interests of the Grand Trunk railway being identical with theirs, they are already beginning to feel their way to see if some arrangement could not be arrived at by which they could be relieved from the obligation to give us their traffic.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Do they carry out the arrangement?

Mr. GRAHAM. They do pretty thoroughly now. There were differences of opinion when the arrangement was first made. A board of arbitrators settled a number of matters such as Montreal being the junction point instead of some other place. It will undoubtedly be strongly urged in years to come that from Lévis at least the Grand Trunk Pacific should be allowed to carry the traffic. We are not in a position now to release the Grand Trunk railway from this contract, but it may be in the interest of the public, it will certainly be in the interest of the through Transcontinental line, and it may be in our own interest that that arrangement should be broken if at the same time we could make other satisfactory arrangements. We would prefer to have our terminal arrangements part of the agreement to enter into a traffic arrangement, and I think it is in the interest of the Intercolonial railway that we should be in a position to go to the Canadian Northern, and make a proposition to them that they should enter into an arrangement with us to interchange traffic, both through and local, as the Grand Trunk railway is doing with its local traffic. That is why I was careful to put it in that way. We are

taking the power to say to the Canadian Northern railway when we are ready to do that: You must enter into such an arrangement with us. But we could not say that now, because we are not in a position to enter into an arrangement.

Mr. LALOR. What did the Minister of Public Works mean the other night by stating that we could only break that agreement with the Grand Trunk railway by serious loss to the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was that if parliament now were to make it obligatory on the part of the Minister of Railways to cancel the agreement with the Grand Trunk railway, that company would know that the Minister of Railways was bound by the Act of parliament to cancel the agreement, and, therefore, they would be in a position to exact terms which might be very detrimental to the Intercolonial railway and might inflict a loss upon that railway which would not be likely to be sustained if the Minister of Railways were allowed a free hand to deal with the Grand Trunk in the matter.

Mr. MONK. This is the last clause of the Bill, and I would avail myself of the opportunity, before the Bill goes out of committee, to ask my hon. friend (Mr. Graham) if it is intended to push this important measure through before the adjournment?

Mr. GRAHAM. I hope so.

Mr. MONK. Is it intended that the Bill shall go through before the adjournment?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have that in my mind. I am very anxious to get it through this House, so that it may go to the Senate.

Mr. MONK. I have listened to the discussion while the Bill was in the committee, and I must say that although that discussion has gone largely upon details, it has left a number of questions which appear to me to be unanswered. Furthermore, it seems to me that for the consideration of a Bill such as this the House would require more time. It is a measure of the very greatest importance. I believe that very few of the members of this House are informed as to the details of the measure. We have not had time. Yet it is being rushed through. Is that wise? We are undertaking to fasten on the public a liability of $35,000,000—that is, if the calculation of the distance over which the guarantee extends is one thousand miles. But there is not a man in this House who can say whether that is the exact distance or not. It more probably is twelve hundred miles, in which case we are pledging the credit of the country for $42,000,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will permit me—I have an amendment to suggest that the Bill provide that it shall not exceed 1,050 miles.

Mr. MONK. That may be the information of my hon. friend (Mr. Graham). I have heard that the distance is greater than that. But it has not been measured. But my hon. friend will admit that even at 1,050 miles, the liability is very large. Yet we really have not had opportunity to consider the measure. There are a number of clauses in the Bill itself which seem to go into details as, for instance, clause 14, which we have put through in a very few minutes, but the experience we have is that these clauses are nothing but a screen. They may be eluded, they have been eluded in the past, and will be in the future; there is no doubt about that. I consider that, under these circumstances, when the House is on the eve of adjourning through necessity for a few weeks— I am using a strong expression, but not too strong it seems to me—its a public scandal, nothing less, to push through a measure of this importance. No man in the House has had any opportunity whatever to go fully into the question and get all the information which we ought to have. I say this—the public cannot be aware of such undue haste, or we should all be condemned for rushing through an agreement of such magnitude under such circumstances of levity. It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there is no reason. Hon. gentlemen are aware that—probably through our own fault but also largely through the fault of the government—measures of this kind are brought in at the end of every session; they are rushed through, and we have no time to look into them. It is not right; it is not fair to our constituents; it is an injustice to the country. For my part, I wish to enter a protest against the passage of this Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course, if we were discussing this matter for the first time—I presume my hon. friend was not here when this Bill was discussed on the resolutions, some days ago. We took a whole day for a full discussion, and did not rush it. The Bill is exactly as the resolutions were, with some very slight amendments which we think a little improves them.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) calls that a full discussion. Members get up who face these resolutions for the first time, and ask questions. I do not think I am doing injustice to the minister when I say that, generally, he cannot get positive and categorical answers. You cannot in half a day discuss any transaction of over $30,000,000. In such a time you cannot get a satisfactory discussion of a measure of that kind. The matter would have to be gone into in the minutest detail as such matters are in other countries. I venture to say there is not a legislature in the world

that puts through measures of this kind with such speed. As a matter of fact, I am perfectly sure that we could take up these clauses, examine them carefully and find a multitude of unanswered queries which would suggest themselves at once to our minds. I can only protest, but I think it my duty to do so.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). To utilize the terminals at Montreal, you will have to have an exchange with the Intercolonial at the Grand Trunk station. I do not see how you can do it otherwise. My recollection is that we have a half ownership in the terminals at the Grand Trunk at the city of Montreal. That was given to us in exchange for our assistance in the widening of the bridge going into Montreal. We pay a lease to them of $140,000, and we have joint ownership of the terminals.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think we have not joint ownership of the terminals.

Mr. MONK. What sanction is provided in case of the non-execution of this clause 14? Without going into the subsections this provides for an agreement to secure suitable terminals in Montreal. This is like the preceding section where there is no sanction whatever provided in regard to the route—and we know what the clauses about routing traffic amount to ; they do not amount to a row of pins—they are violated every day. What is going to happen if the railway company will not enter into the agreement as regards these terminals in Montreal? And if it declares that it is ready to make an agreement with the government, as foreshadowed—though it is nothing else but foreshadowed—who is going to decide whether the terminals are suitable or not? Is there any independent authority? Will the city of Montreal have anything to say? The whole of that clause 14 is to my mind nothing but a screen.

Mr. GRAHAM. The establishment of terminals at Montreal or anywhere else can not be undertaken until after an arrangement is made with the city and approved by the Railway Commissioners, or at any rate approved by the Railway Board. The practice in all such large places is to have a thorough discussion of the city's interests in the matter, and then the Railway Commission says what precautions must be taken.

Mr. MONK. We have but the dictum of a minister that nothing will be done without these precautions, but seeing that this legislation is bound to be put through in a short space of time, and that the country is to be made liable for $35,000,000, talking on my part will not prevent it. Let me ask if there is a report extant from some responsible person as to the advisability and safety of this enormous guarantee.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no special report from anybody. The government made full inquiry, and are fully satisfied that security is ample, and that it will not cost the country a cent.

Mr. MONK. That is the usual answer we get from this government, but I venture to say there is not another legislature in the world that would pass in this way such an important transaction without having before it the report of competent and independent men as to the value of the security offered, and the necessity for giving this guarantee. Sometimes guarantees are necessary and beneficial, and sometimes they are not, excepting to individuals who make money from them. We have no report as to the advantages the country will get from this immense risk it is taking.

Mr. PORTER. The Minister of Railways said that the estimated cost of this railway is from $50,000 to $55,000 per mile, and the guarantee being only $35,000 per mile and being a first charge against the railway, the security was therefore considered ample. I have been told by several people who professed to know—I cannot vouch whether it is a fact or not—that this railway will be constructed, as the Canadian Northern railway have been accustomed to construct their roads, for a total expenditure of not more than $35,000 per mile. If that be so the government would be practically building the railway and handing it over to the Canadian Northern. There is a good deal of force in the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Monk) that there should be before parliament some reliable estimate and information. We ought to know what evidence has been laid before the government to satisfy them that the $35,000 per mile liability is really secured. It occurs to me that if there is anything in the statement that the Canadian Northern in the past has been constructing railways and operating them too, through a country just as difficult as this, at a cost of not more than $35,000 per mile, then it is indispensable that the government should have a proper and reliable estimate made, so that we may be sure we are not guaranteeing the full cost of the road. If it should turn out that default is made by the railway company and that the government is forced to foreclose and acquire the railway, it will not be a very good bargain if, after the railroad has been operated long enough for the company to make default, the government has to take it over at its original cost which would be more than the railway was worth at the time of foreclosure.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think any person experienced in railway engineering and knowing the country through which this line runs would suggest that it would be built for $35,000 per mile. We have laid down a standard to which they must build and there is no doubt such a railway cannot be built for $35,000 a mile.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The point is that the government asks parliament to authorize a guarantee of bonds to the extent of $35,000 per mile, and bases the application upon the assertion that the road will cost $50,000 per mile; surely that statement ought to be supported by some authoritative report by engineers of standing. Up to the present we have nothing but the more or less casual assertion of the minister that his engineers informed him the road will cost so much.

Mr. PORTER. It is common talk that the promoters of this railway have been building railways for less money than they were able to sell their bonds and securities upon that railway for, and that they are growing rich day by day by this means, and that this is only another scheme for adding to their accumulation of wealth. In order to put a finality to that sort of talk, if there is nothing in it, it would be in the interests of the railway as well as in the interests of the government that proper inquiry should be made. There is no denying the fact that this is common talk and common belief among the people of the country.

Mr. MONK. Part of this railway in the province of Quebec can certainly be built for less than $35,000 per mile. I assert that because I know the country. I am perfectly certain of what I say. At the figures given by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways, we are undertaking for 1,050 miles a liability of thirty-six and three-quarter millions of dollars. The minister has said that he discussed the resolution during an afternoon, and now we are putting the measure through finally. Does anybody in his senses pretend that that is a sufficient investigation—with no documents before us, no report, only a statement of the minister. We are supposed to be business men, and the country expects us to look into questions of this magnitude according to business methods. In this instance the investigation has been altogether insufficient.

Mr. LALOR. I do not think I would be doing my duty, as representing a rural constituency, that is not in any way interested in this road directly, if I permitted this Bill to go through the House without entering my protest against it. It is being rushed through too fast altogether. We have had no time to discuss the project or to give it proper consideration. In the short discussion that we have had, we have found already that there are mistakes apparently, in the judgment of at least two members of the government themselves. There has been no estimate provided by competent engineers of the cost of this road. I would have thought that one of the first duties of the government was to have had competent engineers go over this road and estimate its cost to the promoters. But without any estimate before us, we jump to the conclusion to guarantee the bonds of this railway for $35,000 a mile, merely taking the word of the promoters that it is to cost more than the government guarantee. I do not think that is just to the people of this country. I think that as careful an estimate of the cost of this road should have been made as if it were a road that the government themselves were building. It looks to me as if the promoters of this road would be able, with this guarantee, to build the road, and pocket a very large amount of money on the transaction. I do not believe that we are acting with good business judgment, or as any business corporation would act in a transaction of this kind. One of the features of the agreement is the routing of freight by the Intercolonial; but when we look into that, we find that the arrangement does not amount to anything at all, because when the freight reaches Montreal over the Canadian Northern, the company can route it to an American port, and there is nothing to prevent them doing so. According to the Minister of Public Works, there is in existence an old agreement with the Grand Trunk that almost prohibits us making this arrangement with the Canadian Northern company. I find on the Order Paper to-day a notice of a resolution to lease or take over about 12 branch lines of railway in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. I do not know what the cost of this will be, but it is sure to involve an enormous additional cost to the country. This guarantee to the Canadian Northern amounts to nearly $40,000,000. The whole thing savours of an election campaign, and an enormous election fund, and the country pays the bill. As the representative of an agricultural constituency. I want to protest against rushing this project through without any consideration in the dying days of the session, in order, if there is to be an election this fall, that a huge campaign fund may be provided for the government.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). I find that I was correct in my statement that the government of Canada is half owner of the terminals at Montreal. I will read to the hon. Minister of Railways the clause in the Act which confirms my statement. This is from the agreement made on the 1st day of February, 1898:

And, whereas, for the purpose of carrying out the said extension the said company is willing that, for the conducting of the business and traffic of the Intercolonial railway, Her Majesty shall have an undivided one-half share or leasehold interest in the company's railway and property between and including Ste. Rosalie and St. Lambert station at the eastern end of Victoria bridge, together with the use of the company's railway and property between and including Ste. Rosalie and Bonaventure station in the city of Montreal, the use of the Victoria bridge across the River St. Lawrence and of the terminals and connections hereinafter more particularly described, together with an undivided one-half interest in and use of the bridge across the Chaudière river, and of so much of the tracks and line of the said company in connection therewith as are hereinafter described, all of which right, title, property, interest and user shall be used, enjoyed and exercised to the same extent as if the said railway and property were owned by Her Majesty.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For what length of time?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). For 99 years, the lease is made.

Mr. CARVELL. What is the rental?

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Nearly $150,000 a year. Besides that, we paid in cash for making an addition to the Ste. Rosalie branch, and for broadening the Victoria bridge. We become half owners of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Half owners for a limited time.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). My interpretation of that enacting clause is that it is an absolute half-ownership in fee simple. Let us look at this thing. We get no security upon the terminals. There is no arrangement made binding them to use our terminals for the exchange of traffic. We are guaranteeing them $35,000 per mile, and they have the right to build terminals and issue securities for the purpose of doing so independent of our lien. Besides that they have the additional right to issue bonds on the rolling stock, independent of our lien. For our $35,000 per mile guarantee, they contract with us to build the road and put the rails and stations on it—not the rolling stock and terminals, because they are independent of our lien. There is not a railway man in the country who does not know that this road, under the conditions of our guarantee, can be built for half the money. Then we ought to have a report from the permanent officers of the Railway Department showing what would be the cost of building this road. But we have not a word about that. All we have is the statement, which will appear ridiculous to any one who knows anything about a railway, that to build this road and put a track on it, independent of the terminals and rolling stock, will cost $50,000 per mile, and we are only giving security for $35,000 out of the $50,000. That is not the kind of statement which the people are entitled to. We are entitled to all the details of the cost of this undertaking, including the terminals and rolling stock. We ought also to have the route more accurately defined. To give a company the power to build a railway from Ottawa to Port Arthur, without mentioning the objective points, is very dangerous. In the Railway Committee we always insist on certain objective points being mentioned. Why? In order to prevent railway companies from dickering with the municipalities and saying to a municipality: unless you agree to pay us a bonus or give certain other favours, we shall go in another direction. So that we ought to see that the objective points of this railway are specifically mentioned. But the minister says they have a charter. Well, I have not seen the charter, and we do not know where it is. There is no evidence yet before the House as to the charter this company has. We should not leave to the Minister of Railways and the Board of Railway Commissioners the locating of this road. We have the right to know where it goes. We have the right to know which particular route is to be adopted in the building of this line. As my hon friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) says, the information given us is of the most meagre kind ever presented to this House, when asking this House to vote a guarantee to such a large extent.

Mr. PORTER. The Minister of Railways said, in answer to a statement of mine, that anybody would know that this railway could not be constructed through certain portions where it was intended to go for anything like $35,000 per mille. While that may be true as regards the north shore of Lake Superior, are there not other portions—for instance, all of the line east of the particular point I have mentioned—where the road could be built for very much less? If I understood the minister rightly before adjournment, he could not say exactly where the line would be located and would not undertake to define in the Bill the exact location. If that be correct, how can he say that it is going to cost $50,000 per mile to construct a railway, when he does not know where it is going to be constructed?

Mr. GRAHAM. If my hon. friend will study the general contour of the country, he will find that it would not make any difference whether the railway went 10 miles one way or the other. The cost in either case would be practically the same. In the map which I laid on the table, hon. gentlemen will find that there is a route approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners and the Railway Department which this line proposes to take. That route was ap-

proved after full argument before the Railway Commission and the Minister of Railways by every interest involved. All were present and all laid their views before the commissioners and the minister, and a considerable portion of this line has been finally located by the commission. We could not change that again without full notice being given to all the parties.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). What portion from Ottawa to Port Arthur?

Mr. GRAHAM. From Sudbury to Port Arthur has been approved by the Railway Commission, after hearing the representatives of the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway, and all others interested. A piece from Montreal to Georgian Bay has been approved by the Minister of Railways. A short portion east of North Bay and through to Sudbury is the only portion that has not been approved after hearing all the parties.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Why could not the route be defined in the Bill?

Mr. GRAHAM. For this reason. Supposing when the company came to construction that, for some reason, every interest would see that it ought to be moved, neither the railway commission nor the Minister of Railways nor any one else would have the right to move it. There was the statute, and we could not vary it. But no change can be made in the approved route without all parties interested being heard.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). There is a part, the minister says, from Montreal to Pembroke; you go up to the Falls there, cross over and come back again to the Ontario side of Portage du Fort—has that portion been approved?

Mr. GRAHAM. That has all been approved after every one interested was heard, except a few miles on either side of Pembroke. That was delayed in order to allow the company to go to Pembroke and make some arrangement which would be suitable to that city.

Mr. LALOR. Does the provincial land grant apply to this line?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. PORTER. Then they get not only the provincial land grant but our guarantee as well.

Mr. MONK. The minister says 'all parties.' That reminds me of the story of the judge who asked the lawyer if he had any authorities in support of his proposition, 'Yes,' said the lawyer, 'your honour, all the authorities are in favour of my proposition.' What 'parties' does the minister mean? There is a 'party' for whom we are acting—the people of Canada. We are their representatives. But we have not had an opportunity of looking into this matter.

Mr. GRAHAM. That shows distinctly that what I said is correct. My hon. friend knows from his own experience—and I leave it to his own experience—that where his constituency is interested in a line of railway, he is informed of the hearing. And when a town or municipality is affected, the mayor is notified. And so it is with the representative of every parish. They are the people who are interested in seeing where the road is to run, particularly so far as local interests are concerned.

Mr. PERLEY. Who notifies the members of the House as to the hearings?

Mr. GRAHAM. Where a constituency is interested in the location of the line, it is the duty of the Department of Railways to inform the member for that constituency. And I think it is invariably done. Certainly these are the instructions that have been given. And, in the same way, the mayors of towns are notified. I am sure I never have a hearing on a route map in my department when there are not members of parliament there because of having been notified.

Mr. MONK. My hon. friend (Mr. Graham) has asked me as to the route going through Jacques Cartier and neighbouring counties. There is no difficulty about that. But when the route was fixed, there was no question of a guarantee. The point I insist upon is not the route, but the guarantee, the importance and magnitude of the transaction. And when he says—and he has said repeatedly—that 'all parties' have been heard, I can only say that they may have been heard upon the question of the route, and all questions of that kind, but I say also that we have not had an opportunity to be heard as to this particular transaction, which is being rushed through unfairly.

Mr. GRAHAM. I was answering an hon. gentleman who was asking me more particularly as to where the railway was going.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister must be mistaken as to these notifications, or he had better give more distinct instructions to his department. Because, in the case of this very railway, the route of which between here and Montreal passes through the county I have the honour to represent, the hearing was held a couple of years ago, and I never had any notification of when the matter was to be brought before the minister.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it must have been longer ago than two years.

Mr. PERLEY. I do not know, but it was since I became a member of this House.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am very careful about that. My hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) remarked that I did not notify members of the House. I will leave to members about him the refutation of that statement.

Mr. LENNOX. In the case of the Sudbury branch of the Canadian Pacific railway, which was built through my riding since I became a member of this House, I got no notice whatever. And I understand there are a good many other members who have had similar experiences. However, that is not the point I wish to speak about. I wish to say a word about the question of the cost of construction. The minister understands that it will cost $50,000 a mile. On the other hand, it is said by hon. members on this side that it cannot cost $35,000 a mile. I am inclined to think, with all deference, that none of us know very much about it. And that is the very difficulty in the matter; we have no more information about this than we had about the Transcontinental. Take the Transcontinental line, say, from Quebec to Winnipeg. We had specific information from the Minister of Finance——

An hon. MEMBER. 'Mountains of information.'

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, 'mountains of information.' We had not only statements from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) but we had a statement from the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) who was advocating the construction of that road. He stated that he had engaged his own engineer to go into the matter, and that this engineer, in conjunction with another engineer who had been over the route, had placed the cost definitely, as an outside figure, at $30,000 a mile for a large portion of this road. There is no reason to believe that that was not stated in good faith, perhaps, but we have the fact now that this railway, 1,800 miles of it —a large portion of it paralleling this 1,000 miles—will cost $100,000 a mile.

An hon. MEMBER. With stealings.

Mr. LENNOX. Of course, we do not know how much stealings that includes. I do not for a moment imagine that the construction cost anything like $100,000 a mile, if the thing were properly and honestly carried out. But what I am pointing out is that we have a right to some definite information about the cost of construction. But we have the fact that the minister says that he is informed that the total cost will be $50,000 a mile, and then hon. gentlemen on this side state that it cannot be over $35,000 a mile. I venture to say there is no good foundation for the minister's statement. We had an estimate in reference to the Transcontinental that the cost would not exceed $28,000 a mile, including interest, and we know that other estimates put it at from $25,000 up to the estimate of the hon. member for Brandon, $30,000 as an outside figure. And we know also that the cost to the country will be actually $100,000 a mile. Now, we have a right, both on general business principles, and more particularly having regard to the fact that these statements of this government have proved themselves to be utterly unreliable in the past—we have a right, I say, to some definite information about this matter. I am not saying that this road can be built for $30,000 a mile, or that it can be built for $50,000. But what I do say is that as a business proposition we should have placed before us the estimate of engineers who have gone over the route, and who can testify as to the character of the road, and give us a reasonable basis upon which to form an estimate, and that estimate should be laid before the House in advance of our being driven into adopting a measure of this kind. I am entirely in favour of giving reasonable assistance to this company, but I am very much opposed to this system of rushing things in when we are all anxious to go home, and have no reasonable information to justify us in pledging the country to this enormous liability.

Mr. LALOR. I would remind the minister (Mr. Graham) of the fact that the provincial government of Ontario gave a large land grant to the road that we are asked to furnish $35,000 a mile to build. The hon. gentleman has had considerable experience in politics in the province of Ontario, and if I am not mistaken, he took some part in the last provincial campaign. And the chief argument of the leader of the opposition, Mr. Mackay, in that campaign was that the provincial government had given a land grant to this road far in excess of the value of the road. Any one who heard Mr. Mackay in the Opera House in Ottawa, and his followers throughout the country, knows that that was his argument about this railway. Now, the Dominion government step forward, and give them an additional sum of $35,000 a mile, and do that without giving the matter proper consideration, in the dying hours of the session, without any engineer's report, or any information at all before them in connection with it. We grant this large sum of money, which will amount probably to nearly $40,000,000. I say it is not right in the public interest that this should be done. We should have had much more time to consider it, and the government

should not rush hastily into this matter. As I said before, it looks very much as if there was something behind this, some reason for it on the part of the government, and I can see no other reason than the fact that a Dominion election is staring them in the face this fall.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). In addition to the land grant, does the provincial government guarantee the bonds too?

Mr. GRAHAM. There is a small section of ten miles in the vicinity of Sellwood which comes under the provincial guarantee. That guarantee runs out in twenty years, then ours will become the first mortgage. In the meantime, we get $35,000 a mile of mortgage bonds on another portion of their line to cover that ten miles. Without wanting to drag in political questions, I may say that I think my hon. friend will remember it was that guarantee that Mr. McKay discussed more than the land grant.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I notice that one of the principal objects stated in the preamble of the Bill as a justification for the government guaranteeing these bonds, is to afford the government system of railways in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, an interchange of through traffic. That would also include, I suppose, the proposed branch lines, concerning which there is an item on the Order Paper to-day. Section 14 says:

> The company (the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company) and the Canadian Northern Railway Company, respectively, shall enter into an agreement with the government:
> (a) to secure or establish, or cause to be secured or established, suitable terminals for the company within the city of Montreal;
> (b) on the request of the government, to make arrangements with the Intercolonial railway for the interchange of traffic between the company and the Intercolonial railway at Montreal.

I suppose that is one of the chief objects of guaranteeing the bonds. I would like to ask the minister, if the Canadian Northern Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company refuse either to enter into an agreement, or, having entered into the agreement, refuse to carry out its terms, what remedy has the government against the Canadian Northern Railway Company?

Mr. GRAHAM. I imagine that if they refuse to enter into the agreement provided under this Act, they would not get the guarantee. It is a part of the Act that they enter into a certain agreement.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Supposing they agree to do it and do not do it, what remedy has the minister?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would be a legal point.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. As I understand it, the principal obejct of the agreement is to extend the Intercolonial railway westward?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think the members on this side of the House understand that one of the chief objects of the agreement is to make the Intercolonial a paying concern by giving it an interchange of traffic with this company. Now they may enter into this agreement, and there is absolutely nothing that I can see to compel them to keep it. All we are doing with the company is to guarantee the bonds. Once we guarantee the bonds, and the company does not carry out the chief object of this agreement, there is, so far as I can see, no remedy. It does not constitute such a default that would justify us in taking possession of the road. They could refuse to carry out the agreement, and we still have to guarantee the bonds. If they make a breach of the object for which we give a guarantee of those bonds, we have no remedy.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have discussed that point so many times already that perhaps I should not weary the House with repeating it. But I suppose it is a principle of law, or ought to be, that there is a remedy for every wrong. We should discuss the question from a practical standpoint, as well as hanging on the threads of technicalities. Does my hon. friend surmise that they would have a railway all the way from Port Arthur to Montreal and then refuse to have a terminal in Montreal?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I said my principal objection was that if they refused to enter into an agreement for an interchange of traffic, if, for instance, they should find it more profitable to send their goods by way of Boston or New York than by the Intercolonial, and if they refused to send them by the Intercolonial, you would have no redress, so far as I can see.

Mr. GRAHAM. We could proceed against them for damages.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What would be the measure of the damages to this government whose only contract is to guarantee the bonds? You simply have to guarantee their bonds, and you have no measure of damages against this company for not carrying out their agreement.

Mr. GRAHAM. There may be some legal question mixed up in that. I take it for granted that if the government makes an agreement with the Canadian Northern railway that it shall do certain things, the government would have redress against the

Canadian Northern if it did not do those things.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What redress would you have?

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. gentleman is asking a legal question, and I am stating a plain business transaction. It is like a business transaction between two men, and I cannot conceive that the law would place a railway in any other position than I would be placed in if I made a contract with my hon. friend, if he was worth anything, and if I could substantiate that I had been damaged by his refusal to carry out that contract, I could obtain damages.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The action would have to be brought by His Majesty against the Canadian Northern railway or the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company. What would be the measure of damages?

Mr. GRAHAM. That would be for the courts to determine.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Under what principle would they be assessed? I have never been able to understand yet, either under the Grand Trunk agreement or under this, that His Majesty could recover anything more than nominal damages.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If I were making a contract I would make it in such a manner that, if there was a default on the part of the company, I would have some redress. We could seize some portion of their receipts, or something of that kind.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not see how you could attack this company. The operation of this guarantee of ours would be subsequent to the action of the company in breaking this promise. For instance, we guarantee the bonds of the company. The guarantee by the government, that is to say, the action of this government, or whatever guarantee it gives, only takes place after there is a default. Now it is before there is any default that the company would likely refuse to carry out the spirit of this agreement. So long as they are paying interest on its bonds we could not step in. The only way in which action could be taken would be this, that if the company refused to ship goods by the Intercolonial railway, this parliament could withdraw this guarantee. The government of this country has power to withdraw this guarantee at any time by legislation.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not after the bonds are sold.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). We all know that this parliament has absolute power to withdraw that guarantee at any time. The only thing about it is that it would be

repudiation. If you wish to have any hold on the company you must insert a clause in this agreement, that if they fail to carry out the spirit of this clause parliament can cancel this guarantee.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I have here the Act of the Ontario government of 1908 guaranteeing certain aid to the Canadian Northern railway. I will ask the Minister of Railways if we are duplicating the guarantee of the Ontario government? Section 4 of chapter 47 reads as follows:

The securities hereby authorized to be guaranteed are as follow:—

(a) Securities to the amount of $20,000 or its equivalent in sterling or other money per mile of the company's lines of railway specified in the first part of the schedule hereto.

(b) Securities to the amount of the expenditure heretofore made in acquiring the lands and premises for terminal purposes specified in the second part of the schedule hereto and in making improvements thereon for terminal purposes, including wharfs, docks, warehouses, tracks and other terminal works and facilities.

(c) Securities to an amount representing sixty-five per cent of the expenditure hereafter made in acquiring other lands for extensions of the said terminal lands and premises, and in making improvements thereon for terminal purposes, and on the lands and premises mentioned in subclause (b) of this section. Provided, always, that the total amount of the securities authorized by subclauses (b) and (c) of this section shall not exceed $1,500,000.

(d) Securities to the amount of the outstanding debenture stock issued by the company and guaranteed by the province under the provisions of chapter 20 of the statutes of Ontario for the year 1904, representing $20,000 per mile of the line of railway specified in the third part of the schedule hereto.

It is a matter of great public concern to what extent we are duplicating this guarantee, and the total amount of guarantees that this company possesses on the construction of this road.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are but ten miles of that guarantee included in the line we are guaranteeing. The terminals referred to there are to be established in Toronto.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario) What consideration moved the government to specify the specific amount of the guarantee per mile, $35,000, instead of a percentage of the cost of construction which would seem to be the business methods to adopt in guaranteeing bonds. If the actual cost is $55,000 per mile, and we are guaranteeing $35,000, that is a little over 60 per cent. If the cost should be only $30,000, then a guarantee of $20,000 would be sufficient. Then the government's engineer would supervise the construction and you would guarantee a certain percentage of the cost.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend objected to that very principle in the mountain sections of the Grand Trunk Pacific. We guaranteed 75 per cent of the cost of construction of the mountain section, but that was not satisfactory. On the prairie section, we put in a maximum amount, a certain percentage not to exceed a certain amount. The railway has cost over $33,000 per mile on the prairie sections, and the guarantee that we gave has not met the expectations of those to whom we gave it. The Grand Trunk Pacific have to raise another loan of $10,000,000. Having the experience of the Grand Trunk Pacific and of the Canadian Pacific railway, from a business standpoint, I believe it is better in the interests of the country to name a stated amount, which would not be decreased and could not be increased and adhere to that amount. I believe this is only a fair proportion of the cost.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That may be correct. I appreciate a portion of that argument at least; but it is only a good argument when the minister comes down with reasonable evidence of what the road will probably cost. Surely this estimate of $50,000 a mile must have been founded on something? I would imagine that the minister would not trust to an oral report of an officer of his department, that he would insist on a written report. He must have some information. Why not communicate that to parliament, when his whole case is based on the theory that this road will cost $50,000 per mile? Estimating the cost at $50,000 per mile, we guarantee bonds to the extent of 70 per cent of its cost. That is less than we guaranteed in the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Upon the prairie section of that road we guaranteed three-fourths of the cost not to exceed $13,000 per mile. The minister points out certain inconveniences. These inconveniences have not been to the country, but to the persons who are building the road. We are supposed to be looking at it here at least to some extent from the country's standpoint. What is the evidence upon which the minister asks this committee to come to the conclusion that that road will cost $50,000 per mile upon the average, and that, therefore, $35,000 per mile is a reasonable amount to which the country should pledge its credit for the purpose of consummating the construction of the road?

Mr. GRAHAM. I could understand that if we were not naming a certain standard of road to be built?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). To say that the road must be built of a certain standard may convey an idea of its cost to persons familiar with railway construction; to me it conveys absolutely nothing, I do not know whether a road of that standard ought to cost $15,000 or $20,000 or $30,000 or $100,000 per mile. Therefore, I am obliged to rely on the reports of experts who do know. It seems to me as one member of the committee, that I am entitled to the report of some competent engineer who will say that a road built up to that standard through this particular country, although the country is not very well defined, will cost $50,000 a mile, or will cost something so that I can make up my mind as to whether this is a reasonable guarantee. The minister is handicapping his own case before the committee, by not coming here armed with evidence of that kind. If I were trying to put a proposition of this kind through a committee of this House, it would be the first thing that I would think of. I would not expect the committee to pay any attention to me when I asked them to assume that this road would cost $50,000 a mile, and to base their action upon that assumption unless I had provided them with evidence or a report indicating what the road would cost.

Mr. GRAHAM. Of course my hon. friend does not see it from my viewpoint. We have had any amount of evidence as to two roads being constructed through a portion of this country, one of a better standard than this which will cost a large amount of money, and it never dawned on me that any one would intimate that $50,000 was too large an amount for the construction of this road, and the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) has endeavoured to prove that my estimate was too low.

Mr. LENNOX. It would prove that you do not know anything about it.

Mr. GRAHAM. That might not be difficult to prove. However, my engineers know the profile of the country, and the standard of the road has been submitted to them, and I am sure it cannot be constructed for less than $50,000 per mile. I believe myself it will cost a good deal more before it is finished.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Who says that?

Mr. GRAHAM. My engineers. I have not asked for a written report.

Mr. LENNOX. Have they been over the route?

Mr. GRAHAM. They know the contour of the country, and they estimate that it will cost $50,000 a mile, and my experience is that it is safe to add at least 25 per cent to the estimate given.

Mr. LALOR. Will this road be constructed up to the standard of the Canadian Northern from Fort William to Winnipeg?

Mr. GRAHAM. The standard is set out in the Bill.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will it be as high a standard as the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Mr. GRAHAM. No.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. While I do not think clause 14 is of much value, still we might make it as valuable as possible, and we should state a time when the company will enter into the agreement. As it is now they might not enter into the agreement until all the bonds have been guaranteed by the government. The words should be inserted, 'before the execution of the guarantee mentioned in section 4 of the Act.' Otherwise you lock the stable door after the horse is stolen.

Mr. GRAHAM. Our difficulty is that we were not prepared to enter into an agreement now owing to certain conditions existing. I want the right to compel them to enter into an agreement when we are ready.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. They will have the money then, and they don't care whether they agree or not.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The clause is now indefinite as to time, and possibly it could be put in proper shape by inserting after the word 'shall' the words 'when required by the government.'

Mr. GRAHAM. That would cover it. It would carry out what it is intended to do.

Amendment (Mr. Borden, Halifax), agreed to.

Mr. GRAHAM. I move that section 4 be amended by adding the words: 'not exceeding in the whole 1,050 miles.'

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Now, what about the route?

Mr. GRAHAM. I discussed the route question at luncheon, and I do not see that we can describe the route with any more particularity. The charter does not prescribe the route very particularly, but it does say at a point in the township of Chisholm, which is at or near North Bay to a point in another township, which is near Sellwood Junction. The route map has been practically approved by the department and the Board of Railway Commissioners for a great deal of the distance. A short section from North Bay to the junction north of Sudbury is the only portion not approved. None of the other portions were approved without the Canadian Pacific railway, and the other parties interested being notified and heard. The road is agreed to from Sudbury to Port Arthur. From Montreal to a point east of North Bay has been approved by the minister, but is subject to a change of one mile either way by the Railway Board. The question will be at once asked: 'If that is the case, why not describe the route in the Act, and no doubt the route approved will be approximately the route constructed on, but, if we name definitely the route in this Act the minister could not change it suppose it became necessary to move the track to another side of a lake.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Surely the minister could do that?

Mr. GRAHAM. He could, if it is not in the Act. If there was a possibility that the minister would arbitrarily and without notice change the route, it would be another matter, but the practice is to notify all the parties interested, and no route can be varied unless such notice is given, and the parties heard if they object. Once a route is approved by the minister it takes a pretty strong argument to vary it. After that they have to proceed to the Board of Railway Commissioners. If the location were marked out in this Act, it might be necessary to change it, but it being statutory, the Minister's hands would be tied.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is that not an argument for not proceeding with this measure until we know where it is to be located?

Mr. GRAHAM. The route for practically the whole distance has been approved.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The hon. minister is mistaken in supposing that the naming of the principal points on the line would prevent him altering any portion of the line.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the route is not defined in some way, there is the danger that the company will use the indefiniteness of the route for the purpose of extracting bonuses from municipalities.

Mr. GRAHAM. The route is fixed and is approved practically from Montreal to Port Arthur, except the small portion which I have described. A considerable portion of it has also been approved by the Board of Railway Commissioners, and unless good cause can be shown, neither the minister nor the board will allow it to be varied. The company is building under a charter in which the route is defined generally, and if we placed in this Bill something that is not in their charter, they would be tied up to the particular route described, and it might be that when they came to construct, that route would be found to be practically impossible, and the company could not proceed with the work until they came to parliament again.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The minister says, what is the use of fixing the route in the statute? It is fixed already. There is nothing to prevent the minister reversing his decision from day to day as to the location of the route. If we do not name the objective points in the Act, we might

as well have a general statute under which railways could be built anywhere. Let us fix the objective points to which the road must be built, and then these gentlemen will not have the opportunity of holding up the constituencies for bonuses.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why not define the route subject to its being changed by the Minister of Railways. That would give an assurance to the municipalities that it could not be changed at the dictation of the railway company.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of law, the company cannot change that route once it is approved. They cannot build a foot on any other location except with the approval of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand the route is approved for nearly the whole distance except for a part north of Lake Superior.

Mr. GRAHAM. A small part east of North Bay to Sudbury.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does that mean that the line must be built where the route has been so approved, and that no tribunal or minister or any other power can change that?

Mr. GRAHAM. No. Most of this route has been approved by the Minister of Railways, and a portion has been definitely located by the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it first approved by the minister and then located by the board?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is approved generally speaking by the minister after he has given notice to the railways and municipalities and others interested. That location is taken to the Board of Railway Commissioners who can vary it a mile either way. The road from Sudbury west has been approved by the Minister of Railways, and the Board of Railway Commissioners. The line, with the exception named from Montreal to east of North Bay, has been approved by the minister. My hon. friend asks can that be changed? It can be changed, but all the proceedings would have to be gone over again. The company would have to make their application and file a new map showing the proposed deviations and all the parties would have to be heard. Then the minister could, if he considered the argument sufficient, consent to the deviation. Then that would have to go before the Railway Commission again, and the parties be again heard.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The definition of the route leaves Rideau Junction a little west of Ottawa, and hits nothing again until it strikes Port Arthur, eight or nine hundred miles away. Why not name some points fifty or a hundred miles apart to indicate in some general way where the line is to run between Rideau Junction and Port Arthur.

Mr. GRAHAM. It does in one other point:

A line of railway extending from a point in the township of Capreol, in the district of Sudbury, to or near Sellwood Junction.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I thought that was quite close.

Mr. GRAHAM. Sellwood Junction is north of Sudbury. There would be no objection at all to saying 'at or near North Bay.' That would give a general line.

Mr. BRADBURY. Why could it not be described as so many miles north of the Canadian Pacific railway at given points?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is fixed absolutely on the route map.

Mr. BRADBURY. You can revise that any time you like. Why not fix it at given points on the Canadian Pacific railway?

Mr. GRAHAM. Then we could not change it, and that might stop the building of the line.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I have here the Toronto 'Globe' of April 11, 1908, which has an editorial discussing the propriety of the Ontario government guaranteeing the Canadian Northern bonds to the extent of $1,500,000. This is an illuminating editorial. It is headed 'A million and a half endorsement,' and is as follows:

Such an Act as that guaranteeing the bonds of the McKenzie and Mann system to the extent of a million and a half would never be introduced except at the close of a session. The explanation that the necessary information was not available earlier sounds puerile in the face of the obvious attitude of the public towards such a measure. To bring it in at a reasonable time in the session would have been to invite the earnest consideration of the public. It would have led the public to ask why their credit should be pledged to the extent of a gigantic sum for the benefit of these men and their enterprises. If the public had a few weeks to reflect on the matter instead of having it rushed through in virtual violation of the rule, they would have asked why the endorsement of the province, and an endorsement having a large cash value, should be given for nothing. They would also have asked how far the line aided by the credit of the province would go to build up a system parallel to or in competition with the road which the province should complete to Hudson bay.

Then the article goes on:

Such a pledging of the credit of the province naturally occurs, not only in the dying

hours of the session, but in the dying hours of the legislature and when a general election is above the horizon.

We hear rumours around Ottawa that there is to be a general election.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend did not repudiate that guarantee by the Ontario government, but defended it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The Minister of Railways is not repudiating it now. The article proceeds:

Mr. E. B. Osler has stated in the Dominion House that subsidies voted to railway promoters do not always stay with them, but are sometimes diverted to the politicians voting them. This from one so well informed should lead to questioning every time the money of the people is given or the credit of the people is pledged to support any private railway enterprise. The same interest that is freely receiving the credit of the province to the extent of a million and a half is virtually holding up Hon. Adam Beck's power policy and stepping in where the premier was afraid to venture. Taking all the circumstances into account this extension of public favour to men who are interfering with the development of a public policy has anything but an innocent aspect. It is at all events a blunder and a waste of public resources, and it remains for the government to assure the public that it is nothing worse.

That is a very illuminating editorial coming from the source it does, because the conditions at that time bear somewhat of a resemblance to those existing now. Here we have a pledge of $35,000,000 on the eve of a general election. It is being rushed through the dying hours of this stage of the session. Some one has suggested the dying hours of the government. I would respectfully suggest that, owing to the importance of this matter, and the strong condemnation of this pledging of the credit of the people to which we have just listened from the Toronto 'Globe,' the Minister of Railways should postpone the consideration of this Bill until we come back after recess. We would then be in better position to give judgment as we would have had the opportunity of testing the feeling of our constituencies regarding the guaranteeing of such an immense sum to these men.

On the preamble,

Mr. PORTER. As to the preamble of this Bill, I take it to be a recital of the facts upon which this legislation is based. I do not doubt for a moment that the construction of this railway by means of the guarantee that this Bill gives will be of vast benefit to the Canadian Northern railway. But that is not the preamble of the Bill. The preamble is that it is greatly in the interest of Canada that this Bill should pass in the form in which the committee has just pronounced upon it. Now, I would like to know, for my own information, before assenting to the passing of that preamble, whether the facts—or the alleged facts—stated in it, are true, and what evidence there is before the House to show that they are true. I agree, in a general way, that there is prosperity, and great prosperity, in this country. But to go to the extent of saying that the increase, or to use the words of the preamble—'that, having regard to the growth of population'—is another matter. I question very much that the growth of population in Canada since the construction of the last transcontinental railway has been such as to be a reason, a good reason, for constructing a third transcontinental railway. I do not believe that the statement is true, as recited in the preamble of the Bill. The preamble goes on, 'and the rapid development of the production of trade of that portion of Canada lying west of the Great Lakes.' Now it is unquestioned and unquestionable that there has been very great development and production in that part of the country lying west of the Great Lakes, but it does not necessarily follow that there has been such an increase in the production and trade as to warrant the construction of another line of railway. Are we to assume from the statement in the preamble of the Bill that it is a fact that there has been such a development in the production in trade in that part of the country that it does warrant the construction of a railway. I would ask the minister (Mr. Graham) what evidence he has of that fact to convince this House that the construction of another transcontinental line of railway is a necessity, or even advantageous, at this particular time. It seems to me that, in order to pass judgment upon that, it would be absolutely necessary to have some comparative table of the amount of traffic and extent of development in that country that the railways already existing are capable of handling, or some evidence that the railways now in existence are incapable of handling the development and the trade of that portion of Canada. We are absolutely without any information, so far as I have heard the discussion, upon that phase of the Bill. The preamble goes on to say: 'and the rapidly extending trade and commerce of Canada.' No doubt, the trade and commerce of Canada generally is extending; but the extension of that trade—to repeat what I have already said—is not settled such (or may not be such) as to warrant the construction of another transcontinental line of railway. We have no figures upon which to base any such statement. It looks well on paper, and I hope it is all true. I hope that the trade of the west and the trade of Canada generally has developed to such an extent that the construction of this line

of railway, or even still another line of railway, is an absolute necessity; but I do not believe it at this time. I have no facts before me, nor am I able to lay hold on any facts that would enable me to pass judgment as to whether the statement in this preamble is true or false. If true, it ought to be made known to this House and the country; if untrue, it ought not to be recited as a reason for passing this Bill. And it seems to me that the committee ought to have some information on this subject. The preamble says further, 'to open up and develop portions as yet without railway facilities.' Now, I can remember very well, during the argument preceding the passage of the Bill incorporating the Grand Trunk Pacific, that it was said that railway would open up a section of the country that heretofore had been unserved by any railway and would answer the purposes of the country for a long time to come. When the line came to be located finally, we found that it did not, and will not, serve a portion of the country such as it was stated it was designed to serve, but, in very large measure will parallel, and very closely parallel, another line of railway, and will not open up new country to settlement or will not traverse a country that is being traversed and rapidly settled up by the people of this country. Now, this measure may be only a repetition of what took place a very short time ago in regard to the National Transcontinental. It seems to me we ought to have some evidence in regard to that point on which this committee could base a judgment. It goes on to say, 'to promote the internal and foreign trade of Canada,' to develop commerce through Canadian ports, and to afford the government systems of railways in Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, an interchange of through traffic. For these reasons, it is said, this railway ought to be assisted in the manner indicated here. Now, up to the present time, I have not been able to discover any evidence that the statements made in this preamble are true. We are asked to say that for the reasons set out here this government ought to be pledged to the extent that we are pledging it by this Bill, and we are asked to say it in the face of an entire absence of any evidence to convince this House or to cause hon. members to believe that the basis on which we are asked to do this act are true. It seems to me that the hon. minister, before asking the House to adopt the preamble of this Bill, should come to the House with a comparative table of the trade that was handled by one railway, the trade that is just now handled by two railways, and the trade that will be handled by three railways, if this one is constructed, to show that the construction of the third line is a necessity, in order to meet the requirements of our foreign trade or the trade of Canada generally. It seems to me that we need some data, some information, upon which we would be able to form a reasonable judgment in that connection. Until we have that evidence, and in the entire absence of that evidence, I cannot agree with the statements, however much I might hope and desire that they are absolutely true—I cannot undertake to say that they are true without some evidence being furnished in that way.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will not detain the House very long. In the first place, surely my hon. friend (Mr. Porter) does not want any tables outside those in the trade returns, to answer his first objection as to the trade of Canada rapidly increasing. I do not think he would ask me——

Mr. PORTER. I admitted that in opening. I said I admitted it; but to be able to judge whether the increase was of sufficient extent to warrant this Bill, I want a comparative table.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend, of course, will understand that a comparative table would not assist him very much in forming his conclusion. The question of the future of Canadian trade can only be based on the faith we have in the country. I pointed out the other day, when perhaps my hon. friend was not present, that in looking over the western country I found the Canadian Northern railway with 4,000 miles west of the Great Lakes, but without any outlet except over some other line.

Mr. PORTER That is in the interest of the railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not want to contradict my hon. friend, I do not look at it in that way. At the present moment, perhaps, the railways that are under construction could handle the traffic, but there is a good deal of doubt as to the ability of the railways and transportation companies to handle the traffic as rapidly as it ought to be handled. If you give them sufficient time they can handle any amount of traffic.

Mr. PORTER. Do the present railways say that they are unable to handle the traffic?

Mr. GRAHAM. Now, my hon. friend takes the railway side of it, as he accused me of doing a moment ago. I have discussed this matter with a good many people in the west, men who ship goods. The railways contend that they can handle all the traffic, but a good many shippers contend that they cannot get accommodation even now when they need it. What the western production is to-day is hardly an indication of what the traffic will be

in three or four years. I may be wrong, but I believe I would be recreant to my duty as a public man if, having an opportunity to connect the eastern and western sections of this great system by merely lending the name of the government to the proposal, I did not take advantage of the opportunity. To my mind the traffic in the next five or six years when these two roads are completed will be ample to keep all the three railways busy, running to their full capacity for the most part of the year. I believe further, and I think western people will agree with me, that we can improve our waterways, and there will still be sufficient traffic for the railways and the waterways. Now, this is not all done in the interest of the west. A railway train bringing a load of wheat from the west must take back a load of goods from the east in order to give a fairly good freight rate. I am not such a little Canadian that I am afraid the transportation facilities of Canada will not have all they can do when they are up to the requirements of the country. The man who has a carload of wheat in the west will send it to the ocean port by the line that will take it at the best rate, and in the quickest time; and if Canada has the courage to give these facilities we will get the carrying trade, and the country that has the carrying trade is the great country of the world. Now let me point out further that the people of the east have as much interest in this line as the people of the west. It must be borne in mind that one train load of implements going to the west pay the railroad perhaps twice as much as a train load of grain going to the east, owing to the different classification of the freight. In order not only that the west should have good facilities for getting its products to the east, but that the east should have good facilities for getting its products to the west, I say again that I would not be doing my duty if I were to neglect an opportunity of securing this line for the country. It is my belief that in the next five or six years the increase in the western traffic will be something that we cannot now understand. There is not a man in this House, who has not lived in the west for years, who can realize the marvellous advance of that country in the last ten years. The most optimistic people never thought that the west at this moment would have reached the proportions it has reached, and only the fringe has yet been touched. I may be perhaps too optimistic, but I have the fullest confidence that when the Grand Trunk Pacific is built, and when the Canadian Northern is built, when our transportation facilities are completed, including the Hudson Bay railway, there will still be traffic sufficient in Canada to keep all these lines busy, and people will even be asking for better accommodation.

I believe also that Canada occupies a natural position on this continent, not only to do her own carrying trade cheaper than anybody else, but is in a position to offer facilities to our neighbours to the south that will give us a part of their carrying trade from the east to the west and back again.

I come back again to my statement that this proposition to connect the east and the west by this through line, simply by loaning the name of the government to aid them to get money more cheaply, is an opportunity that parliament cannot afford to let go by. Now, as to the eastern section, it is a belief held by most Canadians who have looked over the matter carefully during the last two or three years, that there are abundant signs of great development in eastern Canada during the next four or five years, and a government that does not rise to the situation, and refuse to wait until the opportunity comes and has gone, is not doing its duty to the people. Governments make mistakes, but I believe that the country west and east demands greater transportation facilities, that the rate of wages of the man working on the farm, and in the shop, as well as the profits of the proprietors, depend on the speed and cheapness of their transportation facilities. Those are my views. I believe that in a few years to come we will see in the east a development scarcely second to that in the west, and it is our duty to endeavour to conduct the trade down through our own Canadian territory to Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax, and do everything we can to stimulate the efforts of our own people. We are side by side with a great country with a very much larger population, and we are doing our best to maintain our position on this continent.

Mr. PORTER. What development does the minister speak of in the east?

Mr. GRAHAM. A general development in the east. People do not understand, even in Ontario, that there is as much land in the newer parts of Ontario yet untilled as there is now cultivated in the older portions of the province. This railway will run through the southern portion towards the centre of the clay belt; the Grand Trunk Pacific will run through the northern portion. When the Timiskaming Northern and Ontario Railway was being projected, many people laughed at it, and said it would be merely a colonization road. But the result has been that Ontario has developed, and has been shown to possess some of the richest mineral areas in the world. If we go further east we will find the same wealth in Quebec, in Nova Scotia, and New Brunswick, where there are besides vast areas of good agri-

cultural land that are not being cultivated as they ought to be. These provinces are making efforts through their provincial governments to attract immigration to open up their natural resources. Nova Scotia has a mineral wealth that we in Ontario know very little about, acres and acres of which have not yet been uncovered. I do not know what the future has in store for the little province of Nova Scotia, but if we do our duty as Canadians to assist her, as well as New Brunswick, which has also great mineral resources besides her agriculture and timber, we shall see the eastern part of Canada rivalling the west in prosperity. I have sufficient faith in the country to believe that if we have courage, Canada in twenty years from now will have assumed such proportions in the life of the world that we who are now discussing these questions will be surprised even at our own modesty.

Mr. PORTER. If we just take care of it. The United States have developed along the lines the minister has just indicated Canada is to develop. The United States, we may say, is fully developed to-day; all her natural advantages have been exploited. She has made more rapid progress than any other country. We will have three transcontinental railways in Canada for a population of 8,000,000 and the United States, with all its development and with a century of time, should, according to the same ratio of population, have about twenty transcontinental lines to carry its commerce, which is absurd. Canada is capable of great development in wealth, commerce and trade if we only take care of it, and do not allow it to get into the hands of the Americans through reciprocity or some other mistake of this government, but the minister will see that his argument does not lead to the conclusion he would have us believe, that is, that we should have three transcontinental railways to take care of the traffic now or ten years from now or that the present railway facilities are not sufficient for our present needs. On the contrary it proves by comparison with conditions in the United States, and their development, that we do not need a third road at this time. I agree that the Canadian Northern railway, having lines constructed in the west, and also in the east, it is vitally important to the Canadian Northern that these two systems should be hooked up together, and that this Bill should help the Canadian Northern railway in such a way that they would be willing to reciprocate. It might be well to add another declaratory clause: And whereas there is likely to be a general election in 1911, and the Canadian Northern railway will likely contribute generously to the campaign funds, therefore, it is desirable to pass this Bill.

Bill reported.

Mr. GRAHAM moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, we all agree that this country is now experiencing a period of unusual development, although that development is no greater than is justified by its great resources, and by the enterprise and industry of its people. The Minister of Railways is inspired with a spirit of optimism. I think every Canadian is so inspired, but what I object to is that the minister should develop the spirit of optimism just at the period when this House is about to adjourn for a couple of months and that he should insist on that spirit of optimism running its full course in this particular matter, without that due consideration of the measure which otherwise it would receive. Optimism is a very desirable thing in public men in a country like Canada, in a very interesting stage of its development and progress, but there are other qualities which are just as necessary or which should at least accompany that optimism. Some of these are a reasonable regard for business methods, a reasonable amount of foresight, a reasonable amount of caution in pledging the resources of the country. The circumstances under which this Bill has been introduced, and under which it is being pressed to an unusually speedy conclusion in this House do not indicate that the government is seized of all these qualities. The Bill was introduced at a very late period. My hon. friend received a very great inspiration in the west last year. He returned from the west some time in September. Why is it that this optimism with which he was then inspired did not prompt him to introduce this measure earlier in the session? It is undoubtedly true, as the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) pointed out, that this measure has not received the consideration which it would probably have received if it had been introduced three or four months ago. But we also find that the methods of the government in introducing this Bill are otherwise not quite up to the standard which we might expect. There has been almost a complete lack of information on two points, first as to the necessity of the road and, secondly, as to its cost. When I speak of the necessity of the road, I couple with that the extremely meagre information that is embodied in the Bill with respect to the route over which the road is to be constructed. As to the cost, I repeat that if it had been my privilege to introduce a Bill like this for the consideration of the House of Commons, and if I based my claim that the Bill

should be passed on the statement that the road would cost on an average $50,000 a mile, I would have considered it my absolute duty to bring the report of at least one, and probably more than one engineer of standing who would state to the House of Commons that in his belief a road built up to that standard would cost that amount. I must repeat that I do not think the minister has treated the House of Commons with proper respect when he asks them to assume that the road will cost that amount, he himself having given no more attention to that particular phase of the question than what he has explained to us in the course of his remarks upon this Bill. The route is exceedingly indefinite. I repeat that it was the duty of the government to have given us at least ten or twelve points which this road might have been expected to touch between Rideau Junction and Port Arthur. I have not heard advanced any reason why that should not be done.

In the discussion on the resolutions I pointed out that with regard to the building of this road for a distance of four or five hundred miles north of Lake Superior, that is undoubtedly unnecessary at present. I say so for the reason that I understand the Canadian Pacific Railway can to-day accommodate over that portion of its lines five times the traffic that is offered, and we have the Grand Trunk Pacific in process of construction there, thus giving us three railways north of Lake Superior. I imagine that when these three roads are completed they will be able to carry from ten to fifteen times the traffic that will be offered for many years to come. I regard the construction of these roads there under these conditions as an economic waste. If you waste the money of Canada in building railways where they are not needed, you must necessarily deprive of railways other parts of the country that are justly entitled to them.

I desire to emphasize that this measure contains no assurance that the traffic which will be gathered by this system in western Canada will be brought all the way over Canadian routes to Canadian ports. It is idle for me to repeat my remarks on that subject. It is true the measure does embody a stipulation for an agreement to that effect, but if that agreement should not be fulfilled by these two companies I do not know what can be done about it, except possibly it might be a ground for parliament to take some step against the companies by way of retaliation or punishment, but whether such a step could be taken with advantage to the people of Canada is very problematical.

Another point is this; when the measure for the construction of the National Transcontinental railway was brought down I

urged, and others on this side of the House urged, that as the people of Canada were financing that road to the extent of more than three-fourths of its entire cost, it would have been proper that the people of Canada should have some direct interest in it. I estimated at the time that the government of Canada financed the National Transcontinental railway to the extent of nine-tenths of its cost. The people of Canada received no interest whatever in the common stock of the road, while the Grand Trunk Railway Company which assisted to a very limited extent in financing the project received the entire common stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific amounting to $25,000,000. I also pointed out that while that common stock represented no present investment of capital it would, through the progress and development of the country, ultimately acquire very great value. It seemed to us on this side of the House that the people of Canada by reason of the financial aid they were giving to that undertaking should have some direct interest in the value which would be created in that common stock by reason of the progress and growth of the Dominion. I admit that in the present case the conditions are not quite similar. We asked that the Grand Trunk Railway Company should be called on to indemnify the government against the guarantee which it was giving for the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and our motions in that regard were denied. That which was denied in the case of the Grand Trunk is carried out in this case, because the Canadian Northern does, by the terms of this agreement, indemnify the government and the people of Canada against any loss which may accrue by reason of the guarantee of the bonds of the Canadian Northern Ontario railway; so that the two cases are not quite similar. But notwithstanding that difference, inasmuch as this government is giving very important financial assistance towards the construction of this railway it would have been proper for the government to insist that the people of this country should have some direct interest in the common stock of this railway as a consideration for the aid given. The interests of the people of the Dominion have not been safeguarded in that respect nor in the other respects I have mentioned.

In conclusion I wish to say that I do not pretend to doubt that the road, as the country increases in population and development, will be a financial success, but in the net result the people of Canada, while they get the advantage of the transportation, have no further control of the rates than that which already exists through the Board of Railway Commissioners. And although the common stock of this railway will no doubt

some day reach the very high standard which the stock of other great railways in Canada has attained, and although we are contributing to the building of this road by pledging the credit of the country to the extent of about $37,000,000, the people of Canada in the end will have no direct interest whatever in all that enormous value which will come to the promoters of this road. I regret that the measure was not introduced at a time when it would have been possible for parliament to have given to this proposal the consideration and discussion which its magnitude deserves.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words on this question before we finally dispose of this Bill, if for no other reason than to put myself on record as to some of the views I hold regarding this and similar questions. This session will certainly go down to the history of the Canadian parliament as one in which we have been very prodigal in our provision for expenditure, and our assistance to railways. It is true, we have good times, the country is being developed rapidly, and the people do not feel the pinch of want very much. But that to my mind is no justifiable reason why we should go it too extravagantly in the meantime. I have been looking over what we have committed the country to during the present session and what we propose to commit it to before the session is ended, and I sum up the commitments in the following figures. First, our estimates, main and supplementaries, amount to $156,000,000, a provision for the expenditure of one year which certainly is a record-breaker, being away and above anything that Canada has ever been called upon to expend in any year up to the present time; and when one remembers that this is proposed by a party who, before they came into power, were notable for their desire for stringent economy, one realizes the wonderful difference there is in some men between professions and practice. Then, we are committing the country to an expenditure for the Canadian Northern railway of at least $37,000,000 for the first building of the road, and about $1,250,000 for the two years interest which will be borne by the country before there is anything repaid by the company. We have also on the notice paper some resolutions providing for the leasing or taking over or building of 445 miles of railways in the eastern provinces as branches of the Intercolonial railway. This will cost us, at the rate which we have estimated the Canadian Northern will cost, namely, $35,000 a mile, about $15,575,000; making in all, for these railway projects, saying nothing about the railway subsidies of which I presume we shall have some before the session ends, $52,575,000. This, added to the estimates, makes a sum total of $209,800,000 that we are during the present session, committing the country to either in the expenditure of cash or in credit. That is a very large amount of money. Perhaps the development of the country may justify it; perhaps it may be necessary; but to my mind we have not had submitted to us sufficient evidence to convince me at least that this heavy expenditure is amply justified. I know that the west is developing rapidly; I know that there will be an important trade to be handled in the future; but in my judgment the provision we have already made will be quite sufficient to handle that trade for years to come. I agree entirely with what the hon. leader of the opposition said with regard to the portion of the Canadian Northern railway passing around Lake Superior, where one railway could handle nearly all the traffic if it were run to its capacity. It seems to me it is not the height of wisdom to provide for building three railways, and the cost of maintaining the tracks when one could do the work. Therefore, I look on that expenditure as one which is not justified by circumstances, and which a good business man would have avoided in the interest of the country. We have been obliged to do this on very scanty information. I happened to be attending a committee meeting during the time the Minister of Railways made the most of his speech, and I did not hear all he said; but I read most of it afterwards, and I thought the information he gave was very meagre, and very unsatisfactory to any business man who wanted to satisfy himself as to whether we were doing the proper thing or not. One of the questions that interested me was: What did the Canadian Northern up to the present time cost per mile? I do not know whether that information was given or not. Perhaps the hon. minister will say now.

Mr. GRAHAM. No, it was not given.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that was a very important item of information that we should have had, because it would have enabled us to determine with some kind of approximate accuracy whether or not we were proposing to give too much for the building of this portion of the road. The next question was: What is its bonded indebtedness? Was that given?

Mr. GRAHAM. That was not given.

Mr. SPROULE. That is another item of information which I think the House ought

to have had to enable us to determine about what the portion of the road already built has cost. Then we could have judged whether the country was giving too large a subvention for the portion of the road proposed to be built. The next question was: What subsidies in land or money have the Canadian Northern Railway Company received or are they to receive for any portion of their road, and how much per mile does it amount to?

Mr. GRAHAM. I gave that information.

Mr. SPROULE. Can the hon. minister tell me approximately what it amounted to?

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot tell how much per mile. There was a subsidy, I suppose, of $6,400 per mile, for the portion between Montreal and Hawkesbury; but that has not been earned, as that portion has not yet been constructed. Then the Quebec legislature gave it a land grant, but that has never been earned, and will have to be revoted. The Ontario legislature gave for a portion of the road from Sudbury west 4,600 acres per mile.

Mr. SPROULE. For how many miles?

Mr. GRAHAM. I forget the distance. Then there are ten miles that will become part of this line and on which the Ontario government gave a guarantee in connection with the Toronto terminal. Those are the subsidies from Ottawa to Hawkesbury that had been paid to the Canadian Northern railway.

Mr. SPROULE. We ought to know what assistance this company has received for the building of this railway. We ought to know its indebtedness per mile and the actual cost of the road. All these things we ought to know before deciding whether or not the estimate of the cost of building that portion of the railway not yet built is too high or too low. But we are simply asked to go it blind and put this Bill through on the most insufficient data. That is not the way to treat the representatives of the people. What the road cost per mile, what is its indebtedness per mile, both by bonds and other indebtedness, what subsidies in land or money have been given or remain to be given, what the company has received in every shape or form for these portions of the road—all these things we ought to know. Then the question which interests me is: are we giving the company too much? We know that we give subsidies to railways of $3,200 per mile or $6,400 per mile, according to the cost of construction. But we have had a great many miles built without subsidy, from which the people are getting all the benefits they can expect from this line. Are we giving too much? I heard it said not long ago in Toronto that the Canadian Northern railway is one of the most fortunate railways in Canada because its bonded indebtedness is very much below that of any other railway. How did this company build its various lines? It built them through the subsidies given and by selling its bonds. The owners of this system put very little of their own money into it, so that whatever the railway costs, was paid through the assistance given by the various governments in this country and through selling its bonds. I heard an eminent financier say that if the Canadian Northern railway were as successful in the future as it has been in the past, it will not be long before it will have between five and six thousand miles of railway on which practically there is no indebtedness except the bonded indebtedness. The owners of this system will be among the richest railway men in the world without having put much of their own money into it. Are we helping them by this proposal to a greater extent than we ought, to build that portion which we are told it is so desirable to build? I think we are giving entirely too much, and I am under the impression that such is the opinion of the bulk of the people. Our people have pretty well come to the conclusion that we have reached the time when we should cease subsidizing railways because, although we have many railways to which we have given extensive subsidies, not one of them will carry a pound of freight a cent cheaper than if we had given nothing. These railway men may become rich, their shares may go to 240 or 250, their bonds may sell at a high premium, they may pay large dividends, but the users have still to pay high rates for freight and traffic. Just look at what the Canadian Pacific railway got from the country. Look at the dividends it is paying and the prices quoted for its stock and bonds, largely due to the assistance given by this country, but how much benefit has the country received from that railway on account of this assistance? The more we give, the less we get in return, and the day has passed when we should be so lavish with our assistance, without getting any consideration in return.

There is another question in this connection that interests me, more particularly as a resident of southwestern Ontario. It is said that this system will be beneficial to the whole country. Perhaps in one sense it may. But many years ago I said the building of railways through the hinterland had practically side-tracked line and the trade of the country southwestern Ontario almost entirely. Southwestern Ontario was until quite lately on the great highway of commerce, but to-day it is simply on the branch east and west is being carried away past it, although it is one of the most wealthy and most thickly populated parts of the Do-

minion. Southwestern Ontario paid proportionately a larger share of this money than any other section of the Dominion. What does she get in return? Practically this expenditure has reduced the value of her farms, destroyed her towns and cities and injured her ports in the Georgian Bay. It has practically impoverished southwestern Ontario for the benefit of the back part of the country. Indirectly that policy is doing good, but every additional line we build there is an additional highway that injures the southwestern portion of Ontario. What do we get in return? Little or nothing. The trade is being carried by our ports, our cities are being dwarfed and we are put on the branch lines instead of being the great highway of commerce which we were heretofore. . . I do not think that we should look with any favour on this proposed heavy expenditure. In my opinion the people are not getting any substantial benefit proportioned to the assistance we are giving this road. I think the government would have been well advised had they arranged, when giving this lavish support, to get some reduction in the freight rates. Had they been the good business men they profess to be, they would have made an effort in that direction.

It seems strange that, after all we have given for railways in this Dominion, stuff can be hauled twenty-five, thirty or forty miles with horse teams as cheaply as it can be carried by railway. Two years ago I had some light machinery to bring from a place about thirty-five miles this side of Toronto. I inquired at the factory what it would cost me to lay it down in Toronto and was given a figure, but was told that if it was all the same to me they could send it to Toronto a little cheaper by horse team than by the Grand Trunk railway. So it was carried thirty-five miles by horse team and put on the railway over which it had to be carried to reach its destination, and it was done cheaper than the Grand Trunk would carry it, and transfer it about half a mile to the other road. That means that there is something wrong with regard to the service the railways of this country give the people.

Well, we are called upon to pass this Bill. Is there any urgency in it? The Minister of Railways says there is, but he has not told us in what that urgency consists. We have no information, but we have pushed the measure through in a very short time. Why, if a man were buying 100 acres of land in a section not thoroughly known to him he would take more trouble about it than we are taking about this arrangement that is going to cost the country about $37,000,000. I presume the explanation of 'urgency' in this Bill is that we are near an election. It takes money to run elections, and the government must get money from some source. We know where these funds have come from in the past, and where they are likely to come from in the future.

Mr. CARVELL. The hon. gentleman should tell us where they come from?

Mr. SPROULE. I could easily give the facts as to some, and there is a good deal more that we could clear up if we had a little of the information that the hon. gentleman and his friends could so easily give. In years gone by when Sir John Macdonald proposed to build the Canadian Pacific railway, he and his party were turned out of power because it was claimed they received or were to receive $50,000 for election purposes out of the assistance given to build that railway. How many times has this government got that amount twice over to run their elections from railway corporations and not a word about it? Would they dare to take the people into their confidence and tell how much they got in the past from the Canadian Pacific railway to run an election?—how much they got from the Canadian Northern?—how much they propose to get from the Canadian Northern out of this scheme when it is passed? I am sure that if they did, it would not be worth their while to go to the country, for they would be wiped out so suddenly they would scarcely know what struck them. That is one of the great reasons for 'urgency.' That is one of its great aims, in my opinion. The people of this country ought to know that, so that they might govern themselves accordingly when the day of reckoning comes. We would like to be able to give them that information clearly, but we cannot do it because we are denied the information. So, it is because of the approach of an election that it is important to put this through. I suppose the government will put it through, but we would like the people to know what is being done with their money, the lavish way in which their funds are expended and the reckless way in which they are committed to the burdens of taxation which must be borne for all time. And when in possession of that information, I hope that when they go to the polls, they will record their votes against this very 'economical' government that, a few years ago thought $43,000,000 expended in one year meant bleeding the people white, and to-day give us to understand that $156,000,000 of expenditure is stringent economy.

Mr. LAKE. I do not wish to detain the House at this stage of the proceedings, but I desire to say just a few words in the way of protest against this legislation and of comparison with other legislation that might be introduced. Rumours have been rife during the past two or three years that

it was the intention of the government to hand over the Hudson Bay railway to the Canadian Northern Railway Company. In consequence of these rumours the strongest expression of opinion came from the people, especially the people of the west, and that expression of opinion was so strongly opposed to the proposed action that the government proposals in that respect were headed off. Now, apparently, we find that the government are determined to do something by way of making a gift to the Canadian Northern Railway Company. What can the reason be? The hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) has suggested reasons. It appears to me extremely probable that if the government had been allowed to hand over the Hudson Bay railway to the Canadian Northern Railway Company, we should not be asked to pass this legislation for them. This is making a gift to the Canadian Northern Railway Company. I speak advisedly when I say it is a gift because it means millions of dollars to that concern. And it may mean a very great burden upon the people—not less a burden because it bears the form of a guarantee for this company. For my part I would very much sooner see sums of money given outright rather than these enormous guarantees we are making, and which it appears to be the policy of the government to make to these railway companies. When this legislation is passed, I think we shall find that the people of this country are bound to the extent of somewhere near $100,000,000 of guarantees for undertakings by private companies. And we know that occasionally government guarantees have to be met. We had an example of that in the case of the Quebec Bridge Company. When the bonds were guaranteed for that bridge, it was never believed that the people would have to pay the guarantee, but the disaster to that bridge brought about a condition under which the government had to pay the money that was lost.

I wish to make a comparison between the providing of an additional transcontinental railway and the providing of a new outlet by means of the Hudson Bay railway. The people of the Northwest for many years past have been demanding an entirely new outlet for the produce of their country. They have the very highest hopes of the benefit to be derived from the building of the Hudson Bay railway. It is nearly three years ago now that the Prime Minister gave his word to the people of Canada that that railway should be built immediately. Up to the present time nothing whatever has been appropriated by this parliament for the construction of that road.

It was only on the 8th of the present month that the first sum appeared in the supplementary estimates for the commencement of that work, and up to the present moment parliament has not been asked to appropriate anything for the purpose. The sum which appears in the supplementary estimate is merely the sum of $2,000,000; that is all the government proposes to appropriate at present. If they only appropriate that amount each year, it will take fifteen to twenty years before that railway is provided for the people of the Northwest. There is an urgent demand for the construction of that railway by the people of the Northwest. The leader of the opposition this afternoon has demonstrated that there is no urgent demand for the construction of a third transcontinental railway. He has pointed out that the two railways now provided for, the Canadian Pacific railway and the Grand Trunk Pacific are amply sufficient at the present moment, and that all the freight which will be offering for many years to some will not half equal the capacity of those two railways. I think it would have been better for the government to provide for the Hudson Bay railway than to make this additional provision for another transcontinental railway which is not immediately needed. I yield to no man in my confidence in the great possibilities of our western country, but I think that at the present time the government should apply the public revenues for the extension of railway communication where it is most urgently needed, and that I believe is the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. WHITE (Renfrew). I was unfortunately unavoidably absent this morning when this Bill was discussed in committee. In looking over section 1, I find that it does not state through what towns this line of railway will pass, and I would like to know from the Minister of Railways whether it is to pass through the town of Pembroke. The Canadian Northern surveyors have been in that neighbourhood for some time, and it has been the impression that the road was going to pass through that town. Pembroke being one of the most important towns in the Ottawa valley, I would like to have the assurance of the Minister of Railways that the Canadian Northern will pass through that town.

Mr. GRAHAM. The route as approved passes within two miles on the east side of the town of Pembroke. I understood the town had some suggestions to make as to the entry, and as soon as an agreement is arrived at the route will be finally approved. If I remember rightly, it was at the instance of the town that the route was not approved before. However, I am sure it is the intention of the road to pass through the town of Pembroke. The com-

pany has never discussed any other suggestions with me.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the third time and passed.

GRAND TRUNK WESTERN RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). With the consent of the House I would like to present a matter of some urgency relating to Bill (No. 55) respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company which has been passed this session. It was found that by a clerical error the word 'principal' in one of the clauses was omitted. It is a matter of guaranteeing the bonds of the Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, which is a road on the system from Detroit to Chicago. One clause of the Bill is intended to enable the Grand Trunk Railway Company to guarantee the bonds of the Grand Trunk Western Company, but by inadvertence the Bill was read as only authorizing the guarantee of the interest, whereas the intention was to guarantee the principal as well. The Bill has come over from the Senate, amending the former Bill by inserting the word 'principal'; that is the only change in the Bill. The context clearly shows that that was the intention. I, therefore, move that Bill (No. 223) respecting the Grand Trunk railway of Canada be now read for the first time.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that the Bill sent from the Senate here is being altered?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The Bill that is now presented to the House is precisely as it was passed by the Senate; but it alters a Bill previously passed and assented to by the government, and which is now in force.

Mr. BARKER. Are we introducing the word 'principal' without further consideration by the House? The hon. gentleman will see it makes an enormous difference whether we authorize a company to guarantee principal and interest, or interest only.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is true.

Mr. BARKER. I think it ought to stand a day or two.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The motion now is only to read the Bill the first time, and I propose doing as the Senate did, having it passed without reference to the committee. I have here the proceeding of the Grand Trunk meeting held in London in April, dealing with this Bill, pointing out clearly that the intention was to guarantee the principal as well.

Mr. LENNOX. That is virtually a new Bill?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Yes, just one clause saying that section 5 of the former Bill is amended by inserting the words 'principal and,' before 'interest.'

Mr. BARKER. The interest and principal are very different, the interest would be probably 25 times the principal, and we should not pass this without its going to the committee.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I will move that it be read the first and second time, and be referred to the committee, and that all rules be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. SPROULE. Why is there so much urgency for this Bill?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The urgency is that they are in the midst of negotiations. Since Bill (No. 55) was passed, at this session, the matter has been before the meeting of shareholders in London, and as the House is about to close they are anxious to have this disposed of.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the Bill?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It dealt with several matters, but the only clause in question was one authorizing the Grand Trunk Railway Company to guarantee a new issue of bonds of the Grand Trunk Western Railway Company, part of the system from Detroit to Chicago.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Was not the original guarantee simply a guarantee of interest on those bonds? You are replacing this with a fresh issue of bonds, and in the Bill already passed the Grand Trunk are permitted to guarantee the interest just as before; now you propose to guarantee not only the interest, but the principal as well, on the American end of the road.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is quite right. They are at present guarantors for the interest only, but instead of having a second mortgage they have agreed, and desire to guarantee both principal and interest, and that is how the mistake arose, in drafting the Bill they followed the former one, guaranteeing the interest alone, whereas they wanted to guarantee the interest and principal.

Mr. BLAIN. When the matter was up for discussion in the committee was it understood that they were to guarantee the principal?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Although the Bill was in my name, I cannot now remember what occurred before the committee.

Mr. SPROULE. The hon. member has not been as frank with the House as he ought to have been. He says it was a clerical error, but now it seems it was simply the interest that was intended to be guaranteed.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It was intended to guarantee the principal as well. I have here the report of the meeting in London which shows that clearly.

Mr. LENNOX. When was this meeting?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). In April.

Mr. LENNOX. Since the Bill went through?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Yes. It was the intention from the beginning to guarantee the principal.

Mr. LENNOX. Is there any evidence of that?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I suppose we may say that until we have representatives of the railway present, that was the intention from the beginning.

Mr. BARKER. I have no doubt of the facts, but I am quite sure the proprietors of the Grand Trunk in England would be very pleased to know that some care was taken of these matters in this House, and I do not think that such a far-reaching change should be made without evidence being produced before a committee. I object to the Bill going through except in the usual way.

Mr. SPROULE. That is committing the Grand Trunk to an obligation to guarantee bonds belonging to a railway in the United States. This guarantee would take precedence of any obligations the Grand Trunk railway owe to the Dominion of Canada, and this would make Canada's security that much less valuable. We should not pass such an important measure without careful consideration.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I am not asking that it be considered now, it is to go to the committee in the usual way.

Mr. SPROULE. It looks like undue haste.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I understand there is a company in the United States, the Chicago and Grand Trunk——

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The Grand Trunk Western railway.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). And there is the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. By the amalgamation which took place some years ago, the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada acquired absolute control of the Grand Trunk in the United States although it remains a separate corporation. It had outstanding bonds. It is not as easy now as it was some time ago to finance a railway company, and even great railways like the Pennsylvania and the New York Central are feeling the stress. I suppose the Grand Trunk, desirous of having money as cheaply as possible, and to have the annual net charges reduced, has deemed it wise to have the guarantee extended to the principal as well as to the interest. Is it not a fact that the Grand Trunk owns all the stock as well as the bonds?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I have no reason to doubt that all my friend says is true, but I do not know.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex) moved that the Bill be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines, and that all rules be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That seems to be a pretty comprehensive form of motion. What would be the result of suspending all rules?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). We can strike that out.

Mr. LENNOX. The allegation is that this is to cure a mistake. If it was a mistake it ought to be corrected, but if it is not a mistake we are within a few minutes' initiating a Bill, and advancing it three stages contrary to all rules. We should have some evidence now that it is to correct a mistake.

I am not much concerned in it personally, but I have a lingering desire to see the rules observed. If my hon. friend (Mr. Clarke, Essex), knows of his own knowledge that it was a mistake, I shall be quite willing to take his statement, but if he does not know I urge my point.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I know nothing about it except that the Bill happens to stand in my name, but the committee is the only place where those who know about the mistake can appear and give evidence.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If the directors state they want the Bill amended in this way I do not see any particular reason why it should not be so amended, provided they have given proper notice to their shareholders so that they may appear before the committee if they so desire. Subject to that it is a matter that concerns the company more than it concerns anybody else.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The petition to parliament for the Bill states that it was an oversight in the original Act not to include what is now asked for.

Mr. FIELDING. If it is a clerical error it is not a clerical error on the part of parliament, but in the drafting of the Bill. No harm can be done by letting it go to the committee, but in view of the importance of the change the committee should

give it very careful consideration, and not treat it as a mere clerical error.

Motion agreed to.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING. I would like to call attention to the remaining business of the House up to the time of the adjournment. Hon. gentlemen on both sides have very reasonably urged that we should have a definite understanding as to the time of adjournment so that they may be able to make their arrangements accordingly. We have not hitherto been able to make a definite statement, but we may now say that it is our desire and intention that the House should adjourn on Friday, which is the earlier day of the two mentioned. I believe if we can arrange to adjourn on Friday we should be giving effect to the general feeling of the House.

Som hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. FIELDING. I quite understand that at this stage matters which may be submitted to the House cannot be advanced very far unless by general consent. When you are within forty-eight hours of the date fixed for adjournment any hon. gentleman who has strong objection to any particular measure can very easily prevent its enactment. In giving the list of the measures which we desire to bring to the notice of the House, and to advance, I do so with the understanding that we can only hope for success so far as they are non-contentious. There may be some of the measures which I shall mention which are in part contentious, and in part non-contentious, and we may be able to take that which is generally satisfactory, and reserve that which is debatable. Of course, fair discussion on any of these measures is invited, but if it be found there is such strong opposition to any one of these measures from any section of the House as to indicate that the discussion will carry us beyond the Friday adjournment, we frankly say we will not press that measure beyond sufficient time to ascertain the disposition of the House towards it. We propose to take up as the next measure, the Railway Act, portions of which I understand are not likely to be debatable. If there are any portions of it which are likely to give rise to debate, and in consequence to delay, the Minister of Railways will consider what portions he wishes to press, and what portions he wishes to set aside.

The special Bill respecting the Bank Act, as I have already stated, will be advanced, also a Bill which is associated with it known as the Quebec Savings Banks Bill. The Forest Reserves Bill, I am told, although it has been the subject of considerable discussion, should be passed, and is not likely to be much objected to; I do not know whether I am correct in that or not. There is also the Grain Act which my hon. friend the Minister of the Interior will advance and see what the desire of the House is concerning it. The Water Carriage Bill, which I am advised, is not likely to be contentious, will be brought forward; it is to amend an Act of a previous session, and I understand that it has been agreed upon by the Committee on Marine and Fisheries. Then, there is the Quebec Battlefields Bill, which has already engaged the attention of the House briefly, and which it is desired to advance. The resolution respecting the Japanese Treaty will be presented, and a Bill founded thereon. The Minister of Public Works has a notice on the Order Paper concerning the Collingwood Shipbuilding Company, which he will endeavour to advance. The Minister of Railways has two resolutions relating to the Intercolonial railway which will be presented for the consideration of the House under the conditions I have mentioned. We now come to the question of Supply. I shall have occasion to present this evening a small extra supplementary estimate dealing with a matter in connection with the coronation arrangements throughout the country, to which I am sure there will be no objection. We will bring forward a number of items in the estimates—I will send my hon. friend the leader of the opposition a list of them—which we will ask the House to vote for the whole year. Some of these items are small and beyond all question, and I think the committee will agree to vote them. Others are quite large, but although they are for the twelve months, the actual expenditure is likely to fall within the summer months, and a failure to grant practically the whole amount might paralyze the particular services for the whole year. That of course will have to be explained by the ministers in charge of these items when they are brought forward. Then, having obtained as much as we reasonably may of the votes for the whole year, we shall introduce a vote on account, in which I shall propose to take such sum as, united with what has previously been voted, will make five-twelfths of the estimates for the year, that being in accordance with a previous understanding. This is the programme as far as it is possible to state it now. It is possible that some measures have escaped my notice. If so, they will be added under the conditions I have mentioned. We shall only press each on the House if it proves to be of a non-contentious character.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. Minister of Finance has given us a pretty good programme for 48 hours. Including the Supply Bill, to which he has referred, it

comprises twelve Bills and resolutions which we are expected to dispose of in that time. Well, I do not suppose it is seriously expected that we shall make such remarkable progress on all these Bills or on any considerable number of them within that time; it will be absolutely impossible to do it. So far as I am personally concerned, I would rather remain until Tuesday night and give them proper discussion than to drive them through in order to adjourn on Friday night. We have been rushing things through rapidly enough, I fear too rapidly in some cases. Some of these measures may invite discussion; about some of them there will be no question whatever. I would not feel disposed, for the sake of getting away on Friday, to limit what I would regard as necessary discussion on any one of these measures. At the same time, subject to that, I would be very glad to assist in getting as many of them through as possible.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite content with my hon. friend's remarks, which are reasonable. I have certainly no desire to limit discussion on any one of these Bills. If after fair discussion hon. gentlemen still wish to postpone them, they will not be pressed, if I am right in assuming that they want to get away on Friday. Do not imagine that I would object to remain till Tuesday. I thought I was giving assent to the general wish of the House to get away on Friday, but if I am mistaken in that, I am willing to change the date to Tuesday.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I would suggest that the hon. leader of the House take up his Supply Bill first, and then we shall have time to attend to these Bills afterwards. The most important item before the House, as far as the government is concerned, is the Supply Bill. If the Minister of Railways thinks the Intercolonial Railway Bill is the most important, we can discuss that for 48 hours. There is nothing going to be advanced in this House by endeavouring to give us too much to do or by threatening us that if we do not put all these measures through we shall not get away on Friday. We can stay here till Tuesday. We have enough money left to pay our board till Tuesday, and the reasonable course for the leader of the House, to my mind, was to have brought down all the supplies he wanted as soon as the programme was laid down when the House was going to adjourn. After that we could have discussed these Bills. As I understand, the premier announced, before he left, that all the Supply that had been arranged and promised had been passed by this House except the five-twelfths. Now, there is a large Supply needed apparently over and beyond that. If the government want that Supply passed before the 23rd, I think it would be wise for the leader of the House to bring it down right away and get it passed.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the programme is not so difficult as my hon. friend imagines. We shall try to get through a number of these Bills, and if we find that they will be unduly delayed, we will not press them on the House.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY—SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.

Mr. FIELDING presented a message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting further supplementary estimates for the year ending the 31st March, 1912, which were referred to the Committee of Supply.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

Bill (No. 197) to amend the Railway Act—Mr. Graham—read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. GRAHAM. This is merely to make the section of the Act which compels the railway companies to furnish us with statistics, apply to telegraph, telephone and express companies.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Does this provide for express companies making a return also?

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not know that it would include the return which my hon. friend has in mind, but certain statistics required as to the amount of business, indebtedness, &c., from railways, is also required from telegraph and telephone companies.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The hon. minister said that possibly this Bill would cover the amendment contained in my Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. My department will have the power to make it cover that if they so desired.

On section 2,

2. Paragraph (f) of subsection 1 of section 30 of the principal Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

'And may require the company to establish and maintain an efficient and competent staff of fire-rangers, equipped with such appliances for fighting, or preventing fires from spreading, as the board may deem proper, and to provide such rangers with proper and suitable equipment to enable them to move from place to place along the line of railway with all due speed. The board may require the company to maintain an efficient patrol of the line of railway and other lands in the vicinity thereof to which fires may spread, and generally define the duties of the company, and the said fire-rangers, in respect thereof. The

board may require the company to make returns of the names of fire-rangers in its employ in the performance of the above duties, and of the places or areas in which they are from time to time engaged. For the purpose of fighting and extinguishing fires, the said fire-rangers may follow the fires which spread from the railway to, over and upon the lands to which they may spread.

Mr. GRAHAM. The matter to which this amendment refers has been discussed a great deal. The Canadian Forestry Association passed a resolution concerning this question, so did the Conservation Commission, and suggested certain amendments to the Railway Act, with the view of greater protection against fire, caused by sparks from locomotives. The amendment was not such an easy one to work out as might appear on the surface, and I took the opportunity of asking the chairman of the Conservation Commission, and Senator Edwards of the Canadian Forestry Association, besides the representatives of the railway companies and the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, to meet in my office, with the view of working out an amendment. After discussion, it was decided to ask the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners and the Chairman of the Conservation Commission to draft a clause and present it. I could not say that the clause these two gentlemen drafted met with the absolute approval of the railway companies. These companies object to its not being confined solely to forests, but they did not make serious objection, and it has met the approval of the other parties concerned. This will enable the Board of Railway Commissioners to require a railway company to protect the forests through which its railway runs and give the commissioners power to have the other portions of the country traversed by a railway protected from fire where they deem it necessary.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Does this mean that the companies are to control the whole of their lines of railways?

Mr. GRAHAM. It gives the board power to say to the railway companies, where there is danger, as in a prairie section, from fire on account of the grass: you must patrol that part of your line, but the continuous work will probably be done in the forests.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. From whom must the request come, say in a prairie section?

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the Act, the Board may, on the request of any one or on its own motion without request, give its orders. The information would have to come from some one, and when seized of the information, the board may act without request. No doubt the practice will be that some one would make a request.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The province of Ontario has power to range railways, especially in the north. Does this Act relieve the railway company from liability or expense in that respect? If you put a clause in the Railway Act of Canada, under which Act they are operating, they can say that their sectionmen are patrolling the track, looking for fires and so repudiate any attempt to compel additional ranging.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was discussed, and it was thought that this would not interfere with any arrangement made with the provinces. If there is likely to be a collision, an amicable arrangement could be arrived at by which there would be no increase of expense.

On section 3,

Subsection 1 of section 41a of the principal Act, as enacted by section 10 of chapter 62 of the Statutes of 1908, is amended by inserting immediately after the word 'railway' in the third line of the said subsection the words 'telegraph, telephone or express.'

Mr. GRAHAM. This is on account of the telegraph, telephone and express companies coming under the Act. Under the Railway Act we require each company to have some person in Ottawa on whom the board may serve notice. This provides that the express, telegraph and telephone companies shall comply with this requirement.

Section agreed to.

On section 4,

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a section in which the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara (Mr. Lancaster) is particularly interested. I told the hon. member I would let him know when this Bill was coming up. It was announced by the Minister of Finance last night, but evidently he did not catch it.

Mr. LENNOX. Since the minister mentioned it a little while ago we have endeavoured to find the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara but have not been able to do so.

Mr. GRAHAM. This section involves a legal question. It relates to the limitation to acquire land and give notice. If no hon. member wishes to discuss it now, I would suggest that we might let this stand for a little while in the hope that the hon. member for Lincoln and Niagara will be here.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Section 4 stands for further consideration.

On section 5,

Mr. GRAHAM. This is really a question between the railways. It seems to have been held that land owned by a rail-

way company, not strictly the right of way, cannot be taken by another railway without the consent of the owners. On the face of it, it looks as if every railway ought to be treated as the ordinary citizen would be treated. But such strong representations have been made by several railways concerned that I know this will cause discussion. Therefore, I propose as it is a contentious clause to let it come up another session.

Section 5 struck out.

On section 6,

Mr. GRAHAM. I would like some of the legal gentlemen in the House to look through this and see that it is all right. It is an amendment proposed by the chairman of the Ontario Municipal and Railway Board, and is to provide for the formation of a joint board to consist of members of the Ontario board and members of the federal board to deal with questions such as the physical connections between a railway having a provincial charter and one having a Dominion charter. The Ontario House passed their Act, and I agreed to pass one in conformity with it.

Mr. LENNOX. This is a matter that has been very much needed for many years. The people have had great difficulty about it. As the minister knows I have given some attention to the subject. The chairman of the board here was good enough to talk with me in reference to it; I have had two or three conversations with him at various times. It was up for discussion in the House last session, but we could not get it through. The member of the Ontario board, Mr. Leitch, was here and I discussed the matter with him. The two chairmen gave their experience in the drafting of this section, as I understand it, and I have no doubt they succeeded in putting it in good shape. It would be almost presumptuous in me to say that it appears to me to be all right, but I have taken an interest in the matter, and I feel confident that this section will be found satisfactory.

Mr. BARKER. Do I understand that these clauses have been approved by the provincial authorities?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Ontario legislature has passed a similar enactment. The chairman of the Ontario board and the chairman of the Dominion board came to me and placed this in my hands.

Mr. LENNOX. I think that at the time this was being considered, the international railway question was before the Railway Board here, and so the chairman had the benefit of that experience as well.

Mr. HERRON. As this deals in some way with provincial charters, I would like to know from the minister if there has been brought to his notice the question of a railway with a provincial charter getting right-of-way across an Indian reserve? Is there provision for such an emergency? Would it come under a Bill of this kind?

Mr. GRAHAM. I should think that would be a matter between the Department of the Interior and the company making the application.

Mr. HERRON. The question was brought up last summer in the southern part of Alberta, and I understood from the representatives of the company that they had communicated with the local government, and it was found there was no way by which they could force a right-of-way across the reserve. I did not know but that the matter had been brought to the attention of the minister. Some provision should be made for such a contingency.

Mr. GRAHAM. It should be done under the Indian Act rather than under the Railway Act. Indian lands are in a peculiar position, the Indians being wards of the government. It would hardly do to decide under the Railway Act how land is to be taken away from the Indians.

Mr. DOHERTY. My impression is that we did enact a provision of that kind.

Mr. GRAHAM. I thought so, and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), tells me that it has been done.

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, I think it is covered by the Bill which was passed this session relating to Indian reserves.

Section 6 agreed to.

On section 7,

Section 235 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words 'the railway' at the commencement of the said section and substituting therefor the words, 'Subject to the company making such compensation to, adjacent or abutting land owners as the board deems proper, the railway of the company.'

Mr. GRAHAM. This covers a question which arises where an electric railway, it may be a steam railway, is allowed to run on a highway, there does not seem to be any provision for the owner of property abutting on the street to secure damages. This is provided to get compensation if he sustains damages in this way.

Mr. BARKER. There are cases of that kind referred to in Hamilton. Serious damage was done, and yet no compensation could be had.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why is not the fixing of the amount of damages left under the expropriation clause of the Bill instead of being referred to the Railway

Commission? As the section now reads the board will fix the damages instead of the arbitrators.

Mr. LENNOX. I think section 235 should be amended to read: 'subject to the company making compensation to adjacent or abutting land owners.'

Mr. GRAHAM. I am quite willing to accept that amendment. Let it read: 'Subject to the company making compensation to such of the adjacent or abutting landowners as the board deems proper.'

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Who has been asking for this legislation?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think there is a case in court at the present time about it. But this will not interfere with the present litigation. The Board of Railway Commissioners asks for it.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). We will have a thousand cases of this kind in the courts inside of the next year if you put that amendment in the Act, because everybody having a railroad running in front of his place will soon find occasion of bringing an action against the railway company. In the United States they have just such legislation. In nearly all the states of the union the owner of the property abutting on the highway owns the right of the land as far as the centre of the highway. Consequently if a railway runs in front of his property, even a street railway, they have got to get the right from the owner of the property, apart from the municipality. In this country the rights of highways are vested in the Crown, and the Crown can give anybody the right to run a railway on a highway. The only right the municipality has about highways is the right to prevent the creation of a nuisance on that highway. This amendment will create the impression that the owners of all the land along the railway, or highway where the railway runs, have some vested interest in the highway. I think the courts are quite capable of guarding the interests of everybody along these routes, and they are doing it now. This will simply invite further litigation.

Mr. LENNOX. I am sorry I cannot agree with my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). As I understand this section, there is no possibility of getting any compensation, no matter how much a man suffers, where a railway crosses the highway. This provides that if it is a proper case they still shall have the right to cross the highway; but if it is a case where compensation ought to be awarded, then the crossing shall be subject to the right of compensation after the board has so determined. That does not invite litigation. The board will say whether each man's case shall be considered or not.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I am not a lawyer, but I understand that the railway can run along a highway, but if they put anything on it that will injure the value of your property, you can sue them and get redress. This permits of many other things. For instance, if a railway passes fifty yards from your house and shakes the dishes off the table, you can sue them for damages.

Mr. PORTER. This amendment as proposed seems to go a great deal farther than is intended. Under the original clause, section 235, provision is made for crossing highways. By the interpretation clauses of the Act a highway is defined to cover more than is ordinarily understood as a public highway, certain roadways, alleys, &c., are defined to be public highways for the purposes of the Act. A case arose before the board two or three weeks ago in which I was interested, the case of the Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company. The minister will recollect that there is an approach of about three quarters of a mile from one of the streets in Belleville to the superstructure of the bridge. The Canadian Northern railway in its Toronto-Ottawa line is crossing that approach to the bridge and a question arose whether that was a highway under which they could expropriate under this section of the Act or whether it was private property. It belongs to the Belleville-Prince Edward Bridge Company and they operate for toll, but under the description of a highway in the Railway Act it would come within the description of a highway. The Board of Railway Commissioners held, however, upon the construction of the statute, that the approach to the bridge not being a public highway in every sense of the word, the railway company must treat for that land in the same manner as they would treat for crossing any land of a private individual. The result was that the railway company opened negotiations with the bridge company and made an arrangement by which they were to cross, so far as compensation is concerned. By the passage of this amendment as it appears here, if that power is left in, the Board of Railway Commissioners would have power to deal with that. It would be contrary to the decision already given and unless it is the desire of the Board of Railway Commissioners or unless it would be advantageous to take it out of the category it is now in and place it in the other, it would be better that that clause be not passed now, as it would complicate the matter. It should be made clear, because the order directed by the board has not yet been issued, and as some parts of the Bill will be left over, it might be wise for the minister to allow this to stand in order that the board may be

consulted as the amendment seems to me to go further than was intended.

I would also suggest an amendment to section 196 of the Railway Act, which deals with the expropriation of land as it is ordinarily understood, and provides that:

If within ten days after the service of such notice, or within one month after the first publication thereof, the opposite party does not give notice to the company that he accepts the sum offered by it, the judge shall, on the application of the company, appoint a person to be sole arbitrator for determining the compensation to be paid as aforesaid, provided that the judge shall, at the request of either party, on such application, appoint three arbitrators, &c.

By this clause, the railway company may obtain the appointment of an arbitrator to fix the compensation but there is no corresponding right on the part of the land owner. Suppose the railway company serve that notice, and within ten days the owner does not say whether he will accept or will refuse, that is taken as a refusal. There is nothing in the Railway Act by which the owner can take proceedings to compel the railway company to arbitrate; if the railway company do not see fit to make an application to the judge to appoint arbitrators, the railway company may let the thing drag along for a year or two. That is an undesirable state of affairs. It came up recently in connection with the construction of the Toronto-Ottawa line of the Canadian Northern railway. There in a number of cases where land has been expropriated, the railway has been constructed across this land, but the owners have refused to accept the compensation offered; the railway company will not take any proceedings to have an arbitration, and the owners cannot take any because there is no provision in the statute by which they can do so; the result is that those whose lands are taken in that way are held up, and are at the mercy of the company. It is said the company are using the power thus placed in their hands to force the owners to accept such compensation as they may see fit to offer rather than engage in any litigation. It seems a very unfair position, what is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander. If the railway company is given a right to provide for arbitration the owner should have the same right. It could be remedied by having the clause read:

Upon the application of the railway company or the owner.

Mr. GRAHAM. That matter was brought to my attention some time ago, and an amendment was suggested. Going through the various sections my hon. friend will understand that scores of amendments are suggested. This is one that fell by the wayside. I understand more clearly now the real objection to the clause as it stands, but I would like to discuss it with the Chairman of the Board before making an amendment. If this section is debatable to that extent possibly we might let it stand.

Section 7 allowed to stand.

On section 8, transmission of electrical energy.

Mr. GRAHAM. Under the present arrangement for crossing a highway special application has to be made to the board. This is to provide that the board may give a general order under general conditions by which a wire can be laid across.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Why should that not apply to telephone wires as well as to electrical energy wires?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not see why the Railway Board cannot have their engineers design a standard form of crossing for telephone and telegraph wires, because it is a great hardship to compel small independent telephone lines to appear before the board and go to the expense of drawings and all that kind of thing. A telegraph wire is not nearly as dangerous as a telephone wire, and the minister would be justified in including telephone wires in this clause.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Even though there are standard conditions, should the railway company object, application will still have to be made to the board. I suppose the railway company would invariably object.

Mr. GRAHAM. In nine cases out of ten the companies do not object now, but the chairman of the board thought it wise to leave in that provision in case some special condition might arise. I cannot just now see what objection there is to adding telephone wires, but I will let the clause stand and make inquiry.

On section 9—waterpipes.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). In this case also the consent of the railway company is necessary. Could not the onus be put on the railway company to formulate the objection?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would prefer to leave the clause stand as the board has arranged it, and we can see how it works out.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). In former days the railway companies always objected, and it was only when Mr. McGuigan became a power in the Grand Trunk that a farmer was allowed to drain his land across the railway track. He took the ground that if the farmer could raise an extra bushel of

grain on the land to be drained the railway company would have that much more crop to haul. This has been a very contentious matter. What is the law now?

Mr. GRAHAM. The Board of Railway Commissioners has the power to allow these pipes to be placed on application of the parties, and this clause provides a certain standard method under which the pipes can be laid without application to the board, if no objection is raised.

On section 10—fencing right of way.

Mr. GRAHAM. Hon. gentlemen from the west will have interest in this clause. It is not easy to frame a law on this matter which will apply equally to the older sections of the Dominion as to the new. This clause has received the attention of the Railway Commissioners, and it has been discussed with the representatives of the western farmers in the desire to reasonably meet their views. This clause seems to meet the difficulty fairly well, and has practically been agreed to. The present law relieves the company from fencing unless the board orders them to fence, and we are now reversing this, and saying that they shall have to fence unless the board relieves them from the obligation.

Mr. LENNOX. We contended for that in 1903 when the Railway Act was passed.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Suppose the board should make an order relieving the company permanently, not temporarily, has the board power to vary that order?

Mr. GRAHAM. The board has that power under the general Act, and they use it frequently.

Mr. HENDERSON. They vary their orders every day just as they deem fit.

Mr. MAGRATH. Under subsection 5, where a railway is being constructed through inclosed land it shall be the duty of the company to take effective measures to prevent cattle, and other animals escaping from such inclosed land on the property of the company. That is all right as far as it goes; but if a railway company is building through a field of wheat, and the contractors working for the company see fit to throw down the fences, the railway company claims that there is no responsibility on its part. I know a case in which under such circumstances a man lost his entire crop. That should be from vided for.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a clause to cover that point. The proposed clause in lieu of subsection 5 is this:

Where the railway is being constructed through inclosed lands, it shall be the duty of the company to take effective measures to prevent cattle or other animals escaping from or getting upon such inclosed lands or upon the property of the company, by reason of any act done or permitted to be done by the company.

Mr. LENNOX. Would that make them liable for the action of the contractor?

Mr. MAGRATH. I would like to see the clause put in such shape that the company must settle for the damages in two weeks, because I know cases in which the companies have been humbugging with settlers. How does the settler proceed to secure his remedy?

Mr. GRAHAM. I suppose he can only have the ordinary recourse of suing for damages. The trouble, as I understood it, from the complaints made to me, was that settlers would have their fences thrown down, and cattle would get in and destroy their crops, and the company would not be responsible. We try to make them responsible whether they do that or permit it to be done.

Mr. MAGRATH. I know it is a serious question. You get contractors rushing through and building a railway, and they are not at all considerate of the people whose lands they go through. I know instances where crops have been damaged and the owners have not been able to get any redress, even from the Railway Commission.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not think the wording suggested by the minister would exactly meet the case mentioned by the hon. member from Medicine Hat. It makes the company responsible for anything that is done or permitted to be done by the company. A case might arise where the company, in making its contract, would stipulate with the contractor that he must keep the fences in order, and must refrain from doing anything that would permit the cattle to escape. The company in that case would say, we did not permit that to be done, but did our best to prevent it; it is the action of an independent contractor. If it is intended to make the company responsible for the negligence of its agents or contractors, that should be provided for by express words.

Mr. GRAHAM. The section provides that the company shall take effective measures to prevent.

Mr. DOHERTY. But it goes on to limit the obligation of the company to prevent by the words 'by reason of any act done or permitted to be done by the company.' I am not prepared to say that under that wording the company would not be responsible if the contractors did it; but if the intention is to make it clear that the company

is to be responsible for the contractors' neglect, I would suggest that you make it read: 'done or permitted to be done by the company or by any agent or contractor acting for it.'

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Might I make a suggestion? Strike out the words 'to take effective measures' so that the clause will read 'it shall be the duty of the company to prevent cattle, &c.' That makes the duty absolute upon the company.

Mr. LENNOX. As the minister is leaving a number of these sections over, he might probably leave this one also, and the hon. member for St. Anne division (Mr. Doherty) could draft a clause. There has been great difficulty arising out of this very matter of the independent contractors. I have had cases in which I could not recover from the railway company on that account. The minister is anxious to get a remedy, and we might frame a section in the meantime.

Mr. GRAHAM. What I was trying to accomplish was not only to protect the farmers against loss from the killing of stock, but also from injury to crops by the cattle going through them.

Mr. BARKER. I would suggest that clause 5 should read:

Where the railway is being constructed through inclosed lands, the company shall prevent cattle and other animals escaping from such inclosed lands upon the property of the company.

Mr. GRAHAM. The objection to that would be that it would only prevent their getting on the company's land and they might get into some other fellow's field.

Mr. SHARPE. (Ontario). I would suggest to strike out the last three words 'permitted by the company' and substitute 'done or omitted to be done by the company, its servants, agents, contractors or workingmen.'

Mr. HERRON. I hope the company will be able to arrange this matter so that a clause of this kind may become law. The grievance is a very serious one, especially in the county I represent, as the railway companies are killing horses and cattle there almost every week in the year. Sometimes they kill them in bunches of a dozen head at a time; and in the last few years they have refused compensation of any kind. I would like to know particularly whether, if the railway board, under subclause 4 of section 10, should relieve a company from putting in cattle guards or building fences, would the company then be responsible for stock running at large and being killed?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend will find that provided for in the next clause. How would it do to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) subject to discuss again in committee and add the words 'done or omitted to be done by the company, its agents, contractors or servants'?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). That throws the onus on the owner of the land to prove that the company threw down the fences and let the cattle get in on the land. The hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) made the best suggestion, putting the absolute duty on the railway company of preventing damage.

Mr. PORTER. Suppose a man not connected with the railway should throw down a fence, the railway would be held responsible?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is the view which accounts for the words 'effective measures' being in the proposed amendment. I suggested making it very drastic, but the Justice Department thought I should only make the railway company responsible for their own acts and not for other people's acts.

Mr. MAGRATH. I do not agree with the hon. minister. When contractors take a contract from a railway company, they employ all kinds of people, and those men are passing in and out of one's property when building the road through it. Some one should be responsible for these men. If they should throw down a gate or tear down a fence at night, some one should be made responsible to the owner. If the minister allows this clause to stand over, I would suggest that he give it more thought and let us have an opportunity to discuss the proposed amendment again. If contractors undertake to build a railway and go on my property, they should see that my property is protected.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I would like to call attention to this case. Suppose cattle escape, through the negligence of the company, from inclosed lands on to other property, and then escape on to still further property, would the clause cover that?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think it would. It was intended to make the company responsible for whatever might result from their action or omission.

Section allowed to stand.

On section 11,

11. Sections 294 and 295 of the principal Act, and sections 8 and 9 of chapter 50 of the Statutes of 1910, are repealed, and the following is enacted as section 294 of the principal Act:

294. The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be killed or injured upon the company's lands through the opera-

tion of the railway, save where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person—

(a) failing to keep the gates at any farm crossing, at each side of the railway closed, when not in use; or,

(b) leaving open any gate on either side of the railway provided for the use of any farm crossing without some competent person being at or near such gate to prevent animals passing through such gate on to the railway; or,

(c) other than an officer, contractor, or employee of the company, taking down any part of the railway fence; or,

(d) turning any animal upon or within the enclosure of any railway company; or,

(e) except as authorized by this Act, without the consent of the company, riding, leading or driving any animal, or suffering it to enter upon any railway and within the fences and guards thereof; or,

(f) leaving the gates of the company at railway stations open for the convenience of the public.

Mr. GRAHAM. This clause has the approval of the Farmers' Association as it is now drawn:

The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be killed or injured upon the company's lands through the operation of the railway, save where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person.

Then it gives the exceptions. It repeals absolutely the clause which provides that cattle shall not run at large on the highways within half a mile of a railway. The exceptions are just as they were in the old Act with one added—relating to gates at railway stations left open for the convenience of the public—the company is not held liable for cattle going in through these gates. With the exceptions made in the Bill the railway company is liable in all cases.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). This is a very important section. Cases under it arise in every part of the Dominion. I would suggest that this section be allowed to stand until we have an opportunity to look into it. There are words at the close of this section that, I think, should not be there, the words, 'any person.' The effect of the section is to provide that the railway shall not be liable for cattle killed if the killing is caused by reason of 'any person' leaving the gate open. It does not confine it to the owner of the premises. Might not a stranger, in walking through a man's farm, leave the gate open so that the cattle might get out and get killed? Yet, in that case the railway would not be responsible.

Mr. GRAHAM. Are they to be responsible for the acts of a person with whom they have no connection?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I think that under the Act as it is now the railway company is liable unless it can show negligence on the part of the owner. The onus is on the railway company.

Mr. GRAHAM. The people who are most interested agreed to this. It took me some weeks to get a Bill that would be drastic and yet acceptable, and, having reached that point, I would not like to change it if it can be avoided.

Mr. BARKER. It might be a question whether the neighbour who leaves the gate open should not be responsible for damages.

Mr. LENNOX. It would be all right to make it apply to the owner of the land or his servant. But if it would apply in the case of 'any person' as is proposed here—I would not go so far as that.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). This question of farm crossings is very involved and difficult, but when a railway company goes through a property, and creates a nuisance, the liability properly rests upon them for keeping the fences in order.

Mr. LENNOX. It is the railway fence, and they should keep it closed. The only thing that should deprive the owner of compensation is the leaving of the gate open by himself or his servant.

Mr. BARKER. That would be carrying the responsibility of the railway company altogether too far. The railway is in the public interest, but it is in his own interest the farmer gets the gate. If the railway company were called upon to undertake the keeping of all such gates closed the expense would be enormous. The farmer who gets the gate usually takes upon himself the duty of seeing that it is kept closed, and he should not allow other people to open it. It is his business to keep it closed.

Mr. LENNOX. I do not agree with the hon. member (Mr. Barker), that the farmer gets the gate for his convenience. The farmer has his farm, and the railway company runs through it. The railway company must put up the fence, and it is right that the farmer should be, as far as possible, left in the condition he was in before. I think the only burden on the farmer should be that he shall not neglect to close his gate, but if any stranger or employee of the railway company should leave the gate open, the railway should be responsible. They create the condition of things that makes it dangerous. The farmer should be responsible only for the actions of himself and his servants or agents in these matters.

Mr. NESBITT. I agree largely with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), though I do not go quite so far as he does. I agree partially with the hon. member for South Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), that 'any

person' might include the railway servants, which it ought not to do. If the railway's servants leave the gate open—which, by the way, they sometimes do—the railway should be responsible, but for any other person the farmer should be responsible, for it is his duty to see that the gate is kept shut.

Mr. BARKER. I would like to add this, and I am sure the Minister of Railways will consider it. We here must think not merely of the loss to the farmer in having cattle killed, but also of the more important consideration of the safety of trains. If every farmer along a thousand miles of railway might, without risking personal loss, leave his gate open negligently, trusting to the duty of the railway company to keep his gates closed, we should have plenty of railway accidents, for gates could be left open, cattle would go upon the track and be run into, and trains would be thrown off the track.

Mr. MAGRATH. No one should be on the railway track unless he is a servant of the railway company, and if such a man goes through a farmer's property, and leaves the gate open the railway company should be liable. The railway company has the privilege of arresting anybody for trespassing on its property.

Mr. MARSHALL. It seems to me that the difficulty could be overcome by the farmer putting a lock on the gate. I agree with the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), that it would be unreasonable to ask that the railway be held responsible.

Mr. GRAHAM. This section was an important point, but I think it was pretty well considered. I think it is not a breach of confidence to say that the chairman of the Railway Commission was strongly of the view that it would save many cattle if a clause were put in the Act to fine every farmer who leaves his gate open. I could not go quite so far. A railway runs through a man's farm, and he gets damages. He wants a crossing, and makes application to the board. But the board is very fair to the farmers in giving them crossings. I would insist always that the gate shall be kept closed by the farmer or his assistants or your transportation might be ruined as well as the farmer's stock killed, but I will go as far as any person to make the railways responsible for their neglect to protect the farmer's cattle. But there is a certain liability on the part of the owner of stock from which he should not be relieved altogether. I do not think the farmers would appreciate our saying that they had no responsibility at all. The chairman of the board had strong views on that point, and the farmers themselves are willing to assume all just liabilities for their own actions.

Mr. NESBITT

Mr. SCHAFFNER. When this Bill is passed I presume it refers only to the owners of cattle and property through which the railway runs. We have had cases in the west where the cattle of a man who owned land half a mile from the railway, finding the fences down, strayed away on to the railway. This Bill says the company shall be liable to the owner for the full amount of the cattle killed or injured. Where a man owns cattle a mile away from the railway, and they stray on the railway and are killed, does this law allow him compensation?

Mr. GRAHAM. This law would allow him compensation. I imagine it would not if his cow was killed at a crossing, but if anywhere else on the track, he would get compensation.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. According to the present law I do not think he does receive compensation.

Mr. BARKER. That is the old law.

Mr. GRAHAM. This Act repeals the clause which says that cattle shall not be left running at large within half a mile of a railway. That was made for the west where cattle grazed beside the track, and was the source of vexation. Then the railway must pay full compensation to every person whose cattle are killed, except in the circumstances named here.

Mr. BARKER. Under the old law cattle running at large and getting upon another man's land were trespassers, and the trespassing owner had no right as against the railway company, and could not recover.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the cattle were at large within half a mile of the track, the railway had a defence to put up.

Mr. PORTER. It might meet the case by striking out the word 'person' in the clause which says 'where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person,' and make it read 'by reason of any owner, or railway company, or their agents, servants or workmen failing to keep the gates closed.' That would make it equally the duty of the farmer and the railway company to keep the gates shut.

Mr. GRAHAM. The railway company is not responsible for keeping a farmer's gates shut.

Mr. NESBITT. I suggest to add, after the word 'person,' 'any person excepting the company or their servants.'

Mr. MARSHALL. I understand from the minister that if the gates are left open, and cattle are killed, the farmer will get nothing for his cattle. But supposing those cattle cause the wreck of a train or dam-

age to a train, would the farmer be liable for that?

Mr. GRAHAM. We passed an Act last year to make that clear. Would these words be acceptable 'Where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person not being an employee or agent of the company'? Personally I feel that in the interests of those most affected we might as well not pass the item at all as not meet the views on which all were agreed. It was agreed by all parties that this was a solution of the difficulty.

On section 12, correction of clerical errors.

Mr. NESBITT. The provision in section 12:

No action shall lie against the company by reason of anything in any policy of insurance or by reason of payment of any moneys thereunder,

is unfair legislation.

Mr. GRAHAM. There is no new legislation in this section, that is already on the statute-books.

Mr. NESBITT. I think it is bad legislation.

Mr. CARVELL. The matter wes dealt with by a special committee last year which met representatives of the railway companies and others concerned, and this clause was agreed upon. There would be a good deal of dissatisfaction if it were changed now.

Mr. NESBITT. The railway companies were represented on the committee but not the insurance companies. I was on the committee.

Mr. CARVELL. Everybody was represented who should be.

On section 13, Railway Commission and electrical power.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have given the Board of Railway Commissioners, power to say at what price power generated from waterpowers under Dominion jurisdiction shall be furnished. This gives them power to issue orders as to the quantity to be furnished.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Subsection 2 provides machinery to ascertain the quantity whether they have a sufficient quantity. Should that not also apply to subsection 3 so that they can ascertain whether the company need all the power for their own use?

Mr. GRAHAM. The reason for that is that we have leased many powers to companies solely for their own use. This is to provide that it shall not be possible for any one to demand of them power which they have not even a right to dispose of.

On section 14, government aided railways falling into bad repair.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an important and drastic amendment. In Canada we have granted aid very liberally towards railways. Cases have been brought to my notice where railways liberally aided by the parliament of Canada have allowed their roads to become so delapidated that a train cannot be run safely on them. In some cases the rails have been taken up and we have had the spectacle of a road that the people have helped to construct vanishing as old rails, the receipts being obtained by the owners of the road. The railways are aided for the purpose of giving the people transportation and it ought to be our view to have that object carried out even at the expense of the country. This section provides that where a company under federal jurisdiction has been aided by the Dominion parliament and its road becomes unfit to operate, this aid becomes a first lien on that road, and the Board of Railway Commissioners, at the request of the minister, can practically foreclose that first lien, sell the road or dispose of it and use the funds to put it in proper condition, something to get the people the use of the road for which they paid. The objection has been raised that it is dangerous legislation to say that the aid given as a gift by the parliament of Canada should be allowed to become an underlying charge, even under the first mortgage bonds. There is a good deal of force in that argument, but there is this reply, that a road which gets into that condition does not give any value to its first mortgage bonds or any other bonds, and the only way for the railway to be made of any use to the people or value to the bondholders is to have it put in proper condition. The object of this is to practically give the government power to take possession of these roads it has aided and see they are put in proper condition for the use of the people.

Mr. PORTER. Has the minister any such railway in his mind that he could mention?

Mr. GRAHAM. I would not care to mention them, because if I were wrong it would be unfair to the railways. This clause will, I think, be a mighty lever to have these railways put in a fit condition to operate.

Mr. PORTER. I had in mind the branch line from Madoc to Eldorado, which was subsidized by the federal government and the municipalities through which it runs and has not been operated for a number of years. The hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) made an effort to have this

road operated, but without success. Would this clause compel the railway company to operate that road?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the road is unfit to be operated on account of its condition, means are provided here to put it in proper condition, but I am not sure it would compel operation.

Mr. PORTER. It may be confiscated.

Mr. GRAHAM. Well, disposed of.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There ought to be some provision for notifying the bondholders before the road is closed up.

Mr. GRAHAM. All interested parties would, I suppose, be notified by the board.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). This clause does not cover the case of the railway I have mentioned.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not think it does.

Mr. PORTER. Would it not be well to take power to compel the operation of that and other such railways? This line has been subsidized, but it has not been operated for a number of years, and no other company will undertake to build in that territory, because if they did the Grand Trunk would likely commence to operate the Madoc and Eldorado branch line. In such cases it would be well to empower the board to take action.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is a good deal in the suggestion of the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) that the first notice should go to the bondholders.

Mr. GRAHAM. We will amend the clause so as to read that the trustees of the bondholders, if any, shall be notified.

Mr. PORTER. What does the minister think of the suggestion regarding the case I have mentioned?

Mr. GRAHAM. I think we had better not try to enlarge the scope of the Bill at present.

Mr. MAGRATH. If a road gets into that condition, it is because it is not a paying proposition, and I do not think there is much use in attempting to put it into proper condition unless you are prepared to provide that it must be operated.

On section 15,

Mr. GRAHAM. I wish to move that in the first line of section 372 after the word 'annually' there be inserted the words 'or more frequently if the minister so requires.' Heretofore the companies have been required to make returns semi-annually of certain accidents. As a matter of fact, they only make them annually. I am making it legal for them to make the returns annually for our general report, because we only issue it annually, but I am providing that on the request of the minister they shall make them more frequently, and I propose to include with other accidents, the killing of animals.

Amendment agreed to, and section 15 as amended agreed to.

On section 16,

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a section which I want to substitute for this. At the present time, when a railway company proproposes to change its tariff, it has to give only ten days' notice. I am asking that subsection 3 of section 328 be amended by striking out the word 'ten' and substituting the word 'thirty.' The meaning of that is that the railway company will be compelled to give thirty days' notice instead of ten.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). As the object of this Bill is to straighten out a good many matters that are not very straight just now, I wish to mention that in connection with the building of the Transcontinental railway lands have been taken from the former owners and are now being used for the railway without having been paid for. An ordinary railway company has to make a deposit in court before it can go into occupation of lands so taken. It is not so with the Transcontinental railway. Besides the provision in the Transcontinental Railway Act for the expropriation of lands, there are conferred upon the commissioners all the rights that are given to a railway company under the Railway Act and its amendments. Proceedings have been taken in the Exchequer Court, and Judge Cassels, I believe, has held, in the case of King vs. Jones, that the proper proceeding is to proceed under the provisions of the Railway Act, and not under the Expropriation Act, and in the Exchequer Court. The Deputy Minister of Justice, I believe, differs from the judge, and the case is now in appeal, I believe, before the Supreme Court.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that it has been decided that the Exchequer Court has jurisdiction, reversing the judgment.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). In that case I beg the minister's pardon. That will relieve us from the difficulty. In the neighbourhood of Winnipeg a great many cases were held up, and hundreds of thousands of dollars, I believe, were not paid to the claimants. If the matter had remained as it was, I was going to ask for the insertion of a declaratory section in this Bill so as to relieve the difficulty.

Mr. PORTER. I would like to inquire of the minister whether there has been

any complaint to any great extent in regard to the operation of the provisions of the law in dealing with claims for damages for the killing of animals on railways. The practice now is to take such claims before the Railway Commission instead of as formerly before the local courts, and there has been in my section of the country a great deal of complaint of delay in consequence. Has there been any complaint of that kind made or is the new regulation operating to advantage?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a great deal of complaint from western Canada but none from eastern Canada. The complaint from western Canada arises out of the belief that the railway companies kill cattle and horses and then their employees immediately bury them, so that a farmer, after hunting for months, will discover his stock beneath the sod. It is said that the railway companies dispute all and sundry claims, and it is very difficult for a farmer under the circumstances to prove his allegation.

Mr. PORTER. If the local courts had jurisdiction, at the expense of some $5 or $10, a farmer could bring his action and have his case tried, whereas now the cost and trouble are prohibitory.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does the hon. gentleman say that the jurisdiction of the local courts is taken away?

Mr. PORTER. Yes. Suppose a farmer has a cow killed on a railway, instead of going to a division court he has to apply to the Railway Commission.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What section of the Act compels him to do that?

Mr. PORTER. I have not the section, but that is the practice. As soon as a claim is made on a railway company, which they dispute, they say it has to go to the Railway Commission.

Mr. GRAHAM. In that they are wrong.

Mr. PORTER. That is the practice.

Mr. PUGSLEY. People go to the Railway Commission because they think they can get speedier justice.

Mr. GRAHAM. A year ago we changed the Act relating to the Intercolonial railway to provide that the ordinary law shall apply to the Intercolonial railway, and thus enable claimants for damages on account of cattle killed on the government's railway to go to the ordinary court, as they would in the case of cattle killed on an ordinary railway.

Mr. HERRON. I know of many cases, such as described by my hon. friend from Hastings (Mr. Porter), of animals killed, and the railway companies simply laughed at the claims for compensation. I never heard any complaint made regarding the change from the common courts to the Railway Board because the railway companies have absolutely refused to pay damages of any kind. These companies killed at least 50 animals within a few miles of my home within the last few years and refused to pay damages of any kind.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I would be surprised to learn that such an amendment to the Railway Act was enacted because I had a couple of suits last year for loss of cattle which I won in the ordinary courts. It would be very extraordinary if there was such an amendment because that would deprive us of a right to a jury trial, and jury trials are very effective against railway companies.

Mr. HERRON. I would like to draw attention to clause (5) in section 11:

> The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, swine, sheep or other cattle.

I think that the words 'other animals' should be substituted for 'other cattle,' so as to cover every class of animal likely to be damaged. There is one valuable class of animals plentiful in the country and I do not think you could collect under this clause.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend will look at the interpretation clause of the Act he will find that the word 'cattle' is a very comprehensive term and includes everything except those animals specifically mentioned in that clause.

Progress reported.

THE BANK ACT.

Mr. FIELDING moved third reading of Bill (No. 213) to amend the Bank Act.

Mr. HENDERSON. I find in the schedule the name of the Farmers' Bank, of Canada. That charter, I understand, is to be completed along with others although the bank is practically out of business. What effect will this legislation have on the Farmers' Bank?

Mr. FIELDING. That point has been carefully considered. I am advised by the law officers that this amendment leaves matters exactly as they are. Whatever rights any party has with regard to the Farmers' Bank remain undisturbed.

Mr. HENDERSON. It is not intended that the Farmers' Bank shall be able to do business.

Mr. FIELDING. No, it is practically suspended by its insolvency. This will simply give them beyond question the power of winding the thing up in proper

form. The Department of Justice advised that it was expedient to put in the name for that purpose.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I would call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the desirability of appointing a Royal Commission to inquire thoroughly into the conditions of banks in this country and other countries with the view of improving our present Banking Act. Recent events have disclosed many serious defects in it. The provisions regarding government inspection do not meet with the approval of many people. The provision in the Bill brought down, would not meet the approval of many people outside the bank authorities.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not sure that they approve it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I do not think they would raise any serious objections to it. I should imagine it should meet with their approval.

Mr. FIELDING. It did not emanate from them.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am glad to hear that because I was under the impression it had been drafted by the counsel of the Bankers' Association, or some one standing close to them. I do not think that our banks pay enough for the great privileges they enjoy. In France, England and Germany the banks pay the government for the privilege of issuing currency. Under our system they pay nothing. There should be some restraint, some taxation, should be placed on the right to send money out of the country for speculative purposes. All these and a great many other important matters should be thoroughly investigated by a commission and reported to our next parliament. For when the Bank Act is before the commission what may we expect? We shall have bank presidents and inspectors presenting their views, but no one to speak on behalf of the people. If we had a Royal Commission to examine and report, it might make many suggestions which would assist us to come to a proper conclusion. In the Toronto 'Telegram' of May 16, I find this despatch from Washington:

Washington, D.C., May 16.—Out of a total expenditure to date of $207,130 to study the various banking systems of the world, with a view to improving the United States banking laws, the National Monetary Commission has spent $2,931 to learn about Canadian banks.

Here we have the United States people spending $200,000 in investigating the banking conditions of other countries, and we have not had a Royal Commission to investigate the banking system of our own country. There are patent and admitted defects in our banking law, as shown by the many failures that have occurred. I think it would be well to spend if necessary $20,000 or $30,000 to have a commission investigate thoroughly the conditions in Canada and other countries, and report next session.

Mr. FIELDING. Fortunately, the desire to improve—where it may be improved—the Bank Act is one which hon. members on both sides will share. Therefore, any suggestion looking to that end will be received by the government with all the consideration to which it is entitled. I frankly say that I doubt whether a Royal Commission would serve the good purpose my hon. friend (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario) has in view. To begin with, it would be rather difficult to get the right kind of men to serve on a Royal Commission for that purpose, men who have the capacity, knowledge and experience necessary. To a large extent—not conclusively—we must learn from the experienced bankers themselves. We are not bound to accept their suggestions, but they are certainly well qualified to give us information and useful advice. I do not reject the hon. gentleman's proposal for a Royal Commission, but at first glance I doubt whether it will serve the purpose.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). There was one to investigate life insurance.

Mr. FIELDING. That was for a different condition of affairs. The hon. member will recollect that there had been an outbreak in the United States in regard to the insurance companies of that country, and many irregularities had been disclosed. A feeling of distrust arose with regard to our own companies. I think, notwithstanding some things that occurred which became the subjects of controversy, it was the wise thing to have an inquiry into our insurance laws, and their operation, in order to reassure the public of Canada as to the stability of our insurance companies. At any rate, that was the reason for the commission. I do not think a similar condition exists with regard to our banks. Our banking system, while not a perfect success yet, I think, in the opinion of many of the financial men of the world is held to be a good system. Other countries seek information from us and learn from us.

Touching the question of taxation, it is a common view that the banks should be taxed to a larger degree. That is worthy of consideration. But it must be remembered that the country needs banking capital to facilitate trade, and that if you have too many restrictions upon banks and the organization of banks, you will never get the banking capital needed. When you consider there is a double liability of shareholders, the responsibility the bank direc-

tors have to assume ' with all the obligations now imposed upon shareholders and directors, I am inclined to think that if you enforce substantial taxes upon them you may defeat the purpose the hon. gentleman has in view. However, these are only passing thoughts. I quite appreciate the interest the hon. gentleman has taken in the subject, and I will discuss his suggestions with my colleagues in due course.

Mr. SPROULE. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Sharpe, Ontario), who favours the appointment of a Royal Commission on this subject. I went carefully over the results of the work of the commission in the United States, and it seemed to me that they had collated a lot of very valuable information, which will, if made known to the people of Canada, and especially to the parliament of Canada, would afford us useful lessons in amending our Banking Act. Our banking system is generally regarded as a very good one. But I am far from being of the opinion that it is entitled to the eulogies very frequently expended upon it. I do not think our banking system has fulfilled what the country might reasonably have expected of it. The Minister of Finance says we must learn from the bankers. The experience of the bankers will teach us much if we can get it set forth frankly. But we must learn much more from the great public as well. The public are not being served as they should be by our banking system. Here is a case that is known to me: One of the regular banks of Canada has a branch in a certain town. A farmer living within a mile and a quarter of that branch bank, a man well known to the manager of the bank, the owner of a fine farm of about 200 acres with good buildings and not a dollar of debt on the property, a man having debts of not more than $200 in the world, a sober, industrious man who has always enjoyed the reputation of being reliable and prompt in meeting his obligations—when that man asked the bank manager for the loan of $25 he was refused. Why? Because he would not get an endorser. To that bank as to others, parliament has given great privileges—it can stamp paper and call it bank notes, and earn interest on it from the day it goes out, and many other privileges it has from which it makes money. The people must use the banks, because the banks hold the circulating medium which they must hold to carry on business. Yet this is the way one man was used. I asked the manager why, and his answer was: Our instructions from headquarters are to discount no notes no matter how good the individual may be unless he gets an endorser.

Look at our banks to-day. What has built these palatial banking houses that we see on every corner? Pass along Sparks street or Bank street in this city, pass along King or Yonge street in Toronto, and how many hundreds of thousands, and even millions, of dollars you find invested in costly buildings for the banks. These have been built out of the earnings of the people who pay very sweetly for any business they do with the banks.

Then, go behind the counters of the banks and look at the employees. Consider the long hours they have to serve. We had a discussion on the Bill introduced by the hon. member for West Huron (Mr. Lewis), and since that time I have had two or three letters from parties whose sons are employed in these banks, telling of the long hours they have to work—extending in some instances to eleven and even twelve o'clock at night. One man tells me of his son working until nine o'clock at night without anything to eat—the work had to be finished. And yet that boy works for only $4.75 a week. For what purpose? That they may be able to pay dividends of 9, 10, 11 and 12 and 13 per cent to their stockholders. Would you call that a banking system that is to be admired? What is our banking system? The great central banks send out their dicta to the branches that must be obeyed, everything must be done the same as at headquarters. The branch manager knows the conditions of the locality where his bank is situated, he knows the wants of the people, whereas the head office knows nothing about them; still the branches have to take their orders from headquarters. Compare that with the American system, which is called a bad banking system. There a bank starts in a small village, it accepts the savings of the people, and loans them out to the industries of the country, to the manufacturers and other people, who need money to pay their workmen. The money thus loaned out serves to develop industries in that locality. Compare that with the Canadian system. Here the banks take the savings from the hard working people, and their money immediately goes to the head office, to be transferred very likely down to Wall Street to be used in stock speculations, because they can earn more on it than they can at home. I can point out line after line where our banking system is defective. I remember when a branch of the Central Bank was started in Durham. The manager of that bank told me that every time he got a few thousand dollars, even though it was not half enough to meet the needs of the people in his locality, a demand came from headquarters, and that money went away to be invested in New York. The people who had saved the money and put it into the bank could not get the advantage of it. Then there is the low rate of interest upon the savings of the people.

The banks are strong enough to control this government, and the rate of interest in the government savings banks is put at the same figure as in the private banks, compelling the people to deposit their money with the government at three per cent interest because they can get no more from it anywhere else. I think the banks should be made useful institutions to the public here as they are in England, France and Germany, where they take up the earnings of the people and lend them out again at a higher rate of interest than they can get in the ordinary banks. Such a system puts a premium on industry, on frugality, and economy, by giving the people a larger rate of interest than they get in the banks to-day. Some years ago we were paying depositors four per cent in the government savings banks, but twice since I came into this House the Finance Minister cut down the rate of interest. At whose instance? At the instance of the banks. They appeal to the people to put their money into the bank and only give them three per cent; but when they go to borrow it for their needs they have to pay seven and eight per cent. Is that a proper service rendered to the public by the banks, to whom we give charters? I say many such evils as I have referred to would be brought out by a royal commission, that would enable us to consider them carefully and provide a remedy. When we amend the Bank Act, if we had a royal commission, it would afford us the needed information upon which we could base a remedy for the evils complained of. The representatives of the people do not, in many cases, know how serious these evils are, and they could be brought out by a royal commission in a better way than any other. There are many others that I might refer to. Take the banks of France, take the banks in Germany, take the Farmers' banks. They lend their money at a rate not above five per cent, and they pay a certain per cent to the government on the business they do. Whereas our banks are allowed an unlimited right to earn what they can, and they pay the government nothing for the privilege. Now, with regard to another subject. A few years ago I read about the case of a young man, who was employed in one of these banks. He had been a steady young man for some years, he had been saving his earnings in view of a time when he could settle down. His salary was about $900 a year. He took it into his head to get married, he married a very estimable young lady, and one who had means coming from her own people to assist him. But what was the result? That young man was dismissed from the bank inside three days after his wedding, because he did not wait until he had $1,000 salary. Is that not putting an embargo upon marriage? Is that not an interference with the free rights of the people? I say no young man should be placed under such an embargo as that, at a time in life when he desires to get married, when nature and everything demands that he should settle down in wedded life. When the requirements of the state, the propagation of the species, when everything demands that he should marry, he is not allowed to do so. Some hon. members find this a laughing matter. But I say that it is a very serious matter. I have letters in my possession, and information which, in my judgment, show that this is a matter highly important to the country, one that should receive at our hands the most careful consideration. It is an evil that nothing short of a law, making it a criminal offence for any manager of a bank to enforce such a rule upon his employees, will afford a remedy. It is not only a grievance, it is a cruel injustice, it is at least a moral crime against young men, many of whom could settle down and become even more valuable to the bank that employs them. But why don't the banks pay their employees a reasonable salary? Why do they insist upon extracting from them every drop of blood they can draw out in the way of long hours and steady service, for a mere pittance, in order that they may show the world what large dividends they can pay? Do we not want information about these things? I think we want more information than we have, to enable us to look into these matters very carefully when we come to amend the Bank Act, to see if we cannot provide a remedy against the crying evils that are prevalent to-day.

Mr. PERLEY. Several times lately, and particularly after the Farmers' bank failure, there appeared in some of the newspapers statements and comments regarding bank failures in Canada and the United States. They were compared with each other, to my mind, in an unfair way, because percentages were given of the number of banks that had failed in Canada, without any reference to the actual losses, or to the percentages which the losses bore to the total amount which the public had in the banks.

As a matter of fact, it is chiefly the smaller banks that have failed in Canada, and the amount of loss by the public has been very small proportionately to the business done by the banks. It is only fair that this matter should be put in that shape, so as to show the percentage of money loss in Canada through failure of banks. I have had a statement made up, which I will ask the indulgence of the House to read in order that it may be on record. This is a statement of banks that have failed in Canada since confederation, with the date of their suspension, liabilities to the public, and the amount of loss to the public.

	Name of Bank.	Date of Suspension.	Liabilities to the Public.	Payments made to		Amount of loss to the Public.
				Note holders.	Depositors.	
			$			$
1	Commercial Bank of New Brunswick	July 1868	671,420	In full.	In full.	
2	Bank of Acadia	April 1873	106,914	Nil.	Nil.	106,914
3	Metropolitan Bank	Oct. 1876	293,379	In full.	In full.	
4	Mechanics Bank	May 1879	547,238	57½	57½	232,576
5	Stadacona Bank	July 1879	341,500	In full.	In full.	
6	Consolidated Bank	Aug. 1879	1,794,249	"	"	
7	Bank of Liverpool	Oct. 1879	136,480	"	96½	3,670
8	Prince Edward Island	Nov. 1881	1,108,000	"	59⅛	450,000
9	Exchange Bank	Sept. 1883	2,431,935	"	66½	690,000
10	Maritime Bank of Canada	March 1887	1,409,482	"	11	750,000
11	Bank of London	Aug. 1887	838,339	"	In full.	
12	Pictou Bank	Sept. 1887	74,364	"	"	
13	Central Bank of Canada	Nov. 1887	2,631,378	"	99⅛	14,260
14	Federal Bank of Canada	Jan'y. 1888	3,449,499	"	In full.	
15	Commercial Bank of Manitoba	June 1893	1,341,251	"	"	
16	Du People	July 15, 1895	6,874,217	"	75½	1,618,500
17	Ville Marie	July 25, 1899	1,766,841	"	17½	1,241,174
18	Bank of Yarmouth	March 6, 1905	388,660	"	In full.	
19	Ontario Bank	Oct. 13, 1906	15,272,271	"	"	
20	Sovereign Bank	Jan'y. 18, 1908	16,174,408	"	"	
21	St. Johns	April 28, 1908	560,784	"	"	
22	St. Hyacinthe	June 24, 1908	1,172,630	"	"	
23	St. Stephens	March 1910	570,907	"	"	
24	Farmers Bank	Dec. 1910	1,997,041	"	?	1,567,571
						6,674,665

According to the last bank statement, March 31, 1911, the total liabilities of the banks to note holders was $81,938,753, and to depositors $961,424,425, making total liabilities to the public of $1,043,363,178. I have given the total loss to the public in 43 years, and from this it will be seen that that loss was a shade over one half of one per cent of the total liabilities to the public of the banks of Canada to-day. The average loss to the public of Canada since confederation has been $155,225 per annum.

In order to compare that, which to my mind is a very small percentage, considering the business done, with the American banks, I have here a Standard Book, called 'A Rational Banking System,' by Mr. H. M. P. Eckardt. In that book, at page 25, he says the proved liabilities of the National Banks of the United States which failed from 1891-1909 amounted to $123,988,860; the loss reported was 17·71 per cent of this, which amounted to $21,958,427, or an average of $1,155,706 a year.

Of the state and private banks during the same period, 1891 to 1909, the same authority on pages 28 and 29 give the losses to depositors during 19 years at $201,983,310, an average of $10,630,701 a year, and this, added to the National Banks, makes the total loss during the nineteen years to the public of the United States an average of $11,786,407 per year.

This authority, on page 30, puts it shortly in this way:

> The people of the United States may expect that each year an average of ninety-one banks will close their doors,locking up $31,117,433 of their depositors' funds, and that $11,786,407 of the funds will be irretrievably lost. When the loss to depositors is so heavy as this it may safely be assumed that the loss to stockholders is very large.

In other words, according to these figures, while the loss in Canada to the public since confederation has only been $155,225 a year, the loss in the United States has been between eleven and twelve million dollars. I thought it only fair to put this on 'Hansard' because it seemed to me to be proof positive that by percentages of the business done the Canadian system brings a far less proportionate loss to the public that the average annual lockup of depositors' funds in the United States is forty-eight times as great as occurs in Canada; the average annual loss suffered by bank creditors is seventy times as great in the United States as in Canada. There has been some comment regarding the banks of Canada not lending money for commercial purposes. This same authority gives the following percentages of the manner in which the money of the United States banks is loaned as compared with that of the Canadian banks. It says that in the

United States 41 per cent of the resources of the banks is applied to stocks and bonds, 12 per cent applied to real estate, and only 23 per cent of the resources of the banks in the United States is applied to ordinary mercantile loans. In Canada we have no bank loans on real estate, because the law does not permit of it, but, 24 per cent of the resources of the Canadian banks is applied to stocks and bonds, and 51 per cent is applied to mercantile loans. (Ref. page 40.)

Mr. SPROULE. What do you mean by mercantile loans?

Mr. PERLEY. Ordinary commercial loans, ordinary business paper of all kinds, and not loans on stock or anything of that kind. In the United States the proportion applied to fostering the industries of the country, and the lending of money to ordinary individuals on their notes is only 23 per cent of the resources of the banks, whereas in the case of Canadian banks the percentage is 51 per cent. The banks of Canada lend proportionately over twice as much of their funds for the ordinary purposes of the community as do the banks of the United States.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time, and passed.

QUEBEC SAVINGS BANK ACT.

Mr. FIELDING moved second reading of Bill (No. 219) to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act. He said: There are two old savings banks in the province of Quebec whose charters were granted, I think, before confederation, and from time to time their charters are renewed in the same manner as the charters of the other banks. We propose to extend these charters for one year as in the case of the other banks. There is one other clause which enables them to re-arrange their stocks in shares of $100 which is a very desirable thing.

Mr. SPROULE. What rate of interest do they pay?

Mr. FIELDING. Three per cent.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time, considered in committee and reported.

Mr. FIELDING moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Do these banks do an ordinary banking business?

Mr. FIELDING. They do not issue notes. They are of high standing, and excellent reputation, and have power to loan money within certain limitations.

Mr. SPROULE. I believe there ought to be established all over the country banks for the purpose of taking the savings of the people and paying a higher rate of interest on them than do the existing banks. I believe the state should make better provision for the handling of the money of those who can earn it but are not financiers enough to invest it profitably. I believe the state should put as high a premium as possible on frugality and industry. Other countries seem to do that and succeed with it, and we might well take a lesson from them. My hon. friend gave us a nice history of the failures of Canadian banks. I notice that it has been prepared by a banker, and the best side of it has been put out. I would like to have a man who had been in the business for a few years and dropped out of it to give the other side. I think it would not sound quite as favourable or look as rosy as it does. When he makes a comparison between the failures of Canadian banks and the failures of American banks, he very conveniently leaves out of the comparison the number of failures of national banks in the two countries. Over 25 per cent of all our banks, I think, have gone down in the last 25 or 30 years, whereas, speaking from memory, from 5 to 7 per cent have gone down in the United States. There was another statement with regard to the amount of money our banks put in circulation through manufacturers or merchants or others for the use of the people. I have lived in both countries, and have seen the operations of the banks in both, and I cannot believe from what I have seen and know that that statement is even approximately correct. If it is, it is only accounted for by this, that the large amounts of money put in circulation through large corporations like railway companies or wholesale men are put out in the great metropolitan centres, and not in the small towns and villages. In my judgment, the banks of the United States serve the people better than the banks here. In saying that, I am not especially enamoured of the banking system of the United States, which is defective in many respects, fairer comparison might have been made by comparing the Canadian banks with French or German or English banks. Another consideration in connection with the banking business that has always appealed to me is this. We give certain corporations power to handle the circulating medium of our country—what for? To supply that to the whole people of the country, and not simply to a few millionaire merchants or railway corporations or great manufacturing concerns; every honest and industrious man in this country ought to have some limited credit in these banks. I think I am within the mark when I say that not over 5 per cent of this people of this country can go to these banks and get accommodation. There are at least 90 per cent who are never served by the institu-

tions which the state provides for the service of the people. A system that does not do any better than that for the people of the country is not in my judgment the best that human ingenuity can devise. Why is it that private banks succeed so well in Canada? People will go to them and pay 10 or 12 per cent for accommodation when they cannot get it from the standard banks? As long as the banks maintain the custom of denying accommodation to the great bulk of the people so long will I contend that the banking system of our country is, comparatively speaking, a failure.

Mr. MILLER. How would my hon. friend define by any provision of law what persons a bank should extend credit to, and what not? Also, how does he account for the fact that there is not in Ontario to-day one private bank to every ten that there were ten years ago?

Mr. SPROULE. I cannot go into that as I would like at present; but perhaps at another time I will give a good reason for it. I think the hon. gentleman has overstated the fact when he says there is not one to ten.

Mr. PERLEY. With respect to bank failures, I would like to ask the hon. member from East Grey to consider, what difference does it make what proportion of the banks fail? The real test is what percentage of the money does the public lose that it puts into the banks?

Mr. SPROULE. I think it makes this difference. In the various centres of Canada we have only 25 banks that supply all the credit, whereas the country would perhaps need 25,000. We confine the business to these large banks which do not give the people the accommodation they are entitled to.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

FOREST RESERVES AND PARKS.

House again in Committee on Bill (No. 85) respecting Forest Reserves and Parks.—Mr. Oliver.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill was gone through when it was in Committee of the Whole on a previous occasion, but it was held in committee for the purpose of making a small addition to section 18 suggested by the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty). Since then an amendment has been drafted which has been agreed to by the hon. member for St. Anne division (Mr. Doherty) and I would ask the committee to adopt it and let the Bill take its third reading. The amendment was for the purpose of requiring that regulations for the disposition of the natural resources in the parks should come before parliament for approval just as in the case of regulations under the Dominion Lands Act. The following is the amendment:

That to section 18 be added the following proviso: Provided that any regulation made by the Governor in Council under subsection (b) of section 16 shall remain in force until the day immediately succeeding the day of prorogation of the session of parliament next after the date of such regulations and no longer, unless during the session such regulations be approved by both Houses.

Mr. PERLEY. Why confine it to that particular subsection?

Mr. OLIVER. Because this subsection deals with natural resources.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does this amendment correspond with the provision in the Dominion Lands Act?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not see much distinction in principle between this particular subsection and some of the others. Why make any distinction between (b) and (c) or (b) and (g)?

Mr. OLIVER. The idea was that regulations which merely had to do with the conduct of the business of the parks need not come before parliament, but that those having to do with the alienation of natural resources ought to have the approval of parliament.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There may be some ground for such a distinction, but take subsection (g) which deals with the confiscation of property and disposal of the things seized. That is rather an important regulation.

Mr. OLIVER. It was not considered necessary that parliament should take responsibility regarding regulations for the administration of the parks, but that the alienation of the rights of the Crown in natural resources required the sanction of parliament.

Mr. MILLER. If you are going to apply your amendment to subsection (b) you should divide that subsection into two, and confine your amendment to the cutting and removal of timber, the working of mines, quarries and mineral deposits, and make a new paragraph to include the removal of sand, gravel, &c., so that your amendment shall not apply to comparatively trivial things.

Mr. OLIVER. They are all of the same class. There is the right to the use and occupation of land. That deals with the occupation of land within the reserve.

Mr. MILLER. I understand perfectly the explanation, but if a settler wants a

load of sand for the building of his house or a municipality wants a few loads of gravel, that should not require the approval of parliament.

Mr. PERLEY. Why should the amendment to section 18 not apply to section 17 also?

Mr. OLIVER. I do not know, but that it might apply to subsections (b) and (c) of section 17. I do not know that it is well to cumber the administration by unnecessary references to parliament. At the same time, if the committee insists upon it, I would not seriously object.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It does seem to me that subsection (c) of section 17 is of equal if not greater importance in this respect than subsection (b) of section 16.

Mr. OLIVER. If the wording in the amendment I handed to my hon. friend were left as typewritten without the reference to section 16, the matters in subsection (c) of section 17 would be covered.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why not merely add a few words, so as to make the section read:

Provided that any regulations made by the Governor in Council under the provisions of this Act with respect to the matters mentioned in subsection (b) of section 16 of this Act and subsection (c) of section 17 of this Act shall remain in force until the day immediately succeeding the day of prorogation of the session of parliament next after the date of such regulations and no longer, unless during the session such regulations be approved by both Houses of parliament.

Mr. OLIVER. I will accept that.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. PERLEY. The other night when we were discussing this Bill reference was made to squatters, and I think there is a provision by which squatters are not allowed on the land of a forest reserve. But at page 9 of the schedules, referring to certain subdivisions, it says that they have been withdrawn owing to the presence of a squatter, and that the presence of this squatter will tend to protect the forest against fire. How is the minister so much in favour of this particular squatter when there is a provision in the Act to prohibit squatters from going into the forest reserves?

Mr. OLIVER. This squatter was in occupation before the reserve was located. The question is whether it is better policy to buy out his rights or to cut him out of the reserve. In this case it is thought better to cut him out of the reserve than to buy out his rights.

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

WATER CARRIAGE OF GOODS.

Bill (No. 212) to amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act, read the second time, and House went into committee thereon.

On section 1,

Mr. LEMIEUX. This Bill was left in my care by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. I understand it has been thoroughly examined and reported upon by the Committee of Marine and Fisheries. The Act in question was passed in the session of 1910, and the shippers, especially in the maritime provinces, have represented to the government that section 10 of the Act hampers them in their business of exporting lumber to Great Britain. Some fifty petitions which I hold in my hands were sent to the department, asking for the repeal of that clause, and for the amendment which I now propose. A special committee appointed two or three years ago on Marine and Fisheries sat and heard the interested parties, the shipping federation and the lumber exporters. The legislature of New Brunswick has also passed a resolution to the same effect. In the evidence taken by the committee with regard to this Bill, it is stated on page 7 that the lumber people of the United Kingdom have refused to accept a Bill of lading used under the present Act. The Bristol Timber Importers' Association unanimously resolved not to purchase any more lumber cargoes under existing conditions. On page 29 of the evidence will be found certain telegrams from large shippers of lumber asking for the repeal of clause 10. The lumber industries ask that they shall be at liberty to enter into a contract with ship-owners for a bill of lading with what is known as the conclusive evidence clause in it, so that shipping companies who do not wish to give such a bill of lading need not do so. They represent that section 10 is in restraint of trade with regard to the carriage of wood goods. The chairman of the committee, the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) read a telegram addressed to a Liverpool firm by Price, Walker & Company, Limited, Gloucester, which I will read:

Dear Sirs,—Cargo per SS. 'Hersilia' at Sheet Harbour. The provisions which you suggest will not meet the requirements of the Bristol channel importers. We will not contract without the clause which has been adopted by our association being embodied in the contract itself.

There are one or two communications of a similar nature which I need not quote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The minister has been dealing with section 2 of the Bill, which I understood pretty well. I was

familiar with the legislation passed by the legislature of New Brunswick, and some other protests that had been made against section 10 of the Act as it originally stood. Would the minister tell us what was the original form of subsection (a) of section 2?

Mr. SINCLAIR. The only change is the addition of the words after the word 'animals,' 'lumber, deals and other articles described as wood goods.' Subsection (a) in the original Act contained this clause:

Including goods, wares, merchandise and articles of any kind whatsoever except live animals.

The object of this amendment is to exclude wood goods from the operation of the Act relating to water carriage of goods. The original Act, clause 9, prohibits the shipowner from relieving himself from certain kinds of liability for negligence, and this clause 9 includes those goods. It was stated on behalf of the shipowners that they were not in a position to measure the goods and to find out the superficial feet, that it would take a great deal of time and cause delay, and that to ascertain whether a certain plank or deal contained so many superficial feet, was impracticable. Consequently, they asked for a clause that would relieve them from the liability, provided they delivered the number of pieces that were received from the merchant. That is the meaning of clause 10 which was in the Act of last year. The merchants of New Brunswick, it appears, object to that system and wish to go back to the system in force in that province previously by which the shipowner made himself liable not only for the number of pieces but also for the actual measurement, for the number of superficial feet contained in those pieces, and they required the shipowner to sign a bill of lading that he would deliver on the other side a certain number of superficial feet. Often when he reached the other side, there would not be that quantity of superficial feet in the ship and the shipowner had to make up the difference. The shipowner was anxious to get rid of that liability and it was on behalf of the small shipowners in the maritime provinces that that clause was inserted. The effect of this Bill will be to put the law back where it was before and leave absolute freedom for the shipowner and merchant to make their own contract. If the merchant can pervail on the shipowner to sign a bill of lading for a certain number of superficial feet it will be for the shipowner to deliver that, but if he refuses he has to make his bargain with the merchant.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.50 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, May 18, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

THE ALBERT AND MONCTON RAILWAY COMPANY.

Mr. GUTHRIE moved that Bill (No. 220) to incorporate the Albert and Moncton Railway Company be placed on the orders of this day, immediately after routine proceedings, for consideration in Committee of the Whole, in accordance with the recommendation contained in the twenty-second report of the Select Standing Committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines.

Mr. SPROULE. I think there is too much of this kind of procedure of late. It gives very little time for consideration; the Bill will no doubt be taken up at once. Then we are not by any means at the end of the session, but only going to adjourn for a while. The Bill cannot be delayed long, and I think it should stand over until after the adjournment.

Mr. MONK. The Bill for the Albert railway was adopted by the committee without any amendment, and this seems to be the only opportunity offered to pass the Bill. There is no controversy about it. I do not see any reason why we should not get rid of that Bill.

Mr. EMMERSON. While agreeing with the general remarks of my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule), I want to say with respect to this Bill that unless it is passed now it will very materially delay the development of the shale interests in Albert county. They have for many years lain dormant, but there is every prospect now that, if facilities are not afforded, the English capitalists who are on the spot, and have been on the spot, may be delayed in developing that property. The railway runs from Hillsboro, where large plaster quarries are situated, out into the Baltimore district where the shale quarries are found. The distance to Moncton is about twenty miles. It is for industrial development, and simply because we are going to have a recess is no reason why, if it is at all possible, to have this Bill passed, it should be delayed. We want to go into this business at once, and why should the Bill be delayed until September?

Mr. PERLEY. Will the hon. gentleman state why the Bill was so late in coming before the House?

Mr. EMMERSON. It came from the Senate. The parties from England only came over late during the session, arrange-

ments were only completed very recently, and I think they have moved in the matter with great expedition. It has only been possible to reach this Bill from the Senate within a day or two, and I felt it my duty, in the interests of that section of the country, to attempt to expedite the Bill. I do not see that any interests will suffer; the Bill is not contentious. It is a standard Bill and passed through the Railway Committee unanimously.

Mr. SPROULE. We do not touch private Bills to-day, this being Thursday, and we will reach private Bills to-morrow, when it is very likely to pass. Therefore, there is no urgency from that standpoint. If it passed the committee without any amendment, there is not likely to be any delay in the House. Let it take its natural order and come up to-morrow evening with out any motion.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the private Bills ahead of this one that will prevent its being considered to-morrow. We have only one hour. It would only take a minute to pass this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. I am not opposed to the Bill; I am only drawing attention to what I think is the commencement of a bad practice.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. GUTHRIE moved that the House go into committee on the Bill.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee thereon.

Mr. SPROULE. How is it that the House is moved into Committee of the Whole on this Bill now before we have reached the orders of the day? I see no reason why we should not go on to the questions put by members according to the order of precedence. Why should we disarrange our Order Paper for the sake of shoving a Bill through a few minutes ahead of time? It does not require to go back to the Senate again. What is the urgency?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the objection of my hon. friend is out of order now. If we violated the rules a moment ago when the Speaker was in the Chair, that is no reason why we should continue to do so.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood the motion as read out from the Chair that this Bill be put on the Orders this day, and that the rules be suspended to allow that to be done. Now it is put on first before we reach the orders of the day. That is what I object to.

Mr. EMMERSON. That was not my fault.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In view of a misapprehension, as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) understood it was to come after questions put by members, we had better take up questions put by members first.

Mr. EMMERSON. I have no objection.

Progress reported.

QUESTIONS

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

THE NATIONAL HYDRO-ELECTRIC COMPANY, LIMITED.

* Mr. MONK.

1. At the time of the lease granted by the government to the National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited, of the water-power on the Ottawa river at Carillon, were tenders called for publicly announcing said alienation and calling for bids?
2. On the 1st January, 1911, was the said power under lease to any party? If so, to whom?
3. For how many years was the lease existing in January last of said water-power to run?
4. When was the National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited, incorporated?
5. Who are the president, vice-president and directors of this company?
6. Will the government lay on the table of the House a copy of the order in council of the 14th March, 1911, authorizing the lease of the Carillon water-power to the National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited?
7. Who signed the lease on behalf of the lessee company?

Mr. SPEAKER. Stand, in the absence of the Minister of Railways.

Mr. MONK. I rise to a question of order, as my hon. friend did a moment ago. There is the notice of a question put on the 15th and easily answered; we are just on the eve of adjournment and it would be a great convenience for me if I could get the answer to that question before adjournment.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is not present. On his return, if he has the information, I will be glad to arrange that it shall be handed in. If it is not available we cannot answer it; that is all.

ANNUAL DRILL OF MILITIA.

Mr. SPROULE:

1. How many officers, non-commissioned officers, men and horses were called out to perform their annual drill or training in the years 1894, 1895, 1896, 1897, 1898, 1899, 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909 and 1910, and how many are intended to be called out for drill for the year 1911, with the number from each battalion, and where drill will be performed?

2. (a) What length of time was spent in drill and rifle practice in each of these years, (b) were all the officers and non-commissioned officers properly qualified to handle, instruct or drill the militia forces each year, and (c) who were charged with these duties?

3. Where, how rapidly and in what numbers could the force be mobilized and properly supplied with arms, uniforms and all necessary equipment for active service?

4. How many additional men could be equipped and put in the field for active service, say in three months?

Mr. KING:

ACTIVE MILITIA.

Numbers Trained from 1894 to 1910.

Year.	Officers.	N.C.O's and Men.	Total.	Horses.
1894	1,527	17,810	19,337	2,319
1895	1,584	20,018	21,602	2,512
1896	1,346	16,547	17,893	1,125
1897	2,011	25,463	27,474	2,478
1898	1,921	23,375	25,296	2,565
1899	2,299	27,700	29,999	2,888
1900	2,159	25,416	27,575	2,610
1901	2,377	27,885	30,262	3,260
1902	1,709	18,510	20,219	3,227
1903	2,183	23,807	25,990	4,184
1904	2,835	32,839	35,674	5,494
1905	2,962	36,530	39,492	6,259
1906	3,024	37,776	40,800	6,915
1907	3,178	37,575	40,753	7,387
1908	3,053	39,989	43,042	7,555
1909	2,904	33,320	36,224	6,722
1910	3,260	38,015	41,375	7,997

Numbers to be trained during 1911.

Unit.	Officers.	N. C. O's. and Men.	Total.	Horses.	Place of Training.	Period of Training.
Cavalry.						
G.G.G.B.	32	295	327	280	Niagara Camp..	12 days.
1st Hussars	32	295	327	280	" " ..	12 "
2nd Dragoons	32	295	327	280	" " ..	12 "
3rd "	32	295	327	280	Petawawa " ..	12 "
4th Hussars	32	295	327	280	" " ..	12 "
5th P.L.D. Guards	32	295	327	280	" " ..	12 "
6th Hussars	32	295	327	280	Farnham " ..	12 "
7th "	32	295	327	280	" " ..	12 "
8th "	32	295	327	280	Sussex " ..	12 "
9th Miss. Horse	32	295	327	280	Niagara " ..	12 "
10th Hussars	32	295	327	280	Farnham " ..	12 "
11th Hussars	32	295	327	280	" " ..	12 "
12th Man. Dragoons	32	295	327	280	Sewell " ..	12 "
13th S.L. Dragoons	32	295	327	280	Farnham " ..	12 "
14th Hussars	32	295	327	280	Aldershot " ..	12 "
15th Lt. Horse	32	295	327	280	Calgary " ..	12 "
16th "	32	295	327	280	Sewell " ..	12 "
17th Hussars	26	227	253	215	Farnham " ..	12 "
18th Mtd. Rifles	32	295	327	280	Sewell " ..	12 "
19th Alta. Dragoons	32	295	327	280	Calgary " ..	12 "
20th Border Horse	32	295	327	280	Sewell " ..	12 "
21st Alta. Hussars	12	136	148	130	Calgary " ..	12 "
22nd Sask. Lt. Horse	32	295	327	280	Sewell " ..	12 "

Numbers to be trained during 1911.—*Continued.*

Unit.	Officers.	N. C. O's. and Men.	Total.	Horses.	Place of Training.	Period of Training.
Brought forward.....	710	7,558	7,268	6,225		
Cavalry—Con.						
23rd Alta Rangers.....	32	295	327	280	Calgary " ..	12 days.
24th Grey's Horse.....	32	295	327	280	Niagara " ..	12 "
25th Brant Dragoons.....	26	227	253	215	" " ..	12 "
26th Can. Horse..	32	295	327	280	Farnham " ..	12 "
27th Lt. Horse.....	26	227	253	215	Sewell " ..	12 "
23th N.B. Dragoons.....	32	295	327	280	Sussex " ..	12 "
29th Lt. Horse.....	32	295	327	280	Sewell " ..	12 "
P.E.I. Lt. Horse.....	9	65	74	65	Charlottetown Camp..	12 "
British Columbia Horse..	24	272	296	260	Kamloops " ..	12 "
Lt. Horse (Ind. Squad)...	6	68	74	65	Calgary " ..	12 "
Total Cavalry.....	961	8,892	9,853	8,445		
Artillery.						
1st Bde. C.F.A.....	12	207	219	134	Petawawa Camp	16 days.
2nd " "	12	207	219	134	" " ..	16 "
3rd " " 17th Battery	4	99	103	64	Aldershot " ..	16 "
6th Bde. C.F.A.....	12	207	219	134	Petawawa " ..	16 "
7th " "	12	207	219	134	" " .	16 "
8th " "	12	207	219	134	" " ..	16 "
9th " "	12	207	219	134	" " ..	16 "
10th " "	12	207	219	134	" " ..	16 "
6th Battery, C.F.A.....	4	99	103	64	" " ..	16 "
13th " "	4	99	103	64	Sewell " ..	16 "
25th " "	4	99	103	64	Calgary " ..	16 "
2nd Heavy Bde. C.A.....	17	225	242	142	Local Hdqrs....	16 "
" " " (1 Btty).	6	107	113	69	Petawawa Camp	16 "
4th Heavy Bde. C.A.....	12	214	226	69	Charlottetown Camp..	16 "
" " " (1 Btty)	6	107	113	69	Petawawa Camp	16 "
5th Reg., C.A.....	23	350	373	3	Local Hdqrs....	16 "
6th " "	23	350	373	3	" "	16 "
7th Regt., C.A. (3 batteries).....	23	278	301	132	Aldershot Camp	16 "
7th Regt., C.A., 1 battery	6	88	95	43	Local Hdqrs....	16 "
Cobourg Coy., C.A.....	6	113	119	.....	"	16 "
Total Artillery.	222	3,673	3,900	1,724		
Engineers.						
1st Field Troop.....	3	33	36	36	Petawawa Camp	12 days.
1st Field Co. with Telegraph Det.*.....	9	218	227	49	" ..	12 "
2nd Field Co	7	166	173	22	Niagara Camp..	12 "
2nd Field Co. (Telegraph Det.*).....	2	52	54	27	Petawawa Camp	16
3rd Field Co. with Telegraph Det.*.....	9	218	227	49	" ..	12
4th Field Co. with Telegraph Det.*.....	9	218	227	49	" ..	12 "
Total Engineers.....	39	905	944	232		

*All Telegraph Detachments train for 16 days.

Numbers to be trained during 1911.—*Continued.*

Unit.	Officers.	N. C. O's. and Men.	Total.	Horses.	Place of Training.	Period of Training.
Infantry.						
G. G. F. G.....	32	379	411	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 days.
2nd Regiment.....	65	983	1,048	12	"	12 "
3rd "	32	371	403	5	"	9 "
					Farnham Camp	3 "
5th "	65	711	776	5	Local Hdqrs..	9 "
					Farnham Camp	3 "
6th "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
7th "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
8th "	32	371	403	5	" ...	12 "
9th "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
10th "	32	439	471	5	"	12 "
11th "	32	371	403	5	3 Rivers Camp..	12 "
12th "	32	371	403	5	Niagara " ..	12 "
13th "	32	439	471	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
14th "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
15th "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
16th "	32	371	403	5	Kingston Camp.	12 "
18th "	32	371	403	5	Levis " ..	12 "
19th "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
20th "	32	371	403	5	Niagara Camp..	12 "
					Local Hdqrs..	6 "
21st "	32	371	403	5	Goderich Camp	6 "
22nd "	19	215	234	4	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
23rd "	32	371	403	5	Niagara Camp..	12 "
24th "	20	215	235	5	Goderich Camp.	12 "
26th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
27th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
30th "	38	449	287	5	" ..	12 "
32nd "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
33rd "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
34th "	32	371	403	5	Niagara Camp..	12 "
35th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
36th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
37th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
38th "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
40th "	32	371	403	5	Kingston Camp.	12 "
41st "	20	215	233	4	Local Hdqrs.. .	12 "
42nd "	32	371	403	5	Kingston Camp.	12 "
43rd "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
44th "	32	371	403	5	Niagara Camp..	12 "
45th "	32	371	403	5	Kingston Camp.	12 "
47th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
48th "	32	439	471	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
49th "	32	371	403	5	Kingston camp.	12 "
53rd "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs ...	12 "
54th "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
57th "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
59th "	32	371	403	5	Kingston Camp.	12 "
61st "	32	371	403	5	Levis Camp.....	12 "
62nd "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
63rd "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
					"	9 "
65th "	32	371	403	5	Farnham Camp	3 "
66th "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
67th "	32	371	403	5	Sussex Camp ...	12 "
68th "	32	371	403	5	Aldershot Camp	12 "
69th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
71st "	32	371	403	5	Sussex Camp....	12 "
73rd "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
74th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
75th "	32	371	403	5	Aldershot Camp	12 "
76th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
77th "	32	371	403	5	Niagara Camp..	12 "
78th "	32	371	403	5	Aldershot Camp	12 "

Numbers to be trained during 1911.—*Continued.*

Unit.	Officers.	N. C. O's. and Men.	Total.	Horses.	Place of Training.	Period of Training.
Brought forward.....	1,955	24,034	24,987	305		
Infantry—Con.						
79th Regiment.....	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 days.
80th "	32	371	403	5	3-Rivers Camp..	12 "
82nd "	32	371	403	5	Charlottetown Camp	12 "
84th "	19	215	234	4	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
85th "	32	371	403	5	3-Rivers Camp..	12 "
86th "	19	215	234	4	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
87th "	32	371	403	5	Levis Camp....	12 "
89th "	32	371	403	5	"	12 "
90th "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs... / Sewell Camp..	8 " / 4 "
91st "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
92nd "	32	371	403	5	Levis Camp	12 "
93rd "	32	371	403	5	Aldershot Camp	12 "
94th "	32	371	403	5	" ..	12 "
95th "	32	371	403	5	Sewell Camp....	12 "
96th "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs.. / Sewell Camp..	8 " / 4 "
97th "	32	371	403	5	Niagara Camp..	12 "
98th "	20	215	235	4	Sewell Camp....	12 "
99th "	26	293	319	5	"	12 "
100th "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs.. / Sewell Camp..	8 " / 4 "
101st "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
102nd "	26	293	319	5	Kamloops Camp	12 "
103rd "	32	371	403	5	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
104th "	20	215	235	4	Kamloops Camp	12 "
Kootenay Rifles.....	6	78	84	.....	" ..	12 "
Earl Grey's Own Rifles...	3	39	42	.....	Local Hdqrs....	12 "
Armstrong Ind. Coy. Infantry.....	3	39	42	.....	Kamloops Camp	12 "
Total infantry.....	2,641	30,943	33,584	416		
Departmental Corps.						
No. 1 Co., C.A.S.C.....	6	130	136	67	Goderich Camp.	12 days.
2 " "	6	130	136	67	Niagara "	"
4 " "	6	130	136	67	3-Rivers "	"
6 " "	5	80	85	46	Farnham "	"
7 " "	6	130	136	67	Sussex "	"
8 " "	5	80	85	46	Aldershot "	"
9 " "	5	80	85	46	Niagara "	"
10 " "	6	130	136	67	Levis "	"
11 " "	5	80	85	46	Sewell "	"
12 " "	5	80	85	46	Niagara "	"
14 " "	5	80	85	46	Calgary "	"
Total C.A.S.C	60	1,130	1,190	611		

Numbers to be trained during 1911.—*Continued.*

Army Medical Services.

Unit.	Officers.	N. C. O's. and Men.	Total.	Horses.	Place of Training.	Period of Training.
No. 1 General Hospital...	11	3	14	1	Niagara Camp.	12 days.
2 " ...	11	3	14	1	Aldershot "	"
1 Field Amb.....	10	92	102	21	Sussex "	"
2 "	10	92	102	21	Farnham "	"
3 " (Cav.)....	4	56	60	27	Petawawa "	"
4 "	10	92	102	21	Farnham "	"
5 "	10	92	102	21	" "	"
6 " (Cav.)....	4	56	60	27	" "	"
7 "	10	92	102	21	" "	"
8 "	10	92	102	21	Sussex "	"
9 "	4	31	35	14	Charlottet'n "	"
10 "	10	92	102	21	Niagara "	"
11 "	10	92	102	21	" "	"
12 "	10	92	102	21	" "	"
13 " (Cav.)....	4	56	60	27	" "	"
14 "	10	92	102	21	" "	"
15 " (Sec. A. & B.)	7	62	69	14	" "	"
15 " (Sec. C.).	3	30	33	7	Goderich "	"
16 " (Cav.)....	4	56	60	27	Sewell "	"
17 " (Cav.)....	4	56	60	27	Calgary "	"
18 "	10	92	102	21	Kamloops "	"
19 "	10	92	102	21	Niagara "	"
20 "	10	92	102	21	3-Rivers "	"
Total A. M. Services.	136	1,605	1,791	445		
Grand Total	4,109	47,153	51,262	11,873		

2. (a) 12 days. (b) Unqualified officers to instruct are shown as provisionally appointed officers in the quarterly militia list of each year. As regards N.C.O's., it is impossible to say if all N.C.O's., were qualified to instruct as no return is available which gives the information asked for. (c) It is not understood what is meant by 'who were charged with these duties' as every officer and N.C.O. in their respective capacities are in varying degrees responsible for instructional duties.

3 and 4. These two questions have been dropped. See 'Hansard' unrevised, May 10, page 8874.

IMPORTS OF FARM PRODUCTS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What was the quantity and value of butter and eggs imported into Canada from the United States during each of the months of March and April, 1911?

2. What were the quantities and values of butter and eggs imported into Canada from all other countries during March and April, 1911, and the countries from which imported?

3. What were the quantities and values of various kinds of meats imported into Canada during each of the months of January, February, March and April, 1911, and the several countries from which imported?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The quantity and value of butter and eggs entered for consumption in Canada, from the United States, during the months of March and April, 1911, was as follows:

—	March, 1911.		April, 1911.	
	Pounds.	Value. $	Pounds.	Value. $
Butter.....	92,043	19,035	244,412	45,742
	Doz.		Doz.	
Eggs.....	1,151,496	200,027	222,401	39,026

2. The quantity and value of butter and eggs entered for consumption in Canada from all other countries during the months of March and April, 1911, was as follows:

—	Butter.		Eggs.	
March.	Pounds.	Value. $	Dozen.	Value. $
Great Britain	11,346	2,746		
Australia	67,704	19,035		
New Zealand	168,938	39,882		
China			3,469	386
Hong Kong			5,023	220
April.				
Great Britain	15,120	3,631	5	10
Australia	76,328	16,593		
New Zealand	35,784	8,371		
China			2,475	345
Hong Kong			3,800	173

3. The quantity and value of the various kinds of meats entered for consumption in Canada, by countries, during the months of January, February, March and April, 1911, was as follows:

—	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
Bacon and hams, shoulders and sides—	January.		February.	
Great Britain	56	$ 13		
United States	225,234	34,673	198,017	33,088
Hong Kong	515	28	23	2
Australia			8,959	1,569
Total	225,805	34,714	206,999	34,659
	March.		April.	
Great Britain	762	208	659	183
United States	396,706	60,592	223,988	33,371
Hong Kong	62	4		
Japan	62	4		
New Zealand	1,170	166		
Total	398,762	60,974	224,647	33,554
Beef, salted, in barrels—	January.		February.	
Great Britain	7,902	702		
United States	62,044	4,393	95,675	6,174
Total	69,946	5,095	95,675	6,174
	March.		April.	
United States	133,462	8,447	72,733	4,678
Canned meats, canned poultry and game—	January.		February.	
Great Britain	64,727	7,821	12,826	4,339
United States	8,757	1,987	76,497	3,443
Australia	35,348	3,804	4,720	459
France	1,645	469	1,237	417
Newfoundland	125	9		
China	623	50	44	7
Hong Kong	1,604	78	2,374	134
Total	112,829	14,218	97,698	8,799

Mr. PATERSON:

3. The Quantity and value of the various kinds of Meats entered for consumption in Canada, &c.—*Continued.*

—	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
	March.		April.	
		$		$
Canned meats, canned poultry and game—				
Great Britain	48,559	6,603	43,074	6,169
United States	32,986	8,868	29,074	6,738
Australia	15,000	1,685	16,068	1,772
France	2,386	359	7,400	1,850
Hong Kong	643	54	110	10
Japan	.....	.....	744	82
Germany	786	94	.....	.....
Argentina	5,760	593	.....	.....
Uruguay	1,440	106	.....	.....
Total	107,560	18,262	96,470	16,621
	January.		February.	
Mutton and lamb, fresh—				
United States	54,665	5,027	99,359	8,903
Australia	125,676	8,521	136,379	8,761
Total	180,341	13,548	235,738	17,664
	March.		April.	
United States	95,190	8,992	91,314	8,178
Australia	190,469	12,496	158,471	10,634
Total	285,659	21,488	249,785	18,812
	January.		February.	
Pork, barrelled in brine—				
Great Britain	45,000	5,919	.....	.....
United States	834,765	80,913	447,386	41,991
Hong Kong	302	19	398	30
Total	880,067	86,851	447,784	42,021
	March.		April.	
United States	352,445	32,742	324,403	25,196
	January.		February.	
Poultry and game—				
Great Britain	.....	1,034	.....	578
United States	.....	7,656	.....	2,962
Aust-Hungary	.....	365	.....	.....
Australia	.....	82	.....	1,431
China	.....	43	.....	.....
Hong Kong	.....	720	.....	683
Total	.....	9,900	.....	5,654

3. The Quantity and value of the various kinds of Meats entered for consumption in Canada, &c.—*Continued.*

—	Pounds.	Value.	Pounds.	Value.
	March.		April.	
Poultry and game—		$		$
Great Britain		781		1,107
United States		4,716		1,870
Australia		96		1,294
China		51		19
Hong Kong		185		11
Total		5,829		4,301
	January.		February.	
Dried or smoked meats—				
Great Britain	30	6		
United States	47,914	7,674	103,121	17,898
China	1,243	110	1,068	41
Italy	165	35		
Hong Kong	24,900	1,778	16,456	1,285
Japan	565	32		
Total	74,847	9,635	120,645	19,224
	March.		April.	
Great Britain	104	20		
United States	137,390	21,037	39,878	6,165
China	923	79	72	3
Italy	529	151		
Hong Kong	10,089	710	1,236	75
New Zealand	800	61		
Total	149,835	22,058	41,186	6,243
	January.		February.	
Other meats, fresh—				
United States	29,559	4,550	41,115	5,403
Australia	11,902	595	506	60
Total	41,461	5,145	41,621	5,463
	March.		April.	
Great Britain	13,004	1,032		
United States	142,381	13,185	75,732	8,409
Australia	16,373	1,164	10,653	677
Total	171,758	15,381	86,385	9,086
	January.		February.	
Other meats, salted—				
Great Britain	36,800	2,228		
United States	21,438	2,830	20,093	3,205
Hong Kong	200	10	840	72
China	200	12		
Total	58,638	5,080	20,933	3,277
	March.		April.	
United States	15,800	2,456	17,638	2,630
China			54	3
Hong Kong	80	5		
Total	15,880	2,461	17,692	2,633

EXPORTS AND IMPORTS.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What was the value of Canada's exports to Australia, New Zealand, Japan, British South Africa and British India, for each of the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911, classified respectively, as to agricultural implements, all other manufactures, and agricultural and farm produce of all kinds?

2. What was the value of all kinds of agricultural farm produce imported into Canada from Australia, New Zealand, Japan, British India and British South Africa for each of the years 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911?

Mr. PATERSON:

1. The total value of agricultural implements, all other manufactures, and agricultural and farm produce, &c., exported from Canada to Australia, New Zealand, Japan, British South Africa and British India, during the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911, was as follows, (Canadian produce):

—	Agricultural Implements.	All other Manufactures.	Agricultural Products.	Animals and Produce.
1906.	$	$	$	$
Australia	523,030	891,655	53,274	15,384
New Zealand	143,304	453,984	35,722	2,985
Japan	.....	113,689	65,760	16,132
British South Africa	94,042	447,952	800,659	289,972
British India	.....	9,257	4,540	20
9 months, 1907.				
Australia	603,289	797,717	54,169	12,860
New Zealand	114,638	441,233	43,630	1,690
Japan	.....	81,469	84,743	10,630
British South Africa	75,515	220,108	520,940	171,228
British India	.....	10,379	157	.....
1908.				
Australia	706,113	1,314,081	17,007	21,870
New Zealand	140,959	616,545	55,075	1,590
Japan	40	97,225	129,546	15,813
British South Africa	98,550	389,449	1,227,874	76,362
British India	550	11,547	4	.....
1909.				
Australia	669,468	1,350,311	20,963	16,746
New Zealand	202,723	493,599	31,393	3,528
Japan	.....	163,865	49,623	25,030
British South Africa	64,500	332,223	1,158,719	47,658
British India	506	300,657	4,818	.....
1910.				
Australia	1,264,690	1,284,118	31,275	14,726
New Zealand	226,016	455,971	35,696	14,905
Japan	258	142,345	58,370	19,141
British South Africa	151,762	414,340	1,490,375	126,866
British India	836	29,106	443	.....
1911.				
Australia	1,349,130	1,350,701	40,753	18,763
New Zealand	194,698	609,369	38,751	961
Japan	.....	200,806	14,021	38,487
British South Africa	230,314	432,399	1,193,293	148,525
British India	2,742	54,442	76	751

2. The total value of agricultural farm produce entered for consumption in Canada from Australia, New Zealand, Japan, British South Africa and British India during the fiscal years 1906, 1907, 1908, 1909, 1910 and 1911, was as follows:

1906—	
Australia	$ 24,532
New Zealand	5,039
Japan	8,820
British South Africa	.....
British India	.....

1907—	
Australia	$ 89,276
New Zealand	7,537
Japan	13,823
British South Africa	.....
British India	.....
1908—	
Australia	$156,381
New Zealand	217
Japan	24,164
British South Africa	.....
British India	.....
1909—	
Australia	$193,388
New Zealand	5,377
Japan	26,698
British South Africa	.....
British India	.....
1910—	
Australia	$175,591
New Zealand	12,086
Japan	32,646
British India	50
British South Africa	.....
1911—	
Australia	$114,606
New Zealand	115,240
Japan	42,587
British India	83,716
British South Africa	.....

MILITIA EXPENDITURE.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

What were the amounts spent, respectively, on agriculture and militia in the following years, viz.: 1867, 1874, 1878, 1888, 1896, 1905, 1910?

Mr. KING. The information required so far as the Department of Militia and Defence is concerned is as follows:

Fiscal Year.	Expenditure.
1867-68*	$1,013,016
1873-74	1,222,282
1877-78	618,136
1887-88	1,273,179
1895-96	2,136,713
1899-1900	3,624,615
1904-1905	3,950,284
1909-1910	5,921,314

*No figures before July 1, 1867, available.

SUBSIDY FOR RAILWAY FROM GRAND FALLS TO ST. JOHN, N.B.

Mr. CARVELL:

Has any, and if so, what, correspondence been carried on between the government of New Brunswick, or any member or members thereof, and the government of Canada, or any member thereof, with reference to changing the Subsidy Act, 1910, with respect to a subsidy for a line of railway from Grand Falls, in the province of New Brunswick, to the city of St. John, in the same province?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This question is of such a nature that, in my opinion, the reply should be in the form of a return. Pursuant to clause 4, rule 37, I beg to state that I have no objection to laying the return upon the table of the House.

Mr. PATERSON.

CENSUS—ELECTORAL DISTRICT OF JACQUES CARTIER.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What are the names and occupations of the officers in charge of the census for the electoral district of Jacques Cartier?
2. Where are the said officers domiciled?
3. On what date were said officers appointed?
4. By whom were said officers recommended for appointment?
5. Did the government consult any one from the said district before making the said appointments?
6. From what person or persons did the government seek advice regarding said appointments?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) is not here to reply. On his return the reply will be handed in as if the question had been answered at the moment.

CENSUS—ELECTORAL DIVISION OF HOCHELAGA.

*Mr. MONK:

1. Who are the officers in charge of the coming census in the electoral division of Hochelaga?
2. Are they personally known to the Minister of Agriculture?
3. By whom were these officers recommended?

Mr. FIELDING. That will be the same.

CANADA CEMENT COMPANY.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the leader of the House (Mr. Fielding) if the government contemplate doing anything with regard to the complaint made by Sir Sandford Fleming regarding the organization of the cement company known as the merger?

Mr. FIELDING. We understand that the matter is already before a committee of this House. I am not advised as to the particular shape in which it stands at this moment, but I presume that whatever investigation is necessary in regard to the company's application and the letter of Sir Sandford Fleming will take place before that committee.

Mr. SPROULE. That is the Private Bills Committee?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

THE BAHAMAS AND CANADA.

Mr. SPROULE. I have seen a number of articles of late regarding the proposal to annex the Bahama Islands to the Dominion of Canada, and some, what I should regard as strong reasons why it would be advisable to do so. The people of the Bahama

Islands appear to be especially anxious that it should be done, for their legislature, I notice, have passed a resolution to that effect. I would like to ask the government if they have had any representations on the subject from their legislature and, if so, if the government have given the matter sufficient consideration to take the House into their confidence, and tell us what they propose to do, if anything.

Mr. FIELDING. We are aware, as my hon. friend has pointed out, by the general representations in the press, of a desire in the Bahama Islands to open negotiations with Canada. I think I am correct in stating that we have had no official negotiations on the subject. What has happened is that several enterprising citizens of Canada, residents, I think, of Montreal, who have been visiting the Bahamas, have taken a very warm interest in the matter, and in that way a good deal has been heard of it in the Canadian press. The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) asked a question a day or two ago on the subject, and I said that while I did not think there was any official correspondence on the subject I thought it not unlikely that during the visit of the Prime Minister to England it might be the subject of conversation between the colonial office authorities and himself. I think I am quite correct in stating that we have had nothing official on the subject. I should have made a further search of the records, but I am pretty certain I am correct. If I find there is any official communication I will be glad to have it brought down to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. I would think that there should be some when their legislature has passed a resolution.

Mr. FIELDING. I am quite sure there has been nothing but what has already appeared in the public press. There have been no negotiations whatever on the subject. It is a matter which might engage attention in the future.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood that, while it has been reported in the press that the legislature passed the resolution alluded to, it had not come in an official form to the attention of the government up to the time that the Minister of Finance made his statement on the subject to the House a few days ago.

Mr. FIELDING. I will ask the Secretary of State to make a further examination. It is possible that the resolution has been officially communicated. Of course, we are thoroughly aware that they have passed the resolution. The channel of communication with the colony would be by way of the colonial office. They would hardly communicate directly with us.

DALHOUSIE PILOTAGE DUES.

Mr. CROCKET. I would like to ask the hon. acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Lemieux) if he has an answer to the question I put yesterday.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I was just going to rise to give my hon. friend the answer which has been communicated to me by the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and which is as follows:

With reference to the telegram which Mr. Crocket read in the House to-day, to the effect that the Department of Marine and Fisheries had notified the collector of customs at Dalhousie not to collect pilotage on vessels carrying pulpwood from Dalhousie to Portland, Maine, the facts are these:

Early this spring the department was appealed to for a ruling as to whether a vessel carrying pulpwood from Dalhousie to Portland, Maine, was obliged to pay pilotage dues in the pilotage district of Dalhousie. The reply was to the effect that such a vessel came within the list of exempted vessels named in section 477 (c) (iii) of the Canada Shipping Act, which reads as follows:

'Ships propelled wholly or in part by steam employed in voyages between any port or ports in the said provinces—Quebec, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island—or any of them and the port of New York, or any port of the United States of America, on the Atlantic north of New York were exempted ships.'

The Bill now before parliament to amend the Canada Shipping Act retains this clause. It is, however, proposed to give the power to every pilotage district to say what ships in the list of exempted ships shall be exempted in so far as that particular pilotage district is concerned. Any pilotage by-law varying such list of exempted vessels would, of course, be subject to the approval of the Governor in Council. It will thus be seen that if this amendment to the Canada Shipping Act passes it will be competent for every pilotage district to regulate this matter in such a manner as is best suited to its own requirements.

Mr. DANIEL. Would the minister state why this matter is placed in the hands of the collector of customs? Is it usual for the collector of customs to collect pilotage dues in a pilotage district? It is usually done by the pilotage authority, but this telegram states that the collector of customs has this matter in hand.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not say exactly. It is a matter quite new to me, but I will get more information and communicate it to my hon. friend early in the day.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I presume it will be a question of the collector clearing the vessel, and I take it that it has allowed the vessel to clear without payment of the pilotage dues under that section of the law.

Mr. DANIEL. That is not the way the telegram read.

NAVAL CORONATION CONTINGENT.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I desire to give the answer to the question asked the other day by the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Crosby) regarding officers of the naval service who will attend the coronation. The answer given to me by the naval service department is as follows:

In reply to question of Mr. Crosby in the House on 16th instant regarding officers who will attend coronation: Lieutenant Lord Alastair Graham, in command of coronation contingent; Midshipman Percy W. Nelles, Midshipman Victor Brodeur.

Mr. CROSBY. I would mention to the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries that that statement does not say anything about the 'Rainbow.'

Mr. LEMIEUX. They give the names of the officers, but they do not give the name of the ship to which they belong. I do not know whether these officers belong to the 'Rainbow' or the 'Niobe.'

Mr. CROSBY. I think the 'Niobe.'

DELUSIVE PROMISES OF MARRIAGES.

Mr. DOHERTY. Has the Minister of the Interior any information concerning the report which has been widely circulated in the press that a certain transportation company or some immigration agents in the United Kingdom, have by means of advertisements or other public announcements been seeking to bring, about the immigration of young women, using as an inducement the representation that there were husbands in plenty waiting for them, more particularly in the western country. I am quite aware that this is a matter that perhaps lends itself to a more or less facetious treatment, that it has, in fact, been treated in that way by some newspapers but it has a very serious side. Such an action if even in appearance sanctioned by the government might lead to very false impressions and possibly mislead some not overwise young women into coming into this country with anticipations that were fated not to be realized. This has formed the subject of very serious consideration amongst organizations in Montreal and other places which concern themselves with taking care of young women immigrants on their arrival in the country and endeavouring to protect them. These ladies think it is a matter that ought to be officially cleared up, that it must be quite understood that no one on behalf of this government or no transportation company, at least with the countenance of the government, should be permitted to hold out inducements of that kind to young women who might be misled thereby and might, on coming to this country, be exposed to very serious temptations, which these organizations seek to protect them against.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is this in anticipation of the amendment to the Bank Act by my friend from East Grey?

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not understand that bank clerks are held out as especially desirable husbands.

Mr. OLIVER. No inducement such as this has been held out by the government or any officers of the government with the knowledge of the government, and if it can be brought to the knowledge of the government that any of these officials have held out the inducement that my hon. friend has spoken of, I can guarantee that the connection of these officials with the government will cease there and then. I have some knowledge of the rumour referred to. I think it arose from some advertising said to have been done by the Canadian Northern or some of their agents, but while I am not able to give any particular details at the moment, my impression is that on inquiry being made of the Canadian Northern Company they absolutely repudiated any action of that kind and placed the blame where it is very frequently placed, on the newspapers, and intimated their belief that it was a misinterpretation of an interview to give occasion for a startling headline. No such announcements or statements have appeared recently, which would indicate that this was done without authority and that the practice, if it existed, has been checked.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister had any communication from a Miss Wileman who has been organizing the bringing out of domestic servants to this country? It appears that Miss Wileman before leaving for England had some understanding with the minister and according to the advice I have, the minister promised to give her all the assistance he could in the home immigration office but has failed to make good his promise. Therefore she has been detained over there with the domestic servants whom she had ready to bring to Canada. Has the minister had any communication with or made any promise to the lady which he has not fulfilled.

Mr. OLIVER. I have had letters from a Miss Wileman, and she has discussed immigration matters with me. She said that her purpose was to bring out domestic servants. I told her that the government could not make any special grants to her for that purpose, that if she wished to engage in that effort she would be subject to the same conditions, and considerations as anybody else. She has no promise of any consideration from me as far

as her work in the old country is concerned. The only promise she had from me was that if she could make arrangements here in Ottawa for the proper entertainment, and care of young women who were brought out by her as domestic servants, I would consider the bearing of some part of the special expense thereby incurred in their entertainment, and care on their arrival here. Beyond that she has no promise, and never had any from me.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 220) to incorporate the Albert and Moncton Railway Company—Mr. Emmerson.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

House in committee on Bill (No. 197) to amend the Railway Act.—Mr. Graham.

On section 4,

Mr. LANCASTER. This section is absolutely necessary in some form for the purpose of meeting the state of law as found by the Supreme Court of Canada in a recent decision, and with the principle of the section I am in entire accord. It has been found by a majority decision of the Supreme Court that where railway lands are not expropriated, but where a registration of a plan takes place, thus declaring the lands to be subject to the Expropriation Act, the railway company can practically wait forever without taking any other proceedings. The only suggestion I would make is to insert in the third line of subclause (b), after the word 'sanction,' the words, 'whether made before or after the passing of this Act.' Otherwise the effect of this section would be to make one law for the owner, and another for another, because it would mean that this remedy would apply only to orders sanctioning the location of the right of way made after the passing of this Act, and would not be any benefit to the people who are affected by an order made before the passing of this Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. From my standpoint, I do not see any objection to the proposed amendment; but I would like to hear some legal view as to whether or not it would wrongly affect cases that are now pending.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is the legal effect which I have in my mind. The order referred to granting the sanction, is the order of the board which has located the right of way, and therefore allows the railway company to register their plan which covers the land through which the railway passes, and the registration prevents the owner from selling. Whether the order sanctioning the taking of the land and the locating of the right of way is made before or after the passing of this Act, no railway company can be hurt by this provision, because in either case the owner should have the right which this section contemplates to apply to the Board to have the railway company say whether they are really going to take the land or abandon it.

Mr. GRAHAM. I see no objection to the proposed amendment.

Amendment of Mr. Lancaster agreed to, and section as amended agreed to.

On section 7,

Section 235 of the principal Act is amended by striking out the words 'the railway' at the commencement of the said section and substituting therefor the words, 'Subject to the company making such compensation to adjacent or abutting landowners as the board deems proper, the railway of the company'

Mr. GRAHAM. This section was left over until I would consult concerning it. It was feared it might give cause to litigation, but after close scrutiny, it appears to me that it will have the opposite effect. It merely provides that when a railway asks to go on the highway opposite a man's property, the board may say: You must pay this man so much damages or you cannot go there. The damages will be appraised by the board who have every facility to do so.

Mr. LANCASTER. The only objection is that you make the board both judges and arbitrators. I am not afraid of the board abusing its jurisdiction, but I question whether we should give them the right not only to say that damages must be paid but determine the amount.

Mr. GRAHAM. If a railway runs through a man's land, there is a provision for arbitration, but in this case it does not run through its land, and the board will only grant its application on the condition of its paying this man a certain amount of damages. The clause is drafted in the handwriting of the chairman of the board, and he thinks this would be an expeditious way of settlement. Heretofore there was no provision to meet a case of the kind; and as the land did not belong to any one, the question of damages was a difficult and litigious one. Damages may accrue. Sometimes a road might run between a man's house and his barn but not on his land, and the chairman thought it would be wise to let the board make the payment of damages a condition. It would be right to empower the board to determine whether a man was entitled to damages or not, but as to the quantum of damages, why should you ask the board to sit as arbitrators?

Mr. LANCASTER. You are going to make this a board of arbitration as well as a board for administering the Railway Act. It will

have to take evidence and sit as a court of law to determine the amount of damages and decide on legal points involved in the question of damages.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). This will facilitate the determining of the location. The railway may adopt that location, but only conditional on its paying the compensation fixed by the board. If you adopt this plan you have to pay damages to this individual. They may say: We do not go there. Besides that, in all these cases of expropriation the speediest is the best manner. Why should the party have to go to arbitration? He applies to the commission, they can determine the matter just as well as a board of arbitration. I think it is more to the interest of the party who is affected, and it is an extension of the principle which has not been in the Act at all, because unless a man's property is touched he has no claim for damages. It is an extension of that privilege. I think the plan proposed under the Act is the best.

Mr. LENNOX. It is an arbitration, whether that arbitration is conducted by a board or by somebody else. There are some cases where it would be advantageous to have the question determined by the board. Take, for instance, a case where there could be no doubt as to the damages, where it is an easy question which would not involve the hearing of many witnesses. That would be a case for the board to decide. But these cases are not very numerous. When it comes to indirect damages, where you do not touch a man's property, it is a difficult question to decide, difficult because you have to get a technical class of evidence, and that involves a number of witnesses. It means either that you have to bring a host of witnesses to Ottawa, or it means that the board have to go out, we will say to Calgary, or some other remote place, and that would involve a good deal of trouble. I think, on the whole, it would be wiser to leave the question of the amount of damages to be decided in the ordinary way by expropriation. I do not myself see the necessity of the board coming in at all. I think we might adopt an amendment something like this: 'Without prejudice to the right of a party affected to recover such compensation as he is entitled to.' Then the order might be made for them to go on. If the board is to intervene at all then I think it would be well to let the chairman of the board decide whether there should be compensation, and let the amount of compensation be determined in the ordinary way. But it could be done without the board intervening at all, and the order should be made subject to the right of the party to obtain such compensation as would be fair under the circumstances.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. By this Act we are giving them a new right. As the law of Canada now stands, it gives him no right of action except where he is injuriously affected.

Mr. LENNOX. That is the case at present, because there is no provision at all for compensation. But here we make a provision, and say that they shall have the right to go over the highway, but he shall have the right to compensation. All he can get in any case is whatever damages he has sustained. If he does not sustain any damage, he cannot get any, whether we have this provision or not. I am pointing out that we can either leave it for the board to determine whether he shall have compensation or not, or leave it solely to the arbitrators. But if the system pursued here is that the board should intervene, and if they do intervene, the utmost right we should give the board is to say whether he shall have compensation, and leave the amount of compensation to be determined afterwards by arbitration.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I agree with my hon. friend from Lanark (Mr. Haggart) that it is very much better to allow the board to determine what damages the party who is injured shall have. The board, in the first place, have to determine whether it is desirable to allow the railway to run upon the highway at the particular point asked for. The board would naturally take into consideration whether it is going seriously to injure the land owner or not, or whether it might not be better to compel the company to take some other route. Now, is it not much better for the land owner that the board should settle the damages as a condition of granting the privileges? The whole matter is determined then by a tribunal which is as competent as you could possibly have. If the suggestion of my hon. friend is acted upon, the company might be permitted to go on and build its railway on a highway, and the adjoining owner would be obliged to go to court, perhaps, and go from court to court, and obliged to incur great expenses before he could get redress. I think it is infinitely preferable that the matter should be settled by the board, and that the amount of damages which they find is reasonable shall be paid before the company is allowed to build its railway.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. When I drew the attention of the minister last night to the wording of the amendment, I did not express any opinion as to what would be the better course. I simply pointed out that it would give the board not only the right to determine as to whether a man

is entitled to damages, but also to determine the quantity. I am inclined to think that, as the matter will have to be gone into very thoroughly to determine, first of all, whether a man is entitled to any damages, and as they have to have the evidence before them, it would take but little more time for them to go a little further and determine the quantity of damages. Therefore, under the circumstances, as the board is a perambulating board, and as it is their custom to make a view of the premises, I think they would be able to ascertain in a summary manner, and with less expense, not only the right to damage, but the amount thereof.

Mr. PORTER. It occurs to me, with all respect to the opinion of others who have expressed themselves contrary to my view, that in this legislation there ought to be uniformity. The Railway Act has recognized all through it the principle of arbitration in settling compensation for damages caused to an owner by reason of the railway. That seems to be the principle that has been adopted by this parliament, and has been in vogue for a very long time. Now, if this clause, as proposed, goes into effect, there would be a new jurisdiction, a new court appointed having jurisdiction over this particular matter, which is not in uniformity with the other provisions of the Act. A great deal of difficulty has arisen by reason of legislation in that direction and along that line heretofore. My hon. friend from Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel) proposes to offer an amendment to this present Act covering the point I am about to mention in regard to farm crossings, and in regard to fences along farms. A serious question has been before the courts a number of times as to whether they have jurisdiction over this question, or whether it must be settled by an arbitration, or whether the Board of Railway Commissioners alone have jurisdiction to order the construction of a crossing, and the payment of damages in consequence of not having provided a farm crossing, or fences, and that sort of thing.

It has been before the courts a great many times in the province of Quebec, I think I am correct in saying, six or seven judges have decided one way, while five have decided the other way, and the Supreme Court has decided with the five. The conflict of authority arises from the want of clear language expressing the jurisdiction and the want of uniformity in jurisdiction. It seems to me that this parliament, having adopted the principle of arbitration in settling damages or compensation in the majority of such cases, ought to folow it in this case. And there are other reasons. It would be a great inconvenience if parliament required persons claiming compensation under this Act to go before the Board of Railway Commissioners. I think the Act should be amended in such a way as was suggested by me yesterday—so that the railway company, or the person claiming damages or compensation should have the right to call in a board of arbitration to settle the amount of damages. That procedure is inexpensive, speedy and convenient. The damages may be very small, and it is not well to incur the expense of bringing witnesses to where the board is sitting. It seems most desirable that the jurisdiction should be given to one body to try these questions of damages for compensation, so that there may be no conflict of authority, and no question where the person aggrieved should seek a remedy.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). It seems to me absolutely necessary that the commission should decide whether damages have been incurred or not. But if the commission decide that there are damages, I think it is not going much further to give them power to decide the amount of the damages. I do not know whether these arbitrations are final——

Mr. LANCASTER. Under $600 there is no appeal.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). But in some cases there is an appeal to a court. That is wrong; the decision should be final. I think it would be better to leave the whole thing to the commission, but, in any case, they should have the absolute right to decide whether there is damage or not.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. We all seem to agree that we are going to leave the board to decide whether the owner has right of action or not. That is not determined by the board in ordinary cases. If in this case we are going to allow the board to decide whether there is a right of action, they must necessarily go to a lot of trouble to reach a reasonable decision. It seems fair that this trouble and expense should be used to ascertain the amount of damages. If the Railway Commission were a body sitting in Ottawa to which all cases would have to be brought, I would have some hesitation in allowing them authority to assess the damages. But, in deciding whether there is damage or not they would probably view the premises, and at the same time could ascertain the amount of damages.

Mr. LANCASTER. If the suggestion of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) is carried out, the Railway Board will have to adopt a different procedure from that which they adopt in cases in which they act, but do not settle the amount of damages. The board sends its engineer, and he makes a report. I have

had a good many cases, and I do not recall any case in which the commissioners visited the locality except in the case of one very dangerous crossing at Grimsby which had killed eight or ten people. Moreover, to adopt the proposal made is to throw upon the board an entirely new set of duties—directing them to decide damages without appeal. In cases over $600 at present there is an appeal from the board of arbitrators to the Superior Court of the province. This is because where the damages are relatively large, legal questions are often involved, and it is felt that either party to the case should have the opportunity to go before the courts. But there is no appeal under $600. In the cases covered by this section the damages may be very serious. The whole frontage benefits of a man's property may be destroyed by the railway running along the highway. The commissioners ought to view the locality in order to settle the amount of damages. But, if these new duties were thrown upon them, they might interfere with the performance of duties which are more important, and which are thrown upon them by the present law. The commissioners might say in a certain case—they could do it legally: We will not take time to look at this place, but we will give $1,000 damages no matter what the damages may be; we cannot be bothered going into it any further. That is what might take place. The board is a busy one. It has more work piled on it than it can do. No one would have suggested to establish a Board of Railway Commissioners for such purpose as assessing these damages. I might favour giving them these duties if they had not enough to do, but they are likely to be busy enough attending to matters that properly come to them in the administration of the General Railway Act. I believe that if we go the length of declaring that the board shall decide whether damages are recoverable or not, that is as far as we should go. The fixing of the damages should be left under the arbitration clauses. I think the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter) has well explained that the same principle should apply in these cases of damages as in others. The amount of damages should be settled locally, where the evidence is thorough, and the expense of collecting it is small. Otherwise injustice will be done by compelling people to meet the commission in Ottawa, Toronto, Montreal, or elsewhere where they may be sitting, which may be at a considerable distance from the locus in quo. The more I think of it the more I think that the damages should be assessed and decided according to arbitration under the Railway Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. There are a great many ordinary arbitration cases with a certain method of procedure arising every day with railways. The cases that will arise under this section are very few indeed; in fact, up to date, nobody has any damages that will accrue under this section.

Mr. LANCASTER. But they would have had if this section had been the law.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think that everybody will agree that the number of cases will be very small in which there will be any damages. Let me read the section of the Act:

> The railway may be carried upon, along or across any existing highway upon leave therefor having been first obtained from the board as hereinafter authorized.

They must get leave first to go upon, along, or across the highway.

> Provided that the board shall not grant leave to any company to carry any street railway or tramway, or any railway operated or to be operated as a street railway or tramway, along any highway which is within the limits of any city or incorporated town, until the company has first obtained consent therefor by a by-law of the municipal authority of such city or incorporated town.
>
> 2. The company shall, before obstructing any such highway by its works, turn the highway so as to leave an open and good passage for carriages, and, on completion of the works, restore the highway to as good a condition as nearly as possible as it originally had.
>
> 3. Nothing in this section shall deprive any such company of rights conferred upon it by any special Act of parliament of Canada, or amendment thereof, passed prior to the 12th day of March, 1903.

These are the conditions under which the board may allow a company to use the streets. But here arises another condition: John Smith has some property. The property over which the railway goes is on the public highway, and it, therefore, does not belong to John Smith, but he says: It is going to hurt me if you allow the railway to be placed there. The board will say: We find that is so, and they can say to the company: You may go there provided you compensate John Smith. The damage amounts to so much.

Mr. LANCASTER. Would not an arbitration assess the damage?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, but it may be assessed there before it gets into the courts. The railway company, if it has to go into the courts, cannot tell whether they can go along that highway on reasonable terms or not. It is in the interest of everybody that there should be speed in the matter, and the railway companies say: We cannot afford to go upon the highway on those terms, and we will take a location in some other place. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred it can be settled in twenty-four hours. Looking at it from the practical

standpoint it will tend to keep men out of expensive lawsuits, to secure them fair damages, and enable the railway to be built within a reasonable time.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). That is the objection to your Bill.

Mr. LANCASTER. I agree with what the minister has said, that it will be more speedy, but speediness is not right if the amount is not correct. It is not justice to a man to get a speedy decision, if the decision is not for the right amount.

Mr. GRAHAM. He loses it in costs.

Mr. LANCASTER. If you want to hurry up the decision you can have it done in a month. The railway company must give ten days' notice, the property owner has either to accept or decline the offer and, if he declines it, they can go before the county judge and get the arbitrators appointed.

Mr. GRAHAM. Then there might be delay.

Mr. LANCASTER. If it can be decided in a month what would that amount to? It is the speediness of the matter that I am afraid of. It might be that the board would say: We must hurry up and make this order, and they would issue an order for $1,000 or $500, which might be too much or might not be enough. They just guess at it. It is done by explosion, they do not understand it, and I think it should be done properly. The land owner, as a rule, is a poor man, and the case should be decided in the interests of both parties in a proper way. There would not be much delay because, if the railway made a fair offer, it would be accepted, and it would be all over in ten days. If it made an unfair offer and it was submitted to arbitration, it would be all over in a month, and justice would be done, instead of the thing being jumped at.

Mr. DOHERTY. There would be a very great deal of force in the contention that we ought to have uniformity in the tribunal that is to assess damages in all cases of taking property by railways were it not for one thing. That is that we are dealing here essentially with an exceptional case. Where the matter goes to arbitration, and where the law absolutely settles the right to damages, the one question to be submitted is, how much ought to be paid. As the law stands at present the property owner, where the railway runs on the highway, has no rights. It is proposed to give him a right not absolutely established by law, but a right conditional upon the judgment of the Railway Commission. It would be a very inconvenient system to leave it to the Railway Commission to absolutely determine whether this man should have any damages or not and then proceed to another tribunal to establish how much they were. You may arrive at this result that the other tribunal may determine that this man is entitled to damages of a class that the Railway Commission never meant he should be entitled to. The Railway Commission have the determination of whether this man should get damages. There must be present to their judgment and mind some idea, not necessarily of the precise amount, but of the nature of the things for which he ought to be compensated. For instance, it might be that his access to the highway is interfered with. That is one ground upon which they might determine that he should get compensation. But if they merely say that he should get compensation, and send it to a board of arbitration, that board might assess the damages on some other basis, for instance, because his house is shaken, or for some other reason, which the Railway Commission never intended should be taken as the basis for assessing damages. And if they had foreseen that that was going to be the result, they might, in their judgment, have thought that giving the land owner damages for all injuries of that kind, would be a greater injustice to the railway than giving them damages generally. As the landowner's right depends on the judgment of the Railway Commission, one of the essential factors which must operate in leading them to a conclusion is what kind of damages he is to get, what the extent of the damages is to be; and to ask them to determine in an abstract way simply that he is entitled to damages of some kind, and then send it off to some one else to determine the amount of damages, is creating a situation where you make it exceedingly difficult for the Railway Commission to come to a conclusion on the question.

In the second place, you run the risk that the Railway Commission may say: You do this subject to compensating so and so, and the Board of Arbitration might think there was no damage at all. Thus you would have two tribunals arriving at contrary conclusions. Of course, that is not likely to occur, as boards of arbitration generally are disposed to grant compensation, and rightly so, perhaps, as the railway is disturbing the property of the man. In view of these considerations, it would be safer to adhere to the Act as proposed. By this Act, we are improving the position of the proprietor of adjacent lands; as it stands to-day he gets nothing. Would it not be wise to pass the Act as it now stands, leaving the whole matter to the determination of the Railway Commissioners? The proprietor advances to the extent that he gets to a state of affairs where he can obtain compensation. If it is found in prac-

tice that this does not work satisfactorily with regard to fixing the quantity of damages, it would be possible to remedy it; and if, on the other hand, it should be found to work out satisfactorily, it would obviate a great deal of complication, and in that case, I think, it would be desirable to adhere to it. On the whole, I think that the wise course would be to leave the Bill as it stands.

Mr. PORTER. With all respect to the hon. gentleman from Montreal, (Mr. Doherty), it seems to me there is a contradiction in terms when one reads the provisions of this Act. The hon. member seems to think that the board must determine the question first as to whether or not there is any right to compensation, and then that the arbitrators should say what the amount of that compensation is to be. It seems to me that that contradicts the provisions of the clause as here proposed. The clause, according to its fair reading, declares that where a railway crosses a highway there shall be a right to compensation, it is just a question of the amount. This parliament declares that there shall be a right to compensate, that is already decided by statute. The board would have no right to say: Well, yes, the owner shall have compensation. The statute says that already, so that when the argument is used that the board must determine whether or not there is a right to compensation, it is contradicting the statute. Assuming that the owner is entitled to some compensation, there is no reason why the railway company should not be able to determine that just as speedily as they determine the compensation they shall pay for the lands of an owner taken in any other way. They can serve their notice on him and make their offer, and if it is not accepted they can go to arbitration in the ordinary way. I would suggest that we strike out the words 'as the board may deem proper.' Then you will have the whole thing covered by one court, and the right court.

Mr. LENNOX. We cannot very well agree to this provision, as it is suggested, and I would suggest that this section also be allowed to stand over, so that we may consider it further and deal with it with the other amendments which the minister will bring in after we reassemble.

Mr. LANCASTER. I think, too, that section 11, which will be very contentious, should either stand over or be dropped. It is undoing what it took us three strenuous years to accomplish here for the owners of animals in this country. It is absolutely retrograde legislation, it is putting us back where we were in 1900, when I first came here. Many members will remember that a commission was appointed in connection with legislation introduced by myself, and the House finally determined unanimously upon a principle of law which should protect the owners of animals killed by railways. The minister, who was not in the House at the time, perhaps does not realize that the effect of section 11 is to undo that legislation.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. Order. The hon. gentleman is addressing himself to section 11, while other hon. members desire to speak to section 7.

Mr. LANCASTER. I wish to show why the committee should rise and report progress.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. There is no motion to that effect. I think the hon. gentleman should wait until section 7 is disposed of.

Mr. COWAN. I am very much disposed to agree that under the old section 235 the land owner has no right, and that the purport of this section 7 is under certain circumstances to create a right in the owner. The body that creates the right is the Railway Board, and the body that creates the right should determine its value, if the section remains as it is. But it seems to me that it was a great mistake to destroy the common law right of the owner by section 235. The power should never have been given to a railway to pass upon a highway without compensating the adjoining owners for the damage done to their property. That power was given by section 235, and, therefore, the common law right of the owner to compensation was taken away. It seems to me that that right should be restored, and the compensation to be allowed to the owner for the invasion of that right should be left to the ordinary tribunal of arbitration. My suggestion would be to amend section 235 so as to preserve the common law right of the adjoining owners when the railway passes along the highway, and then let section 7 specify the tribunal which shall determine the compensation after that is done.

Mr. GRAHAM. This clause seems to me to be so much in the interests of the people that I hesitate to drop it unless some good reason is given. The situation at present is that a man's property may be damaged by a railway running along the highway, and he has no recourse. By this section we propose to give him recourse. The clause appears to me to be so simple that I do not like to take the responsibility of dropping it. I would be perfectly willing to accept the suggestion that its consideration be delayed if the committee so desires.

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not adopt the suggestion of the hon. member for West Hastings, and simply declare the railway company liable to pay damages and not

bother the board with the matter at all? It is not the function of the Railway Board to determine whether or not there is an evil in the country that requires redress. It is for this parliament to take the responsibility of declaring that if a man's land is damaged in the way the section describes, he should have compensation, and then let the arbitration clause of the Railway Act settle the amount. I do not see why the board should be brought into the matter at all. They are not properly assessors as to land damages, nor law makers to say that the principle of land damages should be applied. This is the function of parliament. With regard to this provision causing litigation, there is just as much evil in litigation before the board as before the courts, and in my opinion litigation in the ordinary way is more expeditious than litigation before the Railway Board.

Mr. COWAN. I want to add another reason why there should be some little modification. As I pointed out a moment ago, this section deprives a land owner of a right which ought to be restored, and it gives the Railway Board the power to create a right. In the first place, the common law right is destroyed, and then a new right is given. The Board of Railway Commissioners are given the absolute right of determining the value which is a big power to put in its hands. I do not want the Bill withdrawn because it is an improvement on the law, but I want the common law right restored to the land owner, and leave the assessment of damages to the tribunal provided by the Act.

Mr. LENNOX. I want to see this section withdrawn, because if we pass it now, we shall never get it into proper shape. The Finance Minister made a very reasonable proposition last night when he suggested that clauses, which involve diversity of opinion, might be left in abeyance until we meet again. I do not want to drop this attempt to remedy the law, but I want the minister to take the same course with regard to this section as he did with regard to section 5, and as we shall have to do with regard to some other sections which we discussed last night.

Mr. GRAHAM. I do not want to be arbitrary, but here is a clause prepared by the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners for the purpose of getting justice for the people, and in a summary way compensating them for the damages they may sustain. Both sides of the House are preponderately in favour of it. In fact I would be willing to abide by the vote on the other side. Since there is such a preponderating opinion in favour of the section, I do not see why we should drop it. I am prepared to drop it if the committee so wishes, but as far as I can judge, the committee wants the clause put through.

Mr. LENNOX. No one suggests that the minister is arbitrary——

Mr. GRAHAM. Why not leave it for the committee to say whether we should drop it or not?

Mr. LANCASTER. If it were ordered so that the principle we approve be carried out, no one would want to drop it.

Mr. GRAHAM. The majority of the committee are in favour of the section as it is, and I do not think that two or three hon. gentlemen should insist on our dropping it.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Carried.

Mr. LALOR. As a layman, and consequently not qualified to speak from a legal standpoint, it strikes me that this particular clause is in the interest of the public, and I am in favour of it.

Mr. LENNOX. I have great respect for my hon. friend, but I have had better opportunity of forming an opinion as to what is in the interest of the public as regards this class of legislation. I have given a good deal of my time to the study of this class of question, and with the greatest respect for my hon. friend I want to maintain my own position. I want to do the very best I can for the public, and have given this matter such consideration as I could in the short time allowed us. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways is very fair. He says he is willing to leave this over until we meet again in a few weeks.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let the committee decide.

Mr. LENNOX. I think we ought to leave it over, because if we crystallize it into legislation now, we know how difficult it will be to have it changed again. If this were the only provision left over, I could understand the objection, but there are other sections left in abeyance, and when we meet again in a few weeks, we shall have more time to consider the matter. I am quite confident that if we had proper time to discuss this matter, I could convince my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor), that what the hon. member for West Hastings (Mr. Porter), and the hon. member for Lincoln-Niagara (Mr. Lancaster), propose, and I support, is very much more in the interest of the people than the provision we have before us now.

Mr. NESBITT. Did not the hon. member (Mr. Lennox) favour a clause last night containing practically the same language?

Mr. LENNOX. No. My hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) came over here, and I showed him

the form in which it was suggested the change should be made; 'the company making such compensation to adjacent or abutting landowners.' And it was suggested—I do not know by whom—that this should be changed to read, 'The company making compensation to such adjacent or abutting land owners.' But I never became settled in my own mind about it. If I spoke last night, I think I said that I objected to having the Board in it at all. And, having considered it more fully I all the more strongly object to departing from the established principle in these cases.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the general question been discussed of making compensation to persons whose land has not been taken?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is what it is for.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know, this covers it in part, but does not cover the ordinary cases to which I allude. I had a good deal of experience in cases years ago, and, both in Britain and here this principle has been adopted; if a man has a large property, of which, say 50 feet is taken and the rest damnified by the construction and operation of a railway, being rendered thereby unfit for the purposes for which it was intended or for which it is useful, he can recover damages in respect of that detriment; but if the railway runs close enough to his property to destroy it—even within a foot of it—if it does not take any of his property, he has no remedy for any damages resulting from the operation. That is the law, unless there has been a change by statute.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is as the law is now.

Mr. CARVELL. If my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) refers to what is called the Cotton Mill Case, I cannot recall the exact title at the moment, he will find—

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If there is legislation which authorizes it, that is different, but under the old English Land Act the law was construed exactly as I have said. If it were not so construed, in this country, this legislation would not be necessary, because, if by running a railway along a highway a man's property were injured, damages would accrue at once. However, I rose not to argue the question, but to inquire whether there has been any idea of covering the general question as this covers part.

Mr. GRAHAM. I think not. In their experience, the commissioners have found cases in which there is a proposition for a railway to run on or a long a highway, and the commissioners have to give the decision whether it shall do so or not. As I understand it no damages can be collected in that case and the Board wish to have the power to say to the railway commission: You may go there, but you must pay this man for damages.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That covers one class of cases the cases to which I allude.

At one o'clock, committee took recess.

Committee resumed at three o'clock.

On section 8,

Mr. GRAHAM. The discussion about section 8 was with reference to wires for the transmission of electric energy, and we were discussing it last night in the light of an attempt beng made to lay telephone or telegraph wires across. But what the chairman of the board is trying to straighten out is the difficulty when different power lines are crossing each other, or a street railway transmission line is crossing a steam railway. He wants to make standard regulations by which they can cross without making formal application to the Board of Railway Commissioners.

On section 10,

Mr. GRAHAM. This is a section we had a good deal of discussion about. Subsection 5 deals with the case where a railway is being constructed through inclosed land, and animals escape from such inclosed land upon the property of the company. I said last night that this clause had been practically agreed to by consultation with the Board of Railway Commissioners, and the farmers' deputations from the west intimated that it met their views. What was agreed to was the whole section, except the words at the end 'upon the property of the company.' Then after that was agreed to, it was suggested by the farmers' organization that there ought to be something put in to make a railway company responsible for the destruction of crops as well. But this did not quite meet with the view of the committee. Last night we were discussing how to reach that point. I had a clause prepared by the legal department which did not quite meet the views of the committee last night, and they thought there might be some improvement in it. This was the clause I proposed last night, and hon. gentlemen who know the situation in the west will see what I was trying to get at. This is what I proposed:

Where a railway is being constructed through inclosed land it shall be the duty of of the company to take effective measures to prevent cattle or other animals escaping from or getting upon such inclosed lands, or upon the property of the company, by reason of any act or thing done or permitted to be done by the company.

It is contended that by making it obligatory upon the company to prevent animals

from getting on land or in getting off land, they would be responsible for damage done to crops on the land as well as responsible for the killing of cattle who got off the land on to the property of the railway company. In discussing it this morning with my legal department again, I pointed out that the question raised in committee last night was that some officer or agent of the company might do something, such as a contractor, that would allow damage to be done, and under the clause as we had it the railway could not be held liable. I think the member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) said he was not clear whether these words would not be open to that construction or not, and it was thought desirable in a case of that kind to make clear just what the liability would be where a contractor or some official was concerned, because, as he pointed out, the railway company might issue instructions to any of its agents that they must keep the fences closed, and if they did not, then it would be open to the construction that the company had done their part and would not be liable.

Mr. LANCASTER. If contractors are there with their permission they ought to be responsible.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not think there would be much difficulty about an agent, but the difficultv is in the case of an independent contractor, with whom the railway company have made a contract to build a certain section of road, and has stipulated with him that he shall attend to the fences and carry out all the obligations. It is in that case that there might be difficulty about its being held that any acts of his which brought about any violation of his contract, and which brought about damage to outsiders, was an act permitted by the company.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is what I understood. Well, would it be right for us to make the company liable for the action of an independent contractor?

Mr. LANCASTER. He is there with their permission.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). If a contractor performs an act in violation of his contract with the railway company, should the company be liable?

Mr. DOHERTY. I think in that case the railway company ought to be liable, for this reason, that they are given a right to construct that railway, and it is quite proper that we should put upon them the obligation of seeing that the construction of that railway does no damage to an outsider; if we start by doing that, the company have no right to claim that they can throw off that obligation on to the shoulders of a contractor They might come to the contractor to be indemnified for any damage they may have had to pay. But after all, the source of damage to the individual is the exercise by the railway company of its power of constructing this railway. Whether it does it by itself or by another, it would be just that it should be responsible to the outsider for damage caused by the construction of their road.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The question is not whether they ought or ought not to be liable; it is whether the words of the Act cover the case.

Mr. LANCASTER. They should be liable, but they would have redress against the contractor. Like a corporation which is obliged to keep the sidewalks in repair, when they permit a contractor to tear up the sidewalks the municipality will still remain liable for damage to persons injured. Let the company put in a clause to indemnify the contractor. They should have redress against the contractor, but they should be liable to the injured persons.

Mr. GRAHAM. We all agree that somebody ought to be liable, and it seems to me it ought to be the company. I propose these words to cover the case:

Where a railway is being constructed through inclosed land it shall be the duty of the company to take effective measures to prevent cattle or other animals escaping from or getting upon such inclosed lands, or upon the property of the company, by reason of any act or thing done by the company, its contractors, agents or employees.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is still open to the objection of the hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) that the company might make all sorts of agreements with the contractor to protect themselves from damage. The company should be liable the same as a private individual. If a private individual enters my property through a contractor. he is liable for the action of the contractor.

Mr. GRAHAM. Let me read what was agreed upon as likely to meet the situation, and then I will read my amendment:

Where a railway is being constructed through inclosed land it shall be the duty of the company to take effective measures to prevent cattle and other animals escaping from such inclosed lands.

Those were the words approved of after a good deal of discussion. Now it is said that that would not protect the crop, and, therefore, I have replied with this section:

Where a railway is being constructed through inclosed lands, it shall be the duty of the company to take effective measures to prevent cattle or other animals escaping from or getting upon such inclosed lands, or upon the property of the company, by reason of any

act or thing done by the company, its contractors, agents or employees.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why not make it all damages without enumerating grain, stock, &c.?

Mr. GRAHAM. I want to adhere to what seems to be satisfactory to all the people most intimately interested in it. I am making it, if anything, stronger than they had it, and I do not want to go too far the other way.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is it the intention of the minister that the railway company shall be liable for all damages caused by the railway company, passing through inclosed fields, to grain, cattle or any other property?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why, say anything about cattle or wheat? Why not say:

Where the railway is being constructed through inclosed fields, the railway company shall be liable for all damage caused to the owner by the company, its contractors, subcontractors, servants or agents.

Mr. GRAHAM. It will be ordinarily subject to all damages it might cause, I imagine.

Mr. CARVELL. I do not think that is as strong as the minister's proposal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I would propose that the subsection be changed to read as follows:

Where the railway is being constructed through inclosed lands, it shall be the duty of the company to take effective measures to prevent cattle or other animals escaping from or getting upon such inclosed lands or upon the property of the company by reason of any act or thing done by the company, its contractors, agents or employees.

Mr. COWAN. Should you not also say 'or any act omitted to be done'? There are two classes of negligence there are omissions and commissions.

Mr. GRAHAM. I discussed that pretty thoroughly with my legal department today, and they convinced me by legal arguments that everything would be the act of the railway company in producing a condition that did not before exist, and that it would all come under this section.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would be quite a burden on the railway which would require them to take effective steps, because effective steps must mean steps that will effectively prevent any damages. I do not see how you could make it any stronger.

Mr. DOHERTY. The obligation, no doubt, is to take effective measures to prevent any damage resulting from any act done. If the damage results merely from the omission to take effective measures you will not be able to bring suit based on any act that the railway company did to cause that damage. The damage will be caused because they did not do something.

Mr. GRAHAM. Give us a case.

Mr. DOHERTY. Suppose the fences are not up, and they omit to put them up.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the fences are not up it is because the contractors have knocked them down. This applies to inclosed lands.

Mr. DOHERTY. Suppose they are accidentally knocked down. I cannot at the moment lay my finger upon a particular case of omission in this instance.

Mr. EMMERSON. Supposing there is a whirlwind?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, supposing these fences are carried off by force majeure, and the contractor omits to reconstruct them. Suppose he comes through a gate and leaves it open, he does not open the gate but he just leaves it open. The damage is caused because he omits to close it. In most legislation that I have seen of this kind provision is made for acts of omission.

Mr. EMMERSON. Supposing the fence is destroyed by a whirlwind the company would be liable for not taking effective measures to prevent whirlwinds.

Mr. DOHERTY. Not to prevent whirlwinds. Underneath all law there lies the commonsense principle that a man is not responsible for a force majeure; but if the fence has been destroyed by a whirlwind the company are not responsible for the destruction of the fence, but they become bound to put up a new fence, because that would necessarily be an effective measure, and if you undertake to sue them you will not be able to show that by any act they caused the damage; the act was the act of God, but still they would be responsible for the replacing of the fence.

Mr. GRAHAM. Take the case of a whirlwind which destroys a fence. The section speaks of a property which is inclosed. The railway company has nothing to do with property which is not inclosed. It does not touch it, and it is not responsible in any way.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Suppose the fence is destroyed by fire?

Mr. GRAHAM. If the railway company has not taken the fence down it has nothing to do with it. It has not made any change in the condition.

Mr. COWAN. If it is not put up by them would it not be an act of omission?

Mr. GRAHAM. If it did not come within the purview of where they were operating they would have nothing to do with it. I went through this for an hour with my legal department, and they convinced me that this would meet every condition where a railway could possibly be held to be liable.

Mr. COWAN. What would the minister say of the case mentioned by my hon. friend from Montreal, St. Anne (Mr. Doherty), where the gate is left open? Would that be an omission?

Mr. GRAHAM. The next section says that the company shall be liable unless where the gate is left open by some person outside of its employees. The case of a gate being left open is fully covered by another section.

Section, as amended, agreed to.

On section 11, the company liable except under certain conditions.

Mr. GRAHAM. This section was left over largely on account of the words 'any person.' It was argued last night that the railway should not be exempted from liability for damage to such a large extent if 'any person' left the gate open on either side of the railway. It was contended with some force that there should be some qualification which would say that if a gate were left open by persons other than the employees of the company liability would result. This is what I suggest as a prefix to subsection (b). I will read the whole section:

The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be killed or injured upon the company's land through the operation of the railway, save where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person—

(a) failing to keep the gates at any farm crossing, at each side of the railway closed, when not in use.

I believe that clause is all right, because it presupposes that the duty of the farmer is to keep his gate closed. I had thought of prefixing to subsection (b) the words:

Other than an officer, contractor or employee of the company leaving open any gate.

Making the same prefix to (b) as there is to (c). That, I think, would have the legal effect of saying that if any person in the employ of the company left the gate open the railway would be responsible, but that if any other person left it open the railway would not be responsible.

Mr. LANCASTER. If we are going to pass this section, I would say that the limitation should be to the owner of the animal or his servant. Why should the owner suffer because some stranger, who is trespassing on his property leaves his gate open? I appeal to the committee not to pass this section. We discussed this matter for three years, beginning with 1901. We had a commission appointed especially to deal with this question. They took evidence all over the country and reported to parliament, and finally the legislation of 1903 was passed by the unanimous consent of this House. In the committee I had many warm supporters on the Liberal side of this legislation, when it was being passed, among them the hon. member for South Wellington, and the former member for Haldimand.

The hon. gentleman yesterday said that he was repealing for the benefit of the farmers the clause which says that they shall not allow their animals to be within half a mile of a railway crossing on the public highway, but he is repealing more, he is repealing the clause which puts the onus on the railway to prove that the owner is negligent. The hon. gentleman said that the farmers' associations were in favour of this legislation. With all due deference to the farmers' associations, as a man having actions against railways in cases of this kind, I say that the farmers' associations are bringing on themselves interminable litigation to construe this Act. Apparently they do not understand what their rights have been since 1903, if they approve of this. There has been no litigation, the only question has been the amount of damages where they were recoverable, and where they were not recoverable, no attempt has been made to secure them. Any lawyer could tell from the statement of facts whether the company was liable or not, and the railway company also recognized when they were responsible.

The present law is quite clear that the railway company is liable unless they can prove that it was through the fault or neglect of the owner of the animal or his servant that the animal got on the track, except in cases where the animal was killed on the highway. Why change all that? This is a most drastic taking away of the rights which we, after full consideration during three sessions, granted to the owners of animals. I would suggest that the minister should repeal subsections (a) and (b) of section 294, but not the whole section, as this Bill proposes. Sections (a) and (b) cover the point which the minister said yesterday he was dealing with, that is the removal from the farmer of the obligation to keep his animals at least half a mile away from a railway crossing; but subsection (c) provides that the farmer shall not recover if the animal is killed at the point of intersection, which I think is good sense, while subsections (d) and (e) provide for the protection of the farmer by enacting that he is not to be held responsible for anything ex-

cept his own negligence, and is entitled to recover if the railway company does not prove such negligence.

We have the law codified in plain language in subsections 3, 4 and 5 of section 294. Why should we disturb all that and take away the protection it affords? Why should we unsettle the law which was determined on by this parliament after full and careful consideration for three years, and which has been in operation for 8 years, and is now thoroughly understood by everybody? I tell the minister, as a lawyer who has a great deal of experience in these cases, who discovered the outrageous state of the law before he got a seat in this House, and who has realized the beneficial results of the change that was accomplished in 1903, and the great saving of expense in litigation consequent upon that change, that this particular section is under the circumstances very hastily entered upon. The farmers do not know what they are talking about if they think the proposed legislation is going to get them paid for one animal where they were paid for ten before. I am not objecting to the removal of the penalties if an animal happen to get within half a mile of the crossing; but I say, do not go further than that, and remove the protection to the farmer who takes all reasonable care to keep his animal at home, and it escapes because of the act of some stranger or because of a windstorm or a falling tree breaking down the fence, and so letting the animal escape. Most farmers do not want their animals to get within half a mile of a railwawy crossing. I have never known a farmer to get damages equal to what a horse or a cow was worth; they always take a little less; they are not anxious to get their animals killed. They cannot help their animals sometimes escaping, and when they do escape in spite of their reasonable precautions, if this Bill passes, the legislation which this parliament enacted, after three sessions of thorough discussion, will be gone, and these men will not be able to recover.

There is no real protection to the people in this. People are not going to allow their animals to escape just for the sake of getting paid for them, and if it be found that the owner of the animal or his employees be at fault, the railway companies do not pay. If, however, the conditions existed which were so carefully laid down by parliament in 1903, which entitled the owner to recover, he would get his money. Under these circumstances, I think that this section ought not to pass in its present shape. The purpose the hon. minister has in view could be very well met by repealing subsections 1 and 2 of section 294 which deal with the question of animals getting on a highway crossing, which he wants to change, but to take away the principles laid down in subsections 3, 4 and 5 will create chaos. Practically all the liability is gone because the question resolves itself into whether the animal got on the railway through the fault of any person other than the railway company. A railway company is not going to open a man's gate or smash his fence, and if it was not the agent or servant of the railway company who caused the trouble, the man cannot recover, even if the company did not keep the animal off its tracks as it should. The minister should not undertake to undo all we did in 1903, and change entirely the condition of affairs and cause litigation with very little hope for the owner of the animal to get any substantial justice.

Mr. GRAHAM. The object of this Bill was to cut out anything unnecessary and get in a small compass something that would make a railway company liable for the killing of cattle on its tracks. The conditions in the colder provinces are so different from those in the west that it is difficult to devise a section which may be applied with equity in both sections. In the older sections, farmers, as a rule, do not allow their cattle to run near a railway, but in the newer portions the cattle graze at large, and that is not illegal. We had a provision to the effect that if the cattle were grazing within half a mile of a railway, the owner had no recourse. In the east that would be all right, but not in the west.

Mr. SPROULE. Neither would it in the east.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was suggested to make the railway companies liable without reservation for all the cattle killed on their tracks. That was very drastic. I called in the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners to discuss the question with him. He pointed out to me what many farmers in the west did last year, and what does not agree with my hon. friend's experience in the east, namely, that railway companies pay the settler for the animal killed. But hundreds are killed in the west which are not found.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Thousands.

Mr. GRAHAM. It is contended by the Chairman of the Board that this will sweep away a great many of the difficulties, and make the railway companies directly responsible except under definite conditions here outlined. If it does not protect the farmers more than the present law does, the amendment would be futile.

Mr. LANCASTER. It does not.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Farmers' Association is advised by its solicitor that it does.

Mr. MEIGHEN. On what does the minister base his statement that the Farmers' Association in any way has consented to these amendments?

Mr. GRAHAM. I have a copy of a letter here which was addressed to a number of members of parliament by Mr. James Bower, president of the Canadian Council, Manitoba, in which he says that the draft amendment submitted to him, and which is in this Bill, meets their wishes.

Let me read the letter:

Ottawa, March 31, 1911.

Dear Sir,—In response to the request of the farmers for amendments to the Railway Act, giving them more protection from loss in having stock killed on railways, the Hon. Mr. Graham, Minister of Railways and Canals, has caused the following draft amendment to be made, to be submitted to parliament.

The clauses as amended in this form meet with our approval and as representing the farmers, I wish respectfully to enlist your support in having them become law.

Yours faithfully,

JAMES BOWER,

President Canadian Counoil of Agriculture.

I shall now read the draft clause which Mr. Bower endorses:

Sections 294 and 295 are repealed and the following substituted:

294. The company shall be liable to pay the full value thereof to the owner of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be killed or injured upon the company's lands through the operation of the railway, save where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person—

(a) failing to keep the gates at any farm crossing, at each side of the railway closed, when not in use; or,

(b) leaving open any gate on either side of the railway provided for the use of any farm crossing without some competent person being at or near such gate to prevent animals passing through such gate on to the railway; or,

(c) other than an officer, contractor, or employee of the company, taking down any part of the railway fence; or,

(d) turning any animal upon or within the enclosure of any railway company; or,

(e) except as authorized by this Act, without the consent of the company, riding, leading or driving any animal, or suffering it to enter upon any railway and within the fences and guards thereof; or,

(f) leaving the gates of the company at railway stations open for the convenience of the public.

This being the situation, I thought I had arrived at a solution of the difficulty. I had a clause drafted by the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, who has given this more attention than any man in this House, and has made greater complaints to me about the loss of stock suffered by farmers in the west than any man in this House, and who has an experience greater than that of any man in this House and ability equal to any.

Mr. LANCASTER. Without any franchise to make the law.

Mr. GRAHAM. We are making the laws. He has had more experience.

Mr. MEIGHEN. How has he had any experience dealing with cases of damage to cattle?

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend makes a little technical objection. The Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners has to deal with the conditions that bring about the loss of animals, and has had more experience than any man in this House in that direction. He deals with the conditions under which animals are kept off or let on to a railway track, and it is to him we look to suggest a remedy. And it is to him we look to suggest a remedy from his experience. He has suggested a remedy. He has drawn a clause which has been submitted, as I pointed out, not first to me but to the chairman of the Board of Agriculture of the Dominion of Canada. That gentleman as representing the farmers says this is satisfactory, and will meet the conditions, and asks that the House put it through. Of course, these gentlemen are not infallible, but their opinions are worthy of consideration. I am bound to say, with all deference to gentlemen on the other side of the House, that I have not yet found the chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners erring on the side of any company.

Mr. LANCASTER. He has in this case.

Mr. GRAHAM. If there is any charge made against him it is that he is hard on the companies, and favours the public.

Mr. LANCASTER. He is sawing off now.

Mr. GRAHAM. I believe this amendment meets the conditions, and ought to pass.

Mr. LANCASTER. Let me appeal to the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham), as a practical man and a legislator—for I have more respect for him as a legislator than I have for the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners. That gentleman has no franchise to make laws for this country, and, with all deference, he does not know the people's side of this question. He knows the railway conditions, he knows how the track should be built, and how orders should be made as

to railway operation; but he does not know how the farmers live in regard to these railway intersections. He does not know the conditions the farmers are up against. For this gentleman as an administrator—and I do not wish to be misunderstood nor do I wish to throw bouquets—I have every respect. But I have no respect for the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners saying that he knows what the conditions of our people are in these matters better than the Minister of Railways. The chairman of the board is very busy, and he would do well to stay busy administering the laws we put up to him to administer, and not—to use an ordinary expression—butt in and tell the minister that he knows the conditions better than the representatives of the people who have to live under the conditions, and who with all deference to the chairman of the board, know what are the practical evils to be remedied and the practical common sense way to meet them from both sides. I appeal to the minister; can he say the farmer's association is well advised in asking for the repeal of subsections 4 and 5? They were well satisfied with the way this Act was working except as to the conditions of which my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen), is better able to speak than I, though I know something of them from him. The minister is right in repealing the section in regard to animals on the highway within half a mile of the crossing. But, while he gives the farmers five cents worth in this way, he is taking away $5,000 worth by the repeal of subsections 4 and 5. By doing this, as the hon. member for Portage la Prairie shows, he is taking away the chance of the farmer to recover for his animal killed in this way. Subsections 4 and 5 fix on the railway company the onus of proving negligence on the part of the owner. Cannot the minister see that these men were ill advised when they asked for a repeal of these subsections? They do not understand. They are like a child of eight or ten years who is asked if he would not like a dollar to buy candy and told all he has to do is to get his guardian to sign away the farm that will come to him when he is 21 years of age.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). In what case were they protected before in which they are now not protected?

Mr. LANCASTER. If subsection 4 is not repealed here is what we have:

When any horses, sheep, swine or other cattle at large, whether upon the highway or not, get upon the property of the company and are killed or injured by a train, the owner of any such animal so killed or injured shall, except in the cases otherwise provided for by the next following section, be entitled to recover the amount of such loss or injury against the company in any action in any court of jurisdiction,—

The cases provided for in the following sections are practically the same as are provided here.

—unless the company establishes that such animal got at large through the negligence or wilful act or omission of the owner or his agent, or of the custodian of such animal or his agent.

5. The fact that any such animal was not in charge of some competent person or persons shall not, if the animal was killed or injured upon the property of the company and not at the point of intersection with the highway, deprive the owner of his right to recover.

These put the onus of proof of negligence on the company. It was not a matter of guesswork. The farmer goes out in the morning and finds two of his cattle gone. He does not know how they got away any more than the railway company does. But if these animals are killed at the railway and unless the railway company can prove negligence, the owner can recover damages. The fact that the animal was not in charge of a competent person is not to be taken as proof of negligence. That is a necessary part of it.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Which exceptions let the company out of liability in such cases? I cannot understand how they would be relieved.

Mr. LANCASTER. Under the Act as now proposed?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Yes.

Mr. LANCASTER. It says:

The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be injured upon the company's lands through the operations of the railway, save where such killing or injury was caused by reason of any person——

Then you enumerate all the cases that will happen, and make each of them an exception. I cannot see how a man can possibly recover on an animal killed on the track unless he can prove that the station master, or somebody else in the employ of the company deliberately admitted the animal to the property of the company.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is on either side of the railway at a farm crossing.

Mr. LANCASTER. The animal is not killed unless it gets upon the railway, and the party does not recover except in those cases. Now every one of those clauses provided for every possible case where that animal would get killed, unless it could be proved that an agent of the company deliberately led the horse or cow upon the railway.

Mr. GRAHAM. Supposing his cow was at large and strayed on the crossing?

Mr. LANCASTER. Then he cannot recover simply because he suffered it to go there. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the animal is killed because it goes down the highway to the point of intersection, and gets on the track and is killed on the railway property.

Except as authorized by this Act, without the consent of the company, riding, leading or driving any animal, or suffering it to enter upon any railway and within the fences and guards thereof.

Except that before, we had this deliberate statement that that alone should not disentitle a man to recover. That before was in the shape of a liability on the man. No one can doubt what the decision of the courts will be if you repeal subsections 4 and 5, which put the onus upon the company of proving that the man himself was negligent. Then they don't have to prove anything of the kind. I have no doubt that this Act has been drawn in the interest of the railways, although the minister does not think so.

Mr. GRAHAM. I cannot see any point where it is in their interest.

Mr. LANCASTER. None is so blind as those that won't see. I want to point out to him that in the sections that are a protection to the farmer in this regard, the onus is to be on the company to prove him negligent. Surely the minister knows that when these sections are repealed a different construction is to be put upon the sections that remain. I repeat they were adopted by the unanimous consent of this House, and they were sent up to the Senate, who objected to them. We had a conference, and the Senate had to give in. The farmers' associations were thinking of the fact that they were escaping the trouble of having to keep their animals half a mile from the railway crossing, and this section would mislead them into thinking so, because section 294 does say that. I do not see how this can be construed so that the man can be paid for his animals under ordinary circumstances. But I am certain that it won't apply to nine out of ten cases that it now applies to, because there always will be litigation to ascertain whether he led, or drove the animal, or suffered it to enter upon the railway or within the fences and guards thereof. Now let me suggest to the minister to repeal subsections 1 and 2 of section 294, and leave subsections 3, 4 and 5. If he does that he will be doing something for the farmers; if he does not, he will be handing them five cents with one hand and taking away from them five dollars with the other. It is the common law duty of a man to keep his animals at home. Now, unless we declare that the company shall be liable, and if we do not set up against a defence to such liability what is now being repealed, then at common law the man would be guilty of negligence for letting his animal get there, although he did not intend it. We are all sincere in desiring to protect the farmers' rights, and the intention of the minister is to increase the protection to the farmers. Therefore, it can be doing no harm simply to repeal subsections 1 and 2 of 294, and leave subsections 3, 4 and 5 to stand.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I have been endeavouring to ascertain whether the proposed amendments lessen the liability of the railway company for accidents, and it seems to me that if there is any difference it increases their liability. I think if we make a comparison of the law as it was in sections 294 and 295, with the proposed section, which consolidates the two, we will find that in the part which my hon. friend complains of, that is the part where animals are allowed to run at large, the proposed amendment increases the liability of the company instead of lessening it; in this respect, that under the Act as it exists at present, when animals are running at large and get upon the railway, prima facie the company is responsible. The burden is put upon the railway company to prove that the owner of the animal was guilty either of negligence or of some wilful act with respect to it. The meaning of the present section, I think, is that even if he is guilty of negligence the railway is liable.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, they are not liable if he suffers it to get there.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Yes. The only way the railway can escape is by proving that the owner wilfully turned the animal on the railway property. The first two paragraphs of the proposed section 11, (a) and (b), are practically the same as they were before. They refer to farm crossings, and do not refer to animals running at large. Therefore, these are the sections which refer to animals running at large:

The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be killed or injured upon the company's lands through the operation of the railway.

They state there that they shall be liable for everything. What is the exception?

Save where such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person—

(d) turning any animal upon or within the enclosure of any railway company.

That is the only exception with regard to animals at large. They are liable for all animals save where a person turns an animal upon or within the enclosure of the railway company.

Mr. LANCASTER. You must read (e) with that.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). No, (e) does not refer to animals running at large.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, because he suffers it to get there.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). But that refers to wilfully leading, driving or suffering the animal to get on the property of the railway company. That is precisely the same as the old clause. The old section 295, paragraph (e) says:

> Except as authorized by this Act, without the consent of the company, riding, leading or driving any such horse, cattle or other animals, or suffering the same to enter upon any railway, and within the fences and guards thereof.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think the hon. gentleman quite understands my argument. The old clause was a declaration that a man should not do a certain thing. Section 295 was the clause which declared the company's liability.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Quite so, in the case of animals running at large.

Mr. LANCASTER. Section 294 was a declaration of liability. Section 295 simply said that a man should not do certain things but that was not a declaration of the liability of the company.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Section 294 is dealing with animals running at large. Section 295 is not dealing with animals running at large, it is with the question of animals running at large that we are now concerned. Section 294 says that when any animals are killed or injured the owner shall be entitled to recover 'except in the cases otherwise provided.' This section simply says that they shall be liable for all animals unless it be shown that they are deliberately driven upon the railway.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Is not the chief point of difference between the sections, that in the old Act there is an express provision that the company must establish negligence?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Yes, but here they are removing even negligence on the part of the other party.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. But it does not say that they must establish it.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It makes no difference whether there is negligence or not; the company is liable. It does not make any exception for negligence of the owner; it only specifies wilfully driving the animals on the property of the railway company.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Under the old Act, if I find my cattle killed in the enclosure of the railway company, the company will be liable unless they can establish my negligence. Is there anything in this Act which allows me to take a similar position? There is an express stipulation in the old Act which says that the company must establish negligence. True, this Bill says that the company are liable, but it does not say that they must establish negligence. The old Act declared their liability unless they proved that they were negligent. Under the present Bill there is no express stipulation which says that the company must prove negligence. In that respect I think the farmers have been gold-bricked.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Under the present Act the burden of proof is on the railway company to prove facts which disentitle the owner to relief—negligence or some wilful act. The present section does not, in express terms, say that the burden is upon the railway company to prove that the owner of the animal turned the animal upon the railway.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Or was guilty of negligence.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). There is no question of negligence under the present Bill, because the company is liable whether there is negligence or not.

Mr. LANCASTER. The question of contributory negligence is always open, and a court would say that ordinary contributory negligence disentitles the claimant to recover.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not know about that. Ordinarily, in a case of contributory negligence, you cannot recover, but if the Act says that you shall recover except in a certain instance, you must prove this instance. Whether or not the doctrine of contributory negligence is applicable, that stands upon its own footing, and we are not concerned with it one way or the other. I do not know that anybody will say that we ought to put a statute upon the statute-book saying that contributory negligence or the absence of contributory negligence must be proved by either side.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is what was done in 1903, and that has been the law up to now.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Not contributory negligence. What you are saying is that they are not liable unless the company prove negligence or some other act on the part of the owner.

Mr. LANCASTER. We have said that a certain thing would not disentitle a man to recover which would otherwise be con-

tributory negligence. We have said that allowing any animal to run at large shall not disentitle him to recover. We did not say that that should be contributory negligence which should disentitle him.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would the hon. gentleman have any objection to changing the proposed section so as to say that the following only shall be defences to an action under this section? Then we would know if we had our case proved, and it would lie upon the company to make a defence upon the grounds mentioned in the various subsections.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). As to turning the animal upon the property of the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. Suffering it to get there.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not know whether or not it should be amended, but I do not see much need of it for this reason. The only escape from liability is in case, there is evidence that the owner of the animal turns it upon the railway. I think it is going pretty far to say that the railway company must prove that the owner turned the animal upon the railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the law to-day.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). It goes further to-day. It is not a question of negligence. There might be negligence in the way you fasten a gate, or in a hundred other things. That ground of defence is taken away absolutely. The only way one railway company can escape under the proposed amendment is by showing that the owner actually turned the animal upon the railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. No; suffered it to get there.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is a different thing entirely.

Mr. LANCASTER. It says so in paragraph (e).

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). That is another clause. Under the present clause there is no burden upon the railway company as to suffering an animal to get upon the railway.

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). No. The present Act, section 294, subsections 4 and 5, only refer to animals running at large. Section 295, subsection (3) says that:

> Except as authorized by this Act, without the consent of the company, riding, leading or driving any such horse, cattle, or other animal, or suffering the same to enter upon any railway, and within the fences and guards thereof.

There is no burden of proof upon the railway with respect to that.

Mr. LANCASTER. But you must read subsection 5 of section 294 of the Act which you are repealing, and which says that the fact that such animal was not in charge of some competent person shall not, if the animal is killed, deprive the owner of the right of recovery. You are taking that away and you might as well read the two together, that is read the present law with that which you are proposing to-day. It is saying that there shall not be contributory negligence.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I cannot read anything in the present Act which casts any onus on them in respect to anything in section 295.

Mr. LANCASTER. It distinctly says so.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I do not think it is any great hardship. I think it will be going pretty far as the section is to say that before the railway company can succeed, they must prove that the owner of the animal killed, turned it on the highway.

Mr. LANCASTER. That has been the law since 1903.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). In the working out of it any lawyer of experience in these things will say that it amounts to nothing at all. Consider a man going to court——

Mr. LANCASTER. No, they do not go to court.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Whether a man has a genuine claim or not he knows if he turned the animal on the highway. It does not depend on a tramp opening the gate as at present, the only point is that it has to be proved it is there, the company is liable unless somebody shows the man turned it on the highway himself. Then is it any great hardship that a man should have to go there and prove what any honest man should be able to prove without difficulty, that he did not put it on the highway himself?

Mr. LANCASTER. We came to the conclusion that that was not a good argument, the man does not know how the animal got away.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). My hon. friend ignores what I said as to the difference between the present Act and the old Act. In the old Act it was not the act of the person himself that was the issue, it might be the act of other people, of any one opening the gate. There you very well said: 'We will not put the onus on the owner to prove that somebody did not open the gate, or did open the gate, we are going to put that onus on the railway, and say

that unless the railway prove there was some negligence or something of that kind, they shall be liable.'

Mr. LANCASTER. Why change it now?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Because we are striking out the negligence entirely. There is only one thing that exempts the company, and that is if the owner actually turned the animal on the railway himself.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why not strike out the words 'save where,' in the second line of paragraph 11 so that it would read:

Unless the railway company establish that such killing or injury is caused by reason of——

So as to put the onus on them of establishing the exception.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I know that opposition or even comment on this Bill is very likely to be interpreted as opposing the farmers' demands, and consequently a very serious step. Much as I respect the opinion of Mr. Bower and those associated with him, I do not see why we should abdicate our functions in their favour, nor yet in favour of the Chairman of the Railway Commission. We had a committee of the House last year dealing with a proposed amendment to the Railway Act, including an amendment to subsection 4 of 254 which is repealed by this Bill. That committee reported favourably on the amendment which was adopted by the Minister of Railways, and embodied in the law only a year ago. By virtue of that a large class of losses for which there had previously been no compensation, were included in the list of those losses for which a railway is liable. That is now all repealed. What is the explanation?

Mr. GRAHAM. I argued in favour of that clause in my discussions with representatives of the farmers of the west. I pointed out that clause as assisting them in their own protection. They were unanimous in telling me it did not meet the object at all. In one or two places I had very warm discussions with representatives of the farmers, and they told me that this did not meet the case.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The explanation is the same as formerly, that Mr. Bower did not want it.

Mr. GRAHAM. It was not Mr. Bower.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Nobody contended that the amendment of last session gave all that was desired. I introduced an amendment this session that went much further, but to say it meant nothing and did not cover cases not previously covered, is to talk nonsense. Under the old law in certain conditions a railway company was liable if it killed or injured horses or cattle. Under the same conditions of negligence it might do other damage besides killing or injuring horses or cattle by trains or engines, but in such cases the railway company was not liable. The courts held, on the theory of the history of the legislation, that the class of damage for which they were liable was confined to the killing of horses or cattle. There is a line of cases leading up to that where serious losses are suffered with no redress. This parliament got to work and remedied that. Now the whole remedy is to be thrown to the winds because a certain gentleman out in Alberta does not understand what it means. This same gentleman had submitted to him the amendment which I introduced this year and he could see nothing in it. I venture to say that any man on this side of the House could submit any amendment in the world to that man and he would see nothing in it. What has been the law in this regard? Up to the present time the law can be stated in very clear and very brief terms. If an animal is killed or injured on the right of way by a train or engine the owner recovers unless the company shows the animal got there by the negligence or wilful act of the owner. It is very true, as the minister says, that conditions are different in the east and in the west, and that the law as it stood remedied conditions in eastern Canada to a much greater extent than in western Canada, because in eastern Canada it would be almost impossible for the company to show that the animal got at large by the negligence or wilful act of the farmer. In western Canada animals run at large almost indiscriminately, in fact a great part of the industry of western Canada would have to collapse unless animals were so allowed to run at large, and as a consequence of their running at large in this way in almost 80 cases out of 100 the railway company were able to show at once that the animal was simply turned out, that it got out of a gate and was running at large on the commons. In four cases out of five the company got an admission from the man himself and they took the precaution generally of getting it by affidavit. When the killing of an animal was reported to them their usual course was to send an affidavit to the poor fellow whose animal was hurt and he filled it out and sent it in and then and there the whole case collapsed, because the animal got out in that way. A gentleman near Portage la Prairie had a band of horses, some one drifted in his gate, got a drink of water, and went away leaving the gate open. The band of horses got out. But it happened that the farmer knew that the gate was open; he was passing

some corner of his farm and saw the gate open. We were compelled to advise that man that he had no case, although his animals were killed by getting on the track through the negligence of the company in not keeping their gates closed. Although the negligence of the company was tne clear cause of the loss, the farmer had no case.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an improvement on that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. This is no improvement. Whereas before it was a matter of some difficulty to advise the farmer whether he had any cause of action or not, under this Bill he who runs may read and may tell him that he had no cause for action. It has been held that unless you expressly put the burden on the company to prove the exceptions, the burden is on the plaintiff, and he has to negative the exceptions. Previously he did not have to negative them. All he had to show was that the animals were not on the right of way, and the burden was on the company to show that he had let them loose. The state of the law before was not satisfactory, at any rate in western Canada, because the company should have been liable unless they could prove that they were not negligent. It is not hard to frame a statute to meet the case if we simply take the common law of the country, and apply it to the Railway Act; but the railway companies have taken good care that the common law is negatived almost throughout the Act, and it was never more clearly negatived than it is by the amendment now submitted. If we apply the principles of the common law, the result will be that the railway company will be liable for loss if the negligence or breach of the law by the company is the immediate cause of the loss, no matter whether there was a remote cause or not. Let the railway company show that there was no negligence on their part, and then they will escape. That is all that has to be done. I submitted to this House a Bill which unfortunately did not meet the approval of Mr. Bower, but which I did hope to submit to the approval of the House of Commons, which to my mind would have brought the railwav law into conformity with common law principles, and make the last party whose immediate negligence was the cause of the loss, the party to pay for that loss. The exceptional circumstances that attend the operation of railways, and the exceptional advantage a railway company has over private individuals, should make it responsible for disabusing itself of that negligence and should throw upon it the burden of showing that it was not negligent. That would not be hard to do. If the company provided the best possible guard, kept its fences up and its gates closed, it would not be negligent, and should not be held liable. The two principles of law pertaining to railway companies should be these. They should in every case be responsible, where under common law principles an individaul would be responsible; and, by virtue of the great advantage they have over the ordinary individual whose animals are injured, they should shoulder this additional responsibility, and have the burden where in the ordinary case the plaintiff has the burden. If we embody that in the Railway Act we clearly cover the ground. But to alter section 294, which has been the foundation of all the legal decisions which have made the law pretty clear, and substitute five new exceptions, making it not only impossible to recover, but almost impossible for counsel to advise the farmer whether he has a ground for action or not, is only to make it a case of scorpions instead of whips. I submit that these amendments should not pass at the present time. If it can be shown that they in any degree relieve the difficulty under which the farmers of the west suffer to-day, I will vote for them; but I can see no advantage in them except the striking out of clause which I support. From that on they are doomed not only to produce confusion, but to make it more difficult to advise the farmer whether he is shouldering a lawsuit or the hope of success, and at the same time to make it impossible in many cases that now exist to advise him clearly that he has any case at all.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Both sides are evidently agreed as to what the law should be. The difference is only one of interpretation. Surely both parties can get together and draft a clause which will carry out the meaning of what the House wishes.

Mr. COWAN. What change does the minister propose in subsection (b)?

Mr. GRAHAM. I was going to prefix these words: 'Other than an officer, contractor or employee of the company.'

Mr. LANCASTER. It should be 'other person than the owner.' You are putting the liability on the farmer for the acts of somebody else. Why not say the converse of what you have—unless it is the owner or an agent of the owner? Why should he take the risk of other people's acts? I think I made it quite distinct what the vice of this proposed legislation is. Under the present law, unless the owner or his agent or custodian is guilty of some negligence, he should not be debarred from the right to recover.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). If you look at the old section, you will find it provides: that no person whose animals are killed by

any train shall have a right of action if they were killed by reason of any one, for whose use any farm crossing is furnished, failing to keep the gate on such railway crossing closed.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister now suggests that this clause be modified so that the person shall be an officer or agent or the company. But an officer or agent of the company is not at all likely to let an animal through. The most likely person is the mischievous or careless one who does not own the animal and is not responsible —the tramp or meddler, or trespasser. Surely the owner should have the right to recover unless he himself or some one employed by him is to blame. Subsection 4 of section 294, which we are repealing, has this declaration:

> Unless the company establishes that such an animal got out through the negligence or wilful act or omission of the owner of the animal or his agent or custodian.

Why not put in these words? You are taking away the only protection the farmer has.

Mr. DOHERTY. I notice that in the old Act the clause that corresponds to section (a) has these words:

> The person for whose use any farm crossing is furnished failing to keep the gate closed.

The company is liable unless it shows that the accident was due to the person for whose use the farm crossing was furnished, failing to keep the gate closed. But under this amendment the company escapes having to prove that. What is the reason for the difference?

Mr. GRAHAM. It is the specific duty of some one to keep the gate closed. That is quite different from opening a gate. To my mind it is the duty of a farmer to see that the gate is closed because the gate is his. It would be very hard to prove who left the gate open, much harder than to prove who opened it. Everybody might leave a gate open who saw it open and did not close it. My own opinion is that the man responsible for keeping the gate shut is the farmer; and if it be left open, he should see that it is shut. But the next clause imposes a penalty on the company if any of its employees left the gate open. I am strongly of the opinion that this section, as now drafted, is a great improvement on the present statute. The people who have given it the most study and are most interested are of that opinion. Looking at the thing from a business standpoint the present law contains some paragraphs, to which my hon. friend referred, which are so obscure that they give rise to great difference of opinion as to what they really mean. At any rate the farmers in the west who have lost cattle have not been able to get paid for them, whatever the reason may be. In discussing this question with men of some legal ability, they take the ground that we ought to wipe out all this excrescence of language and show clearly that, no matter who may be in fault, the railway company shall pay for the cattle except under certain specified exceptions. This Bill is plainer than the present Act and it leaves less room for expensive lawsuits and gives greater facility to the farmers to get paid for their cattle. However, I do not want to detain the House. If my hon. friends opposite insist, we will drop the clause for the present and take it up when we meet again and let the rest of the Bill go through.

Mr. LANCASTER. I have no doubt that if we could have a private conversation—say a committee of three or four of us—I could convince the minister of things he does not yet see. There is the common law principle of contributory negligence which we must not forget. The present law provides that it shall not be contributory negligence if an animal loose on the highway gets on the railway track. But no matter how clear the liability, if you provide that if the person injured knew the danger at the time and could have avoided it, you practically nullify the provision. We have got round that hitherto by the section I have referred to. However, I am glad this is to stand. I presume it will not be proceeded with until after the holiday? And it will be struck out in the meantime?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes.

Mr. HERRON. I am not a lawyer, and I do not know what would be the effect of the clause proposed, but for my own part, personally, I would be prepared to accept any amendment accepted by this House, knowing that nothing could be worse than the present situation so far as our part of the country is concerned. I would accept this Bill on trial and be glad of it, for it can be no worse than what we now have. I am sorry it is to stand over, because farmers are sustaining losses every day by having their cattle killed or injured on the railways, and in no case have the railways paid damages for the last three or four years—and they do not make pretense of paying as the law is now; they completely ignore the claim of the farmer for the loss of his cattle.

Mr. EMMERSON. That is good for lawsuits.

Mr. HERRON. People will not attempt lawsuits, because they know they cannot win. I am very sorry the House cannot agree on something in regard to this Bill.

Mr. DOHERTY. I am free to say that, as I read this proposed section as it stands, it

does seem to me to be a great improvement from the point of view of the farmer whose cattle are killed on the railway. Personally, I think there might be some verbal alteration that would make it clearer; but I would be sorry to be responsible for creating a situation in which the Bill would be passed and this left out, for I think leaving it out would be a distinct loss to the persons who wish to invoke the benefit of the law against the railway company in these matters.

Mr. NESBITT. I would suggest that the company follow the advice of my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron) and let the section pass. This is not as the laws of the Medes and Persians; if it is not satisfactory we can amend it. I am not a lawyer, but I am a farmer; and from a farmer's standpoint I think this is much more satisfactory than the old clause.

Mr. LANCASTER. Is not the present law satisfactory in your part of the country?

Mr. NESBITT. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. What are the objections?

Mr. NESBITT. I would not like to take up the time of the House at this stage explaining to my hon. friend, but if he will take dinner with me I will tell him all about it.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, you can't do that with me.

Mr COWAN. I would suggest alterations that, I think, will bring the opposing views together. In subsection (a) I would insert the words that are in the present subsection (a), 'for whose use any farm crossing is furnished.' That would make it read that the company shall be liable save where killing or injury of cattle is caused by any person 'for whose use any farm crossing is furnished failing to keep the gates at each side of the railway closed, when not in use.' In subsection (e) I would insert the word 'wilfully' before the word 'suffering.' I am inclined to the view expressed by the hon. member for South Essex (Mr. Clarke) that this amendment limits the defence of the company to the subsections in section 11. Prior to that, the company would have the additional defence of negligence. But these subsections in section 11 are wider than those in the old Act. The words I suggest, if added, confine the failure to keep the gate closed to the man for whose use it is furnished, and under subsection (e) it would confine the suffering of the animals to enter upon the railway to wilfully suffering them so to enter. And if similar change were made in subsection (b) as in subsection (a) would not that meet the case and improve the law? In other words, I would insert before the word 'leaving' in subsection (b) the words 'for whose use any farm crossing is furnished,' making the other verbal alterations that this change would necessitate.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Cowan) understand that a man can recover damages for cattle killed on the track unless he himself, and not some stranger, left the gate open?

Mr. COWAN. In regard to subsection (a), yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is not the law. If any person left the gate open the man could not recover. But the law should be changed in that respect.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). Did the hon. gentleman say he could not recover if a tramp left the gate open?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Clarke, Essex) say that if a tramp left the gate open and cattle got through the farm crossing gate—

Mr. GRAHAM. We are not speaking of the farm crossing gate.

Mr. COWAN. That is under subsection (b). I should think it strange if, with these words inserted in subsection (a) the railway company could succeed without proving that the owner for whose benefit the gate was furnished had failed to keep it closed. I think the extent of subsection (a) should be limited so that that failure should be confined to the owner for whose use the farm crossing was furnished.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was the wording, but it was held that as regards a farm crossing, a layman would not understand it to be the law.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The case that went to appeal held this point, that if that gate was opened by any human agency whatever, the farmer could not recover; but if the gate became opened by any other agency than a human agency, he could recover. Take subsection (f):

Leaving the gates of the company at railway stations open for the convenience of the public.

Now upon the prairie it is a common thing at country points for the gates to be left open. I have in my mind a case where the gates are left open by careless people, and animals are permitted to run from the roadway on to the track. The gate is opened in the first place by some person for the convenience of the public. But why should an individual who is no party to that Act, be deprived of his recourse if he is injured, simply because the station agent, for instance, is no longer obliged to see that the gate is kept open?

Mr. OLIVER. I would like to follow up what my hon. friend from Macleod (Mr. Herron) has said. Coming from a part of the country that is more interested in cattle raising than possibly any other, I want to say that what the hon. member for Macleod said is said by every person in that part of the country, namely, that they cannot recover under the present law. I do not think that is a creditable condition of affairs to this country. I think if, on the authority of the Chief of the Railway Commission, a section is drafted which, in his estimation, will cover the point, parliament should accept that drafting and have the law go into operation, so that cattle owners will have some effort at protection which at present, and under existing circumstances, they have not.

Mr. LANCASTER. The trouble is that most of us on this side of the House are not convinced that this gives the remedy the hon. gentleman wants. I have had a good deal of experience in connection with this question for twenty-five years, I have had a lot to do in making this law before the hon. gentleman from Oxford ever entered this House, and this House was unanimous in putting on the statute the clause we have now.

Mr. OLIVER. It does not matter what legislation we pass here, it must run the gauntlet of the courts, and even neither my hon. friend or any one else can say what interpretation will be placed upon any legislation by the courts.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does not the minister think that we should pass legislation here so clear and distinct that it will not have to go to the courts to be fought over? Then why leave it in this chaotic state that is now proposed?

Mr. GRAHAM. We will never get legislation that lawyers will not differ about, that would be ruinous to the profession. But I think we have discussed it pretty well. I do not want to force my views on the committee, and if the committee wish to drop this I will do it if the committee want to vote on it, let us vote on it and get on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The minister proposed an amendment to subsection (b) which has not yet been put, namely, that before the first word, 'leaving,' the following words be placed, 'other than an officer, contractor or employee of the company.'

Mr. COWAN. Instead of the words the chairman has read I would suggest 'for whose use any farm crossing is furnished.' It was because of the omission of those words in the old Act that the liability my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie mentions, arose. If these words were inserted the chief of our difficulties would disappear.

Mr. PORTER. Does the minister intend to alter the last word in the section as it is framed here? It reads now 'or injury is caused by reason of any person.' Is it intended to change those words 'any person,' or leave it in that way?

Mr. GRAHAM. In the reprinted amendment placed in my hands, the only change I was suggesting was the one read a moment ago by the chairman, prefixing certain words to subsection (b).

Mr. PORTER. When these words are left there it seems to reverse the whole state of affairs that has existed up to the present time. It not only repeals the clauses of the old Act which fixed the onus upon the railway company, but it declares that the onus shall be upon the other party. Let us take an illustration. Suppose a farmer finds his horse lying upon the railway track killed. He goes into the court to recover the loss sustained by him. He knows that he did not leave his gate open, and he knows that the horse has escaped by reason of the gate being opened. He has been guilty of no wrong and his servant or workman has not been guilty of any wrong. In connection with that one must recollect that this railway has been put upon his farm against his wish or will, and that it is something he could not possibly prevent. This dangerous thing which has killed his horse has been forced upon him. He should be surrounded by every possible protection, but if this section passes, what is the result? He finds his horse dead, and he sues the railway company to recover the damages which he has sustained. When he goes into court he is met by this section, and he must prove, first, that his horse was killed by the railway. He proves the value of his horse. He has to prove that his horse was not killed by reason of any person failing to keep the gate at his farm crossing closed. He has to prove that no person left the gate on either side of the railway open. He has to prove that no other person, other than an officer, contractor, or employee of the company took down any part of the fence. Then, he has to prove that nobody led, drove, or suffered the animal to be put upon the railway. He has to prove every one of these negative propositions, and it is utterly impossible for him to prove them. He can go into court, and put his agent, his boys, and his girls, into the witness box and prove that no one of them did any of these acts, but for him to prove that no other person did them is utterly impossible, and the result will be that

unless he does prove any of these things he will be non-suited by the court. Under the old law that condition of affairs is reversed. If he finds his horse killed upon the railway track the onus is upon the railway company to prove that it got there through his negligence or through his wilful act. This entirely reverses the whole situation. This is most dangerous legislation. It is most unfair because this dangerous thing has been placed there against the man's wish, he had no way of preventing it, and yet you make him responsible for everything that happens. It would make it reasonably fair if the onus of proof were confined to the acts of the owner, and if, instead of the words, 'any person' it read 'or injury is caused by reason of the act of the owner, his agent, servant, or workman.' He could prove that, but when it is left open by the use of the words 'any person,' he cannot recover at all.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Would the amendment that I proposed about an hour ago meet the point raised by my hon. friend? I suggested that we strike out the words, 'save where,' and put in the words, 'unless the railway company establish that.'

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. PORTER. I would like if the minister would do me the favour of answering the question I put to him. Does he think it is fair to reverse the whole system of proof, and the right of recovery in the way I have pointed out, or does he say that it is not the case?

Mr. GRAHAM. My answer is that my advice is that it is not the case.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I understand the hon. gentleman (Mr. Porter), is referring to the clause of crossings and gates. Hon. members will probably remember that under the present law the railway company is not liable for the acts of third persons.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is in regard to gates and farm crossings.

Mr. PORTER. We are making that still stronger by legislating that it is a fact.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). No, I think we are making it the other way. I do not think my hon. friend has read section 295 which says that no person shall have any right to recover if his animals are killed by reason of any person, without any qualification, leaving open any gate. If any person at all wilfully leaves it open there is no relief.

Mr. PORTER. Is that fair?

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I am speaking of the old law. You say we are going back.

Mr. MEIGHEN. It has been held that 'any person' does not include any officer or person connected with the railway corporation.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). I would think so. So, by putting these words in you are only making the statute read in the way in which it has been accepted by the courts.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister stated that his advice was that it was not shifting the onus by this legislation. I can give him my own experience on that. I have argued as strenuously as I was able that under the present law we should not have to negative the exceptions, but I did not succeed in convincing the judge, and the judge held that we had to negative every exception that is in the Act. We will certainly have to under this law. The minister's advice, of course, may come from the distinguished authority in Alberta who told him that there was nothing in last year's amendment.

Mr. GRAHAM. My hon. friend has no right to make that insinuation. I got my advice from as eminent a lawyer as is in the House.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I was not making any insinuation.

Mr. GRAHAM. I am not quite sure that the gentleman from Alberta is not an eminently respectable man, but I did not get my advice from him.

Mr. LANCASTER. Let us get to the actual law we are making.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Question, question.

Mr. LANCASTER. You will not get it through in that way. I did not labour for three or four years to get a law in the interest of the people to have it wantonly kicked out on the eve of adjournment, and in the dying days of the session. That sort of spirit will stop this Bill altogether

Mr. GRAHAM. That is not the spirit that was shown last night in withholding this Bill for the convenience of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. LANCASTER. The minister made a reasonable proposition that we should drop this, and consider it during the recess, but certain gentlemen behind him who have very little regard for the legislation that they are passing, did not think his suggestion reasonable, and called out 'carried.' The statement of my hon. friend from West Hastings (Mr. Porter), is absolutely unanswered. He has put it

better than I did. He has put it more concisely, and the Minister of Railways ought to be able to answer it. Why does he want to enact that because any person leaves a gate open by which an animal escapes, therefore, the man who loses the animal has no right to recover The minister says he is advised that he is not changing the present law.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say that.

Mr. LANCASTER. He says he is not changing it to the injury of the owner of the animal.

Mr. GRAHAM. I did not say so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was once a lawyer myself. Would my hon. friend look at the old section 295 and compare it with the language of the new section, and tell me whether it does not change the onus of proof and place it on the company? Under the present law the wording is entirely different, and the onus is on the individual claiming damages.

Mr. LANCASTER. No.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, because it says 'no person whose horse, &c., shall have any right of action if the animal was killed or injured by reason of any person for whose use, &c.' The present section has been framed to throw the onus entirely on the company and it says the company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of the animal that may be killed or injured on the company's lines, except where such killing, &c. You have there a positive provision for the company being liable, and in order to bring the company within the exception, the company is obliged to prove that those exceptions exist. I think it is clear that the language shifts the onus of proof from the individual to the company.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman says he was a lawyer. When he was, did he read the whole contract and not a part of it only before giving an opinion.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I got tired of being a lawyer.

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman takes good care to ignore what was so insisted on here and what cannot be answered, that sections 4 and 5 of the Act which is now being repealed did put the onus on the railway company, and that the section which he says formed a liability does nothing of the kind. Section 295 as it reads to-day is that no person shall do certain things. It is not a declaration of liability on the company, and the hon. gentleman should have taken care to read the section before undertaking to make the House think it was a declaration of liability. If the minister does not do what I have suggested he should at least accept the suggestion of the hon. member for West Hastings, and strike out the word 'person,' so that it would be unless such killing or injury is caused by reason of such owner or his agent or servant, &c. That would be reasonable.

Mr. COWAN. I understood the Minister of Public Works to deny that a person going into court to a statutory right has to prove the statutory exceptions to that right. I understood him to say he does not have to prove those statutory exceptions.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I said was that the section makes the company expressly liable save in certain excepted cases. I said that my view of the law was that the company would have to prove the exceptions, and I think that is manifest from this: suppose a plaintiff went into court and proved that his animal was killed on a railway track and there was no further evidence, the judge would in that case direct the jury that the plaintiff was entitled to recover, and if the company wished to prove there were exceptions, which took his right to recover out of that express provision of the statute, the onus would be on the company to prove that.

Mr. COWAN. The minister then recognizes that the right of the owner of the animal killed is a statutory right. If that be the case I say with all deference to the minister, who in times gone by was a lawyer, that it is elementary law that that man cannot come into court and assert a statutory right without proving and without having upon him the burden of proving that he comes within none of the statutory exceptions to that right. I cannot understand from what source the Minister of Public Works gathers his knowledge. I am not professing to have the most profound knowledge of all the principles of law, but I think I know whereof I speak when I say that no farmer who had a horse destroyed by a railway and who went into court under that provision would have a ghost of a chance of succeeding unless he alleged that he did not come within any of the exceptions and proved that he did not. It is an elementary principle of law that where a man has a common law right, he has to prove the facts that give him a right to recover; but in a case of a statutory right, he has to prove that he is within the four corners of the Act; and you will find it in all the reports in every case dealing with statutory right, that he must prove that he does not come within the statutory exceptions to that right. So that I can see no possible objection to the amendment suggested by the hon. member for North Grey. If it is really intended to put the burden of proof upon the company, that is the only way in which it can be done. You must expressly say in your statute that the burden of proof is upon the company and

not upon the man who claims a statutory right under the Act.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I think we are all desirous of having the Bill go through. If we are all agreed that the onus should be on the company, there can be no harm in inserting the words which I suggest. I would, therefore, move that the words 'save where' in the 44th line be struck out, and there be inserted in lieu thereof the words 'unless the company establish that.' The section would then read:

The company shall be liable to the owner for the full value of all horses, sheep, swine or other cattle that may be killed or injured upon the company's lands through the operation of the railway unless the company establish that such killing or injury is caused by reason of any person——

Then follow the exceptions.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an amendment that may mean a good deal more than I can see at the present time. As far as I am concerned, I would rather let the clause stand for consideration, because this may have a far-reaching effect.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I am proposing the insertion of these words because they are in the old Act.

Mr. GRAHAM. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has argued for two or three hours that the changes we have made in this Bill do not make the clauses applicable to the old Act—that what was a good clause in the old Act would not be a good clause now. The proposed amendment may be all right, but I would like some time to consider it and advise as to just what the effect of it is.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The hon. minister might submit the Bill to the Minister of Justice, and some one from that department should be here to explain its legal bearing. It is lamentable that no member of the government who is responsible for its legal construction is here. The Bill before being approved of by counsel should have been submitted to the Minister of Justice and have received his imprimatur.

Mr. GRAHAM. That was done, and the Department of Justice approved of the section as it is now before the House.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The amendment of the hon. member for Norh Grey cannot be now entertained, as there are two amendments already before the committee—that of the Minister of Railways and that of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan).

Mr. COWAN. I think the principle involved in the amendment proposed by the hon. member for North Grey is of more importance, perhaps, than the principle involved in the amendment proposed by myself. For that reason I would withdraw my amendment so as to get an opportunity of voting for the other.

Amendment (Mr. Cowan) withdrawn.

Mr. GRAHAM. If the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) urges his amendment strongly, I would prefer to let the clause stand. I was in hopes the committee would accept the Bill as it is.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Surely the amendment of the hon. member for North Grey simply carries out what the minister says is the intent of the Bill.

Mr. GRAHAM. It may, but my hon. friend urges that I should get the advice of the Minister of Justice. I have got as good advice as I could get in the country. The Bill has been approved by the Justice Department and the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and I do not want to accept something that may alter the whole situation.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. There is every disposition on this side to have the Bill go through with reasonable amendments. We are losing one of the large benefits under the old Act. I would move to strike out the words 'save where' in the forty-fourth line, and substitute the words 'unless the company establish that.'

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The question is now on the amendment of the hon. the Minister of Railways.

Amendment agreed to.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I beg to move in amendment that the words 'save where' in the 44th line be struck out and the following inserted in their stead: 'Unless the company establish that.' This means that the company must establish the defences set out in these five subsections.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is a step in the right direction, but I am not prepared to say that it meets the whole difficulty. The minister made the suggestion a few minutes ago that this clause be dropped and we should pass the rest of the Bill. I think it would be well to carry out that suggestion.

Mr. GRAHAM. Rather than accept the amendment proposed, I will postpone the clause. If the hon. gentleman presses his amendment I shall have to vote against it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If the hon. minister says he will drop the clause and let us amend it when we meet again, I am willing to withdraw my amendment.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. GRAHAM. I shall probably introduce again this section the first opportunity. If we had a week more to discuss this measure, I would feel like pressing it. as I fully believe it is a great improvement over the old Act on behalf of the farmers.

Mr. NANTEL. I beg leave to propose another amendment. Section 252 in the present Act provides as follows:

Every company shall make crossings for persons across whose lands the railway is carried, convenient and proper for the crossing of the railway for farm purposes.

Section 253 provides:

The board may, upon the application of any landowner, order the company to provide and construct a suitable farm crossing across the railway, wherever in any case the board deems it necessary for the proper enjoyment of his land on either side of the railway, and safe in the public interest.

Section 254 says:

The company shall erect and maintain upon the railway, fences, &c.

The amendment I propose is as follows:

In the exercise of his rights, as set forth in sections 252, 253 and 254, the claimant may apply concurrently either to the provincial courts having jurisdiction in the matter of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and sections 252, 253 and 254 are amended accordingly.

My reason for proposing this amendment is that the courts have construed section 253 as taking away the jurisdiction from the provincial courts in this matter. I think it is important to restore this jurisdiction. This section of the law, though it seems very clear and inoffensive, has given rise to a great deal of contention and controversy. Twelve judges, seven in the province of Quebec and five in the Supreme Court here, have given judgment on this question. Seven have decided on one side and five on the other side. And the result has been that the five were right against the seven. I consider that it is in the interest of the farmer not to be obliged, when he needs a farm crossing or when he needs a fence repaired, to be obliged to come to Ottawa and make his application to the Board of Railway Commissioners. I do not believe that, at the beginning, it was the intent of parliament to create in that board a tribunal to decide points in litigation. For these reasons, I move the amendment which I have read.

Mr. GRAHAM. The Board of Railway Commissioners was established to deal with these very matters. It is not stationary in the city of Ottawa, but traverses the entire country where business arises which demands its attention. It gives a quick and ready adjustment of these differences. Only to-day I read in the paper of a widow woman writing a letter to the board about a railway crossing. The railway was asked if the letter were true, and when it (the railway) said, 'yes,' judgment was given, and the question settled. It would disarrange the whole machinery for the control or management of these things if we were to refer them to every court in every province. I think it would be reactionary legislation and not in the public interest. I would certainly ask the committee not to accept it.

Mr. DOHERTY. I think there is something to be said——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Six o'clock.

Mr. DOHERTY. If hon. members think it is not right of an hon. member to put forward his views on these matters, I am prepared to bow to the will of a brute majority. At the same time, I do not think it proper that endeavour shoud be made to prevent a member speaking in this House. I do not propose to deal with the subject at any length, and I think I can say that I usually express myself in a manner not to give offence. This involves the rights of the people, and I think hon. members should be willing to listen to a discussion—

Mr. TALBOT. I call your attention, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that it is six o'clock.

Mr. DOHERTY. I take it that hon. gentlemen prefer to hear me after dinner when, I think, I may assume, they will be in better humour.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. DOHERTY. At six o'clock I was saying, in support of the amendment proposed by the hon. member for Terrebonne (Mr. Nantel), that his proposition does not involve withdrawing jurisdiction from the Railway Commission. In all cases such as referred to by the minister, where the matter is very simple and can be disposed of by an application, which might be made by letter, the jurisdiction of the Railway Commissioners would remain perfectly untouched. In cases of that kind the parties would take their cases to the commission. But there is another class of cases, cases in which the right may be subject to serious dispute, and where it may be necessary for one side or the other to examine a number

of witnesses. Now, I fail to see that any injury could be done if, in cases of that kind, it were made possible for the person seeking to enforce his rights, to address himself to the ordinary tribunal. It is true that the Railway Commission moves around from place to place, but I hardly think it would be desirable that the Railway Commission should transport itself to the remotest limits of the county of Terrebonne, or the county of Gaspé or any back county, for the purpose of hearing a contested claim for a railway crossing. Yet if that were not done, you would put perhaps a large number of people, and in many cases poor people, to heavy expense as well as trouble and inconvenience, by having to go into some large centre where the commission is sitting, to be heard upon the matter. After all, the right involved is a purely civil right, given, if you will, by a statute of this Dominion; and it is a reasonable proposition that the right should be allowed to stand, as it was certainly understood to be up to the time of the judgment of the Supreme Court, to which my hon. friend from Terrebonne referred; that is to say, in a condition where, though the Railway Commission would continue to have jurisdiction, a jurisdiction which might be very advantageously exercised in certain cases, there would still remain a jurisdiction in the ordinary tribunal of the province to deal with the matter. It is doubtful whether the statute meant to take away that jurisdiction from the ordinary civil tribunals, because the courts themselves were, as my hon. friend pointed out, divided upon the question. I can see no injury that would result, either to the railway companies or to the parties interested, from leaving it open to the complainant to address himself to the Superior Court. There are cases where justice is more satisfactorily obtained before an ordinary tribunal than before the Railway Commission. The amendment would leave the very beneficent jurisdiction of the Railway Commission still in existence, and liable to be exercised in cases to which it is appropriate.

Mr. GRAHAM. The decisions of the Railway Board in regard to these crossings have been eminently satisfactory. The commission has all the machinery for hearing evidence, and further, they have a full engineering staff at their disposal. In a dispute as to the practicability of a crossing they despatch an engineer, no matter where it is, to make an examination on the ground and report. It seems to me the proposition before the committee is rather calculated to favour litigation. It looks to me as if it would be a breeding ground for litigation rather than a quick and speedy way of settling disputes.

Amendment (Mr. Nantel) negatived.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterick.)

Mr. GRAHAM. With the consent of the House, I will answer two or three questions which I was not able to do this afternoon.

THE NATIONAL HYDRO ELECTRIC COMPANY, LIMITED.

Mr. MONK:

1. At the time of the lease granted by the government to the National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited, of the water-power on the Ottawa river at Carillon, were tenders called for publicly announcing said alienation and calling for bids?
2. On the 1st January, 1911, was the said power under lease to any party? If so, to whom?
3. For how many years was the lease existing in January last of said water-power to run?
4. When was the National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited, incorporated?
5. Who are the president, vice-president and directors of this company?
6. Will the government lay on the table of the House a copy of the order in council of the 14th March, 1911, authorizing the lease of the Carillon water-power to the National Hydro-Electric Company, Limited?
7. Who signed the lease on behalf of the lessee company?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. No.
2. Legally speaking, no, but the former lessee having assured the department that he was in a position to have a strong company organized to develop the power, was given time to complete these plans.
3. Answered by No. 2.
4. 9th of December, 1910.
5. Henry Miles, president, Louis Gosselin, secretary.
6. No objection if moved for in the usual way.
7. Henry Miles, president, Louis Gosselin, secretary.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—EASTERN DIVISION.

Mr. LENNOX:

1. What is the total expenditure made and incurred for the construction, whether included in the original contracts or otherwise, of that part of the eastern division of the Transcontinental railway extending from Quebec to Winnipeg, and what is the estimated amount required to complete?
2. The same inquiry is made as regards the part of the line from Quebec to Moncton, the Quebec bridge not being included in either question?

Mr. GRAHAM:

The following is given by the Transcontinental Commissioners:

1. Total expenditure to February 28, 1911, $69,983,500; estimated amount to complete, $43,052,850.

2. Total expenditure to February 28, 1911, $26,634,800; estimated amount to complete, $5,668,550.

Note—The right-of-way for terminals at Quebec city is not included.

CENSUS OF NORTH AND SOUTH RIDINGS OF ONTARIO.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. What was the population of the North and South Ridings of Ontario, respectively, as found by the census of 1891 and 1901?

2. What was the cost of the census for each of these two Ridings in the years 1891 and 1901?

Mr. FISHER:

1.	1891.	1901.
Population of North Ontario ..	21,385	20,689
Population of South Ontario ..	18,371	16,793
2.	1891.	1901.
Cost of census, North Ontario	$1,613.97	$3,468.82
Cost of census, South Ontario	1,249.78	2,184.32

AMOUNT SPENT ON AGRICULTURE AND MILITIA.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

What were the amounts spent respectively, on Agriculture and Militia in the following years, viz.: 1867, 1874, 1878, 1888, 1896, 1900, 1905, 1910?

Mr. FISHER:

AMOUNTS SPENT BY DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

Year.	Civil Government.	Arts, Agriculture and Statistics.	Immigration.	Quarantine.	Total.
	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
1867	32,636 77	108,078 25	50,137 91	2,660 83	193,513 76
1874	46,208 59	58,562 31	275,102 37	43,470 50	423,343 77
1878	49,395 75	93,419 28	154,351 42	26,340 02	313,506 47
1888	75,233 13	311,159 17	244,789 09	67,701 47	698,882 86
1896	76,151 05	210,877 61	.....	96,404 19	383,431 85
1900	74,835 65	461,560 76	.....	136,134 18	672,530 59
1905	99,811 96	698,210 65	.....	304,758 28	1,102,780 89
1910	351,953 28	997,054 39	.....	143,512 67	1,492,520 34

CENSUS ENUMERATORS, DISTRICT OF JACQUES CARTIER.

Mr. MONK:

1. What are the names and occupations of the officers in charge of the census for the electoral district of Jacques Cartier?

2. Where are the said officers domiciled?

3. On what date were said officers appointed?

4. By whom were said officers recommended for appointment?

5. Did the government consult any one from the said district before making the said appointments?

6. From what person or persons did the government seek advice regarding said appointments?

Mr. FISHER:

1. W. F. Gingras, 48 St. James St., Montreal, and H. L. Peiler, 52 St. James St., Montreal, and the officers in charge of the electoral district of Jacques Cartier.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. By order in council of date 31st March, 1911.

4. The Minister of Agriculture.

Mr LENNOX.

5. The minister obtained such information as decided the recommenration.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS, DIVISION OF HOCHELAGA.

Mr. MONK:

1. Who are the officers in charge of the coming census in the electoral division of Hochelaga?

2. Are they personally known to the Minister of Agriculture?

3. By whom were these officers recommended?

Mr. FISHER:

1. The officers in charge of the census for the electoral district of Hochelaga are Raoul Tourangeau and John Taylor.

2. No.

3. Such recommendations were obtained as satisfied the minister.

WAYS AND MEANS—TRADE RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into committee of Ways and Means to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, that it is expedient to amend the Customs Tariff, 1907, and to provide as follows:

1. The Governor in Council may, by order in council, extend to Japan for a period not exceeding two years from the 17th day of July, 1911, the benefit of the tariff advantages at present enjoyed by that country on its exports to Canada, as expressed by and contained in article 5 of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Japan, signed at London, July 16, 1894, which treaty was made applicable to Canada by the Convention between the United Kingdom and Japan respecting commercial relations between Canada and Japan, signed at Tokio on January 31, 1906; Provided, however, that such advantages shall only be extended to Japan when and so long as the Governor in Council is satisfied that Canada will receive and is receiving during such period the reciprocal tariff advantages at present enjoyed by Canada on its exports to Japan under the provisions of the said article 5 and the said Convention.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Mr. Speaker, before going into committee on this resolution, as there has been a good deal of discussion on the general trade question, I would like to deal somewhat fully, yet as hurriedly as I can, on some aspects of our trade with Japan. As the House knows there have been a great many expectations raised in the past as to the great value of oriental trade. I do not want to give too many quotations, but I want to remind the House of one or two statements which have been made by public men upon this question. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), in 1907, speaking in the House of Commons made this statement:

> We have a growing trade with Japan, a trade which must be improved, and which will assume in years to come, and in the very near future, very large proportions.

On December 16, 1907, the Prime Minister, speaking to a delegation from the Trades and Labour Council, said:

> The treaty has proved of great advantage, and our trade with Japan under it has considerably increased.

There have been many other statements made by supporters of the present government along similar lines. I find that the Prime Minister, speaking before the Manufacturers' Association in 1907 spoke in a similar strain upon this subject. Amongst others I have an extract here from a speech by the hon. member for Nanaimo (Mr. Ralph Smith) delivered in this House, on December 6, 1907. That hon. gentleman said:

> I say that if the full development of British Columbia is to take place, we must have a share of oriental trade. The prosperity of that country, the development of its trade, require a market in the orient * * * * Now, Sir, the trade with Japan, in my opinion, is tremendously important.

Then, again on January 28, 1908, the same hon. gentleman said:

> The commercial future of the Pacific coast depends very largely upon the extension of Canadian commercial markets in the Orient.

And he added:

> We want the chief productions of Japan, articles that are desirable for our consumption, when those productions do not come into competition with our own productions.

A sentiment which I wish he had given utterance to in connection with the recent reciprocity negotiations. Then, we have the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) making a speech upon this subject in which he dealt with the hopeful outlook from his point of view with regard to certain classes of manufactured goods. In Hansard of 1905, page 7192, he is reported to have said:

> There are the following manufactured goods in which Canada might reasonably expect to enter into trade with Japan: cotton goods, woollen goods, paper, enamelled kitchen goods, rubber goods, wire of all kinds, hats and caps.

I think it might be of interest to the House to have on record exactly what the state of Japanese trade with Canada has been during the past few years. I propose dealing, not with the year 1907, because that was a nine months' period and that was the first year in which the treaty was in effect. But, for purposes of comparison I propose to take three years prior to that beginning with 1904 and coming down to 1910. If my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will permit me, I would very much like not to weary the House with all these figures, but to put them on 'Hansard' assuring him they have been compiled by the statistician of the Customs Department at the commissioner's request.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no objection.

Mr. BURRELL. I will deal first with imports and the statement is as follows:

STATEMENT showing the Value of the Principal Articles Imported from and Exported to Japan during the Fiscal Years 1904, 1905, 1906, 1908, 1909 and 1910.

ARTICLES.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1908.	1909.	1910.
	Value.	Value.	Value.	Value.	Value.	Value.
Imports.	$	$	$	$	$	$
Rice	157,820	116,980	139,952	350,112	392,373	268,587
Brushes of all kinds	24,686	23,211	24,238	32,231	27,964	39,575
Earthenware and china	45,420	73,636	94,229	103,798	62,188	76,020
Linen damask	15,148	17,586	34,025	72,635	35,722	70,383
Nuts	6,938	18,775	10,530	24,773	22,129	39,778
Silk fabrics	366,259	356,512	350,378	276,982	249,054	275,803
" handkerchiefs	74,384	88,131	67,164	114,771	28,092	50,544
" clothing	15,467	22,668	23,513	45,545	27,230	46,397
" manufactures of, n.o.p	26,217	18,298	28,101	20,072	11,863	18,061
Straw carpeting, rugs, &c	25,761	34,726	35,133	61,040	38,013	49,449
Vegetables, n.o.p	4,312	8,578	6,933	20,788	21,561	25,500
Oranges, &c	15,620	9,991	10,980	26,656	15,284	20,908
Brimstone	35,750	14,654	18,703	37,744	46,941	60,728
Fish lines, &c	22,143	21,225	6,527	12,233	18,787	46,231
Tea	976,199	869,495	562,317	657,450	708,026	743,803
Total	1,812,124	1,694,466	1,412,723	1,856,830	1,705,227	1,831,767
Total, other articles	185,887	220,321	250,206	340,329	284,690	370,842
Grand total, imports	1,998,011	1,914,787	1,662,929	2,197,159	1,989,917	2,202,609
Exports.						
Wheat	602	.....	.....	.....	.....	
Salmon, canned	44,956	18,953	8,148	341	1,505	3,816
" pickled	40,337	209,320	115,505	119,241	99,781	101,164
Planks and boards	41,688	52,187	61,771	69,858	37,178	23,000
Flour	140,815	62,007	64,131	129,526	49,347	58,136
Cotton	14,172	67,613	26,889	13,910	8,318	9,804
Pig lead	.....	17,684	81,185	181,420	163,262	182,836
Herrings, pickled	3,364	7,227	21,128	90,279	251,052	107,731
Total	285,332	434,991	378,757	604,575	610,443	486,487
Total, other articles	56,471	73,618	113,518	130,293	145,590	174,035
Grand total, exports	341,803	508,609	492,275	734,868	756,033	660,522

IMPORTS.

—	1904.	1905.	1906.	1908.	1909.	1910.
Australia	102,169	161,470	226,197	536,935	405,210	403,484
New Zealand	19,254	51,276	302,075	257,044	205,131	774,166
South Africa	69,141	21,372	297,659	32,193	901,190	926,980

It will be noticed that our imports from Japan have steadily kept at about the rate of three to one, that being the balance against us in our trade with that country. While I am quoting these figures, if the minister has no objection, I would like to give very briefly the figures of our trade for the corresponding years with Australia, New Zealand and South Africa which should be an interesting record, this statement having also been prepared by the statistician of the Customs Department. This statement is as follows:

EXPORTS.

Australia—

1904.. .. .. $2,622,756
1905.. 2,194,223
1906.. 2,082,219

1908	2,873,461
1909	2,769,049
1910	3,583,447
New Zealand—	
1904	5,592,827
1905	540,633
1906	734,054
1908	993,442
1909	996,901
1910	890,549
South Africa—	
1904	$2,380,456
1905	1,883,362
1906	1,759,719
1908	2,011,382
1909	1,679,733
1910	2,354,928

I would like to give just a brief analysis of these figures as bearing on the general theory of the trade question with the Orient and especially with Japan. I may say frankly that possibly the greatest benefit we have derived in Canada in so far as any preferential treatment or any benefit which we have enjoyed under our trade arrangement with the Orient has been with regard to the article of lead. We have preferential treatment on lead which amounts practically to 79 cents a ton. That is one of the larger items, the export of which amounted last year to $182,836. With the exception of lead, however, we practically find no encouragement at all. We can point to two items, pickled salmon and pickled herrings, which are the only items totalling over $100,000 and we do not enjoy the benefits of the conventional tariff with Japan on these items. Japan's tariff, as the House probably knows, while not very protective as it exists at present, is now being placed upon a more protective basis by the new arrangement which will become operative on July 17. With regard to these two special items affecting the trade of British Columbia, there is no material advantage as far as Canada is concerned for the simple reason that practically all of that particular industry is in the hands of the Japanese who are resident in British Columbia. They practically carry on the whole of that business, it enures only to their advantage, and they ship these goods to their own people.

Then, I take up the next item with regard to which a great many hopes were raised in the minds of people, not only in the east, but especially in the west. I refer to the question of lumber. We find that in the three years subsequent to the treaty we have actually exported less lumber than we exported in the three years prior to the treaty, showing that, in so far as the benefits that are derived from the treaty go, we have not received any great amount of advantage. The encouragement of trade with Australia and South Africa would be far more valuable in the development of our western lumber trade. There are a good many reasons which we never expect any very great advances in the development of our timber trade with Japan. There is the protective tariff that exists in some lines by reason of which we cannot hope to derive much advantage, and there is also, what the House may not know, that sixty per cent of the total area of Japan is covered with a carefully preserved forest. All of these 58,000,000 acres are directly under government supervision. So large is this industry in Japan itself that the dues to the government for cutting timber amounted in 1907 to no less than 12,000,000 yen, that is $6,000,000. In 1908, Japan exported $4,500,000 worth of various timber products and imported only $700,000 worth, so that, on the whole, I do not think there is any very great expectation of a big trade being built up along those lines.

I might deal somewhat hurriedly with other productions on which large hopes of Oriental trade were based in this country. One has first to observe that nearly all the agricultural products of Canada are protected in Japan, and in the new Japanese tariff there is a tendency to a higher rate of protection on practically all the various agricultural lines; in very few of them, with the exception of condensed milk which has a conventional tariff that gives us a slight advantage, have we any preference in the markets of Japan; she does not place any of these things on the conventional tariff. Take cheese and butter, hams and bacon, vegetables and fruits, not only do we get no preference in the markets of Japan, but in every one of these articles the tariff which goes into operation on July 17 is actually higher than the tariff that has been in existence in the last few years.

I come now more particularly to the wheat question, because great expectations were based on the development of the trade in wheat, and flour from Canada to the Orient. We have heard a great many extravagant statements from all sources as to the enormous trade and the enormous advantage to Canada to be reaped from the development of our wheat and flour trade with Japan. I need only say that our expectations have not been realized. Our actual exports have been insignificant. In 1904, we shipped $602 worth of wheat to Japan, and we have not shipped any in any other year except 1907 when we shipped $1,525 worth. We are told that Japan is a very large consuming country with a population of 52,000,000 in an area not much greater than the riding I have the honour to represent. Being such a congested population we have been led to suppose by some of our free trade friends that naturally they would welcome free all the products that went to supply food to their people. Curiously enough,

under the present tariff we have to pay a duty of 57 sen a hundred kin. A sen is half a cent, which makes 28½ cents on 132 pounds or 12½ cents a bushel. I am advised that under their new tariff they have actually raised that tariff, not very much, but from 5 sen to 60 sen per 132 pounds, nor do we get the preference. The average production of wheat in Japan, for Japan is a wheat growing country, to some extent, as reckoned by Mr. Crowe, the Commercial Attaché of Great Britain in Japan, for the seven years ending in 1908, is placed at 19,500,000 bushels and as Japan is very largely a rice eating population it is not at all likely that over and above their own supply they will ever very largely increase their imports. Another element is that they are developing their wheat raising areas in their northern country, in the Hokkaido district and in the future there will be a tremendous development of one of the biggest wheat growing areas in the world, in Manchuria.

The greatest hopes of trade were built on flour. In the three years subsequent to the passage of the treaty ratified by this parliament in 1907, we actually exported less flour to Japan than we did in the three years before the ratification of that treaty. Flour is again a protected item in Japan. Under the present tariff there is a considerable duty, and we get no preference under the conventional tariff now or under the new arrangement. The present tariff on flour is 1 yen, 45 sen per 100 kin, or 72½ cents per 132 pounds. In the new tariff they propose to raise that to 1 yen, 65 sen per 100 kin or 82½ cents per 132 pounds, which is rather a heavy protection on flour. As a matter of fact, from 1898 to 1908 the figures as they apply to the importation of flour into Japan are the reverse of encouraging. The imports rose to the very highest point in 1903 when there was an importation into Japan of 5,162,000 worth of flour. Since that, it has steadily sunk, and in 1908, the last year of which I have the record, it had sunk to $1,414,000. In reference to this special question of flour I would like to refer you to the experience, and to the very emphatic declarations of a man who, perhaps, has more authority to speak on this subject than any other man in America, Mr. J. J. Hill. Mr. Hill, who is a man of very large vision, a man who is reaching out to develop not only the trade of his railways, but in a large way to develop the trade of the whole country, some years ago conceived the idea that the Asiatic trade in general would be of immensely greater value to the United States if it was properly looked after, and for this purpose he built two of the largest ships ever put on the Pacific, the 'Minnesota' and the 'Dakota,' of 28,000 tons each,

to handle the traffic which he confidently expected to develop from the great central and western states when he had assisted in building up the trade with Japan. The whole story of that development is almost a romance, a romance that had rather an unfortunate ending in some ways. Mr. Hill, when he first started on the development of this trade, especially of the flour trade, made this remark. He realized that:

> The country had to give to the Japanese and Chinese, wheat flour so cheap that they would use it instead of rice. Profits would have to be cut to the bone.

I do not want to go into the story of Mr. Hill's failure; it was partly owing, as a good many of us know, to the interference of the Interstate Commerce Board on the long haul rate which made it impossible for him to lay the goods down in Japan where he would meet the world's competition at a price which would meet the prices of countries producing even more cheaply than the United States. Mr. Hill remarked that whereas by 1904 the export of flour from the United States to Asia had increased very much, yet in 1908 it had sunk down to very much smaller figures. Another vital factor which Mr. Hill pointed out, which has to be borne carefully in mind, and which is no doubt appreciated by the government in regard to this Oriental trade, is the extraordinary difficulties and differences in the money exchanges of the two countries. Writing in 1910 Mr. Hill said this:

> For the present we can sell some flour in China and Japan, until the Manchuria uplands shall be turned into wheat fileds. Then China can grow wheat at a cost of seventy cents a bushel in silver, which is about equal to thirty cents in gold in this country.

I do not know that I need say any more about the flour and wheat question. I would like now to refer briefly to a larger phase of trade namely, that relating to manufacturing industries. I have already referred to the statement of the Minister of Agriculture about the hope he had of our building up a trade in manufactured cotton goods, hats, caps, and articles of that kind. I might point out that even with the British preference lowering the general rate of our duties on these things, we still have on these articles for the benefit of the Canadian manufacturer, a duty of from 22½ to 25 per cent against the British manufacturer. How we can expect to compete in these articles with the British manufacturer in the open markets of Japan on an even footing is a conundrum which I leave the Minister of Agriculture to answer; I confess I am not able to answer it. As a matter of fact, our trade with Japan in these lines, especially in cotton manufactures, is

practically a negligiable quantity. Our exports of cotton fabrics to Japan were never heavy; they are diminishing, and last year they reached a figure of only $9,804; and I think we may fairly expect that they will go to the vanishing point in the near future. I may add that in 1908 Japan exported in cotton yarns and cotton fabrics over $21,000,000 worth. She has steadily increased her importations of raw cotton, and has developed her factory system in a marvellous way. The Japanese Year Book of 1910, in which hon. members will find a lot of valuable information in regard to Japanese development along industrial lines, states that the textile industry alone employs 354,000 employees, and that a few years ago the wages of these employees averaged 16 cents for men, 11½ cents for women, and 6 cents for children, large numbers of women and children being employed. It is quite true, there has been a rise of wages in recent years, but not after all a very heavy one. In the report, Mr. Crowe, from which I have already quoted, showing the rise of wages between 1902 and 1908, placing the wages of 1902 at 100, and by 1908 they had risen to only 134·76, which is not a very heavy increase; nor, with Japan's conditions of population, is there likely to be a very rapid advance, at any rate such an advance, as will bring them within measureable distance of what we have to pay on this continent. An analysis of present industrial conditions, especially in regard to manufactures, is not only discouraging, but absolutely alarming to the future trade of this country, for two reasons; and here again I will refer to a remark of the Minister of Agriculture, which will be found at page 888 of 'Hansard,' December 18, 1907:

The advantages secured in regard to Japan are of the utmost importance to our manufacturing industries.

I must confess that I cannot agree with that, and anybody who has given any close study to this subject will hardly agree with this opinion of the Minister of Agriculture. It is a subject profoundly interesting, but a detailed examination of the matter at this time would only weary the House. I will, however, quote again Mr. J. J. Hill, who has given a more comprehensive, and close study of commercial conditions in the far east than any other living man. He says:

Japan has organized her industry with the same scientific attention to details that she gave to her military operations. She has her own shipyards in which her ocean carriers are built. She has her own factories, in which almost every manufactured commodity obtained heretofore from Europe or the United States is made by her own artisans, working for wages that would not be accepted here. She is preparing and hoping to dominate the Oriental markets, and to invade those of the rest of the world. . . The markets of Europe, our own markets, may, not long hence, be full of goods made in the Orient, for sale at prices so low that no tariff endurable by our own people would keep them out. . . The country needs to rid itself of the illusion that its Oriental trade is to be one of the big elements of its future prosperity.

To show the actual results of the industrial development of Japan, I might quote from a report prepared by the Foreign Trade Association of Japan, which says that the total volume of exports during the ten months ending last October amounted to 373,452,000 yen, the value of the yen being equal to 50 cents, the figures being an increase of 43,999,000 yen over the figures for the corresponding period of last year. The most conspicuous items of the increase were manufactured articles and manufactured raw materials, which showed a conspicuous increase of 15,429,000, and 22,595,000 yen respectively. That is enough to show, without going more fully into the subject, that any hope that we have built on a market in Japan for our manufactures along almost any line, is entirely illusory. It has been a favourite theory of some people that not only will this trade be valuable to our manufacturers and our producers generally, but that it will cause an immense development of the Canadian merchant marine on the Pacific. My own opinion, based on the researches of a great many people who have given this matter a lot of study, is that the markets of both the United States and Canada will in the future be far more valuable to Japan than Japan's market will be to us. But with regard to shipping, the Prime Minister especially has been seized with the idea that it is going to be a great thing for Canada, and in Vancouver last fall, on his western trip, he made these remarks:

VANCOUVER'S TRADE AND HARBOUR.

Now with these Japanese and Chinese we can only trade in what we produce. We can do there what has been done in our own country. We can exchange our flour for their tea; and, therefore, my fellow-citizens of Vancouver, there is a future in this Oriental trade. This city must trade with the Orient as well as with the Occident. And if I have the happiness again—as I know I have the certainty in my purpose—when I come again to Vancouver—as I hope to come again soon—because if I don't come soon I will not come at all—and, therefore, when I come soon, I hope now, and feel sure that I will see this noble harbour, second to none in the world, full of steamers plying between China, Japan, India and Canada. This is the hope that I have cherished, and I believe it is a hope that will be realized.

The Prime Minister has referred on other occasions to this Pacific Ocean trade, and has expressed extremely rosy, optimistic, and I think wholly illusory sentiments in

regard to our share of that sea-borne traffic. To those who have noted the various phases of Japan's commercial development in the last twenty years, nothing is so significant, I might almost say portentous, as the extraordinary expansion of her merchant marine. In 1884 there was not a single Japanese vessel navigating any but Japanese waters. In 1890 Japan had 1,450 seagoing vessels with a tonnage of 145,000. In 1900 she had 4,500 vessels with a tonnage of 600,000; and in 1908, 5,654 vessels with 1,543,000 tons. One noticeable feature of this growth is the conversion of sailing vessels to steamers, and while it was thought at one time by many of our shipping people that the Japanese would never make expert sailors, so far as their officers are concerned, the facts show the contrary, because Japanese officers are practically handling the whole of this fleet. The Japanese marine will always be more cheaply paid than can possibly be the case in the United States or Canada, for the reason that Japan has a larger population to draw on, three millions of her people being engaged in the fishing industry at of course much smaller wages than we pay our fishermen. This Japanese marine has been developed for national purposes, along scientific lines, with systematic organization and precision, and has also been aided by very considerable bounties. Under her navigation and ship building encouragement laws, Japan has spent enormous sums of money. As far as I can figure it out, this year she is paying something like $4,000,000 on subsidies for ship construction and to various shipping companies.

I might give one more reference to show the ship development there has been quite recently in that country. Another very large steamship company has been organized in Japan under the name of the Nippon Yusen Kaisha Company. That company has been organized in order to be ready for the opening of the Panama canal which, it is expected, will be finished in 1915, and thus be in a position to capture a large share of the trade through that canal. A gentleman, who is largely responsible for the organization of that company, made these remarks concerning its plans:

> An idea of the extent to which the trade of Japanese shipping companies has grown is given in the address made by R. Kondo, president of the Nippon Yusen Kaisha, at the banquet held on December 15 at Tokio to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of the company. He said that the N. Y. K. which started this trans-Pacific line in 1900 has reached the sixth place in order of the world's shipping companies. It has now a fleet which aggregates 280,000 tons and includes six vessels of 8,600 tons each. From the point of view of a commercial carrying agent it is noteworthy that whereas the foreign trade of Japan in 1895, the year before the company opened its first regular ocean-going lines, aggregated $129,000,000, and the share carried by Japanese steamers amounted to only 3 per cent—the foreign trade in 1909 totalled some $403,000,000, no less than 45 per cent of which was carried by Japanese steamers.

These figures indicate fairly the general trade situation, as it exists between us and Japan and is likely to exist in the future. In apologizing to the House for dealing with this trade question at such length, I venture to think there is some justification for my doing so because in the earlier days I find, throughout the various negotiations such as these which the minister proposes to bring down, it was generally assumed that the commercial advantages would be so great as to justify concessions in more important directions. But the fundamental fact, the vital feature of the whole oriental question, from the point of view of any man who has made a study of it, especially from the western point of view, is the oriental immigration and the danger of such an immigration in large quantities to the vast unfilled spaces of our great west, notably British Columbia.

With regard to the resolution before the House, with regard to the arrangement to give us favoured-nation treatment in the markets of Japan, I do not want to be understood as opposing any arrangement that will put us on an equally favourable footing in the Japanese market as the United States; but I think I have shown that the conditions are such that the hopes of any great commercial prosperity arising from a treaty with Japan, are wholly illusory. Therefore, the paramount, almost the sole reasons, which should guide us in any trade arrangement with Japan are those which concern the question of immigration, which is really the strictly national and vital feature of the whole thing. I understand from the return that the government proposes to enter into direct treaty arrangement with Japan. While it is true that the British treaty, as is stated in the correspondence brought down, may not be altogether adapted to the commercial situation in Canada, it might be well to point out that in adhering to any treaty with Great Britain, we would have all the weight and authority of the empire at our back. Whereas in making a treaty direct we would be without that tremendous prestige, that great reserve power which is expressed in that simple phrase 'British power.'

The United States treaty with Japan, which has recently been ratified, has two very important safeguards, certainly more real and essential than the shadowy one we have had in past treaties. Our treaty, I understand, will expire on July 17, next, and we then resume that control which is the inalienable right of every nation—the control over immigration. I do not know

that I can do better than quote in justification of that absolute control, the citation read by the Minister of Public Works, publicly the other night from Chief Justice Marshall. Speaking of the principles of international law underlying all these questions, he said:

> The jurisdiction of the nation within its own territory is necessarily exclusive and absolute. It is susceptible of no limitation not imposed by itself. Any restriction upon it, deriving validity from an external source, would imply a diminution of its sovereignty to the extent of the restriction, and an investment of that sovereignty to the same extent in that power which could impose such restrictions. All exceptions, therefore, to the full and complete power of a nation within its own territories must be traced up to the consent of the nation itself. They can flow from no other legitimate source.

I can only say in closing that if this arrangement were to diminish at all that control which we should have at the expiration of the treaty, it will be the right time for us to again reassert the supreme necessity of our having that control within our own territory. And if that question does develop in the course of the discussion in committee, I shall hope to have an opportunity of touching upon it as well.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the resolution.

Mr. FIELDING: The relations between Japan and Canada have been governed for some years by a treaty which will expire on the 17th of July next. The foundation of that arrangement is to be seen in a treaty made between Great Britain and Japan on the 16th of July, 1894. The treaty did not immediately apply to Canada. It contained a proviso that the self-governing Dominions, as we usually described the larger colonies, should be excepted from the operation of the treaty, but that they might be brought within its operation by special arrangement. Canada, therefore, had the opportunity to adhere to that treaty but did not at the time, or for some years, avail herself of that opportunity. I do not think we suffered any serious disadvantage from non-adherence to the treaty in any respect save one. We did find some embarrassment as affects customs tariffs. We found that other countries were having advantages in Japan which Canada did not enjoy, and naturally that was regarded with anxiety by parties in lines of trade in which it was hoped for an extension of business with Japan. For that reason largely, I think, it was determined to open negotiations, and, in 1906, a supplementary treaty was made under which the British treaty to which I have already referred was applied to Canada. From that day until the present time we have been under the operation of that treaty.

Treaties of that character are very broad and comprehensive and elaborate in their terms. To the ordinary layman who reads them it would probably seem that there is much repetition in them. But there is no doubt that all that is in them is put there for a good purpose. As we read the treaty it deals with travel and residence; protection of person and property; free and easy access to the courts; right to employ counsel; conditions with regard to freedom of worship; exemption from compulsory military or naval service; reciprocal freedom of navigation in a general way; protection of dwellings, factories, &c. Article 5, of which I make special mention because it is the subject of our present measure, provided that no higher or other duties could be imposed on the products of Japan on the one side or of Canada on the other, than are imposed upon like products of most favoured nations. Article 6 deals with equality of duties as to exports. Proceeding with the various articles we find in various matters of trade and commerce equality of treatment is stipulated. British vessels and Japanese vessels were to have equal treatment in various shipping matters; equal privileges in unloading; coasting trade excepted; equal privileges of vessels in distress; privileges of consuls to the respective countries; equality in all matters of commerce and navigation; protection of trade marks or patents; conditions with respect to foreign settlement in Japan; and certain other things, all no doubt necessary in a treaty of this character, but most of them things which a country like Canada would grant to any other country without any treaty stipulations. While it might be well that we should have undoubtedly the right to protect ourselves in all these things, yet, as a matter of fact, in all these things Canada would be disposed to grant to any country equality of treatment. But we found, as I have stated, that in the absence of any commercial arrangement we were at a disadvantage owing to the lack of a treaty, and for that reason largely steps were taken in 1906 to bring Canada within the operation of the British treaty of 1894. That treaty has been in operation, as I have said, until this time. Japan, not long ago, determined to put an end to her commercial treaties and leave herself free to make a fresh start. In consequence of this general policy, notice was given to the British government that the British treaty would fall on the 17th of July next, and with it would also fall the special treaty relating to Canada. So, on that date, as matters stand, we shall cease to have any treaty obligation with Japan. The British government have

recently made a new treaty with Japan, not very materially differing from the old treaty. As usual, we have the opportunity to adhere to that treaty. But we thought it best that we should not do so. Recently, the Japanese authorities, through their Consul General at Ottawa, approached us, and rather urged that we should adhere to the British treaty as the best way of continuing friendly relations with Japan. But, upon close examination of the British treaty we thought it not particularly adapted to Canada, and, on the whole, prefer to have further time for consideration. And so it has been suggested that we should make a temporary arrangement on the only point which seems of immediate importance, and that is in relation to the customs tariffs of the two countries. It is true, as the hon. member for Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) has pointed out, the trade with Japan is not so extensive as we could desire. Our exports have not been increasing in the way we at one time hoped. But we all agree that, though the trade is not all that we could desire we do not want to diminish it or to find ourselves at a commercial disadvantage in Japan, compared with other countries. We have suggested to the Japanese authorities, leaving all the other matters in the old treaty to be dealt with by the mutual goodwill of the two countries, that we should make a temporary arrangement with them confined entirely to the various matters in article 5 of the old treaty. Let me read article 5 to show exactly what we are now proposing to do:

No other or higher duties shall be imposed on the importation into the dominions and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty of any articles, the produce or manufacture of the dominions and possessions of His Majesty the Emperor of Japan, from whatever place arriving; and no other or higher duties shall be imposed on the importation into the dominions and possessions of His Majesty the Emperor of Japan of any article, the produce or manufacture of the dominions and possessions of Her Britannic Majesty, from whatever place arriving, than on the like article produced or manufactured in any other foreign country; nor shall any prohibition be maintained or imposed on the importation of any article, the produce or manufacture of the dominions and possessions of either of the high contracting parties, into the dominions and possessions of the other, from whatever place arriving, which shall not equally extend to the importation of the like article, being the produce or manufacture of any other country. The last provision is not applicable to the sanitary and other prohibitions occasioned by the necessity of protecting the safety of persons, or of cattle, or of plants useful to agriculture.

We have proposed, therefore, that we shall extend to Japan for a period not greater than two years the provisions in effect of that article; that is to say, while we should have no special rates of customs duties between the two countries, each guarantees to the other that it will grant what is called 'most favoured nation treatment,' that is: We shall grant to Japan no less favourable treatment than we grant to any other foreign country. Of course, the term 'foreign country' is used for a purpose, because it does not interfere with our liberty to make any arrangement that we deem proper within the British Empire. But if we adopt this arrangement, for a period not exceeding two years, practically the same conditions we now grant to other foreign countries we will grant to Japan. We have received information from the Japanese authorities that regarding this as a temporary arrangement, they will be content to meet the suggestions we have offered. Some correspondence has been brought down, only one or two letters of which I think have any immediate bearing on the proposed arrangement; and with your permission I will read these, because they will give in brief space the nature of the arrangement we propose to make. This letter is dated the 10th of May, and is addressed by myself to the Consul General for Japan residing in Ottawa:

Ottawa, May 10, 1911.

Sir,—Referring to our several interviews and to the note verbale of the 24th April last, communicated to me by you this day in an amended form, I have to observe that the terms and conditions of the treaty of the 3rd April, 1911, between Great Britain and Japan do not seem to be in their entirety adapted to the circumstances of Canada, and, therefore, we have some hesitation in advising that immediate adherence to it on the part of Canada which your government desires.

Article 8 of the treaty of the 3rd April provides that:

'The articles, the produce or manufacture of the United Kingdom, enumerated in Part I of the Schedule annexed to this treaty, shall not, on importation into Japan, be subjected to higher customs duties than those specified in the Schedule.

'The articles, the produce or manufacture of Japan, enumerated in Part II of the Schedule annexed to this treaty, shall be free of duty on importation into the United Kingdom.'

There might be a question whether in the event of Canada giving adherence to the treaty, the schedule referred to in article 8 would thereupon become applicable to Canada. Granting, however, that it would so apply, an examination of its details shows that while no doubt well adapted to the conditions of the trade between Great Britain and Japan, the schedule is not wholly suitable to the commercial interchanges between Japan and Canada. Part I of the Schedule, for example, which contains a list of British products upon which maximum duties are fixed does not include many products in the export of which Canada is largely interested; and on the other

hand, Part II of the Schedule, containing a list of Japanese products to which Great Britain agrees to give admission free of duty, includes silks and other articles which are dutiable on importation into Canada although free of customs duty in Great Britain.

It would, therefore, appear that the schedule to the treaty of the 3rd April is not wholly applicable to the conditions of trade between Japan and Canada, and that if a commercial arrangement is to be made to suit these conditions it will probably have to be accomplished by means of a separate treaty. It would be reasonable to expect that the negotiations and formal steps necessary to the making of such a treaty could not be completed before the 17th July next, when the present treaty will expire.

The Canadian government, therefore, propose to avail themselves of the suggestion contained in the 3rd paragraph of the note verbale of the 24th April communicated to me this day:

'The Imperial Japanese government have no hesitation in expressly declaring that it is their policy not to extend the term of their present treaty with any country, even though the new treaty could not be concluded before the expiration of the existing one. However, in case unavoidable circumstances prevent the conclusion of the new treaty in due time, the Imperial Government may, as a matter of convenience, enter, with the parties concerned, into a temporary agreement engaging the reciprocal grant of the most favoured nation treatment, for the purpose of regulating their commercial and tariff relations pending the conclusion of a new treaty. But they are firmly determined not to extend the term of their existing treaty with any country.'

In pursuance of what I understand to be the policy of your government as thus set forth, I would suggest that, leaving all other matters affecting the intercourse between Japan and Canada to the mutual good will of the two countries and the comity of nations, a temporary arrangement be made providing that from and after the 17th day of July, 1911, Canada shall receive in Japan the tariff treatment as expressed in Article 5 of the Treaty of Commerce and Navigation between Great Britain and Japan, signed at London on the 16th July, 1894, which was made applicable to Canada by the Convention between the United Kingdom and Japan respecting commercial relations between Canada and Japan, signed at Tokio on the 31st January, 1906, and that reciprocally Japan shall receive in Canada the tariff treatment as expressed in the said article 5.

The question of the form in which such an agreement may most conveniently be made is a matter which can receive further consideration upon our receiving an intimation that the Japanese government are willing to agree to the proposal herein made.

The question of immigration has been discussed between us on several occasions. I do not deem it necessary that this should be more than mentioned here, inasmuch as the assurance received from you of the willingness of your government to continue the friendly understanding on that matter at present existing is entirely satisfactory to us.

I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant.

(Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING,
Minister of Finance.

The Hon. T. Nakamura,
Imperial Japanese Consul General,
Ottawa.

The reply of the Consul General for Japan, on behalf of the Japanese Imperial government, is as follows:

IMPERIAL CONSULATE GENERAL OF JAPAN FOR THE DOMINION OF CANADA.

Ottawa, May 15, 1911.

Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 10th instant, setting forth the views of your government in regard to some hesitation which they have in advising immediate adherence on the part of Canada to the treaty of the 3rd April, 1911, between Great Britain and Japan, and suggesting that, leaving all other matters affecting the intercourse between Canada and Japan to the mutual good will of the two countries and the comity of nations, a temporary arrangement be made providing that from and after the 17th day of July, 1911, Canada shall receive in Japan the tariff treatment as expressed in article V of the treaty of commerce and navigation between Great Britain and Japan signed at London on the 16th July, 1894, which was made applicable to Canada by the convention between the United Kingdom and Japan respecting commercial relations between Canada and Japan signed at Tokio on the 31st January, 1906, and that reciprocally Japan shall receive in Canada the tariff treatment as expressed in the said article V.

In reply, I have the honour, duly authorized by my government, to state that the Imperial Japanese government fully concurs in the proposal therein made by you in regard to a temporary tariff arrangement engaging the reciprocal grant of the most favoured nation treatment.

I have honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd) T. NAKAMURA.
Consul General of Japan.

The Honourable W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

It will be observed that in the communication which I sent to the consul general I confined myself to two points: First, entirely to the question of the customs tariff, all other things are allowed to stand aside, and the treaty as respects these other things will lapse. My proposal was that we should reciprocally have what is called the most favoured nation treatment, so that we might guard against any other country getting terms with Japan which would place us at a disadvantage. That they have agreed to give us. Then I went on to speak of the question on which my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) addressed the House, and which is one of great importance. Let me again read the paragraph on the question of immigration:

The question of immigration has been discussed between us on several occasions. I do not deem it necessary that this should be more than mentioned here, inasmuch as the assurance received from you of the willingness of your government to continue the friendly understanding on that matter at present existing, is entirely satisfactory to us.

Now it is necessary to observe that whatever has been done in the matter of immigration has not been done by treaty at all. Under the terms of the treaty which is soon to expire, Japanese subjects had the right to enter, to reside, to travel, and to have all the rights of British subjects in Canada. But we know that embarrassments arose from the free exercise of the rights so granted, and a friendly arrangement was made several years ago by which the Japanese government, though not going into details, not being content that the matter should be discussed very much in detail, gave this government an assurance, through the proper official of the Japanese government, to my hon. colleague the Postmaster General who was at the time in Japan, that the Japanese government would itself place certain limitations and restrictions upon immigration from Japan; and we had every reason to believe that, with the arrangement which the Japanese government, for its own purposes, was ready to make, there would be an absence of the difficulties which had unhappily arisen on our Pacific coast. That assurance so given has been fully lived up to. It is fair to the Japanese government to say that though it was never a matter of treaty, but a somewhat loose understanding, it has been acted up to in all good faith, and the number of Japanese who have desired to come into Canada has not been large. The number has been in the last year some 400, while in the last three years some 1,200 have come in. So, having received the assurance at that time that the Japanese government were prepared to deal with the problem in that way, and having received the assurance that they would continue that friendly arrangement, we have accepted that assurance and we feel that all will be well.

We do not, in the resolution before the House, touch the question of immigration at all. The old treaty undoubtedly did touch the question of immigration, because, if its terms had been enforced by the Japanese, it would have given them all the rights and privileges of British subjects in the Dominion; but, as I pointed out, they did not insist upon the exercise of the rights that came to them under the treaty. But when, on the 17th July, that treaty expires, there will be no arrangement of any kind, by law, or statute, or treaty, of a legal and binding character with respect to immigration from Japan. While we would be free as a matter of law to make our arrangements with Japan in the same manner as we would be with any other country having no treaty obligations, and while we would be, under the terms, absolutely free to apply all our immigration laws and every other law to our relations with Japan, we do not hesitate to say that it is our desire and inclination to maintain that friendly understanding that already exists. We are happy to acknowledge the fact that the Japanese government have dealt with the matter in a good spirit, and we have every assurance that they mean to continue to deal with it in the same spirit; so that we feel that there is no probability of a revival of those unpleasant incidents that occurred on the Pacific coast several years ago. With these few explanations, I beg to ask the committee to adopt this resolution and, upon its adoption, I will have the honour to present a Bill to carry it into effect.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the resolution is adopted, I would like to have a little clearer understanding with respect to the matter which has been alluded to by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his concluding remarks. I must confess that the situation does not seem to me quite so clear as it seems to him. In article 1 of the treaty of commerce, by which Canada became bound by the convention of the 31st January, 1906, it was provided as follows:

The subjects of each of the two high contracting parties shall have full liberty to enter, travel or reside in any part of the dominions and possessions of the other contracting party, and shall enjoy full and perfect protection for their persons and property.

That gave to the citizens of Japan the absolute right to enter and reside in any part of Canada. It is unnecessary to recite the troubles that arose afterwards in British Columbia in consequence of which my hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) made a visit to Japan and entered upon some negotiations with the government of that country, through the intervention of the British ambassador. The result of those negotiations was embodied in a letter bearing date Tokio, December 23, 1907, addressed to the Postmaster General. That letter is in the following terms:

Monsieur le Ministre,—

In reply to your note of even date, I have the honour to state that although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees to Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the imperial government to insist upon the complete enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranteed by those stipulations

when that would involve disregard of special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

Acting in this spirit and having particular regard to circumstances of recent occurrenec in British Columbia, the imperial government have decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada. In carrying out this purpose, the imperial government, in pursuance of the policy above stated, will give careful consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada, with a view to meeting the desires of the government of the Dominion as far as compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state.

Although, as stated in the note under reply, it was not possible for me to acquiesce in all of the proposals made by you on behalf of the Canadian government, I trust that you will find in the statement herein made proof of the earnest desire of the imperial government to promote by every means within their power, the growth and stability of the cordial and mutually beneficial relations which exist between our countries. I venture to believe, also that this desirable result will be found to have been materially advanced by the full exchange of views which has taken place between us, and it gives me special pleasure to acknowledge the obligation under which I have been placed by your frank and considerate explanations regarding the attitude and wishes of your government.

I avail myself, &c., &c.,
(Sgd.) TADASU HAYASHI.

The Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux,
Postmaster General and Minister of Labour for Canada, Tokio.

The arrangement between Canada and Japan, when that letter was written, was to be found, in the first place, in the article of the treaty which I have quoted, and, in the second place, in this letter I have just read. The treaty was thus supplemented by an informal engagement on the part of the Japanese government that it would restrict emigration from Japan to Canada, and in doing so that it would have regard from time to time to any special conditions in Canada that made such restriction desirable in the interest of goodwill between the two countries. I am unable to divorce the letter from the article of the treaty to which that letter continually alludes. If there is no treaty there is no need of any understanding. If the continuation of the understanding means anything, it seems to me to mean the continuation of the article of the treaty to which I have just now alluded and which is almost in terms embodied in it. If you continue the understanding embodied in this letter then it seems to me you continue the article of the treaty which is not only referred to but embodied in the very letter itself.

That is one view of it. The only other view is that the treaty is absolutely gone, that the understanding is gone also, that because the treaty is gone, therefore, there is no need of any understanding and that matters will subsist between the two countries as far as immigration is concerned, exactly as if there were no treaty. It is not the latter position which the Minister of Finance seems to take. In his letter he has, in the first place, said:

I would suggest that leaving all other matters affecting intercourse between Japan and Canada to the mutual good will of the two countries the comity of nations, a temporary arrangement be made with regard to commercial affairs.

That would be entirely consistent with the view, that, in so far as immigration is concerned, we are absolutely unhampered by any treaty or understanding, but the latter part of the letter, where special reference is made to immigration, is not consistent with that view. These are the words which have already been quoted by the Minister of Finance:

The question of immigration has been discussed between us on several occasions. I do not deem it necessary that this should be more than mentioned here, inasmuch as the assurance received from you of the willingness of your government to continue the friendly understanding on that matter at present existing is entirely satisfactory to us.

I am unable to understand how you can continue, how it is possible to continue, that friendly understanding unless you continue as a part of that friendly understanding, because it was a part thereof, the article of the treaty of 1894 which I have quoted just now and which gives to the citizens of Japan the absolute and full right to enter and reside in Canada, subject always, of course, to the modification which is embodied in the letter written by the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, to my hon. friend the Postmaster General.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the error in my hon. friend's argument is in assuming that article 1 of the treaty and the arrangement respecting immigration hang together. That is the foundation of his contention. I do not think that is correct. The Japanese have always claimed that this arrangement is independent of the treaty, and I think we ought to go upon the assumption that that is correct. The treaty, with article 1, ceases to exist because the Japanese authorities, of their own motion, have determined that it shall cease to exist; they cannot claim that in any way that article is in operation. However, while that is the legal position, the technical position, I do not think it practically makes much difference, because the arrangement after all is this: We have assurances that they will themselves restrict the number of Japanese citizens coming to Canada. That is the essence of the whole thing, they gave us that assurance several years ago,

they have lived up to it. We have the assurance. We cannot always bring down papers in relation to matters of this kind, but we have the assurance, in terms admitting of no doubt, that the Japanese authorities are willing to continue that arrangement which has worked so satisfactorily in the last three or four years. It is a point upon which the Japanese government have been rather unwilling to go into details. They have asked us to accept their assurance in good faith. We did so at the time and we have every reason to feel satisfied with the manner in which they have acted and feel that they would do the same thing in the future. We will be free, as a matter of law on July 17, from any obligation under that treaty except whatever obligation we shall assume if we adopt this resolution respecting customs tariffs; but while we will be absolutely free, as a matter of treaty and of law, to put these matters aside, we desire to give to the Japanese government the assurance that we wish to continue our friendly relations with them, and we feel that we should not take advantage of the absence of that treaty to engage, by legislation or administration, in any course of treatment different to what we apply to them to-day. If they continue, as I believe they will, in good faith to act up to that arrangement, we should be willing even without any treaty, to deal with them in a friendly spirit. That is a correct statement of the situation.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not wish to suggest that any harsh action should be taken by this government at this moment in consequence of the denunciation of this treaty and while negotiations are pending; nor do I desire to cast any aspersions on the good intentions of the government of Japan. They have carried out the arrangement made some years ago, and embodied in the letter which has been read, in a very fair spirit, so far as I am aware. But I do not see how it is possible to divorce that understanding from the previous treaty, because the letter makes the article of that treaty which I have quoted part of the understanding. I think it exceedingly desirable in all negotiations of this kind that we should have a perfectly clear understanding in this parliament and more especially as between the two governments as to just what the situation is. That is conducive to good relations between the two countries. I shall not go over the argument again as I understand that the hon. member for Vancouver is going to deal with the same subject, but I am bound to say that while I appreciate the force of the observations of the Minister of Finance, they are not absolutely convincing to me that the view which he takes of the situation is the correct one, nor am I convinced that the situation is such that future misunderstanding may not occur.

Mr. COWAN. I would ask the Minister of Finance at the outset whether the friendly understanding to which he refers in his letter of the 20th of May, 1911, is embodied in the letter of December 23, 1907, from Count Hayashi to the Postmaster General?

Mr. FIELDING. That expresses it in part, but, as has been more than once stated, there were communications between the Canadian government and the British Ambassador and the Japanese government which, if read in association with this, would perhaps help to make it clear. I can only state the general fact that there is no misunderstanding. Article 1 which is alluded to in that letter cannot be an essential part of any understanding now when that article has been terminated by the action of the Japanese authorities themselves.

Mr. COWAN. Then am I to understand that there are other documents setting forth this friendly understanding to which the Minister of Finance has referred and which the Japanese government treat as being independent of the treaty? Are these documents in the possession of the government?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but they are of a confidential nature.

Mr. COWAN. Do they, in any degree, change the conditions set forth in the letter of December 23, 1907?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think so; I think they are quite consistent with one another.

Mr. COWAN. Then I will be safe in assuming that the minister, when he is speaking of a friendly understanding, is referring to the understanding as set forth in the letter of December 23, 1907?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, but you must read that in the light of the fact that article 1 ceases.

Mr. COWAN. Yes, but the substance of the understanding is to be found in that letter.

Mr. FIELDING. The essence of the understanding is the restriction of the immigration of Japanese to Canada.

Mr. COWAN. To be found in this letter?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes in the letter to the Postmaster General, that is substantially correct.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But this letter is implemented by a note of a confidential nature.

Mr. COWAN. But that note of a confidential nature does not change the character of the understanding.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is the understanding.

Mr. COWAN. This letter is the understanding?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Implemented by a note of a confidential nature.

Mr. COWAN. But the note of a confidential nature does not change or modify the understanding in this letter?

Mr. FIELDING. And that note which did not change the understanding was a correct expression of the understanding at the time; but my hon. friend must read it now in the light of the fact that article 1 is being terminated by the Japanese authorities themselves, and he must read that termination into that letter.

Mr. COWAN. If the minister will kindly exercise a little confidence in my ability to read that letter, and wait, he will see what I wish to say. I wish now to ask him to what document I may look for this friendly understanding. I understand that I am to look to that letter of the 23rd of December, 1907.

Mr. FIELDING. And the history of the last four years. We must read it in the light of that understanding with respect to the restriction, and the way in which that restriction was carried out is a legitimate part of the study of the question at this moment.

Mr. COWAN. Then I am to understand that that friendly understanding, to which the minister refers in his letter of May, embodies not only the terms of this letter of the 23rd of December, but the whole history of Japan and Canada in connection with this transaction. Am I right in that?

Mr. FIELDING. No, not the whole history of the number of Japanese subjects who came in. The understanding has reference to the number of Japanese subjects coming into Canada, and the results of the last four years in that respect are a useful element in the study of the question and in the interpretation of the understanding.

Mr. COWAN. But the whole understanding itself is to be found in this letter. We might as well confess that.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In the letter plus a note of a confidential character.

Mr. COWAN. But that does not modify it. Does it modify it?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It does not.

Mr. COWAN. We have got something at last. This friendly understanding is to be found in a letter which reads as follows:

> In reply to your note of even date, I have the honour to state that although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees to Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel, and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the imperial government to insist upon the complete enjoyments of the rights and privileges guaranteed by those stipulations when that would involve disregard of special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

In other words, that understanding hands over to the Japanese government the power to consider the special conditions obtaining in Canada; and if those special conditions require them to limit the number of Japanese coming into Canada from Japan, they say they will do it. In other words, we have handed over our power to legislate for the protection of the people of Canada to the government of Japan.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is your inference.

Mr. COWAN. Will the hon. the Postmaster General draw any other inference from it, I will give him the opportunity. I would regret very much to find myself wrong. Will the hon. Postmaster General please give me the right inference to be drawn from that letter?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The hon. gentleman is waxing too eloquent on his own inference. I will let him go on.

Mr. COWAN. But, in the interest of truth, and perhaps to the delight of the House, the minister could expatiate upon the pleasures of life in Japan while he was explaining exactly the right inference to be drawn from this letter. Does he wish the opportunity?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No, I am listening.

Mr. COWAN. Well, we will look at it again. The Japanese—there are forty-nine millions of them—have full liberty to enter, travel, and reside in Canada, but that liberty will be checked, not by the Canadian government, but by the Japanese government, after studying the conditions, not of Japan, but forsooth, 'the special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.' If we need more Japanese immigrants, the power is no longer in the Canadian government to decide, if we need fewer Japanese immigrants, the power to decide that is no longer in the Canadian government. Under this friendly understanding it is in the Japanese government. Now, it may be that I have not a right interpretation of this

sentence. I am willing to be writ down as a man incapable of construing English if I am wrong in my construction of that sentence. That, I have ascertained at least, is the basis of this friendly understanding that is going to be continued, that is independent of a treaty, and that does not expire with the treaty. By the way, perhaps the Minister of Finance would tell me, out of the heap of his oriental wisdom, whether he agrees with the Japanese government in saying that this friendly understanding is independent of the treaty.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, I do not hesitate to say that the Japanese government, I have reason to believe, regard it as quite independent of the treaty.

Mr. COWAN. And it does not terminate with the treaty?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, that is my view, unless either party wishes to terminate it. They are willing to continue it, and we have no objection.

Mr. COWAN. Then, this is an understanding between two nations that does not expire on the 16th or the 17th of July, 1911, with the expiration of that treaty. I wonder what member of the government ever told the people of Canada that before—that they had entered into an understanding with Japan on the subject of immigration which does not expire with the treaty adhered to on the 31st of January, 1906. Perhaps the minister will tell me now just when this friendly arrangement will expire. Is there any limit put to it?

Mr. FIELDING. I should say when either party becomes displeased with it.

Mr. COWAN. Now, perhaps the minister will be good enough, out of the abundance of his reasons, to tell us why we want this treaty with Japan. Is it in the public interest of Canada that we should encourage immigration from Japan? Does the Minister of Finance regard it as so? —Silence. Then, if it is not in the interest of Canada to encourage immigration from Japan, why in the name of all that is sensible have we entered into this agreement which does not expire with the treaty? Can the minister give a single reason for it? I do not think he can give one reason in the public interest of Canada. I do not believe he can justify before the people of Canada having entered into that secret understanding with Japan, which does not expire on the 17th of July next, when the people of Canada believed that it would expire.

The fact is that under that friendly understanding with Japan, the Japanese people have free right of entry and residence in Canada, and that free right is to be restricted only by the Japanese government. There is nothing more to it, and we are handing over for no reason which any minister or public man dare state publicly, and are continuing to hand over, in spite of the expiration of this treaty, this power to regulate immigration into Canada. What reason can any public man give for handing over to a foreign power the jurisdiction which was given by the Act of confederation to this parliament with regard to immigration? What reason can the government give in the public interest for doing it? They can give none; and mark you, the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) sneered once, in answer to a suggestion I made, that the right of the Japanese to enter Canada under the Japanese Treaty is less encumbered by conditions than the right of an Englishman, a Scotchman, an Irishman or a Frenchman under our Immigration Act. Perhaps the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) will make bold to say again that I am wrong in my construction of the Japanese Treaty or of the friendly understanding or of the Immigration Act. I say again you are not, by this friendly understanding, putting the immigrants from the mother land on an even keel with the immigrants from Japan; you are discriminating in favour of Japanese immigration. You cannot cut down those rights acquired by agreement between two nations by an Immigration Act. The United States evidently believe that cannot be done because they made an express stipulation in their treaty that Japan shall be subject to the immigration laws of the United States. But under this friendly understanding which this government has entered into, every Japanese subject has an absolute right to free entry and residence in Canada except when that right is restricted by his own government. That understanding gives privileges and preference to the Japanese immigrant which the immigrants from other countries do not enjoy. Can any reason in the public interest be advanced for this discrimination in favour of the Japanese? Are we so anxious to increase the Japanese population of Canada that we are going to discriminate in their favour against Irishmen, Englishmen and Scotchmen and men from other European countries? That was the legal effect under the old treaty which expires on the 17th July next, and it will be the effect of the continued understanding between the two nations. The difference between a treaty and an understanding is the difference between tweedle dum and tweedle dee. It is infinitesimal. It does not modify the fact that when an agreement between nations is entered into, neither one has any right to pare down that agreement, and limit by legislation the rights of the citizens of the other coun-

try with regard to immigration or any other subject. So that we are presenting to the world this spectacle. We started out with a great desire to make treaties, and we blundered into this treaty in January, 1906. The government blundered into it and tried to justify it by the misleading statement that they had an agreement with Japan limiting the number of Japanese immigrants to come from Japan into Canada. Within six months after that treaty was ratified, 8,125 Japanese immigrants had landed in the ports of Vancouver and Victoria. Then my hon. friends opposite will say: Oh, but our Postmaster General went over and made this arrangement, and the number coming into the country since has been considerably reduced. With that point I propose to deal later, but the fact remains that this agreement will continue to the Japanese people the right which the people of the United Kingdom would be delighted to enjoy, the right of free entry and free residence, the right to be restricted only by the government of the country from which the immigrant comes. Suppose that right were given to Englishmen, do you not think it would increase the number of English, Scotch and Irish immigrants? Is it any wonder that the Japanese were so alert to avail themselves of this right and rush into Canada in such numbers?

The vice of the thing is this, and no one knows it better than the Finance Minister —I venture to say that he has wished a thousand times he had never made the fatal blunder of entering into this foolish treaty of the 31st January, 1906, the vice of the thing is this, that you have selected a people who never intend to become Canadian citizens, who are unfit to become Canadian citizens, and you are giving them a preference in our immigration field over every other people in the known world.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I see absolutely no reason why we should continue this alleged friendly understanding. The advantage of the tariff arrangement has been discussed to-night fully by my hon. friend from Yale-Cariboo (Mr. Burrell) I think he has shown that its advantages are nil. Why should we not avail ourselves of this opportunity, when this treaty is expiring, to make no arrangement that is not to the advantage and honour of Canada? The commercial side of the treaty is of little or no benefit to Canada. The balance of trade is with Japan, and gold has to go from Canada to Japan to meet that balance. This 'friendly understanding' on the subject of immigration, I venture to say, is, in the view of ninety per cent of the people who are affected by it, a most unfriendly arrangement so far as the interests of Canada are concerned. I see no necessity for Canada making any move at the present juncture. She does not have to adhere to that agreement. There is no breach of national honour or national etiquette in our failing to adhere to that agreement. There is no advantage in adhering to that agreement or making a new commercial arrangement. Why not, with the dignity and self-respect that becomes a nation, exercise the power given us by that Confederation Act, the power to regulate and restrict and govern immigration from any country we please according to the interests of Canada? Why do we hand that power to a foreign country? What advantage are we getting in return? How does it add to our self-respect or advance any of our interests? What end is it attaining for Canada? Why not stand exactly as we are in all treaty relations between the two countries, until we can get an arrangement that is really for the interest of the country?

Now, I know of no power possessed by the government of Canada which enables it to enter into an agreement that has never been submitted to parliament for ratification and which is described by the representative of the Japanese government in this language:

> The understanding arrived at between the two governments——
>
> The Canadian and the Japanese.
>
> —in 1908 on the subject of immigration is quite independent of the existing treaty concluded between Japan and Canada in 1906 and is not terminated on the expiration of that treaty between Japan and Canada.

I am prepared to say that the Canadian government has no power to enter into a side agreement with a nation which agreement was never submitted to parliament and is not part of the British treaty. I am prepared to state that the government does not need to take the view that there exists any understanding or agreement independent of the treaty and not expiring with the treaty. There is no necessity put upon the government to take that view; and I say it is in the interest of Canada generally that no such view should be taken, and no action taken such as the minister has outlined to-night.

I can only say, in conclusion, that I know that the people who live in these conditions, and who are as broad and generous-minded as any other part of the electorate of Canada, regardless of occupation or origin, race or creed, are of one mind in believing that it is a fatal mistake in the interests of Canada, looking to her larger destiny, to encourage by treaty or friendly understanding with Japan, the immigration of people who never intend to become citizens of Canada and who take the place in that western country of men who should be citizens undertaking the responsibilities of citizens. In that western country we have duties to perform; we have to establish

there the institutions that have made Canada and the other portions of the British Empire what they are. We have to do this by our own exertions. And when you find that of the people we are adding to the population of this country, twenty-five per cent of them at least are aliens and intend to remain aliens, who intend to leave the country, who take upon themselves no part of the duties of citizenship—I tell you that you are casting upon what the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in an unfortunate moment called the 'white portion of British Columbia,' a burden that may become, one of these days, greater than they can bear. I have no desire to refer to past events or to affect in the slightest degree the relations between Japan and Canada or between Japan and the British Empire. I hope these relations may always remain cordial. But I do say that the men who propose these arrangements with Japan on a subject which, under the Confederation Act we have the power to deal with, are not rising to the great height of Canada's destiny in those matters that affect not only Canada but the whole Anglo-Saxon race. I say there are other duties cast upon us besides this two-penny half-penny chasing after the dollar in the remote corners of the earth. I say that our patriotism should not be of that sordid kind which is measured by the price of a ton of lead in Japan or of a sack of potatoes on the Boston market. I think we have other and higher duties to perform. I feel that this government is failing, and failing absolutely, in the performance of those high duties, in this attempt to put through this arrangement with Japan.

Mr. KING. At this late hour of the night and at this late stage of the session, I would not like to detain the House more than a moment or two. But I feel, after listening to the remarks of the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) that I would be doing an injustice to those whom I more particularly represent in this House, the working classes of this country, if I allowed his remarks to pass without comment.

I was particularly struck with one phrase the hon. member made use of, that there was danger of casting on British Columbia a burden greater than she could bear. As I listened to his remarks I could not help feeling that if many speeches of that kind were delivered throughout Canada, we would be casting upon this country a greater burden than the people would be able to bear. I wonder if the hon. member realizes the extent and magnitude of this question of Oriental immigration. It has been my privilege to see something of the 300 millions of India, to see something of the 400 millions of China, to see something of the 50 millions of Japan; and as I wandered through those countries and saw those multitudes, and thought that we on this side of the Pacific were a people of only 8 or 9 millions, I could not help feeling that the manner of dealing with the problem of Oriental immigration was one of the most important and far reaching concerns of this nation. Now what is the manner my hon. friend suggests tonight? It is that we should claim the rights which we have under the British North America Act, and begin to legislate in this parliament by a series of acts in the nature of exclusion.

Mr. COWAN. I never suggested such a thing.

Mr. KING. What other meaning can be attached to my hon. friend's remarks? He has spoken of the arrangement which this government is making.

Mr. COWAN. When I say that I did not made such a statement, and every one in this House knows I did not, I have a right to ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw his assertion.

Mr. KING. I am prepared to accept what my hon. friend says as to his statement, but every hon. gentleman in this House will draw his own inference from his remarks. There are only two methods by which this question of Oriental immigration can be dealt with. There is either the method of diplomacy which this government has followed, and there is the other method of hurling defiance in the face of these Oriental people and telling them that, despite their numbers, despite their industrial and commercial importance, we shall legislate against them in a fashion which will exclude them totally from our shores. Now I believe with all my heart that it is absolutely necessary to restrict immigration from the Orient. I think in the interest, not only of the working classes of this country, but of all other classes it is absolutely necessary that the people of the Orient shall be restrained from coming to this country. But there are two methods of doing that. One method is to attempt it by legislation, with the possibility of incurring the hostility of those peoples, the other method is to allow those people themselves to show their desire to deal with us as a friendly nation, and when they express a willingness to restrict their own emigration, if they carry out that promise faithfully, to give them an opportunity to do so, and to continue that arrangement with them as long as we have reason to believe in their good faith. Now that is the position we are in with regard to Japan at the present day.

Our position, and the position of the nation to the south of us, is precisely analogous in more than one particular. We have

each had a treaty recently with Japan, a trade treaty which deals also with the subject of immigration. In the treaty with the United States I believe the American government reserved to itself the right to handle the question of immigration as it pleased. At the time we were discussing this treaty with Japan some years ago, hon. gentlemen opposite urged that we on this side of the House should have put into our agreement the same clause which was in the agreement of the United States, namely, that nothing in that trade treaty should in any way restrict our privileges in the matter of legislating on the subject of immigration. But what has taken place in the United States within the last six months as a result of their experience? The United States has entered into a new treaty with Japan, and what is the first clause in that treaty? This treaty has been signed within the past few weeks, on the fifth day of April in fact, and the first article in that treaty reads as follows:

The citizens or subjects of each of the high contracting parties shall have liberty to enter, travel and reside in the territories of the other, to carry on trade wholesale and retail, to own or lease and occupy houses, manufactures, warehouses and shops, to employ agents of their choice, to lease land for residential and commercial purposes, and generally to do anything incident to or necessary for trade upon the same terms as native citizens or subjects, submitting themselves to the laws and regulations there established.

Mr. COWAN. Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to read on to that section which shows that all these rights are subject to the Immigration Act of the United States.

Mr. KING The hon. gentleman may read any section he pleases.

Mr. COWAN. But it is there.

Mr. KING. I am reading what is here at present, and no language can be more emphatic than this:

The citizens or subjects of each of the high contracting parties shall have liberty to enter, travel and reside in the territories of the other.

That is the language which appears as part of the treaty lately entered into between the United States and Japan, and which gives complete liberty of movement in the matter of immigration between the two countries. Now my hon. friend says: Read on. After you get through the treaty altogether, I find at the end of it the following paragraph, which comes under the head of a declaration, not as part of the treaty, but as a separate document altogether, signed by Mr. Uchida, who is the ambassador of the Japanese government at Washington. And what are the words of this declaration?

In proceeding this day to the signature of the treaty of commerce and navigation between Japan and the United States, the undersigned, Japanese ambassador in Washington, duly authorized by his government, has the honour to declare that the Imperial Japanese government are fully prepared to maintain with equal effectiveness the limitation and control which they have for the past three years exercised in regulation of the immigration of labourers to the United States.

Mr. BURRELL. The minister surely does not mean to intimate that a formal declaration of that kind by a plenipotentiary is to be compared with the shadowy assurance which this government has got?

Mr. FIELDING. Does my hon. friend complain that we have not an assurance? His friend is complaining that we have too much.

Mr. KING. I may say that I regard the two assurances in every particular, so far as honour can make them such, on exactly the same footing. This assurance is given by the highest representative of Japan in the United States to the United States government, given on the honour of the Japanese government. The assurance with this government is also given by the highest representative of the government of Japan in Canada, and given with the full honour and knowledge of the Japanese government and on its behalf. Moreover, the assurances given by the Japanese government to the government of Canada have been given in formal documents signed by the Japanese Minister of Foreign Affairs, and given to the British Ambassador in Japan.

Mr. COWAN. It may be that the minister's copy differs from mine, but my copy contains this:

And whereas, the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States to the ratification of the said treaty was given with the understanding 'that the treaty shall not be deemed to repeal or affect any of the provisions of the Act of Congress entitled 'An Act to Regulate the Immigration of Aliens into the United States', approved February 20, 1907.'

Mr. KING. Exactly the same thing applies to this country. We have in this country an Act respecting immigration from other countries, relating to different classes of undesirable immigrants, and that law is enforced against Japan as against every other country, and the United States is in exactly the same position. My hon. friend cannot have looked into the matter carefully, or he would know that we have in this country immigration laws applicable to all immigrants that come to this country, whether on the

Atlantic or on the Pacific, and the stipulation to which my hon. friend has just referred applies exactly in the same way to Canada.

Mr. COWAN. Was that under the old treaty, too, ratified on the 31st of January, 1906?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Mr. COWAN. So they are subject to the Immigration Act. I suppose it was on legal advice at that time that the government was acting?

Mr. KING. My hon. friend is endeavouring to insinuate that it is not a fact that our laws in regard to the various classes of immigrants that are undesirable coming to our shores, operate against Japan. I inform him that I have seen myself the officials of this government putting those laws into force on the Pacific coast, turning back men and refusing them the right to land in this country because they were not able to pass the medical examination which was required of them. My hon. friend knows the law has been enforced out in British Columbia.

Mr. COWAN. That is not answering what I said. The treaty between the United States and Japan is subject to the Immigration Act of the United States while our treaty is not subject to the Canadian Immigration Act.

Mr. FIELDING. There will be no treaty after the 17th July.

Mr. KING. I was just going to point out to my hon. friend that under the treaty the United States have found it desirable to make with the Japanese government they have given the Japanese the free right of entry into the United States. The immigration of Japanese into the United States is restricted only by the general application of the United States immigration laws along lines exactly parallel to our own; that is with reference to the question of diseased and undesirable immigrants and the like. With that exception the whole matter of immigration from Japan to the United States is based on the declaration that:

> The Imperial Japanese government are fully prepared to maintain with equal effectiveness the limitation and control which they have for the past three years exercised in regulation of the emigration of labourers to the United States.

I may say to my hon. friend that perhaps he is not aware of the fact that the agreement between Japan and the United States went into effect subsequent to the time at which the arrangement was effected between Canada and Japan. My hon. friend the Postmaster General left this country for Japan in December, 1907. He was able at that time, through negotiations with the Japanese government and with the assistance of the British Ambassador, to make an arrangement which has effectively stopped emigration of any extent from Japan to Canada. After that arrangement had been effected the United States government sought to make a similar arrangement with the government of Japan. They were successful in getting either in part or in whole what this government got with Japan, but not more; and that arrangement has been found to work so satisfactorily that the United States government, in consenting to this treaty with Japan, has accepted the assurance that this arrangement will continue to work satisfactorily as far as immigration is concerned. That assurance is given irrespective of the treaty one way or the other. It is because of the policy of the Japanese government, that they have given this assurance to two different countries. It is part of their present policy that their people shall not come to this side of the water, but that those who leave Tokio and other Japanese cities shall emigrate to different parts of the Orient, Corea and Manchuria in particular. That is why this government has found a more effective way of dealing with this question by friendly negotiations through the channels of diplomacy rather than by an attitude of defiance and by the passing of exclusion laws against the citizens of that country. I have some figures here which show the immigration from Japan under this present arrangement.

Mr. COWAN. Does the minister mean that it is better to allow the Japanese government to exercise the right of restricting immigration from Japan into Canada than that Canada should exercise that right herself?

Mr. KING. If the Japanese government will undertake to restrict emigration of its own people, it is much better that they should restrict it than that this country should be put to the necessity of enacting exclusion laws. Let us see how it has worked out. I have here some statistics giving the actual numbers of immigrants from Japan to Canada, and also the number who have gone from this country back to Japan. Every month the Japanese government furnish this government with a carefully tabulated statement showing the number of Japanese who have left Japan to come to this country, and the numbers who have returned from this country to Japan. These figures, by comparison with the figures of our own immigration officers, have been shown to be absolutely correct all through. Under the heading of 'labourers' the Japanese government in-

clude returning emigrants, relatives of emigrants, domestic servants, agricultural settlers and contract labourers. Taking of these classes all those who have returned to Japan from Canada, and noting those who have travelled third-class, which would likely be the labouring and coolie classes, I find that the following are the comparative figures for the years 1909, 1910 and 1911 in so far as I have been able to obtain from files in the Department of Labour which have just been sent to me:

	1909.		1910.		1911.	
	Came to Canada.	Returned to Japan.	Came to Canada.	Returned to Japan.	Came to Canada.	Returned to Japan.
January	....	....	12	20	16	35
February	....	....	17	17	25	26
March	....	...	26	21	63	6
April	....	....	78	35	....	
May	....	....	80	24	....	
June	....	....	62	18	....	
July	19	20	76	41	....	
August	11	8	65	47	....	
September	23	4	35	37	....	
October	23	70	36	100	....	
November	3	117	19	153	....	
December	7	159	39	115	....	
Total	86	378	545	628	104	67

The actual result as shown by these figures is that in that period of time the last two years all but three months 338 more Japanese labourers have returned to Japan from Canada than have come from Japan to this country. This is a tribute to the agreement which has been effected by my hon. friend the Postmaster General, and that is the arrangement which, I understand, my hon. friend from Vancouver would have this government annul without considering the desirability of maintaining it one way or the other. In other words, an agreement which has had the effect of actually sending back to Japan 338 more labourers than have been brought to this country he would have us put an end to if we could. Speaking on behalf of the working classes of this country I would say that an agreement which has worked out in that way is a great deal more beneficial to them than any legislation which we could possibly put on the statute-books of this country.

I have nothing more to add other than to say that, looking carefully at the letter from the Minister of Foreign Affairs in Japan, to my colleague the Postmaster General, dated Tokio, December, 1907, and which has been read, I entirely disagree with the leader of the opposition, and also with the hon. member for Vancouver that it necessarily implies that this agreement hangs upon the treaty which has been entered into with Japan. If one will read the last paragraph of that letter one will find that no mention is made whatever of the treaty, and if one takes into account each of the paragraphs one will see that the emphasis is laid upon what is the policy of the Japanese government. Mention is made of the special conditions in Canada by which is meant the economic conditions which exist in this country, and which are different from the economic conditions in Japan, and the letter throughout implies a desire to maintain the cordial and mutually beneficial relations which exist between these two nations. I maintain that that should be the supreme object which this parliament should seek to obtain namely the promotion of cordial and beneficial relations between not only Japan and Canada, but between all these countries of the Orient, and this particular country, and that end, I think will be best effected, first of all by taking into serious consideration the experience of larger nations; nations such as the United States which have precisely similar problems to deal with, and profiting to some degree by their example; and I would emphasize this in the case of my hon. friend who belongs to the very loyal party, by having regard also to what we owe to our British citizenship, and to allies of the British nation, and, more than all, and lastly, by keeping before this nation what is likely to be the policy which in the long run will best serve the object in view. That will be found to be a policy of conciliation, and not a policy of coercion and defiance.

Mr. BARNARD. As far as I can see, reading the letters which have been produced here, and hearing the debate as far as it has proceeded, there can hardly be a possibility of a doubt but that the proposed agreement is merely a continuation of the existing arrangement, so far as immigration is concerned, for the next two years. That arrangement, I can assure the members of the government, is unsatisfactory to the people of the province of British Columbia who are most immediately concerned in this question. It is unsatisfactory to them for the simple reason that the question of the regulation of immigration is left wholly to the government of Japan, and this government has absolutely nothing to say in it. The Minister of Labour eulogized the arrangement that had been made by the Postmaster General when he was in Japan. He told us what a magnificent arrangement it was, and how very well it had worked out. One thing is very sure

and that is that that arrangement was not what the Postmaster General asked when he went there; he certainly wanted something more than that, but he did not get all he asked for. Of course the correspondence, and what took place between him and the Imperial Japanese government I assume was more or less of a confidential nature, but I have here what purports to be a copy of the letter from the Postmaster General to Count Hayashi, dated 23rd December, 1907, the reply to which is the agreement which is now under discussion. He states in that letter:

I understand the imperial government is not able to accede to my wishes in the matter of limiting the number of the above immigrants. I am therefore persuaded in the sequel of negotiations that it is quite unnecessary for me to further dispute the fact that the Canadian government's desire cannot be acceded to.

What he asked for I do not know, but he evidently thought he should get much more than he did get; at any rate he asked for it, and did not get it. The people of British Columbia are not satisfied, and have not been satisfied with this agreement as it stands. They are not satisfied because the control of this immigration is in the hands of the Japanese government to deal with as they see fit. The letter of December 23rd, 1907, which is the basis of the agreement, provides that the Japanese government is to give careful consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada, and that for the purpose of this discussion means in British Columbia, with a view of meeting the desires of the government of the Dominion of Canada, as far as compatible with the spirit of the treaty, and the dignity of the State. That is to say, when they feel inclined, they can send as many immigrants as they like into British Columbia, and the Dominion government has no right to say anything in protest. It is unnecessary, and would be futile at this stage of the proceedings to discuss the desirability or undesirability of Japanese immigration.

Mr. KING. Where does he find any language which will give him any reason to say that this government has bound itself so that it has no right to say what immigration shall come into this country?

Mr. BARNARD. I understand this government has accepted this letter, and this letter states that the imperial government is to give serious consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada with a view to meeting the desires of the government of the Dominion as far as is compatible with the spirit of the treaty, and the dignity of the state. That is, if the imperial government do not think it compatible with the spirit of the treaty, or the dignity of the State of Japan, they would be still living up to their arrangement, and coud do as they pleased.

Mr. KING. That is simply an offer on the part of the Japanese government to this government. It does not in any way restrict the power of this government to do what it thinks right in the premises provided that offer is not lived up to.

Mr. BARNARD. That is the whole agreement that the Minister of Labour has been telling us is such a very fine agreement. Surely he does not propose to continue that agreement which he praised so highly.

Mr. KING. What I have praised is an arrangement whereby the Japanese government have voluntarily offered to do a certain thing which has left this government absolutely free to do what it thinks best. That is the arrangement I have applauded.

Mr. BARNARD. The government at Ottawa have not appreciated the feelings of the people of British Columbia, they never have from the time that this question first became a live issue. I do not wish to enter on anything particularly controversial in connection with this matter to-night, but we have had statements from different ministers which go to show beyond question that the sympathies, and the feelings of the government were not at one with the people of British Columbia. The government undoubtedly made a blunder when they first entered into this treaty, a blunder which was absolutely unnecessary because the details were called to their attention by the imperial government at the time, and the imperial government informed this government that they did not need to adhere to that treaty so far as the question of immigration of labour was concerned. In spite of that they adhered to the treaty, and found themselves in trouble by reason of having done so. At this time it would be a mistake on the part of the government to perpetuate that blunder; let this matter drop, and begin all over again. The people of British Columbia wish to develop their own province along their own lines. We think, rightly or wrongly, that we have the finest province in the Dominion. We have any amount of difficulties to overcome, and we do not want these difficulties increased by a large influx of alien population which can never be assimilated with the population of the province, and which will be for all time to come a detriment to it.

Mr. KING. Hear, hear.

Mr. GOODEVE. I would like to add a word or two of protest in regard to the resolution. If the resolution as it is on the Order Paper was all that we had in connection with the matter to be dealt with, I would have nothing whatever to say, but yesterday the Finance Minister brought

down a return of correspondence leading up to the resolution that we have on the Order Paper. In that return I find a letter which the Finance Minister has read in the House this evening. In it he referred to the fact that he trusts the same relations will continue in regard to immigration that have been in existence since the letters referred to between the Postmaster General and the Imperial Japanese government were exchanged. I absolutely agree with the argument advanced by the leader of the opposition, that we must read the reference in the letter addressed by the Finance Minister to the Imperial Japanese government in connection with article 1 of the original treaty to which, undoubtedly it refers.

The whole argument of the hon. Minister of Labour has been that they have no treaty now, and that therefore we can at any time restrict the immigration of Japanese subjects. But that is contrary to the correspondence brought down and laid on the table yesterday, and repeated by the Minister of Finance to-night. Following that argument, the Minister of Labour refers to the recent treaty between the United States and Japan, from which he endeavours to argue that they are using exactly the same agreement that we have had with the Japanese government. But what are the facts? As the hon. member for Vancouver pointed out, in the latter clause of the agreement between the United States and Japan, it is expressly stated:

> And, whereas, the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States for the ratification of the said treaty as given with the understanding that that treaty was not to be deemed to repeal or affect any of the provisions of the Act of Congress entitled an Act to regulate immigration into the United States.

By that clause the United States absolutely claim the right to control the immigration. The hon. Minister of Labour says that refers only to criminal immigration; but in the original treaty made with Japan that class of immigration was not excepted. That was one of the objections taken by the province of British Columbia, namely, that instead of retaining control over our own immigration, we had handed it over to the Japanese government.

Mr. KING. I think my hon. friend is mistaken. The objection was this, that we had allowed to go on the statute that section of the treaty which said that the subjects of either country were to have the right of free entry. The question was not in regard to our not having applied for immigration laws against undesirable classes, but it was that the Japanese would have the right to enter this country without any restriction.

Mr. GOODEVE. The objection was that we had failed to put in a clause regulating immigration, and the result was a large influx in the following year.

Mr. KING. The fact that we did not expressly name our immigration Act did not exclude its provisions from applying to the Japanese in the same way as to immigration from other nations. Any labourer from Germany who could pass our laws in that regard could also come from Japan.

Mr. GOODEVE. The Minister of Labour does not seem to recognize the fact that the treaty superseded any immigration laws we had, and we had absolutely no control over either criminal or other immigration, at that time. It is quite true that possibly the Japanese government would not have taken objection to our excluding criminal immigration, although even in regard to that we have no absolute right under the treaty; but we failed to retain control over our own immigration, even of labourers from Japan. We are satisfied that this government should have friendly trade relations with Japan; but at the time this treaty was made with Great Britain, the Secretary of State for the Colonies called attention to the fact that the colonies could accept these rights and privileges with respect to trade, and yet retain control of immigration. We have no objection to trading with these people; on the contrary, we are from time to time increasing our shipping in that direction, and we desire to have trade with them; but the Japanese government, through the imperial government, said that they were quite prepared that the Dominion government should accept these trade relations and still retain control of her own immigration. What is the condition to-night? This treaty lapses in July next, and we had a right, not only as citizens of British Columbia, but as citizens of the Dominion of Canada, to expect that this government would have taken advantage of that opportunity to retain control of our own immigration. There was absolutely no necessity for the Minister of Finance, in negotiating on behalf of this government, to report that they had difficulties in regard to immigration, and practically to continue the treaty. You have not only deliberately handed over the control you had given to them by the treaty with Great Britain, but handed over that control by that letter without any reciprocal return whatever. I do not mean to say that we would value Japan as a place of immigration for Canadian citizens, but we had at least that reciprocal right by the treaty. To-day that right is taken away. The letter of the Finance Minister deals with the arrangement based on the letter about which the hon. member for Vancouver was so careful to ask, and as to which he got the assurance of both the Postmaster General and the Finance Minister

that it was the basis of the agreement. Under that letter the Japanese government indefinitely, or at least to the full extent of two years, will have the absolute right, if they so desire—and they will only be guided after an investigation of the Canadian situation—to control that immigration, and we have absolutely no rights in return.

Mr. FIELDING. Where does my hon. friend find that?

Mr. GOODEVE. I find it in a letter which was read here to-night by the hon. gentleman. No one will dispute that that letter bases the position we occupy to-night in connection with article (1) of the original treaty and in connection with the agreement based on the letter of the Postmaster General.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend must not say that no one disputes it because I do.

Mr. GOODEVE. I would like to know on what ground.

Mr. FIELDING. I have explained that already.

Mr. GOODEVE. And while doing that, we have not even the previous concessions, which we had under the treaty. There are no reciprocal concessions with regard to immigration. True there are with regard to trade, but absolutely none with regard to immigration, and that is why I enter my protest, not only on behalf of the people of British Columbia but of the Dominion.

I do not propose at this late hour to go into all the arguments why we think this immigration is not suitable to Canada. Every one will agree that we cannot assimilate Asiatic immigration and make the Asiatics good Canadian citizens. But that is no reason why we should not trade with them, and the Japanese recognized that in the treaty of 1906 and said they were quite prepared that the Dominion should accept the advantages of a trade treaty, but still retain control of her own immigration. Now when the opportunity arises this year to resume our control of immigration, we find, by the letter of the Finance Minister, that the government has given away the right to control that immigration. I am free to admit, from the figures furnished by the Department of Labour which I assume are correct, that to a large extent the Japanese have restricted immigration, but that is purely a matter of goodwill on their part, and it is on that my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) argued that to-day the Japanese have more rights with regard to immigration than British people. They have the absolute right and freedom to come in, reside, travel, &c.—rights exceeding those which any other nationality has to-day. It is on that basis we object to this proposed agreement. We do not object to the proposed extension of our trade or our traffic regulations, but solely to our immigration regulations.

Mr. FISHER. On what does my hon. friend base his statement that under the treaty the Japanese have greater right of entry than British subjects?

Mr. GOODEVE. I base it on the fact that under the original treaty we retain no control over the immigration from Japan whereas British immigrants from other countries are subject to our Immigration laws.

Mr. FISHER. That is not the case. Our Immigration Act applies to the people of Japan as well as to all other people as regards disabilities of any kind contained in that Act. That is a statement I make with the full responsibility of the government.

Mr. GOODEVE. I take exception to that. A treaty obligation overrides that Act, and I appeal to the lawyers in the House if I am not correct.

Mr. BURRELL. If the minister's view be correct, why should the United States have found it necessary to have a special protocol making the Japanese subject to their immigration laws.

Mr. FISHER. If the clause in the United States Treaty, which says that the treaty does not exempt the Japanese from the immigration laws of the United States—and which clause is contained in the body of that treaty—has the effect my hon. friend says it has, why is it that a protocol was required outside of that treaty to continue the agreement between the United States and Japan? Why did they want that agreement to continue if their immigration laws shut out Japanese immigration? Either one of two things. Either the United States immigration laws did not have that effect or else the United States, like ourselves, considered it better for the Japanese themselves to restrict emigration to the United States than for the Americans to pass laws and regulations to shut the Japanese out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The protocol deals with something which is not covered by the general immigration laws of the United States.

Mr. FISHER. But if these laws apply what need was there for a protocol?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Because the general immigration laws do not touch that particular subject.

Mr. FISHER. The immigration laws of the United States can shut anybody out. They can shut the Japanese out; but by reason of the protocol attached to the treaty, it is evident that the United States authorities prefer a friendly arrangement of that kind to being obliged themselves to shut the Japanese out by their own laws. They might be able to do that under the treaty but they preferred a friendly arrangement with the Japanese because, like ourselves, they prefer the policy of friendly relations between people, rather than be under the necessity of insisting on their full rights by shutting them out. The policy of this government has been that we should secure the restriction of Japanese immigration by friendly arrangement with the Japanese government, under which the Japanese government would restrict that immigration themselves, rather than undertake to restrict it by our laws.

Mr. GOODEVE. Why does not the government of Canada make similar arrangements with all other countries and allow all other countries to restrict immigration to Canada? If the government are going to hand over to one country the right to control emigration to Canada, it would only be logical that they should give that right to other countries.

Mr. FISHER. As a matter of fact we have just such an arrangemnt with the government of India. My hon. colleague the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) went to England some time ago in consequence of certain immigration of Hindoos into British Columbia which was objectionable.

Mr. GOODEVE. That was a British country.

Mr. FISHER. And he then made an arrangement with the Indian authorities by which they agreed to restrict and discourage the emigration to Canada of those Hindoos. My right hon. leader stated not long ago in this House that he would be glad, as soon as the time was ripe, to make a similar arrangement with China if possible. It is true that with regard to European countries generally, we have no such arrangement, but we have other means of dealing with them. We might adopt it there also if the opportunity should arise, but it has not yet arisen. With Japan, however, we had the opportunity of making such an arrangement, and we did make it with the most satisfactory results. There is a direct difference between the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite, and that of this government. The policy of this government is to deal with Oriental immigration by means of arrangements by which the governments of those countries will themselves restrict emigration from them to Canada, and we shall not be obliged to pass regulations to restrict it ourselves. Apparently hon. gentlemen opposite think it better to ignore the friendly proposals of governments in the Orient who are willing to agree to such an arrangement, and have Canada herself pass such drastic regulations as they would like for the purpose of shutting out Oriental immigration. That seems, so far as the discussion to-night has shown it, to be the direct difference between the two policies here to-night.

There is another point on which I wish to say a word. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to consider that the arrangement is dependent on the treaty. I have no hesitation in saying that the arrangement is not dependent on the treaty. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) read an extract from the document which was laid on the table to-day by my colleague the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) which bears out entirely what I say now. The memorandum is explicit that the understanding arrived at beween the two governments in 1908 on the subject of immigration is quite independent of the existing treaty and does not terminate on the expiration of that treaty, and that is quite in accord with the understanding we have always had on the immigration question. The immigration arrangement was made after the treaty. It is a mutual arrangement by which the Japanese government undertakes to restrict the emigration of Japanese to Canada. As a result of that, Canada makes no drastic regulations of immigration against the Japanese. If the Japanese government did not maintain its part of that arrangement Canada would be free to make any restrictions she chose in regard to Japanese immigration. We believe it is better in the interest of Canada—and not only in the interest of Canada but in the interest of Japan—that the Japanese government themselves should restrict their emigration to Canada. We wish them to continue that. The Japanese government also wishes to continue it. But I wish to have it clearly understood that this arrangement is independent of the treaty and that it is dependent upon the faithful recognition of the arrangement by both sides to the agreement. If at any time the Canadian government considers that the Japanese government is not fulfilling its obligations, or the Japanese government considers that the Canadian government is not fulfilling its obligations, either party would have the right to terminate the arrangement at once. It is not a treaty, but an arrangement, and it continues by the mutual good feeling and good understanding between the two countries and can be terminated the minute that that mutual feeling of faith and confidence ceases to exist.

Mr. GOODEVE. With reference to the similar agreement that the Minister of Agriculture has stated they have made with the Indian government, it must be remembered that the people of India are British subjects and would of necessity have to be dealt with in an entirely different manner from those who are not British subjects. I can readily understand an arrangement of that kind being made with our fellow subjects. It was a difficult question to handle, and if an agreement of that kind was come to, I think it is eminently satisfactory, and I am quite prepared to give credit for it. But, speakinf for myself alone, and not on behalf of this side of the House, I differ entirely with the policy of the present government in regard to foreign and alien immigration—handing over the absolute control of that immigration to the foreigners themselves. I say it is not a question of defiance as stated by the Minister of Labour (Mr. King). There is absolutely nothing infra dig in treating with Japan on the basis of controlling immigration. And I point out to the government that they did not consider it so, and the British government themselves did not consider it so, as shown by the letters from the Colonial Secretary. I have not the letters before me now, but I think that on three separate occasions by cable and afterwards by letter they stated to this government that they could have all the benefits of the trade relations and still retain control of immigration. Further, these hon. gentlemen argue quite contrary to what they argued before, for they stated that until this treaty expired nothing could be done in regard to immigration. I think that was the argument used in this House,—in fact I am quite sure of it. Now they are arguing that the arrangement is entirely independent of the treaty. I am protesting because the time has come when we are again in the position to say to Japan, without offending them in the slightest degree, that we will resume control of immigration. I respect the progress the Japanese have made, and we are glad to interchange commerce with them; but that is no reason why we should hand over to them the con trol of immigration. It is difficult to make a parallel case. It did occur to me to ask whether we should request Japan to allow us to control our emigration going to Japan. But we are a different country. We are the last great open country—as the government likes to put it, 'the last Great West,' and it is not likely that our citizens, for a century to come at least, will be seeking to emigrate to these countries. So, we cannot apply that parallel. But, it is for that very reason that we should exercise the greatest care, because we are the last great west and desire to build up here a Canadian nationality; because we believe in our own young nationhood; because we believe that immigration should be restricted, and not only criminals should be excluded, but only the best people of European countries should be selected, only those people who can assimilate with us to make one united, sound, Anglo-Saxon race. That is the principle which I advocate, along with others on this side of the House. It is not the idea that we should defy these people; neither do they feel that it would be contrary to their dignity that we should retain complete control of immigration. I think it would be more consonant with the dignity of the Canadian parliament that we should say to Japan that while we welcome her trade, yet we intend to maintain control of our own immigration.

Mr. FIELDING. Is my hon. friend advocating exclusion or restriction?

Mr. GOODEVE. Control, we must control our own immigration.

Mr. FIELDING. But we have control. If we are not satisfied, if any day we believe that more Japanese are coming into the country than we think is desirable, all we have to do is to enforce such laws as the parliament of Canada may see fit to pass to that end.

Mr. GOODEVE. The letter the Postmaster General read from the representative of the Imperial Japanese government is clear on that point. It states clearly that they, Japan, must be guided by Canadian conditions, not the conditions that we set forth, but their understanding of our conditions. They are to be the judges, and that is what I am objecting to, that is the issue between us. I say that we should maintain such control of our immigration as becomes the great Canadian people. The Minister of Agriculture went further. He says: Why, we did that with India, we are going to do it with China; and it may be possible, he said, that we shall extend the same treatment to other European countries. I say we differ with him. We have an absolute right, and it is our duty, to retain control of our own immigration.

Mr. LEMIEUX. As I understand the hon. gentleman's remarks, he would exclude by our immigration laws against Japan, all Oriental immigrants.

Mr. GOODEVE. I want to retain control.

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is no question that we do maintain control of our immigration laws, as they are admitted by the comity of nations. For instance, in spite of clause 1 of the treaty passed between Canada and Japan in 1906, giving recipro-

cal entry to British subjects in Japan and Japanese subjects into Canada, the laws which apply against the white races as regards paupers, anarchists, diseased and undesirables generally, these immigration laws which apply by the comity of nations to all people and races, apply to the Japanese as well. If to-day there were landed on the shores of British Columbia anarchists, paupers and diseased, unfit mentally and physically to become Canadian citizens, they would be excluded according to the immigration regulations passed by this parliament and enforced by the Minister of the Interior. Besides that, there was in 1906 the general law applying to Japanese and all other nations, and there was a special arrangement. I have not got it under my hand at the moment, but it was quoted in the debate on the Address which took place in 1907-8 and in 1909 after the last general election. There was an arrangement made by the Japanese and Canadian governments to restrict the number of immigrants coming from Japan to Canada. After the treaty went into force, through some misapprehension on the other side of the Pacific, a general influx of Japanese took place into Canada, and riots occurred in the streets of Vancouver. We remonstrated, and as a result an arrangement was arrived at between the Japanese government and the Canadian government. Now what has been the result of that agreement? My hon. friend read only one portion of the letter which was handed to me by the Foreign Minister in Tokio. That part of the letter reads as follows:

In reply to your note of even date, I have the honour to state that although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees the Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the Imperial government to insist upon the complete enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranteed by those stipulations when that would involve disregard of special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

My hon. friend stopped there and did not proceed any further. Let me read the next sentence:

Acting, in this spirit, and having particular regard to circumstances of recent occurrences in British Columbia, the Imperial government have decided to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada.

Now what is that restriction, admitted by the Japanese government themselves? I tell my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cowan), who knows that I am right, that the agreement does consist not only in a letter which was published at the time and which I have just read, but it is implemented by a note from the Japanese government of a confidential nature which we are not at liberty to publish, which is known not only to this government but to the British government as well. Would we be justified in publishing it? Is it not sufficient to quote the words of the Foreign Minister of Japan, who says in his letter addressed to myself that they intend to take efficient means to restrict emigration to Canada. In a letter which I read concurrently with this one I find these words:

In order to further this object, I understand they are willing to restrict voluntarily within reasonable limits the volume of immigration.

Now because no number is mentioned, does that imply that there is not a numerical restriction? If my hon. friend will allow himself to be guided by common sense, by his experience in British Columbia in the summer and fall of 1907, as well as in 1908, not less than 8,000 or 9,000 immigrants came from Japan to Canada. This was the cause of riots in the streets of Vancouver. Now what has happened since then? You have the figures, they are loyally sent to this government by the Japanese consul in Ottawa, and there we find the exact number of Japanese immigrants coming to Canada. We know that Japan has lived up to that agreement, and I have no hesitation in saying that the agreement has been most loyally and most faithfully carried out to the letter.

Mr. COWAN. The Minister of Finance and the Postmaster General have both given us to understand that although we are handing over to the Japanese government the power to restrict immigration into Canada, yet we still retain that power which we agreed to hand over to Japan. You must either eat your cake or keep it. If you are giving the power to restrict immigration to Japan as long as that agreement is in existence, you cannot exercise that power which you have given away.

Mr. KING. Can my hon. friend tell me where, when this treaty expires, and it will in July, there is anything in the agreement to which he refers which will prevent this government from enacting any legislation it pleases in reference to immigration from Japan?

Mr. COWAN. There is the friendly understanding or agreement that the Japanese government and not the Canadian government shall exercise control over immigration into Canada. As long as that agreement endures you cannot exercise a power which, by that agreement, you have given to the Japanese government.

Mr. CARVELL. Suppose the agreement is abrogated?

Mr. COWAN. That is what we say will surely happen.

Mr. CARVELL. Supposing it is in six months, what then?

Mr. COWAN. Then we would have the control which we ought to have now. As long as that agreement endures it gives the control to the Japanese government and we cannot exercise it. I do not know that anything further need be said in answer to the argument that although we have given our cake to the Japanese government we still keep it. That is the argument, but I say it is impossible. If you have given them the control over immigration into Canada you cannot exercise that control as long as the agreement continues. I was a little astounded tonight to learn that this agreement has blossomed into a policy, forsooth, for Canada, that throughout the whole world we are hunting for bidders for the power to legislate with regard to immigration into Canada. We have gone to India and now we are trying to get China, if you please, to study the special conditions in Canada and to determine the number of immigrants that should come into Canada according to her judgment, and not according to our own. When we have exhausted the yellow races we are going to Europe and we are offering to give away the jurisdiction conferred upon this parliament by the Confederation Act. We are bartering the whole thing away. This is quite of a piece with the policy that proposes to barter away to a foreign country the power to legislate with regard to our tariff. The two policies have this in common that they are consistent the one with the other. They are able to give away the powers of legislation vested in this parliament by the Act of union to a foreign country and have no return whatever to Canada.

I was delighted with the pleasant, self-satisfied assertion of the hon. Minister of Labour when he rose in his place and declared in an orotund voice that he peculiarly represented the labour interests in Canada. I am prepared to admit that he does represent the labouring interests in this House in a peculiar way. When he consigned to the scrap heap the resolution in favour of technical education, better calculated than almost any other Bill that could be introduced into this House to develop a common citizenship in Canada, a national life and a national sentiment, he represented labour in a peculiar fashion.

Mr. KING. What Bill does the hon. gentleman refer to? There was never such a Bill before the House.

Mr. COWAN. Again, when the eight-hour Bill came before the House——

Mr. CARVELL.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FIELDING. What has this to do with the Japanese question?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. A point of order is raised. The question before the Chair is that of the treaty with Japan. I do not know what conclusion the hon. gentleman is going to draw from the argument he is now bringing forward, but whatever argument he brings forward must be applied to the particular resolution before the Chair. The connection is not very apparent to the past record of the Minister of Labour.

Mr. COWAN. I must apologize, Mr. Chairman, for the fact that the connection is not apparent because the connection of the remark of the hon. Minister of Labour that he represents labour in this House in a peculiar fashion is not exactly apparent as being apropos of the question under discussion. I am forced to deal with the matter in the same way the Minister of Labour did and I want to show that the policy which he is attempting to inaugurate in this House as a representative of labour in a peculiar fashion, culminating in this agreement, is a policy that from start to finish, is inimical to the best interests of the workingmen of Canada. I think I am justified, when he says that he is the peculiar representative of labour in this House, to agree with him to the extent of saying that his representation of that great interest—the labour interest—is a peculiar one. I was about to say, subject to your correction, that he is correct in saying that his position in this House as the representative of that class was peculiar when he mutilated that eight-hour Bill that has been before this House every session since I have had the honour of being a member of the House until it finally became a travesty on what it was when introduced. If he represents labour in the same peculiar way in reference to this question that peculiar way is one that the people and especially the labouring interests of Canada do not appreciate.

There is one more question to which I wish to make a very brief reference. The hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), with all the outward suits and trappings of eloquence, rose to the height of this great argument and to his own height, and said, a few moments ago, that the treaty now in existence between Japan and Canada is subject to our Immigration Act because his government had so determined it. The minister and his government cannot lift themselves over the stile by their boot straps in that way. They cannot make rules that govern the interpretation of international treaties. While they may exercise great power within a small radius, the arm of that power cannot reach to the

extent that they can control the international rules that govern the interpretation of treaties. I would like some responsible lawyer on the other side to get up and repeat what the Minister of Agriculture had the hardihood to say that the treaty now in existence between Canada and Japan is subject to the Immigration Act of Canada. The Postmaster General in his own eloquent fashion has attempted to show that the Japanese immigrant coming into Canada is subject by law to exactly the same conditions as the English immigrant coming into Canada. Can the Postmaster General tell me that the provisions in the Immigration Act requiring the English immigrant to have $50 in his pocket would apply to the Japanese immigrant coming into Canada?

Mr. KING. That is not in the Act, that is a regulation.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. Chairman, the profundity of that remark is exactly in keeping with every argument that has been made in support of this 'friendly understanding.' 'It is not in the Act, it is in the regulation.' That regulation is made by virtue of the Act, and, therefore, that provision is enforced by virtue of an Act of this parliament. Whether it is in the Act or in the regulation, I want to know if, out of the depths from which that remark came, I can get an answer to the question whether that provision can be lawfully applied to a Japanese immigrant coming into Canada under the present Japanese Treaty. No answer. The thing is so superficial and so out of joint with every principle of international law, and international usage that it taxes a man's common sense to deal with it. I believe that the member for Carleton has a thought upon this subject. We have heard him time and again in this House laying down the laws, not only the domestic laws, but the international laws, and rules and usages that govern the relations of nations, with a face of wisdom that would do credit to Coke. Perhaps he can tell me if the Japanese immigrant is immune from that regulation which requires an immigrant to have $50 in his poke, and if he is immune why is he immune? Why does the English immigrant have to show up or go back, and why has the Japanese immigrant a right to say: I will not show up, I will enter freely, and reside and travel in your country, and you can demand proof that I possess that $50 till you are black in the face, I will not give it. He has a perfect right to say that. Why again have we enlarged this policy of giving favours to any country that will undertake the legislative duties of this country? Why do we surrender our legislative functions to Japan, to India, or to China? This effort to show that the Japanese immigrant is on an even keel with the English immigrant is futile, it is impossible for you to show it. You cannot, for example, exact that $50 provision. That is a specimen brick of the whole structure. There are many other onerous conditions that apply to the English, Scotch and Irish immigrant coming into Canada that do not apply to the Japanese immigrant. Do we want to make this a preserve of China and Japan?

I wish to say publicly what I have never said publicly before, that my duties in Vancouver in September, 1907, at the time of the riot, to which the Postmaster General referred, revealed to me a state of things of which I think it is well for this House to take some cognizance. It is an absolute fact that a portion of the Dominion of Canada in the city of Vancouver was in the insurrectionist control of the Japanese for five days, and that notwithstanding the fact that there was a 'friendly understanding' at that very time. The Minister of Agriculture had told the hon. the leader of the opposition that that friendly agreement was both verbal and in writing. Notwithstanding that same friendly understanding, the influx to which the Postmaster General has referred took place and these 8,000 or 9,000 men, army reservists, bound by the most solemn oath ever administered to a subject of any country to return to the home land at the bidding of their emperor, no matter what their obligations to another foreign country, gathered and took actual possession of a portion of the city of Vancouver. The powers that be in Canada, the police of the city, the arm that enforces the laws of Canada, was powerless in the face of that insurrectionist mob. I do not want to sound the note of danger too strongly, but I tell you that British subjects who live in those conditions and realize what they mean to the arm that enforces the law, realize that the condition of things is absolutely and entirely different from any condition that we ever saw in Canada before, and I hope we will never see such a condition again. They realize that it is our duty, while we maintain the most friendly and courteous relations with those people, to see to it that not they, but we study the special conditions in Canada, which will tell us whether or not we want more immigration from that country. We cannot do that as long as we have this agreement. I think that right now is the time when we should recover to ourselves the power that we have voluntarily given away, and maintain it in the public interest. The Postmaster General was anxious to ascertain what exercise we would make of that control if we had it back. That would depend entirely on the special conditions,

and it is our duty to study these conditions, and should not be the duty of a foreign power. These special conditions are in Canada and our solemn duty is to legislate under the powers given to us in the Confederation Act, and to enforce the law. We have been derelict in both these duties, we have been handing over the legislative power to a foreign country, and when a little disturbance came, we were unable to enforce the domestic laws of our country.

Keeping in mind these conditions, it behooves us to go carefully. We in the west know it, we realize these problems as the people in the east do not, and I hope that this House will not take a sectional view of this question. We in British Columbia I hope take no narrow view of this question. We do not wish to legislate against the Japanese. We do not wish to discriminate against them, but we wish to retain our own national self-respect, and to exercise the legislative and administrative control which it is not only our right, but our duty to exercise.

Mr. OLIVER. It seems to me that some of our hon. friends opposite are unduly excited about the measure of control which Canada exercises in regard to immigration. We have an immigration law, and it applies to such people, and in such way as the parliament of Canada sees fit to decide that it shall apply. I do not know what more our friends want. The idea that they seem to have that Canada has in some way abrogated its control of its own affairs does not seem to me to have any warrant. We pass a statute, and we pass regulations under that statute which declare that certain people are admitted to Canada under certain conditions, and certain other people are admitted to Canada under certain other conditions. That does not in any way argue that Canada has not control of her own immigration laws or her own affairs. It may be that it suits Canada to deal with one class of immigrants in one way, and with another class in another way. We have done so, as a matter of fact; and if it suits Canada to deal with Japanese immigrants under certain conditions, with Hindu immigrants under other conditions, with Chinese immigrants under other conditions, and with European immigrants under different conditions, in what way is Canada's control over immigration abrogated? I cannot see any warrant for the suggestion. Our hon. friends have taken the view that in the case of Japan we have handed over our authority in regard to immigration to Canada, to the government of Japan. I fail to see the foundation for their view. They are pleased to put it that we have negotiated with Japan, and have said to Japan, we will accept in immigration matters such direction and legislation as you see fit. From my point of view, it is this way; we have said to Japan, unless you restrict the movement of your people to Canada, we will take such measures as will restrict it. That seems to me to be the position, and there is no derogation from the authority of Canada in taking that position, nor is there any handing over of our authority over immigration from Japan. Immigrants from Japan are subject to our immigration laws the same as any other immigrants. If our hon. friends want any enlightment on the subject, they will find that during the excitement in regard to immigration from Japan, when large numbers of Japanese had come to British Columbia, and large numbers of others were in prospect of coming, while we were negotiating with Japan as to the attitude that Japan should take in regard to her citizens who were under her control, it was just as necessary for us to take action in regard to her citizens who were not under her control. It will be remembered that the movement of the Japanese into British Columbia was not so much a movement from Japan as it was from the Sandwich Islands, which are a part of the United States. There were thousands of those people there, and there was a concerted movement to bring them to Canada. No law of Japan could control that movement; but the parliament of Canada passed legislation empowering the government to take certain action. An amendment to the Immigration Act was passed, called the indirect passage provision, authorizing the Governor in Council to pass regulations to prevent the landing in Canada of persons who came otherwise than from the country of their citizenship or birth. This amendment was passed for the purpose of excluding these Japanese from the Sandwich Islands who were going to be brought to Canada in thousands, and the result was that they were excluded.

Mr. GOODEVE. Was it not a fact that before that applied to Japan you had to get the consent of Japan?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly we did not have to get the consent of Japan. We had to get the consent of Her Majesty's loyal opposition, and I may say we had some difficulty in getting it; but once we got that, there was no impediment whatever. We passed the order in council, and the prospective movement was checked, and did not take place. It is a figment of the imagination to suppose that the government of Canada is not controlling its own immigration affairs; but if by frendly arrangement the government of Japan sees fit to take action that will arrive at the same end as other action which the government of Canada might take, and certainly would take, it seems to me that

there is no fault to be found, and no derogation from the authority of Canada or the proper exercise of that authority. Surely it is better policy to be on friendly terms with another country than on unfriendly terms. It is better not to have restrictive and coercive measures if they can be avoided. We would be very glad to-day if we could have an arrangement with the United States that would remove the difficulties that arise along the three thousand miles of our border by reason of the exclusion of undesirables; everybody will agree that that would be a good thing. The same with the Empire of Japan. If we can have a friendly arrangement with that country, it is better in the interests of this country, and of the world. The hon. member for Vancouver expressed surprise that a certain Act should have blossomed out into a policy. Well, I understand that this Act is a part of the general policy of the Liberal government of Canada. It is always the policy of the Liberal government of Canada, if I understand aright, to make a friendly arrangement rather than to have unfriendly acts: and the prosperity which Canada has achieved under the Liberal administration is all the evidence I want that that policy is the best policy for Canada, and I believe that it is the most acceptable to the people of Canada.

Mr. GOODEVE. The Minister of the Interior started out by taking the direct opposite view to that of the other four ministers who have spoken to-night. He argued from entirely different premises. I do not know whether or not he was in the House while they were speaking, but certainly they laid it down that they had decided as a policy that they would allow the Japanese—and the Minister of Agriculture went further and said that they were negotiating to allow the Chinese—to regulate their immigration into Canada instead of Canada regulating it itself. So that is entirely contrary to the argument of the Minister of the Interior started out with, although he ended somewhat by following along the same lines as the other four ministers. With regard to the other question which has been raised, particularly by the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) over and over again, namely, on what ground I base my statement that the Japanese in this particular instance were regulating the emigration into Canada, I had not the papers at the time, but I have them now, and I propose to read the one in connection with the other which I think will prove conclusively the argument I have made. I have here a letter of December 23, 1907, addressed to the Minister of Labour from the Japanese minister. I shall not read the whole of it as it is in 'Hansard'. In that letter the Japanese minister says:

In reply to your note of recent date, I have the honour to state that although the existing treaty between Japan and Canada absolutely guarantees Japanese subjects full liberty to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion of Canada, yet it is not the intention of the Imperial government to insist upon the complete enjoyment of the rights and privileges guaranteed by those stipulations when that would involve disregard of special conditions which may prevail in Canada from time to time.

Then he goes on:

In carrying out this purpose the Imperial government——

That is the imperial government of Japan——

—in pursuance of the policy above stated, will give careful consideration to local conditions prevailing in Canada with a view to meeting the desires of the government of the Dominion as far as is compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state.

Absolutely as far as compatible with the spirit of the treaty, and the dignity of the state. Based on that treaty——

Mr. FIELDING. Which the Japanese government have themselves terminated.

Mr. GOODEVE. I am going to show you that they have not terminated it. He says: 'As far as is compatible with the spirit of the treaty and the dignity of the state.' The Minister of Finance has admitted that. Then the Japanese minister goes on:

Although I stated in the note under reply, it was not possible for me to acquiesce in all the proposals made by you on behalf of the Canadian government, I trust that you will find in the statement herein made proof of the earnest desire of the Imperial government to promote by every means within their power the growth and stability of the cordial and mutually beneficially relations which exist between our countries.

By this it is absolutely clear that the imperial government of Japan retains the absolute right to judge of the conditions, and to interpret the terms on which they shall have free right to enter, travel and reside in any part of the Dominion.

This refers to the treaty, and that is the letter, admitted by the Minister of Finance to my hon. firend from Vancouver, on which that was based. Here is the letter written by the minister, dated Ottawa, May 10, 1911. The last paragraph of that letter is as follows:

The question of immigration has been discussed between us on several occasions. I do not deem it necessary that this should be more than mentioned here, inasmuch as the assurance received from you of the willingness of your government to continue a friendly understanding on that matter at present existing is entirely satisfactory to us.

Here we have the admission of the Minister of Finance that the agreement is based on that letter I have just read.

Mr. FIELDING. Not guilty.

Mr. GOODEVE. It cannot be based on anything else. What is the agreement that is entirely satisfactory to the minister?

Mr. FIELDING. The agreement, or understanding which was expressed in a letter read by the hon. member for Vancouver, in which it was stated by the Japanese authorities that this understanding was absolutely outside the treaty and in no way dependent upon it.

Mr. GOODEVE. But the Minister of Finance says he is now dealing with a new condition, and I must hold him to that. I am discussing the resolution on the Order Paper, and that resolution is based on a certain return brought down by the Minister of Finance.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot find anything of the kind on the Order Paper.

Mr. GOODEVE. In connection with that resolution the minister gives us a certain return which he lays on the table as full information. I find the last paragraph of that return is just as I stated. He proposes that the agreement shall continue. I ask what agreement? It must be some agreement. And we have the admission that the agreement was the agreement based on that letter I have just read, and which was accepted by this government. That being the case we take exception to it because we think that the time has arrived when we should take back the control over that immigration. It does not matter whether or not the Japanese have lived up to the spirit of that agreement. The question is we have not the sole and absolute control which we ought to have, and there is no reciprocal benefit for the Dominion. We have the right to know on what basis the minister is binding us for another indefinite term of years. I put him the question, and so did my hon. friend from Vancouver, and he said it is on the basis laid out in these letters. That being the case, I think I have proved the contention I have made.

Mr. BURRELL. Let me reply to the remark made by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) who said very clearly that in no respect had Canada deferred to the wishes of Japan in curtailing the immigration from Hawaii. I have here a speech by the Postmaster General made in this House on January 28, 1908, and in the course of that speech he said:

> But I can tell him that public opinion in Canada, public opinion even in British Columbia, accepts in good faith the assurance given by the Japanese government. But that is not all. We have this written assurance from the Minister of Foreign Affairs. It is the more binding because it is given of Japan's own free will. We also have the declaration that we may stop any immigration of Japanese originating from the Island of Hawaii, whence this great influx of labour came. Still more than that, we have a formal declaration that no contract labour will come to Canada from Japan or Hawaii or any other place where Japanese are colonized.

I think that shows pretty clearly that the government did get the consent of the Japanese before they dealt with the question of Hawaii. In a debate of this kind we should not lose sight of the fact that we are all Canadians trying to deal with an immensely grave question and to deal with it in the best interests of the future of Canada. And I must enter rather a protest against the tone of the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) who told us there were two ways of dealing with this question, one by conciliation or diplomacy, and the other by 'defiance,' to use a word which he repeated several times, the very plain imputation being that those who do not agree with the particular form of diplomacy which he favours were following the other method. I think that is very regrettable. I can assure the Minister of Labour and the other members of the government that the average man in British Columbia regards this question as of supreme national importance; he is not looking at it in the narrow-minded way. And I think it was gratuitous folly, also almost to assume that we are 'hurling defiance' at another nation on a question which should be above that method of treatment. This is all the more to be noted because nearly every one of the members of this government have come round to the views in favour of restriction that they now entertain simply through the opinion in British Columbia expressed year after year. I do not wish to weary the House, but I could quote passage after passage from the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux)—although he came round sooner than the others—the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher), and many other members of the government to show that they did not understand the gravity of this question or appreciate our view until the constant reiteration of those views and compelled them to look into the question, and to their gradually being converted to the views we hold, though their methods of solving the problem may be different. The government tells us that ours is simply a policy of harsh legislation, while theirs is a policy of diplomacy. One thing is certainly true—that no Canadian has the right to forget that, for the people of Japan and for ourselves, the time has come, when we should look this question frankly in the face and recognize

that oriental immigration into western Canada is an impossible thing without creating violent friction between the two countries. But let me point out also to the government, who argue that we favour an intolerant method, that the Japanese do not hesitate to exclude the Chinese labourers from their country. They have a clause forbidding absolutely the Chinese Coolies who come into competition, and fierce competition with the Japanese labourers. When economic conditions are sufficiently stringent and national dangers sufficiently grave, the Japanese government does not hesitate to practise what this government tells us we ought not to practise in regard to Japan. The Minister of Agriculture asked us whether we want restriction or exclusion. We want exclusion. And he himself is coming round to that view. I could quote that from his speeches to show that the principle of exclusion commends itself to him. We have had a new doctrine from the Minister of Labour, the Postmaster General and the Minister of Agriculture. They have taken the ground that the treaty is subject to our immigration law. I cannot say that the remarks of the Minister of Agriculture were very clear to me. In section 38 of our Immigration Act are these words:

The Governor in Council may, by proclamation or order, whenever he deems it necessary or expedient, prohibit for a stated period or permanently the landing in Canada, or the landing at any specified port of Canada of immigrants belonging to any race deemed unsuited to the climate or the climates of Canada, or an immigrant of any specified class, occupation or character.

I could quote, if there were time, a number of passages from government speakers to show that the Japanese are regarded by them as not suited for the requirement of Canada and, therefore, would come under the section. According to the Minister of Agriculture the Japanese treaty would have to be read in the light of that section. If they were to plainly say that it would save trouble. Now, let me point out the situation in the United States—I asked the Minister of Agriculture a question on that point which he did not answer very clearly. In the former treaty with the United States they have this clause:

It is, however, understood that the stipulations obtained in this and the preceding article do not in any way effect the laws ordinances and regulations with respect to trade, the immigration of labourers, police and the public security which are in force, or which may hereafter be enacted in either two countries.

The United States had that clause in their treaty; and, after much correspondence, and with great efforts on the part of Japan to restrain the United States from putting such enactments into their immigration law as would mean absolute exclusion, they deleted this clause from their present treaty, as is known to the government, and in doing that it is perfectly clear the present treaty did not come under the Immigration Act of the United States, and for that very reason the United States put in this very protocol which has been referred to and which distinctly says that this treaty is on the understanding that it shall be subject to the general immigration law of the United States. That, I think, is absolutely clear. Now, if we are to solve this question I hold we should solve it by having admitted the principle of our inalienable right to control our own immigration. But, if we were to make any other arrangement, the arrangement the United States have in this treaty is far ahead of anything we have. It means a contract, practically, on the part of a recognized plenipotentiary of Japan to maintain restriction which has almost amounted to exclusion in the past three years, and in addition put the whole matter under the immigration law of the United States, which, in spite of anything said here to-night, I fail to see it done in our case.

I have only to repeat that our feeling in British Columbia must not be misunderstood. We regard the whole matter as of intense, vital importance not only to British Columbia but to the whole of Canada. We are looking to the future. No man can say what the development in the national life of Japan may be—what clashes there may be between the east and the west—that is too big a subject to go into. But we should be fools if we were to shut our eyes to the possibilities of grave dangers, and it would be grave danger to allow the Japanese people to imagine that we do not control, had not control, over these matters ourselves, or to think anything else but to face the broad fact that fusion of the two races is impossible, that we should be better friends far apart, and a frank recognition of these things now would save a great deal of trouble in the future.

Resolution reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. Fielding moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 223) respecting duties of customs on importations from Japan.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time and second time, and the House went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. FIELDING. This Bill has been prepared and submitted to the Justice Department, and is giving effect to the resolution which the House has just adopted. It is substantially for the same purpose, and has the approval of the Justice Department.

Mr. COWAN. I want to examine that Bill more carefully.

Mr. FIELDING. It can only go through with general consent. We will let the Bill go through, and stand for third reading to-morrow, so that hon. gentlemen opposite may examine it.

On section 1,

Mr. SPROULE. That would allow them the privilege of sending free goods in here the same as into the United States.

Mr. FIELDING. That is the principle of the favoured nations. Any concessions granted to any country would have to be granted to Japan, the same as by the present treaty.

Progress reported.

NATIONAL BATTLEFIELDS AT QUEBEC.

House in committee on Bill (No. 222) respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.

Mr. SPROULE. I understood we were to have a ruling of the Speaker as to the regularity with which the Bill was introduced.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not understand that my hon. friend raised a formal objection. He mentioned that he would raise it later on. I do not think the objection can be taken seriously, because, as I explained yesterday, this is not a money Bill. The commission which was organized by chapters 57 and 58 Edward VII., is empowered to receive from various sections of the country, subscriptions towards the acquiring and maintaining of the National Battlefields on the Plains of Abraham. I have here the statute which constituted that commission, and the powers of the commission are defined in section 7:

> The commission may (a) receive and expend any moneys, whether appropriated by parliament or the legislatures or contributed by any municipality or other body or private individual, for the purposes authorized by this Act;
>
> (b) remove all buildings and other structures upon the lands taken or acquired, and erect a museum and such monuments and statues or other works as seem fitting or approprite; and
>
> (c) lay out and construct on or through the said lands such avenues, drives or paths, gardens, squares or other works as are, in the opinion of the commission, desirable for the improvement of the grounds and the conversion thereof into a national park of a character to commemorate worthily the great events which happened there.

Now, the same statute also enacted that whenever they acquired property for the purpose mentioned in the statute, the payment for such lands, properties, and buildings and for the maintenance of this park, must be ratified by the Governor in Council.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose this was a Bill for the purpose of the commencement of a new navy and it would entail a charge on the revenue in future, the minister could with equal propriety, advance the same argument that he is doing now. There would not be a dollar spent until it was voted by parliament on this undertaking which is expected to involve in future a charge upon the revenue of the country.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Unquestionably. If the commission were coming before us to-day asking aid from parliament towards the acquisition of the properties and lands mentioned in this Bill, unquestionably it would have to be dealt with through a resolution to the House. My hon. friend would be perfectly right then, but, at the present instance, the commission has a trust fund in its own hands, subscriptions received from various parts of the empire, and it is with the money that the commission has in its own hands that it purposes to purchase some of the properties mentioned in the Bill. Under these circumstances the objection taken by my hon. friend does not apply.

Mr. SPROULE. I think I had a perfect right to raise the point of order. I understand distinctly that I have a right to have the ruling of the Chair upon it and that is all I ask. It is my right and I shall insist upon it at some stage of this Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly, when the third reading comes, my hon. friend will be quite at liberty to raise the objection.

Mr. SPROULE. Not quite at liberty to raise it, but I do raise it and my understanding was that the Speaker was to rule upon it the next time we reached the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I did not so understand it. At all events I shall be glad to have the decision of the Chair and I am sure that my hon. friend will find that his objection does not apply in the present instance. The object of the Bill is clearly mentioned in the preamble. The commission has authority to purchase, as my hon. friend will see by chapter 58, 7 and 8 Edward VII, certain properties and lands for the National Battlefields Park at Quebec. The lands to be acquired now are the lands which will complete, according to the plan of the architect engaged by the commission, the park in question.

Mr. LENNOX. I have been singularly unfortunate in failing to make myself clear or else the hon. gentleman is a little obtuse. What I desire the hon. gentleman to point out, is whether or not

the purpose, that is now sought to be accomplished is within the scope of the purpose for which the commission was organized.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. LENNOX. The hon. gentleman, a moment ago, read an extract from the statute stating that it had the right to receive and dispose of moneys in accordance with the purpose and objects mentioned in the original statute. If he would refer to the part of the statute which says what the objects are or what they can do we will know what they can do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Section 5, of chapter 57, 7 and 8 Edward VII, provides that:

The commisison may purchase, acquire and hold the lands or immovable property in the city of Quebec, or in the vicinity thereof, where the great battles were fought, or which were occupied by the various commands of the respective armies upon the battlefields.

The lands mentioned in the sections of the Bill which I have the honour to present to the committee are exactly the lands where the two battles were fought. The hon. gentleman will see that it is within the scope of the powers of the commission.

Mr. LENNOX. I really do not see it. I would think that probably they have the right to acquire lands and that they probably have the right to acquire the lands that are here spoken of. I have not read the Bill, but I heard it explained by the minister the other day and one of the objects was that it was to lend money to the village of Montcalm.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is provided for in the last clause of the Bill, and when we reach that I will explain it.

Mr. LENNOX. All I was concerned about— and I am not very much concerned because the government will take the responsibility—was to know whether we had the right to authorize the commission to lend money in the way contemplated by this Bill. I would think we had not, but I am not going to try to embarrass the position or delay the passage of the Bill.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think that my hon. friend, with his legal experience, will see that it is within the power of the commission to do what is applied for now. By clause 5 they are empowered to purchase land where the two battlefields are situated. By another clause they purpose opening an avenue between the Plains of Abraham and the Monument des Braves on the Ste. Foye road. In order to open that avenue they are obliged to apply to the municipality of the town of Montcalm. The municipality is ready to cede the lisière needed for the avenue in question, which will be one of the features of the great national park and, in order to cede the lisière the town of Montcalm is obliged to pay a certain price for the acquisition of the property. The town of Montcalm has proposed to get from the commission a loan of $15,000 which will be applied towards the acquisition of the lisière. The property will revert to the commission. The commission, within thirty years, will have recovered the amount of $15,000 with interest at three per cent per annum. Otherwise the commission would have been forced to take another avenue called the Belvidere avenue, which would cost $19,000. By this transaction the commission save $4,000, immediately, and get, in the long run, the lisière gratis. From Mr. Todd's report my hon. friend will see that for spectacular effect this is the only available place to locate that avenue.

Mr. BLAIN. What amount has been expended by this government in connection with this work?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The government of Canada contributed $300,000 for the celebration, including the reception to the present King, and distinguished visitors from France, the United States and the various colonies. The commission has not spent any of the money subscribed from the various colonies, and by the Daughters of the Empire, or the votes of $100,000 each from the governments of Ontario and Quebec.

On section 2,

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why are they obliged to come to parliament, have they no power under the original statute to acquire property?

Mr. LEMIEUX. By section 10 of chapter 57, 1908, it is provided:

No land or immovable property shall be purchased or acquired by the commission except with the previous authority of parliament, and no expenditure shall be made by the commission until it has been approved by parliament.

Mr. SPROULE. How much land in all is there, and how much is it intended to purchase?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cannot state the acreage necessary to complete the park. I have here a plan which I shall show to my hon. friend. Later on the commission may apply to parliament for some aid for the maintenance of the park, and then they will probably give to the House a more elaborate plan than the present one, which is only for the purpose of this Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. It appears that it is contemplated buying a considerable quantity of land. We ought to be informed

from whom this land is going to be purchased, what it is going to cost the country, and its area.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I gave yesterday the report prepared by the architect, Mr. Todd, in which my hon. friend will find a description of about the area of the park. I could not give it exactly myself.

Mr. SPROULE. Surely the minister ought to be able to tell the House how much land it is proposed to purchase.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may say that no payment will be made for these lands without receiving the sanction of parliament. The members of the commission have told me that already they have approached the owners of the various properties. My hon. friend can be assured that nothing will be done in this matter that will not redound to the credit of the commissioners.

Mr. SPROULE. That seems to be, I was going to say, only trifling with the House. We do not know how much they propose to buy, what options they have received or what they are committing the country to—nothing at all but the assurance that the commissioners will do nothing but what is right, and that parliament will be called on to approve of what they do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The total area is 220 acres. Many of the properties belong to the federal government, some belong to the local government, and two or three belong either to the federal government or the local government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why is the purchase of this property accomplished in this indirect way? Would it not be better to acquire it directly?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It will cost $4,000 less this way than the other project of passing through Belvidère road but finally it will cost nothing to the commission. It is a loan which the commission makes to the municipality of Montcalm, in order that the municipality may be in a position to purchase the strip of land necessary to have the avenue. Then the municipality undertakes to cede that strip to the commission and within thirty years to pay that $50,000 loan with interest of 3 per cent.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

SUPPLY.

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

Mr. SPROULE. Before you leave the Chair, Sir, I had an understanding that the Speaker was to give a ruling on this Bill.

Mr SPROULE.

Mr. SPEAKER. The rule by which we are guided is section 54 of the British North America Act:

It shall not be lawful for the House of Commons to pass any vote, resolution, address or Bill for the appointment of any part of the public revenue, or any tax or impost to any purpose that has not been first recommended to the House by message of the Governor General in the session in which such vote, resolution, address or Bill is proposed.

Mr. SPROULE. But this is likely to cost $165,000, and the commission will not have enough to defray the expenses.

Mr. FIELDING. We have to take the resolution as it stands and it imposes no burden on the treasury. Surely my hon. friend will see that this is not in that sense a money bill. We have to take things as they are and not possibilities.

Mr. SPEAKER. I can only judge of the Bill now before me and, for that reason the objection is not sustained.

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

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am going to ask the committee to pass some items that it is very important to have voted in order to carry on work which has largely to be done by day work, some of it being for repairs. Then there are some items for dredging, in regard to which it is necessary to have the full vote, because the dredging work is performed in the summer season.

Harbours and rivers—Nova Scotia—Amaguadees pond (Castle bay)—to complete addition to wharf and road, $500.

Mr. LENNOX. Where is this?

Mr. FIELDING. In Nova Scotia.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is a local election going on in Nova Scotia.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This has nothing to do with that election.

Mr. SPROULE. If there is a portion of the whole vote already given, I should think that would be sufficient to keep the work going during the season. The understanding was that we would vote a certain sum which would keep all public works going until about the 1st of September. We will be able to vote the rest of the supply long before the 1st of September.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have kept that in mind. I asked my deputy to go through the items, and act on that principle. But suppose there is $1,000 to be spent on a wharf, and that work ought to be done in a fortnight, or in a month. The men who are to be paid for their day's work will not be able to understand why the government cannot pay them every week. I have had these

items marked, and I showed them to my hon. friend the leader of the opposition. I have not heard from him, but I do not think he would consider it unreasonable that this should be done. I am leaving hundreds of items in my estimates which I do not propose to touch at all, only those that are absolutely essential in order to carry on these works during the working season.

Argyle sound—repairs and extension to public wharf, $700.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is in the county of Yarmouth.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Did the minister say that I had consented to these items?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I said I had no reason to suppose that my hon. friend would object to them.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the hon. gentleman told me that he was desirous of having them passed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not say that the hon. gentleman had agreed to them, but I said that I had not reason to suppose my hon. friend objected.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, that he had no reason to suppose that the hon. gentleman objected.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does that mean that he was satisfied?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I do not think it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What the hon. gentleman did in reference to the matter was to supply me with a copy of the estimates with the items marked to which the minister desired to direct my attention. I placed this in the hands of the committee on this side of the House, which looks after these matters.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does the committee think?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The members of the committee are here now.

Mr. SPROULE. There is enough in the list to keep us going until morning.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The items that I am asking to have passed are for small repairs or for some other work which has to be done by day work, and which has to be done in the summer season. They are all believed to be necessary works and in some cases for material are actually made. Unless these amounts are voted I would have, in the course of a short time, to stop the work. That is not in the public interest. There are hundreds of items in my estimates that still remain.

Mr. LENNOX. There are hundreds of items every year which the minister takes and does not attempt to expend the money. It is kept dangling before the electors for years and some of these are probably of that character.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. BLAIN. Is there much shipping at Argyle Sound?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think there is a great deal, but the wharf is there and it requires repairs. The item is only $700.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). May I interrupt to ask the minister with respect to the marked copy of the estimates he handed to me? What is meant by the marks? Some are marked with straight lines and some with crosses.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The straight line means an existing wharf, and the cross means a new work on which the work is to be done by day labour. I am not asking for votes for any works which have to be done by contract.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the hon. gentleman want all these items?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the deputy tells me that it would be very awkward if we do not get them.

Mr. BLAIN. How many will be left?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Hundreds.

Mr. LANCASTER. Does the minister want us seriously to believe that this money is required by the 1st September.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The deputy tells me that it is.

Mr. LANCASTER. Five-twelfths would be all that would be spent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it would not be sufficient.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not my hon. friend think that this is a violation of the proposition laid down by the Prime Minister before leaving for Europe?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood the Prime Minister to make the statement in the House that he desired before leaving that a certain amount be passed. He made a subsequent statement in the House asking that further items be passed naming in particular the annuities of Indians. As I understand it the list now submitted by the Minister of Public Works is a brand new list.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no understanding, and no obligation, expressed or implied, upon hon. gentlemen opposite to pass these items, but I understand that

we are perfectly free to submit them for consideration.

Mr. LANCASTER. Are we, at twenty minutes past one, to take up these items? When we passed the three-twelths additional it gave you a supply until the 1st of September. We will meet in the middle of July and the hon. gentleman will have six weeks from then until the 1st of September wherein he can report what has been spent and tell us how much more he needs, if any. If we pass this whole item we have voted the money in full and then no information and no criticism are any good. It is done. We are voting money without knowing whether we should vote it or not when we vote it in full. As long as we retain a portion of each item we are free to protect the people by refusing to vote the balance. At twenty minutes past one in the morning I do not think it is reasonable that we should be asked to strain our minds with regard to these items and pass them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What my hon. friend says would be quite true if there were a lump sum voted which we could draw upon for different works. Let me answer the hon. gentleman by reference to the item we now have under consideration. It is for repairs and extensions to a wharf. The item is $700 and five-twelths of that would be a little over $300. When the work is undertaken it has to be all done.

Mr. LENNOX. Does the hon. gentleman say seriously that it will not be finished by the 18th July?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Certainly it should be finished in three weeks time.

Mr. LENNOX. It can be done in three weeks after we come back.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the repairs are urgently required there should be no delay.

Mr. SPROULE. The minister says that none of these are contract works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. SPROULE. What about Port Arthur for which $650,000 is asked. Is not that a contract work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not asking for that. I have decided on abandoning that. I told the hon. leader of the opposition that I would leave that out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The list which the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule), has in his hands is a list which the hon. Minister of Finance was good enough to give to me by way of notice that a certain number of items would be presented, and that we would be urged to pass them in full.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Minister of Public Works afterwards saw me, and said that the first six items would not be pressed at all.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, and the reason was that I felt that my hon. friend might fairly object to these because they are large items. I took these small items which are necessary to do repair work, and other small works, which, from their nature, could better be done by the day than by contract.

Mr. SPROULE. What about your extra dredging for which you are asking $3,000,000? That could not possibly be done inside the time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. With a vote of only that proportion the work would have to stop in July. This is in the county of Yarmouth.

Mr. JAMESON. What is the nature of the work to be done?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This is undertaken on the report of the resident engineer. It is to provide for the reflooring of the present wharf and a short extension of cribwork 28 feet long. The wharf was built 10 years ago and there has been no expenditure on it since.

Mr. CROSBY. Is wharfage collected on it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure if this has been transferred to the Marine and Finance Department or not, but I think it has not.

Mr. CROSBY. We passed an Act a session or two ago providing for the transfer of all these wharfs to the Marine and Fisheries Department, the idea being that wharfage was to be collected on them all. I do not want to insist on wharfage being collected on any wharf because the people derive the benefit from a free service, but I have been told that where wharfage is collected there is sometimes discrimination as between different persons using the wharf and when you have not uniformity in different places people residing in places where wharfage is collected are dissatisfied when they go to other places and find that wharfage is not collected. Whatever system is adopted it should be carried out uniformly and universally.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have been very reluctant to comply with all requests made by the Marine Department for the transfer of wharfs to them, because I know the collection of wharfage in some cases at least would be a hardship on the people. The wharfage is not very much to the government, but it is quite a burden on the people who have to pay. Two wharfs, one in New Brunswick and one in Nova Scotia, at Campbellton and Digby, pay about one-sixth of all

wharfage collected in the Dominion. Some years ago a proposal was made to collect wharfage on the St. John river where no wharfage is collected on the provincial wharfs, and the people objected very strongly. Only this morning I found a request from the Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries to transfer all wharfs to that department. I do not think I shall do so without bringing the matter before council and having it talked over. I would like to see some better system adopted, and possibly I ought to transfer all the wharfs to the Marine Department. But the Marine Department does not repair the wharfs, except some little repairs to the extent of $25. The repairs are all done in my department.

Mr. BLAIN. Are we to understand that when a wharf is transferred to the Marine Department, dues are at once collected?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. I do not think the revenue will show any great amount of dues.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The revenue is very small except in cities and towns, and at these small wharfs in the country districts it seems hardly worth while to collect it.

Argyle sound—repairs and extension to public wharf, $700.

Mr. JAMESON. When is it proposed to go on with this work? Votes of this character have been placed in the estimates from time to time, and have not been expended, but have been merely dangled before the eyes of the people and used for the purpose of securing votes, and after the election is over it is found that the money has not been expended or the work gone on with. Will the minister give me the direct statement to-night that he intends to go on with this work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. This work has been asked for, not by the member for the county nor by any of our friends in the county, but by the resident engineer, who reports that it is necessary. The intention is to go right ahead with the work this year.

Mr. CROCKET. Is this amount intended to cover the whole expenditure?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BLAIN. Has not my hon. friend been careless in letting his wharf go to pieces? It has been standing for ten years, and now this is a hurry-up order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, it is not a hurry-up order, but Mr. Dodwell, the resident engineer, says that the work is necessary, and that is why the vote is proposed.

Mr. CROCKET. What is the size of this extension?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Twenty-eight feet long, eleven feet wide and ten high.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I hope the minister does not intend to waste the time of the House on small items such as this, which can easily be voted after the recess. They surely cannot expend more than five-twelfths of this $700 in these six weeks. I do not see any urgent necessity for passing this item.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The deputy minister reports that in respect of these works the engineer is instructed to go ahead and make the repairs; he assembles the men, appoints the foremen, and they go to work. It does not take them long to spend $700. If they cannot go on and complete the work, it has to be left half finished, and when a further amount is voted, the men have to be brought back again. In many cases, if these repairs are not made, it means serious damage to the wharfs and an expenditure of thousands of dollars.

Mr. DANIEL. Will the minister state what is the nature of the traffic carried on at that wharf?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not that information. I am told that it is a fishing and trading district. I am told this is to accommodate fishing vessels and other small craft.

Mr. CROSBY. I understand it is to be extended 28 feet long by 11 feet wide and 10 feet high. Is that 10 feet over the surface of the water?

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not build on top of the water.

Mr. CROSBY. If you build it much under water, you will not have any on top.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We do not want very much above the water. A couple of feet above the surface is sufficient. It is only for small vessels drawing about 8 feet of water. The neap tide is 10 feet.

Mr. DANIEL. Is this owned by the government?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, it was built by the government in 1902.

Mr. BLAIN. The minister says that the revenue was about $30,000 for the whole Dominion for these wharfs. In the Auditor General's Report I find that the contribution of Ontario was last year $5,661; Quebec, $2,879.29; Nova Scotia, $5,456.46; New Brunswick, $3,637; British Columbia, $314.16; making a total of $20,042.46.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose I admit all that would my hon. friend cease further objection?

Mr. LANCASTER. Why not wait until the 14th of June?

Mr. PUGSLEY. These amounts are for repairs and my engineers report that they are absolutely essential. The work is urgently required, and if the repairs are not made the result may be a considerable loss to the country. Every reasonable man knows that to be the case. If hon. members opposite wish to keep back supply they can do it, for there are a large number of items in my department. But the responsibility must rest with them. I want it to be borne in mind that I began early in the session and remained here day after day and night after night trying to get these items through. But the hon. member for Simcoe and the hon. member for Grenville specially requested that further time should not be spent on the Public Works items, because my department had been fully discussed. We yielded to that and the items were allowed to stand. I am not asking for amounts for wharfs to be built by contract.

Mr. CROCKET. This for day labour.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, entirely, and the men who do the work must be paid.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I made a certain arrangement with the Prime Minister about Supply. I am anxious to carry out that arrangement and if there is any doubt I will give the benefit of the doubt against myself. I did not hear anything about items that were to be passed in full until the right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) made his statement in the House. But I thought his statement reasonable and assented at once. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) sent me, yesterday, I think, a list, not very large in number but rather large in amount, forty-seven items altogether, which he said he would like to have presented to the committee and voted in full if possible. That was followed by a list from the Minister of Public Works covering 449 items. It seems a pretty large wholesale order especially when one felt that he had fulfilled what had been arranged before the Prime Minister went away.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But they do not amount altogether to as much as the five or six items I have abandoned.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Some are small, but some are fairly substantial. I think it would be hardly worth while to waste a great deal of time in endeavouring to pass to-night 449 items, unless hon. members on this side are prepared to pass them as a wholesale order and without information.

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. How would it do to put it over until the morning?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think that would be a good idea.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well, we will do that.

Mr. BLAIN. This is an item of $700. The minister's statement is that if the money is not voted the work cannot be done. Did not that suggest itself to him at the beginning of the session, six months ago?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are about 1,100 items in my department. We have to be guided by the reports of the engineers, and a great many of them are reported as urgent. I began last November and taking the items in order, did everything I could to get them all through, but yielded as I explained to the request of some hon. members opposite that the discussion of the Public Works items should be suspended. We have now reached the time when the working season is beginning, it will be necessary to have this money to pay these men, and it will be a great hardship if they cannot get their pay when it is due.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not see why the hon. gentleman's deputy did not come to him with the information about the urgency of these votes two or three months ago. I cannot see any bona fides in it; apparently there are none. The five-twelfths voted ought to cover the purpose. The explanation is, to say the least very fishy.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think we had better accept the suggestion of the Minister of Public Works and adjourn until to-morrow.

Mr. FIELDING. Perhaps some other minister might get some items through. The Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) has some suggestions to offer.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). If the Minister of Railways desires to break the arrangement in this matter he can urge these things.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not urging anything. I am 'the mildest mannered man that ever cut a throat.'

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I do not understand the desire to break an arrangement.

Mr. GRAHAM. I will submit the items, and we will leave them till morning if hon. members say so. The first is an amount of $10,000 to pay expenses in connection with cases before the Board of Railway Commissioners. We have a very important case before the board in the telegraph investiga-

tion. It would be embarrassing while they are in the midst of that case; if it prove that there is no money to pay expenses. The next item is for several compassionate allowances for the heirs of two men drowned in the Hudson bay survey and others who lost their lives in the employ of the department.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Carried.

Mr. GRAHAM. The next item is for protecting highways. This is for the removal of level crossings, and I want to remove more of these crossings. The engineer says he would rush the work as it is dangerous to leave things until the fall rain. I have an item for this purpose in the main estimates.

Mr. LANCASTER. Have not you a regular statutory amount for that work?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, we always take a vote for it. The vote was criticised as being too small. It was too small.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will the minister tell me if this is necessary for the purpose of rendering the crossing safe, is it necessary now?

Mr. GRAHAM. My engineer says that if this remains only partially completed when the fall comes on, it would make it very disagreeable and even dangerous. To be working in the fall rains is liable to cause slides and troubles of that kind. There are two more items I would like to have passed. One has reference to the dock at Halifax, for which there is a vote of $600,000. The shippers there urge that they must have accommodation for this next season's trade, and my department is afraid that five-twelfths of this sum, which will be less than half, will not be sufficient for rushing the work, and possibly we may run out of money. The other item is to complete the Welland canal survey. I hope to have a recommendation to the House when we meet again, at least by November, and I hope to get some information as to the route when we meet again after adjournment. I do not wish to urge these items if there is any opposition.

Some resolutions reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 2.13 a.m., Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FRIDAY, May 19, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

GRAND TRUNK RAILWAY.

House in committee on Bill (No. 223) to amend an Act of the present session intituled an Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

On section 1: correction of clerical error by insertion of the words 'principal and' before the word 'interest.'

Mr. LANCASTER. I would like to have an assurance from the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) that this is really a clerical error. We passed this Bill in the Railway Committee this morning on the understanding that the intention had been to guarantee principal and interest. It will make a great difference if it is to be made to include principal. If it is really a clerical error I am not opposing it.

Mr. FIELDING. I understood the Bill was to go to the Railway Committee and I presume they investigated it.

Mr. LANCASTER. It was a very short sitting this morning. The statement was made, the House was going to sit in a few minutes, and we only had the word of Mr. Wainwright for it. I am not questioning it, but I would like to know if it is really a clerical error.

Mr. FIELDING. From what I have heard it is not a clerical error in so far as any of the officers of the House are concerned, but it is a clerical error in the application.

Mr. LANCASTER. The Bill followed the application?

Mr. FIELDING. I fancy so. I have not given any close attention to the matter, but I assumed that the Railway Committee would look into that.

Mr. LANCASTER. We assumed that it was all right, but we thought we would have some assurance from some member of the cabinet when the Bill came to the House.

Mr. SPROULE. The Railway Committee did not look into it, and Mr. Wainwright read the resolution passed by the board asking to have this done. It clearly said 'principal and interest,' but, Mr. Wainwright said, in some accountable way when the Bill was drafted the word 'principal' was omitted?

Mr. EMMERSON. The bonds were prepared in accordance with the resolution, were they not?

Mr. SPROULE. Yes. When the Bill went back to the company they noticed this error for the first time.

Mr. FIELDING. If the resolution clearly intended to include principal, and it being a matter between the two companies, I do not think we should offer any objection to it.

Mr. LANCASTER. I am not objecting; I want to make sure of the facts, that is all.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

OFFICIAL STATUS OF FOREIGN CONSULS.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask the government a question. During last session I asked them whether they were taking any steps to change the status of foreign consuls now in Ottawa. We are now negotiating treaties with other nations, and it is necessary that something should be done in regard to this matter. Replying to my question on December 2, 1909, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) said:

> The question which my hon. friend has brought to our attention is an important one, not perhaps so much on account of the drawing room as on account of the duties which consuls-general now discharge in Canada. We have no diplomatic service in Canada, and the consuls-general are exercising by tolerance some, I shall not say diplomatic powers, but powers very often cognate to such. The question is one which should be settled, and the matter is now engaging the attention of the government.

I would like to ask the hon. leader of the House (Mr. Fielding) if any steps have been taken, or if the government purpose taking any steps in the immediate future, to deal with this question. The present colonial conference should be the place to bring this up.

Mr. FIELDING. The matter has engaged the attention of the government. I regret that I am not in a position to give any positive statement as to the results, but I can assure the hon. gentleman that this question has been considered along the lines of the statement of my right hon. friend the Prime Minister.

CANADIAN COMMERCIAL AGENT AT WASHINGTON.

Mr. LEWIS. I wish to ask another question. On December 15, 1909, I brought forward the question of a commercial agent to represent Canada at Washington, stating at that time that we have commercial agents in almost every country in the world—the Netherlands, Australia and some countries connected with us by treaties, but that in the country of our greatest commercial neighbour, with which we have the most intimate personal and other relations, we have no agent.

The matter was again brought up in this House on March 14, 1910, when reference was made to an article in the Toronto 'Daily Star.' I then asked the government whether it was not high time that it should have an agent at Washington so as to furnish us with information of what was going on in the United States, a country with whom we had such large dealings. I pointed out that every commercial agent of the United States in Canada sent a weekly report as to our commerce and as to how the United States merchants could improve their business with Canada. The government at that time stated that they had no fault to find with the British ambassador, but I say that this agent would not replace the British ambassador but would be there to advise and consult with him, and I have no doubt the British Ambassador would welcome the appointment of such an agent.

Mr. FIELDING. I understand the hon. member is putting a question; what is the question please?

Mr. LEWIS. I asked whether the government had taken steps to appoint a commercial agent at Washington and whether, if not, they do not consider it high time to do so?

Mr. FIELDING. Washington is not a commercial city and the conditions under which commercial agents are appointed in other places would certainly not apply to Washington. If there were an agent at Washington at all he would probably have to be something more than a mere commercial agent. While the matter has not escaped the attention of the government, no action has been taken upon it.

Mr. LEWIS. Why should we not have a commercial agent in other large American centres?

Mr. FIELDING. Speaking from recollection I think we did have a commercial agent in Chicago, but my impression is that he was transferred to another place. There certainly would be no reason why we should not have commercial agents in commercial centres in the United States, unless it be that in appointing such agents somebody might say that we were disloyal.

GRAIN ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER. (Minister of Interior) moved the second reading of Bill (No. 209) respecting grain.

Mr. BORDEN. (Halifax). Please explain.

Mr. OLIVER. This Bill was introduced in the Senate, discussed there at length, referred to a special committee to hear objections which might be offered to certain portions of the Bill, reported to the Senate and considered by the Senate and passed. While the Bill is somewhat bulky the portion of it which is new legislation is comparatively small. Hitherto, the grain

trade has been administered under the Manitoba Grain Act and a certain portion of the Grain Inspection Act. It was desirable to provide for still better administration of the handling of western grain and it was thought a commission should be appointed to control the grain trade instead of it being controlled direct by the Department of Trade and Commerce through its officials. Instead of bringing in a Bill merely to make provision for the appointment of a grain commission, it was thought better to consolidate the Manitoba Grain Act and that portion of the Grain and Inspection Act relating to grain, into one statute, providing in addition for the appointment of a board to control the grain and administer the Act. It was in regard to the constitution of the board and the authority that would be vested in it, that the Senate spent such a large part of their time considering the measure. There is no change and there is not intended to be any change in the terms of the Manitoba Grain Act or of the Grain Inspection Act. The Senate thought it advisable only to take cognizance of the new principle that was being introduced. It was thought that after this board had exercised its authority during the coming grain handling season it would be a proper time to make a further revision of the Grain Act and the Grain Inspection Act, feeling that it would be better to have the advantage of the knowledge and experience of this board than to undertake to deal with details at the present time. As a matter of fact it is not understood that the present law requires amendment, for I am given to understand that the administration of these Acts has been as satisfactory in principle and detail as could possibly be expected from the administration of any Act so complicated and so closely concerned with the business interests of the people. However, it was found that the authority vested in the officers of the department was inadequate, and provision is made in the Bill to extend the authority of those who administer the Act. It is desired to have the Bill passed so that it can come into operation as soon as possible. We may get the advantage of the knowledge of the grain commission acting under the special authority conferred on them, in order that we may the sooner arrive at a conclusion as to what amendments may or may not be necessary.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the the new part of the bill?

Mr. OLIVER. The several clauses providing for the appointment of the Board of Grain Commissioners, namely sections 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, together with sections 123, 124, and I think 229.

Aside from that, to all intents and purposes, there is no attempt to amend the existing Act.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Is it the intention to put this Bill through to the third reading to-day?

Mr. OLIVER. That is something which of course I cannot say. I would be glad to do so if the House would agree, but we might consider that in committee.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In the very great pressure of work during the past two or three days, and it is only during that time that this Bill has been on the Order Paper, it is manifestly impossible for any considerable number of members to have themselves acquainted with the scheme of this measure. I do not profess to have done so. It is exceedingly important that such legislation should be passed at the earliest possible moment as would remove the grievances from which the grain growers of the west have been admittedly suffering during many years in the past. They have proposed to the government during the past year or two a certain scheme by which that may be accomplished. As I recollect their claim went to the extent of asking the government to take over, by actual ownership or lease, the terminal elevators and to operate those elevators under complete government supervision and control, so that the mixing of grain and the other frauds which are claimed to have been perpetrated upon the grain growers would be impossible of future continuance. I do not understand that anything of that kind is proposed by this measure, except the constitution of a board or commission, and I suppose it is expected that that board or commission will have a more complete and effective supervision of these matters than has been possible in the past.

Mr. OLIVER. Section 17 of the Bill gives the proposed commission authority to take over for operation terminal elevators. That, of course, is an important feature of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Section 17 is as follows:

> Upon the construction, acquisition, leasing or expropriation by His Majesty of any terminal elevator, the board shall be charged with its operation and management, and the board may, with the approval of the Governor General in Council, make regulations for its management and operation and prescribe a tariff of fees and charges for the use thereof.

Has the government come to any conclusion as to the policy upon which it will embark in that connection?

Mr. OLIVER. I have said on previous occasions that the policy of the government is not to undertake as a government to interfere with such an important portion of the trade of our country unless and until they feel themselves to be fully informed in regard to the effect of any action they may take, and, therefore, they desire the authority contained in this Bill to provide for a commission which will be able to take knowledge of all the facts of the case, and will have authority to deal with these facts, and to bring into force a policy of actual operation of elevators, if, after investigation, in the judgment of the board it is considered to be feasible and desirable.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The declaration of the minister of the Interior is contained in a very long sentence which is accompanied with a great many qualifications. It does not seem to be very direct or to the point. He speaks of further information. Considering the extent to which these grievances have prevailed in the past, and that the government has been informed of these grievances not only through the public press, and through actions in court, but through inquiry after inquiry, and by delegation after delegation of these men from the west who have come here to press their claims—and I know that delegations were here four or five years ago urging exactly the same thing—it would seem quite reasonable, quite possible, quite necessary that the government should have made itself acquainted with the facts and have come to its own conclusion upon these matters long ago. Why is it necessary, after all this investigation, after all these inquiries, after all these delegations, to appoint a board for the purpose of coming to a conclusion as to whether or not the facts are such that the government should embark on a certain policy? The minister proposes to move the House into committee on the Bill. I think this Bill should receive greater consideration, and a fuller discussion than we could possibly give to it in the time at our command during this day.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). The Winnipeg Grain Exchange, which is a rather important commercial body, has been in communication with me for the last few days. They are objecting to this Bill being proceeded with now until they have an opportunity of disclosing their case to this House. They have not had an opportunity up to date. This Bill comes to us through the Senate. While passing through the Senate it was referred to a special subcommittee of that House, not to consider the whole Bill, but to consider three clauses only

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

They wanted to be heard before that committee, but the committee refused to take evidence with respect to any other part of the Bill except those three clauses, 122, 123 and 242. The first refers simply to terminal elevators. 123 refers to the buying and selling of grain by the owners of terminal elevators and 242 deals with penalties. They never had an opportunity of being heard by the Senate Committee at all. The Bill never went to the Banking and Commerce Committee of the Senate but went direct to this special committee which reported direct to the Senate. Now it comes here for a second reading and in the ordinary course would be referred to a Committee of the whole House. The Winnipeg Grain Exchange or the Montreal Corn Exchange would not be heard before a Committee of the Whole House. That difficulty might be obviated if the Bill were referred by this House to the Committee on Banking and Commerce or a special committee might consider the whole measure and hear evidence. I have here a telegram which was sent me by the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, which handles from 80,000,000 to 100,000,000 bushels of grain per year, and therefore ought to know something about the business. This is the telegram:—

Winnipeg, May 15, 1911.

Alexander Haggart, M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

Grain Exchange request you to protest against the Grain Bill until exchange delegation is heard by committee of House. Exchange has repeatedly requested government for such hearing without success. Grain men generally agreed that Grain Act will require amendment if reciprocity agreement passes to prevent diversion of grain through American channels. Hence our anxiety to be heard before Bill passes House. Think more desirable legislation should be postponed till after reciprocity matter disposed of.

The WINNIPEG GRAIN EXCHANGE.

On receipt of that telegram I had an interview with the Minister of Interior, and he intimated to me that he thought everybody had been heard and that he would like to get the Bill disposed of. I wired to this effect to the Grain Exchange, and on the 17th of May, I received this telegram:—

Telegram received. Senate only referred three clauses of Grain Bill respecting terminal elevators, ownership and penalties to special committee and refused discussion on all other clauses. This exchange both wired and wrote Sir Richard requesting that when Bill went to Commons, exchange would be heard before committee and especially in view of effect reciprocity agreement will have on grain trade. Reciprocity without necessary amendments to Grain Act will certainly seriously damage Canadian trade and unnecessarily divert grain through United States channels. This is firm opinion. All interest

in grain trade urge strongly for second reading after adjournment with opportunity all concerned submit facts to committee of House.

I have searched the records of the Senate and found that the allegations of fact set out in this telegram are substantially true. These people want to be heard, they are vitally interested in the sucess of this country, and they can give as much information as any other body of men. If this Bill should be referred to the Committee on Banking and Commerce, the object of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange would be attained.

I might say that the hon. the Minister of Interior (Mr. Oliver) informed me that the Corn Exchange in Montreal, a similar body, is of the same opinion and want practically what the Winnipeg Grain Exchange ask for. There is no doubt about the inquiry in the Senate having been directed solely to three clauses of the Bill. We want the Bill to be open to criticism. We all want information. I doubt if there is any man in this House who has the information required regarding this very important Bill, which as the Minister of the Interior has told us, is complicated and important, and if we want legislation to be perfect we want all the information we can have.

Mr. NEELY. The most serious objection to delaying the passage of this measure is the fact that this present season is so far advanced that unless it is put through before adjournment, there is no probability of its going into effect in the present year so far as the grain trade is concerned. I quite agree that the subject is of too vital importance to be judged hastily or passed upon without the most serious consideration; but at the same time I am sure that this Bill has been long enough before us to enable us to give it at least cursory consideration. No one can fail to be impressed that it will provide considerable relief to the western producer of wheat. As the Minister of the Interior pointed out to the leader of the opposition, its primary object is to establish a Board of Grain Commissioners who shall have the interests of the grain trade of the whole of Canada in their jurisdiction. It is not to be expected that even if this House gave this Bill the most thoughtful and long continued consideration, it would pass a measure which would be absolutely without a flaw. But the first consideration to my mind is the establishing of this Board of Grain Commissioners. The Bill provides for government ownership and operation of the terminal elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, if, in the view of this board, that is necessary in order to remedy the evils complained of; but in any case the first step, before any project of government operation could be entered upon, would necessarily be to establish a commission which would have the absolute supervision and control of these terminal elevators. That is the primary object of the Bill; and even supposing there is no definite provision made for government ownership, which is the remedy demanded by the large majority of western grain producers, the establishing of this commission will enable the government to have this matter considered by the board before this House reassembles.

If my hon. friend from Winnipeg, or the leader of the opposition, or any member of the House, wants expert evidence on the question involved in the Bill as affecting this very important question, I can see that the conclusions of such a board of commissioners would be of inestimable value. I am free to say that, having given some consideration to the Bill, there are a number of its features that do not appeal to me as covering all the necessities of the case. But, as I have said, we have come almost to adjournment and there is this year's crop to be considered. Delay in passing the Bill means that there will be no opportunity for the commission to dea. with the present year's crop; and so it would appear to me that in the interests of the people of the west there should be no delay in passing this Bill to-day. My hon. friend from Winnipeg has mentioned the fact that the Winnipeg Grain Exchange are anxious to be heard before a committee of this House. So far as my information goes—I am open to correction by my hon. friend from Winnipeg—the most serious objection that the Winnipeg Exchange, or the Montreal Exchange have to the matter is in reference to the very clauses that were submitted to the special committee of the Senate for their consideration. The Senate committe gave a number of sittings to the consideration of these clauses. So far as I know every interest was notified when these clauses were under consideration, and had an opportunity of being heard before that committee. The Senate committee having given due consideration to these representations, and having modified the Bill to its present form and sent it to this House, I do not see that any serious harm could come to the Grain Exchange, or to any one interested by the passing of this Bill now. The Grain Act is not a thing that we have not found it necessary to change from time to time. No matter in what form we pass this Bill, when the commission is appointed to take charge of the grain trade no doubt they will suggest many changes in any legislation we pass. The western grain producer I think, is satisfied that the Bill furnished a very considerable amount of relief from the conditions he complains of at the present time. For that reason, I would ask

that this Bill rather than being sent to a special committee of this House, or to any standing committee, should be put through the House in the form in which we have received it.

Mr. BARKER. I would ask the minister who has charge of the Bill, what is the object of presenting the Bill here to-day? This Bill, if passed in its present form, must go back to the Senate.

Mr. OLIVER. No.

Mr. BARKER. The head note indicates that there are clauses that have not been before the House.

Mr. OLIVER. I am wrong if I said so. This Bill has been passed by the Senate, and if the House should pass it without amendment it would not need to go back to the Senate. Any amendments that are made would have to go back.

Mr. BARKER. The head note says:

The clauses and portions of clauses inclosed within square brackets, namely 10, part of 12, subsection 1 of 14, 16 and 17, do not form part of the Bill as passed by the Senate. They are printed in the copy for information only. It is intended to propose their insertion when the Bill is in Committee of the Whole in the House of Commons.

Mr. OLIVER. These are the sections involving the expenditure of money, and the Senate has not the authority to pass it.

Mr. BARKER. Section 17 involves a very important matter of principle. It provides that the Governor in Council may authorize the minister to construct, acquire, lease, or expropriate for His Majesty any terminal elevator if parliament grants money for this purpose.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Bill would have to go back to the Senate in that case, would it not?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, but only for the formal acceptance by the Senate of the provisions passed by the House in regard to money matters. Hon. members are aware that the Senate does not deal with questions of money, and as the Bill was introduced in the Senate, these sections should not be considered by the Senate.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I should hardly suppose that the minister would contend that section 16 would go to the Senate for the purpose of mere formal consideration. Sections 16 and 17, according to the minister constitute the most important part of the Bill——

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. NEELY.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is, all the important new provisions of the Bill have not been passed by the Senate at all.

Mr. STAPLES. Like the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax)and the hon. member for Humboldt (Mr. Neely) and others who have spoken, I say that this is very important legislation. But for that reason it should have been dealt with long ago by the government. The government may say to this committee that they have not had sufficient notice as regards the legislation required by the grain producers of the west; but I have been a member of this House for seven years, and every year since I came here representations have been made to the government asking for legislation, and the most particular request was for the government ownership of elevators. The government has been jockeying with this question for years. Instead of taking action in a business-like manner they have been putting it off, shunning the evil day, until the present time. And this morning we have the spectacle of the minister introducing this Bill at the eleventh hour, for the purpose of making what I would call a stage play, trying to make the farmers of the west, and those who are interested in the farmers in the west, believe that if this legislation is not passed it is not the fault of the government.

It has been pointed out by the leader of the opposition that even if we do proceed with this legislation and it passes this House, it cannot possibly get through the Senate. There is no one in this House who is more anxious to have the legislation asked for by the farmers of the west placed on the statute-book than I am. Unfortunately the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not a member of this House, and I suppose that is the reason why this legislation was introduced in the Senate. In my opinion, this legislation should have been introduced in this House, and should have been in charge of a minister of this House from beginning to end, instead of having been first introduced in the Senate by men who are not in as close touch with the farmers of the west as we are. Yet we are in that unfortunate position. I do not know why it should be so. It has occurred to me ever since I came into this House, that if there is one minister more than another who should have a seat in this House where we can speak with him face to face, it is the Minister of Trade and Commerce. But for reasons best known to the government that is not the condition of affairs. Now I say this legislation should have been introduced into this House at the beginning of the session. The government have had sufficient notice of what the farmers of the west desire. Instead of coming down now at

the end of the session, they should have brought this legislation in earlier when we could have considered it and passed it. But they have chosen to bring it down at this moment, and to railroad it through the House, so that they can stand up before the electors and pretend that if this legislation did not go through it was owing to the obstruction of the opposition. I say that is the secret of the action of the government. My hon. friend from Humboldt (Mr. Neely) says that he has been advised by the farmers he represents in the west what legislation they require, and he has told us this morning that this legislation, although it does not go nearly as far as he believes it should, nevertheless will afford a certain measure of relief. Well, I leave it to the judgment of the grain growers of the west, whether it relieves them to any large extent. I think my hon. friend from Humboldt will find, when he goes back to the representatives of the Grain Growers' Association, that they will not agree with him that it affords them much relief. It is simply playing with the question. The government knows the legislation that the grain growers of the west require, it has been urged upon them time and again, and there is no reason why they should not have introduced this Bill at the beginning of the session so that parliament might have dealt with it. We know that several times this session the government have passed special orders bringing in some private Bills and dealing with them. Why did not the minister who has this thing in charge do that many days ago, when we might have given it consideration? So far as I understand the situation, all the legislation that the grain growers have been petitioning for has been introduced over in the Senate, though as the minister said in introducing the Bill, there is practically no new legislation in it, it is simply a consolidation of existing Acts; thus it furnishes a make-believe to deceive the farmers of the west into thinking that the government is doing something for them, when in point of fact nothing is being done for them. All the special legislation they have been asking for, and which was in the draft Bill that went before the Senate committee, has been pared out, so that we are practically getting nothing. As the leader of the opposition has pointed out, the farmers will be no further ahead by leaving the Bill stand over until the end of the session. I regret very much this condition of affairs. We should not be put in this position this morning. We should have had this legislation before us days ago, when we could have considered it and passed it on its merits.

Mr. SPROULE I presume that other members of the House have received a copy of a memorial, which I hold in my hand, from the United Farmers of Alberta. It reads as follows:

I have been instructed by the board of directors of the United Farmers of Alberta to forward you a copy of the following resolution:—

'The directors of the United Farmers of Alberta reaffirm their belief that absolute control of our terminals can only be secured through government ownership and operation. We view with alarm the apparent disposition of supporters of the government to still further experiment along the lines of control by supervision and inspection, knowing as all concerned do that this policy has failed entirely in the past. We respectfully urge that the Dominion government make financial provisions in the estimates for leasing, purchasing and erecting terminal elevators this session, providing also that such charges shall be placed on grain passing through these elevators as shall provide for cost of operation and paying off purchase price within a reasonable time.'

In requesting that you support the proposal for government ownership and operation of all terminals, this association would ask you to keep in mind the need for terminal facilities at the Pacific coast, and the necessity for the early opening up of this route if the farmers of western Canada are to secure full advantage of the year open port.

That comes from the farmers. If I understand this Bill, it does not provide to do that; it provides for making another effort by a commission or by some other means of inspection to do what the farmers of Alberta declare the experience of the past has shown cannot be done. Then if it is a failure, the government may consider the advisability of taking possession of the terminal elevators. It seems to me that the government are only tampering with the situation. They also say:

It is also our firm belief, and we firmly maintain the stand our association has always taken, that it is impossible for the producers to secure full returns for their grain as long as individuals or companies having any interest whatever in line elevators or in the purchasing of grain, are allowed to have any interest or control in the terminals. It seems an impossibility to prevent mixing in the terminals while they are under private control. We believe that this is a matter which must necessarily be handled by the government, and therefore ask that section 16 of the proposed Bill Q, an Act respecting Grain, be made effective at the present session of parliament.

There is more of this which I need not read. But the gist of it is that they want what the government are not prepared to give them, and which, in their judgment, will alone remedy the situation. In face of that it is most unlikely that this Bill will meet their requirements. Then there

is the additional fact that if it is pushed through to-day it must be done without our giving it any consideration. I forgot to say that this memorial is signed by Edward J. Fream, secretary.

Mr. KNOWLES. Representing as I do an important agricultural constituency, whose inhabitants have taken a live interest in this proposed legislation, I wish to give my humble support to this Bill and ask that it be proceeded with.

It is true that it is contemplated that there may be an adjournment in the near future, but that is not compulsory. I cannot see any reason why the Bill cannot be proceeded with to-day, why, after the full discussion which has been enjoyed throughout the country, and in this House, on this very same question we might not, at this moment, be sufficiently well informed to proceed to pass this legislation. I do not agree with the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Staples), that it is impossible to have it become law before the adjournment, because the Senate can facilitate the matter there, and it can be disposed of. It is almost certain that the Senate would not interfere with any amendment we might make in regard to the expenditure of money, because it is a principle well known under the British parliamentary system that the Upper Chamber should not interfere in the matter of public expenditure. The delay which has been caused is a delay that the government have reason not to be ashamed of, but to be proud of. Upon such an important Bill as this they have given the fullest opportunity to every person who desired to be heard. A great many people appeared as witnesses before the special committee in the Senate, and I do not think that anybody should criticise or condemn the government, because the right hon. gentleman who had charge of the Bill in the Senate permitted delay for that purpose. I trust that my hon. friend from Macdonald will not be too harsh with the government for having brought the Bill in at this late day.

Mr. STAPLES. It may satisfy you, but it will not satisfy me.

Mr. KNOWLES. Perhaps, if he had not been so loquacious on Monday we would have had more time to deal with this question. A whole day was lost with a lot of drivel when we might have proceeded with this Bill. I trust that our hon. friends opposite will cease obstructing and opposing this Bill——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. KNOWLES—and do what is necessary in order to bring this legislation into effect.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. If there was the faintest possible ground for saying that the Conservative party, or the opposition, were obstructing, I would not rise to a point of order, but when an hon. gentleman gets up for political purposes, and makes a statement absolutely out of whole cloth, saying that which he knows not to be a fact, I rise to a point of order, and I ask that the hon. gentleman take it back.

Mr. KNOWLES. What is the point of order—that I told a story?

Mr. CASH. Mr Speaker——

Mr. LENNOX. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, that if any gentleman in this House rises to a point of order he at least has the right to have the Speaker pay some little attention to it?

Mr. SPEAKER. I intend to rule upon it, and I have to give the decision that has been rendered in England, to the effect that the word 'obstruction' is not unparliamentary. I am ruling from memory but if the hon. gentleman desires the precedent, my hon. friend the Deputy Speaker is looking it up, and I will give it in a moment. But, I know it has been so held by the English Speaker that the word 'obstruction' is not unparliamentary.

Mr. LENNOX. Mr. Speaker——

An hon. MEMBER. Order.

Mr. LENNOX. Will the hon. gentleman keep quiet?

Mr. LANCASTER. He wants his house painted.

Mr. LENNOX. This is the hon. gentleman of whom I remarked some few years ago that I thought he was playing the buffoon, but he is playing something more important since.

Mr. FIELDING. That is not parliamentary.

Mr. LENNOX. I have said that now, and if the hon. gentleman wants me to discuss it I can do so. If you recollect the decision to be as you state, Mr. Speaker, and you feel you are sure about it, I am quite willing to abide by your decision. I have accomplished my purpose, at all events, by calling attention to the fact that the hon. gentleman got up for the purpose of making a purely political speech, and dragged in what he knows not to be the fact.

Mr. KNOWLES. I want you to deal with it.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. member (Mr. Lennox), is certainly not in order when he states that an hon. member makes a statement which he knows is not a fact.

Mr. LENNOX. Yes, I do make that statement.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman must know that that is not parliamentary. He is bound to assume that when another hon. gentleman makes a statement he makes it in good faith. It may or may not be a fact, it may be a matter for a difference of opinion, but to say that an hon. gentleman has made a statement which he knows is not a fact, I do not think makes for good order in the House.

Mr. LENNOX. I entirely differ from the hon. leader of the House (Mr. Fielding). We, on this side of the House know there has been no obstruction.

Mr. FIELDING. I never said anything about obstruction.

Mr. LENNOX. I said that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Knowles), made a statement which he knew was not a fact.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order, order.

Mr. FIELDING. We should have your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr SPEAKER. I will rule on the first point first. In Peel's 'Decisions' it is said:

There is nothing unparliamentary in attributing obstruction to an hon. member.

Mr. BUREAU. I want to know if the word 'buffoon' is parliamentary? If not I want the hon. member to withdraw it.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not use the expression at this time; it was at another session, and you are a little late.

Mr. SPEAKER. The word would not be parliamentary if applied to a member of the House.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman used the expression.

Mr. LENNOX. I said that three or four years ago I had to apply the word 'buffoon' to the hon. gentleman. He has graduated into a higher class since then.

Mr. BUREAU. I ask your ruling, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have not heard the expression, and as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox), says he has not used it there is nothing to rule on.

Mr. CASH. I understand this Bill is a consolidation of the two grain Acts which have been in force for some years, the object of which is to carry out the desire of the farmers of the west to have the government divorce, as far as possible, the grain dealer or the grain handler, from the trade and to proceed by way of the appointment of a commission to do this work. I do not understand the difference between the government doing this themselves, which they personally could not do, and doing it through a commission. Provision is made for the appointment of a commission by this Bill. It has been the cry of the west to prevent the grain, after it has once passed into the hands of the government, and been graded, from being interfered with by other parties. They want it to go to the consumer as it is graded by the government, and that is what the government is trying to do. That is the main object of the present Bill, and it is proposed to accomplish that object through the appointment of a commission. It would be unfortunate if this could not be effected before the movement of the present season's crop. I see nothing in this Bill which should provoke contention. A number of members of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange are of the same opinion as I am myself, that this matter should be attended to in some such way as that which is here suggested. We may differ somewhat as to the details, but I cannot see how there can be any great difference of opinion as to the main provisions of the Bill. There has been a lot of discussion in the Senate on the question, and we have had some private elevator men obstructing and objecting to certain provisions. They have had certain clauses cut out which it would have been better to have left in. As the time is so short I think we should proceed with the Bill at once in order that it may be passed as it will ultimately result in accomplishing the very object that the grain growers desire to have accomplished.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I just want to make a few remarks in connection with this Bill. A grain Bill has been before this House for a great many years. I understood the minister to say that with the exception of a very few clauses the Bill before us is simply a repetition of clauses of the Grain Act as it stands on the statute-book. The grain growers of the west have either been sincere or they have not. For years the grain-growers of the west have urged on the government the redress of their grievances; they have had a grievance in connection with the weighing of the grain and in connection with unfair dockage and, most serious of all, the manner in which their grain was tampered with in the elevators. They urged that the identity of their wheat should be preserved so that when it reached the world's market in Liverpool they might receive the highest price possible for it. During this session, and during previous sessions, it has been my privilege to address the House on the question of terminal elevators, and I point out again that the burden of the complaint of the delegation which came before us on the 16th of December last, was insistence on government operation of the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William. The western farmers truly said that useless experiments have been tried long enough, that thou-

sands and thousands of dollars have been expended during the last few years in duplicating the supervisors at the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William, and these farmers who are the best judges on such a matter told the government that all that money was wasted, and that no good results followed. They pointed out that this duplication of supervision ultimately reflected on the price of the wheat, and that radical changes had to be made in the system to make it effective for good. The question before us to-day is: Does this Bill give the farmers of the west what they have asked for?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I say the chief demand of our farmers is that the government should operate these terminal elevators, and that is denied them. Hon. gentlemen opposite who want to assist the government in getting out of a hole and in neglecting their duty, and the Grain Growers' Guide, may be satisfied with this Bill, but I am not; and if the Grain Growers' Guide is satisfied then it is not true to the arguments it has used in the last few years in connection with terminal elevators. The farmers of the west have asked for government operation principally; they have asked for government ownership, but to my mind it is not so important who owns the terminal elevators as it is who operates them, and there is absolutely nothing in the Bill that grants government operation. Will the Minister of the Interior answer this straight question: Is it the intention of the government at this session to provide in the estimates for money to buy or lease these terminal elevators and to operate them entirely by the government? If the Minister of the Interior answers that question in the affirmative I will admit there is something in clause 16 of the Bill to meet the demands of the farmers.

Mr. OLIVER. I am not authorized to speak for the government, but I would like to make the bargain with my hon. friend, that if he will let this Bill pass now we may possibly be able to get a sum in the estimates to enable the Bill to be operated in that way.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I will have to be more definite in my question, and the Minister of the Interior will have to be more definite in his answer. Here is what the United Farmers of Alberta say on the question:

> The directors of the United Farmers of Alberta reaffirm their belief that absolute control of our terminals can only be secured through government ownership and operation. We view with alarm the apparent disposition of supporters of the government to still further experiment along the lines of control by supervision and inspection knowing as all concerned do this policy has failed entirely in the past.

That is a definite demand from the farmers. At this very session the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Martin) was frank enough to admit that after the government had appointed 96 men to duplicate the service at Port Arthur and Fort William, and after spending thousands and thousands of dollars, the experiment was a failure, and that the only way to make the business a success was for the government to operate the terminal elevators. The minister says if I will allow this Bill to be read the second time and go to committee——

Mr. OLIVER. I said that if the hon. gentleman and his friends will allow the Bill to pass there would be some object in the government providing a sum in the estimates, but until the Bill passes there is no warrant for the government putting a sum in the estimates.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I tell the Minister of the Interior—and I think I can speak for my colleagues from the west—that if he will promise us right now—no 'may' about it—place a sum in the estimates to purchase or lease these elevators and to operate them by the government, I, and I believe my colleagues from the west, will allow the Bill to pass at once and give it no opposition. I am suspicious of that clause 16.

Mr. OLIVER. I might suggest to my hon. friend that it might not do any harm to try it. Let him allow the Bill to pass and take chances on the government voting the money and the farmers would not be any worse off.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. We have had too much experience of letting things go through without a definite promise, to lead me to place any faith in the government. But I do say that if the minister would state right now that there will be a sum placed in the estimates to buy or lease these elevators and operate them, we will not oppose the Bill for a moment.

Mr. OLIVER. My hon. friend knows that no member of the government can pledge the government off-hand in that way, and he is not fair in making such a challenge as that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The government is here and can answer.

Mr. SPROULE. And they have already this session given a similar pledge with reference to a dry dock, and if they can do that they can also give a pledge in connection with the terminal elevators.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I am not familiar with the working of the Privy Council, but

as we all know this is a government Bill promoted by the Minister of the Interior, and there is no doubt that this Bill has been debated by the Council, and that the minister has a pretty good idea as to what the government is willing to do. I believe the Council will be prepared to do what the Minister of the Interior recommends. If the minister and the government want to meet the demands of the farmers they have it in their power to do so. This commission business has been on trial for a great many years, and the farmers have come to the conclusion that it does not meet the case. The farmers refuse to accept or experiment with that system any longer. I shall oppose this Bill until I have some promise from the government that they will this session place in the estimates a sum of money for the acquisition or control of these elevators. I must accept the statement of my farmers and believe that they are sincere when they say they will not accept any half measure. This Bill as it stands does not give what we want, it is absolutely useless. The farmers came here on December 16, and presented their grievances. Now, on the 19th of May, 6 months after, on the day the House is to adjourn, we are asked in one day to pass over 200 sections of a grain Bill which has been before the government for about 6 months. I am not obstructing this Bill. If any one of my constituents takes the position that I am, I shall leave it to his opinion, but I want a Bill passed that will meet the demands of the farmers. This Bill does not do so. If I take the stand I have taken this morning, I think it will be absolutely unfair for the Grain Growers' Guide or any other institution to say that I am obstructing this Bill. I want exactly what I advocated in this House, and what the farmers have asked, that is, that we should have government operation of the terminal elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William.

Mr. CAMPBELL. This Bill has been so well discussed by my hon. friends that there is little left for me to say, but, as the matter is one of paramount interest to the people of the west, I would be derelict in my duty to the farmers whom I try to represent, if I did not say a few words. I agree absolutely with my hon. friend from Souris who has put the case in a nutshell. The farmers for years and years have been asking a certain thing. They sent a large deputation here, and the most important thing they asked for was the government control of terminal elevators. That request was the most strongly urged of any. The matter was discussed at that meeting by the farmers, the grain buyers and the millers, all of whom voiced the opinion that it was an absolute necessity for the grain trade of the west that the government should control the terminal elevators. Now, at the eleventh hour, we are asked to pass a Bill not a clause of which touches in a practical manner the request laid before this government by the farmers, that the government should control the terminal elevators. I am not obstructing, but I am most seriously anxious to have effective legislation put through, and it could go through in five minutes if the minister would take the bull by the horns or answer definitely the proposition laid down by the hon. member for Souris (Mr. Schaffner). Will the government vote the money? The ministers are nearly all here, and we could hear from each one of them separately in a moment. If the Minister of the Interior will say that he will do this, and use his influence to have it put through Council, and the other ministers would say yes, that they would carry out the semi-pledges which they have been making to the farmers of the west the matter could be settled at once. The farmers' delegation asked for half a dozen things, and the reply to all of them is: We will give you reciprocity, we will give you free trade in everything you produce, and you will have to buy everything you require in a protected market. By this grain Bill the farmers do not get what they wanted. As far as I can see there is only one little bunch who will get anything out of this, and that is the three commissioners, who will be appointed and who I am quite certain will have been party heelers at some stage of the game. They are the only people who will get anything. The farmers are not getting anything they want, and for that reason I am with my friend from Souris, I am absolutely against this being passed at the eleventh hour in this way because it does not go one step in the direction of protecting the farmers' rights, and his wheat, and giving him what he has been asking for all these years.

Mr. BRADBURY. When this question of government control of elevators was before this House two years ago and again a year ago, it was urged strongly from this side of the House that in the best interests of the farming community of western Canada the government should provide means for taking over and operating the terminal elevators. That matter was urged by every hon. member on this side of the House from the west. The attitude of the government's supporters from the west was directly opposed to that. They advanced the argument that the government had appointed supervisors of the elevators, that the elevators were now under government supervision, and that the men who had been

appointed should be given a fair chance to demonstrate whether the supervision would meet the requirements of the west or not. The claim of the farmers of the west was that they were unfairly treated, in fact that their grain was tampered with, that its identity was lost, and that the men who were operating the elevators were mixing the grain to the detriment of the farmers and to their own gain.

That was demonstrated in this House time and again. Some of the men who were guilty were punished and fined heavily. The attitude of the government on that question and of the western men was opposed to the proposition of the farmers that the elevators should be owned and operated by the government. They said in this House, one after the other, that they were not prepared to urge the government to grant the demands of the farmers in the west because they believed that the present system should be given a fair trial. The proposition of the government to-day is very similar to the conditions which have existed during the last two or three years. The control of the elevators is under government supervision and the country has paid out from $60,000 to $70,000 a year to men who are supposed to take control of the wheat passing through the elevators. But what the farmers believe is necessary is the government operation of those elevators pure and simple. The minister has intimated that if we would allow the Bill to go through, the government might see fit to put a sum in the estimates to carry out the wishes of the farmers. I would suggest that he would consult with his colleagues now and make a definite statement so that we might know whether the farmers are to be treated fairly or not or whether this is another gold-brick they are handing to the farmers. There can be no doubt that, when from time to time the farmers of the west have made requests to the government to redress their grievances, they have been side tracked. They came down to Ottawa a large delegation asking for reciprocity in natural products and manufactured goods, but the government astutely turned the tables on the farmers by giving them reciprocity in natural products whilst still maintaining a high protection on agricultural machinery and everything the farmer has to buy. Thus the farmer has to meet the competition of the world in everything he produces, but he is not given the advantage of competition in things he has to buy. This Bill is along the same lines. The farmers have adduced evidence in abundance to show that the only possible relief is the government taking over these elevators and operating them. The question is whether the government should own these elevators or not. I hold that they should. I would therefore urge the Minister of the Interior to consult his colleagues now and see if it is not possible for him to make a definite statement to-day to the effect that he will provide the means for the government taking absolute control of these elevators. It seems to me that the government have been injudicious in bringing this Bill before the House at this eleventh hour within a few hours of adjournment. Surely we ought to have reasonable time to discuss a Bill of such vast importance. I do not want to delay this Bill unnecessarily, but I am not afraid of the insinuation made from the other side that we are obstructing. I am satisfied to oppose any measure which I believe is to the detriment of the farmers. This Bill does not meet the demands of the farmers, and the minister would be well advised to allow it to stand over until the House meets again so that we may place it fairly before the people in the meantime that the farmers may know what the government proposes to do.

Mr. FIELDING. It is quite evident that this Bill can hardly be classed among the non contentious measures; and as hours and even minutes are beginning to become very precious if we are to carry out our intention of adjourning, I would suggest that the debate should be adjourned and the Bill stand over.

Mr. KING moved the aljournment of the debate.

Mr. LAKE. I do not desire to keep the House more than a few minutes. For years we on this side have been advocating the government operation of terminal elevators and have placed ourselves on record this session to that effect. Liberal members from the Northwest have agreed with the government in its desire to continue the system of government control and supervision in preference to that of government operation. Now the minister has before the House a resolution on the Order Paper to adjourn to-day and at the same time brings before us for the first time this important measure. To my mind it is merely a bluff. The hon. members on this side, while believing in the principle of government operation, would desire to have the opportunity of replacing in this Bill special clauses which were in it originally at the desire of the grain growers and which made it of some use, but which were struck out in the Senate. It is ridiculous to ask us to consider a Bill of 71 pages and 245 sections and put it through in the dying hours of the session. The grain growers have said time and again that they will not be satisfied with anything less than government

operation. I had intended to read an article which appeared in the 'Grain Growers Guide' only a short time ago declaring that they would not be satisfied with anything short of that, but as the Minister of Finance has asked that this Bill be withdrawn, I shall not detain the House any longer.

Motion to adjourn the debate agreed to.

TRADE RELATIONS WITH JAPAN.

Bill (No. 224) respecting duties of customs on importations from Japan.—Mr. Fielding—was considered in committee and reported without amendment.

Mr. FIELDING moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the Bill is read the third time, I would like to allude to the fact that last evening there was a good deal of discussion upon the very important question of immigration. That discussion arose, however, out of some correspondence brought down in connection with this proposal from which it appeared that the government between the two governments embodied in a certain agreement which had been entered into some four years ago should be regarded as still continuing. The Bill itself contains no reference to the question of immigration. So far as this country is concerned, the fact that the treaty between Canada and Japan which came into operation a few years ago will cease to have any effect or operation after the 17th of July next leaves it entirely open to us in Canada to deal with that subject as we may see fit, unless the action of parliament in that regard would be impeded in any way by an understanding arrived at between the two governments. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has assured us that any such understanding as continues by virtue of the correspondence alluded to can be brought to a termination at once. Assuming that to be the case, and in view of the fact that the Bill itself does not deal in any way with the very important question of immigration I can see no reason why it should not pass.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax), has correctly stated my understanding of the matter as I expressed it to the House last evening. The reference in the correspondence to immigration did not arise from the Japanese authorities at all. We regarded the assurance that had been given of the restriction of immigration as a desirable thing, and we were anxious to be assured that that arrangement would be continued, and hence I made the allusion to and hence, I think the allusion to it did not arise in the proposals of the Japanese authorities. My hon. friend's statement of what we understand to be the situation is entirely correct.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

MONTREAL HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS' ACT—AMENDMENT.

On consideration of an amendment made by the Senate to Bill (No. 48) to amend the Montreal Harbour Commissioners' 1894.—Mr. Brodeur.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Section 1 of this Bill is designed to correct an error in the description of the harbour boundaries. That passed in this House. But when the Bill was before the Senate it was decided to further amend the Act. The first error was in the wording of the designation of the boundary. For the word 'southern' we substitute 'eastern.' The Senate made another correction. Section 2 of the Bill transfers all the powers possessed by the Harbour Commissioners in the port of Montreal up to the 19th of May, 1909, to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries. On the 19th of May, 1909, by chapter 24 of the statutes of that year, assented to on that date the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal were relieved of all responsibility within the limits of the port of Montreal. It may be here stated that the port of Montreal, and the harbour of Montreal, are two separate and distinct areas, the harbour extending only to foot of the island of Montreal, but the port extending as far as Portneuf near Quebec. After the passing of the legislation in 1909, a doubt arose as to whether the Minister of Marine and Fisheries had jurisdiction in the port of Montreal. The proposed section in this Bill is to remove all such doubts on that point. Section 3 of the Bill is merely a verbal amendment. The heading of section 37 is 'recovery of rates, penalties and harbour dues.' As the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal no longer are the pilotage authorities, the reference to pilotage dues in the section is superfluous. Under section 39, of the Harbour Commissioners' Act, 1894, the Harbour Commissioners had originally the right to seize vessels for non-payment of pilotage dues. In 1909, this section was amended in regard to pilotage dues in so far as paragraph (a) of the section was concerned, but in reference to pilotage dues the paragraph (h) was however overlooked. That is the explanation given to me why this amendment was made in the Senate.

Mr. EMMERSON. I thought I heard the words read 'The boundaries of the harbour of Montreal.' It is within the knowledge of my hon. friend that there is a certain litigation now pending before the courts

respecting the bounds of the harbour of Montreal as they existed a few years ago. Will this in any way affect that litigation?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I am informed it does not affect it at all.

Mr. EMMERSON. It would seem to me that the rights of parties involved in that litigation should be in every way protected. I think my hon. friend from St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) is much more familiar with that question than I am.

Mr. DOHERTY. I have not yet been able to judge accurately of the alterations made in the Senate; they seem to make a new Bill. The Bill as it originally passed this House contained one clause substituting the words 'southern' for the word 'eastern' in the description of the boundaries. There is no doubt that correction needed to be made. The error arose from the fact that in Montreal we always talk of the north when we really mean the east. When a man is going north we say he is going east, and no doubt that is the way the error arose.

Mr. EMMERSON. The difficulty is with respect to the western boundary.

Mr. DOHERTY. The amendments made by the Senate seem to me to constitute practically a new measure. While I have no reason to doubt that the provisions are reasonable, still I have not had time to consider them.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the Senate has made several amendments, which have to be followed closely and compared with the previous language. We might let the Bill stand until after the noon recess, and take it up again after my hon. friend from St. Anne has had time to look into it.

Mr. MONK. What will be taken up after recess?

Mr. FIELDING. I think we will go into Supply.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Am I to understand from the hon. member for St. Anne that he would ask the Bill to be postponed until after adjournment, unless, during the noon recess, he looks at the statute to see if there is anything in it debatable? I understand from the officers of the department that there is nothing debatable in it.

Mr. DOHERTY. I will endeavour to examine it during the noon recess.

Mr. FIELDING. Unless this Bill be proceeded with, we will move the House into Supply. If the items under consideration last evening can be agreed to without debate; we will be glad to have them passed, but we do not wish them to be a cause of delay. If we have time we will take up the Bills respecting the Post Office Savings Banks, and the Customs, but with Supply ahead of them, in order to assist the clerks in their work.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. DOHERTY. Before the House rose I was discussing the amendments made by the Senate to the Bill respecting the Montreal Harbour Commissioners. I have looked into the powers conferred on the harbour commissioners under the old law, and I find that some of these powers appear by this Bill to be transferred to the minister. I have no doubt there is some explanation of the fact. The statute of 1894, I find, did confer powers with regard to the port of Montreal upon the harbour commissioners which I hardly think it is intended to confer upon the minister. They have the power to acquire vessels and property and to exercise civil and criminal jurisdiction. I do not think it is intended to confer these powers upon the minister, and therefore I think it would be desirable that the Bill should stand over until we have had an opportunity of further considering it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no obejction to the position taken by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Doherty). The amendments made to the Bill were not submitted to me before they were proposed in the Senate; therefore, I am not in a position to insist upon them. However, nobody will suffer if the Bill is postponed until after the adjournment.

Debate adjourned.

MESSAGE FROM HIS EXCELLENCY.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that I have received the following communication:

Ottawa, 19th May, 1911.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that the Right Honourable Chief Justice of Canada, acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, will proceed to the Senate Chamber this afternoon at five o'clock to give the Royal Assent to certain Bills which have passed the Senate and House of Commons during the present session of parliament.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) D. O. MALCOLM,
Governor General's Secretary.

The Honourable
The Speaker,
House of Commons

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RAILWAY MAIL CLERKS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG:

What are the names of railway mail clerks injured or killed in railway accidents during the past ten years, and the names of those to whom or to whose families a compassionate allowance has been made

Mr. LEMIEUX:

(a) The following are the names of the Railway Mail Clerks, who have been injured on duty during the past ten years:

Halifax District—D. O'Sullivan, T. Keith.

St. John District—J. P. Hipwell, A. S. Belyea, C. E. O'Reilly, H. D. Porter, C. J. Dionne.

Quebec District—A. Lachance, C. Audet, J. E. R. Roux.

Montreal District—W. E. C. Jones, A. Tetreault, C. W. Candlish, J. Lallier, J. H. Duval, J. Beaulieu.

Ottawa District—E. A. Beach, A. P. Black, W. E. Alguire, E. A. Roberts, W. H. Gass, J. D. C. McFarlane, Geo. C. Chattaway, L. E. Galipeau.

Toronto District—W. Mitchell, T. J. Atkins, J. D. Thomson, T. H. Brent, P. H. Wainwright, Thos. Mason, G. B. Stanton, W. J. Kirkpatrick.

London District—Geo. Matthews, A. J. Cheyne, W. McKee, W. J. May.

Winnipeg District—J. Kinney, J. W. Flatt, T. J. Smith, B. A. Parson, W. H. McKinnon, T. Glendinning, G. E. Hawkins, O. D. Benoit, A. M. Ferguson, S. H. Might, J. O. Bernier, A. L. S. Emsley.

Moosejaw District—J. H. Lewis, W. B. Greenhalgh, R. M. Manahan, W. B. McNair.

Calgary District—A. A. McLatchie, G. G. Buell, H. E. Wilson, E. J. Dutton, W. W. Peel, J. A. Poole.

Vancouver District—Thos. Morton, R. F. Drummond, R. J. Herbert, F. N. McCrimmon, W. Willis.

(b) The following Railway Mail Clerks have been killed during the past ten years, but in no instance has the family of any of them been granted a compassionate allowance (other than the usual gratuity equal to two months' salary) as, in each case, the family had recourse against the Railway Company:

M. Roy, Quebec District, 3rd October, 1901.

R. E. Curran, Toronto District, accident 29th May, 1908, died 31st May, 1908.

W. D. Tye, London, 4th February, 1911.

MAIL ROUTES IN NORTH GREY.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What are the starting and terminal points of the various mail routes in North Grey and the intervening post offices where mail carrier calls?

2. What are the hours of starting and termination of each of said routes, the name and salary of each carrier, and the days of the week on which said mails are carried?

3. What rural mail delivery routes have been established in said riding and what applications or petitions have been received therefor?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Name of Service.	Days on which mail is carried.	Hour of Departure.	Hour of Arrival.	Intermediate Post Offices.	Name of Contractor.	Contract Rate.
						$ cts.
*Ashley and Railway Station (Rockford)	Monday, Thursday, Saturday	To meet trains	as required.		G. Follis	0 32 per trip.
*Balaclava and Owen Sound	Monday, Wednesday, Friday	9.00 a.m.	12.15 p.m.	Johnson, Annan, Leith	D. McAleer	500 00 per an.
*Bognor and Woodford	Daily (except Sunday)	1.00 p.m.	2.12 p.m.		D. Murdoch	289 00 "
*Cape Rich and Meaford	Wednesday, Saturday	9.00 a.m.	12.30 p.m.	Colenso	W. McRae	140 00 "
*Clavering and Grand Trunk Railway Stn	Daily (except Sunday)	To meet trains	as required.		Mrs. M. Perkins	0 15 per trip.
*Cruickshank and Shallow Lake	Monday, Wednesday, Friday	2.00 p.m.	2.45 p.m,		D. Cameron	90 00 per an.
*Derby Mills and Owen Sound Road	Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday	To meet stage from Owen Sound to Tara as required.			R. Robertson	24 00 "
*Epping and Meaford	Daily (except Sunday)	8.00 a.m.	1.30 p.m.	Griersville, Fairmount, Rocklyn and Minniehill.	T. P. Hawkins	645 00 "
*Garry Owen and Owen Sound	Tuesday, Thursday, Saturday	11.00 "	1.00 "	Annan, Leith	T. Gallagher	196 00 "
*Hoath Head and Owen Sound	Tuesday, Friday	11.30 "	1.00 "	Grey	J. Fisher	100 80 "
*Jackson and Owen Sound	Daily (except Sunday)	12.30 "	1.42 "		W. Caswell	214 00 "
*Lake Charles and Owen Sound	" "	7.30 "	12.00 noon.	Wolseley, Lindenwood, Shouldice, Ben Allen.	N. McCoag	600 00 "
*Meaford and *Owen Sound	" "	8.00 a.m.	12.00 noon.	Bay View, Woodford, Bothwell Corners.	F. Thomson	600 00 "
*Meaford and Grand Trunk Railway Station.	" "	To meet trains	as required.		T. Heppenstall	198 00 "
Meaford and *Walters Falls	Monday, Wednesday, Friday	7.15 a.m.	12.45 p.m.	Oxmead, Strathnairn, Blantyre, Elmhedge.	J. T. Walter	429 00 "
*Morley and Woodford	Tuesday, Friday	12.45 p.m.	2.15 p.m.	Silcote	H. M. Vail	90 00 "
*Murphy and Grand Trunk Railway Station.	Daily (except Sunday)	To meet trains	as required.		R. Morrill	0 04 per trip.
*North Keppel and Owen Sound	" "	6.45 a.m	10.45 a.m.	Kemble, East Linton, Brookholm, Presqu'Isle	R. McLaren	600 00 per an.
*Owen Sound and Canadian Pacific Railway	" "	To meet trains	as required.		J. D. Stoddart	0 15 1/10 p. trip
*Owen Sound and Grand Trunk Railway Stn.	" "	"	"		"	198 32 per an.
Owen Sound and *Tara	" "	8.00 a.m.	12.00 noon.	Keady, Kilsyth, Squire, Inglis Falls.	J. E. Grant	680 00 "
Owen Sound and Street Letter Boxes	" "				J. D. Stoddart	287 34 "
Oxenden and *Wiarton	" "	3.30 p.m.	4.00 p.m.		S. Hyatt	175 00 "
*Shallow Lake and Grand Trunk Railway Stn	" "	To meet trains	as required.		J. Osborne	0 08 1/2 per trip

* The starting point of each route is indicated by *.

3. Applications have been received for the establishment of rural mail delivery upon the following routes:

Balaclava and Owen Sound.
Epping and Meaford.
Garry Owen and Owen Sound.
Meaford and Owen Sound.
Meaford and Walters Falls.
Morley and Woodford.

Rural delivery has been established upon the following routes:

Balaclava and Owen Sound.
Garry Owen and Owen Sound.
Morley and Woodford.

SUPPLY—ENGLISH MAIL SERVICE TO THE MARITIME PROVINCES.

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

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair there is a matter that I want to bring to the attention of the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) and it is in respect to the mails from points west of Montreal destined to points in the eastern provinces. Letters mailed in Ottawa after two o'clock in one day should reach Montreal at eight o'clock the next morning, and if addressed to a point anywhere in New Brunswick or Nova Scotia, it seems to me that these letters, and other mail matter, should go to the east in the Intercolonial railway train which leaves Montreal at 12 o'clock. In a great many instances, with very many of which I am conversant, these letters and other mail matter are held until the Canadian Pacific railway train leaves Montreal at 7.25 in the evening, thus delaying the letters reaching their destination until some twenty-four hours after they should reach the recipients. It seems to me that there must be negligence on the part of somebody connected with the postal department. A few days ago, I think it was on Thursday of last week, I called the attention of the Postmaster General to the delays incident to the transmission of the English mails from Rimouski to points in the eastern provinces. I realize that this is a question between the Departments of the hon. Postmaster General and the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals. I showed where the mails which arrived at Rimouski at a certain hour went to St. John at an average rate of 12½ miles an hour, and that the mails from Moncton only reached there at the average rate of a little over five miles an hour. That brings us back to the old stage coach days when the mail contractors had to enter into an agreement with the imperial and provincial governments that they would convey the mails between Halifax and Quebec at a rate of not less than five miles an hour. We have not advanced in any great degree beyond the conditions which prevailed in those bygone days. I realize that the delays are incident to a difficulty between the two departments.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what case was it that the mails took so long?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mails which reached Rimouski on the 6th of May reached Halifax at an average rate of 12½ miles an hour. They were delivered in Moncton some 53 hours after they had reached Rimouski and the average rate in that case was 5½ or 5¼ miles per hour.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). That is this year?

Mr. EMMERSON. May 6th of this year. They were not delivered in Moncton until some time during the day on the 8th.

Mr. FIELDING. That does not mean the average rate of travel. My hon. friend is counting the time when they were not travelling.

Mr. EMMERSON. They were held somewhere.

Mr. FIELDING. But to say that it is the average rate is not a fair statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. But they counted the average rate in the old days in respect to the stage coaches including stops at the houses of entertainment along the way. I bring this matter up, not with any desire to complain, but I think that the eastern provinces are entitled to a little more consideration. I do not attach the whole blame to the Department of the Postmaster General. There has been for many years a misunderstanding, or a failure to reach an understanding, between the two departments. It is true that to avoid these delays perhaps there would require to be special arrangements made with the Department of Railways and Canals. Now, with a department, such as that which the Postmaster General controls, with a surplus of nearly $1,000,000 a year, it seems to me that instead of that surplus going into the consolidated fund of Canada and being part of the revenues of Canada, it should be applied in some way to the facilitating of the carriage of the mails, whether they are from England, or I care not from what point they may come. I am sorry that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) is not in his place, but it seems to me that he should take cognizance of the conditions which prevail, and that an effort should be made by either the Postmaster General or the Minister of Railways and Canals to find a remedy. Mails mailed in Moncton at noon to-day will, via Canadian Pacific railway, reach Ottawa at one o'clock to-morrow, but if they are addressed to any point south of Lisgar street they would not be delivered until to-morrow morning. If mailed in

Moncton on Friday, although they reach the Ottawa post office at one o'clock on Saturday, they would not reach the addresses in the part of the city I have referred to until Monday morning. This matter should receive attention from the postal authorities.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The information brought down by the Postmaster General on the 11th of May shows delays of the mails up to twenty-two hours at Rimouski. I have correspondence which has passed between the secretary of the Halifax Board of Trade and the Post Office Department from which, if time permit, I would like to read copious extracts. Under date May 11, 1910, I quote from a letter addressed by the secretary of the Board of Trade to the Postmaster General:

Last year, it was a frequent occurrence for the eastern mail to lie at Rimouski, or some point there, from twelve to twenty-two hours, and I think, sir, you will agree that it is rather rough treatment, when the western mails are forwarded immediately on their arrival by special train.

The Postmaster General in reply said that special trains are not ordered beyond Montreal and the Halifax Board of Trade answered that from Montreal to the west there are several trains a day, and, therefore, special trains are not necessary. The board of trade then forwarded to the Post Office Department a letter from a passenger giving his experience as follows:

On Friday morning, April 29, at 3 o'clock, the English mail was landed from the ss. 'Empress of Britain' at Rimouski and some of the passengers also landed. The mails and passengers were kept at Rimouski station for twelve hours, when a local freight train dragged them into Campbellton, where they waited for the regular Intercolonial train, due in Halifax Saturday afternoon about 5.15; the time from Rimouski to Campbellton, 123 miles, was 20 hours. The merchants of the city of Halifax should have had English letters on their desks early Saturday morning, instead of that, those mails did not reach here until 6.30 Saturday night, and were not delivered until Monday morning. Had the mails reached here Saturday morning as they should have done, the letters could have been answered that day—same leaving here Saturday night for England. The time of the mails and passengers from Rimouski to Halifax was forty hours, instead of 17½ hours.

Another communication from the Board of Trade says:

The members of the council do not consider they were asking anything unreasonable when they asked that a special train be provided should it be found that the mails would have to lie at Rimouski for, say, over six or eight hours, and a recurrence of last winter when on one occasion, I think, there was a delay of twenty-one hours and on several occasions a delay verging on twenty hours, would warrant a little outlay on your department to give better despatch.

I should think that from a business standpoint it would be well to send these mails forward because there are usually a number of passengers, and I imagine that it would pay fairly well to send a special train. The government operates the Intercolonial, and the government is responsible for the delivery of the mails, but there seems to be some friction between the Post Office Department and the Railway Department as to which shall be responsible for any loss incurred by the speedy transportation of mails and passengers. I trust that such friction will not be allowed to militate against the public interest. We have a good steamship service between Britain and Canada—although not so good as we hope to have in the early future—and it is a very great handicap on that service that passengers and mails should be delayed twenty-two hours after landing. I would not have been surprised had the Halifax city council and the Halifax Board of Trade expressed themselves even more strongly than they have. I do hope that the Postmaster General and the Minister of Railways will get together and see that better arrangement is made so that in future delay and inconvenience to passengers and mails will be obviated.

Mr. LEMIEUX. We have an excellent staff at Rimouski, and a mail tender which does good service. The business of the Post Office Department is to deliver the mails on the wharf at Rimouski, and there they await the first available train. Sometimes the trains are late, and for that the Post Office Department is not responsible. Besides, the Post Office Department does not carry passengers, and the bulk of the complaints come from passengers who have to wait for the regular trains. I realize that the business men of Halifax and the maritime provinces have some reason to complain about this matter. I shall endeavour to force the Intercolonial railway and the Department of Railways to provide better train accommodation from Rimouski, and if it is possible to meet the Railway Department half way I shall do so. I may say that representations have also been received on this matter from the Minister of Finance, who represents the interests of Nova Scotia in the cabinet, and I shall urge the views presented, on the Department of Railways. As regards the mails which are sent from Ottawa to the maritime provinces I shall have the following memorandum from the controller of the railway mail service:

With reference to the despatch of mail to the maritime provinces, the Postmaster General is informed that all mail for the maritime provinces posted or received at Montreal

is despatched from there by 7.25 p.m Canadian Pacific railway train, except for the counties of Gloucester, Kent, Northumberland and Restigouche in New Brunswick, mail for which is invariably forwarded via Intercolonial railway trains.

Any mail received at Montreal after departure of 7.25 p.m. Canadian Pacific railway train is forwarded the following day by Intercolonial railway train at 12 noon, the only through train at present operated by the Intercolonial railway from Montreal to Halifax.

Next month (June) the Intercolonial will issue a new time-table under which a train leaves Montreal for Halifax at 8 a.m, and another at 7.45 p.m., and both these trains will carry mail (and have always done so) for the maritime provinces.

Any mail for the maritime provinces now posted in Ottawa up to 3.30 p.m., except for the counties mentioned, is despatched from Ottawa so as to connect with the 7.25 p.m. Canadian Pacific railway train from Montreal.

Any mail posted between 3.30 p.m. and 7.30 a.m. the following morning is despatched to connect with Intercolonial railway train at present leaving Montreal at 12 noon.

No reports or complaints have been received that mail for the maritime provinces is not forwarded by Intercolonial railway trains when same will gain thereby in delivery.

B. M. ARMSTRONG,
Controller.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend may understand that to be the case but I have tested it personally and found that it is not so. I have mailed letters here before 10 o'clock in the evening addressed to Dorchester. The next morning, I travelled to Montreal and on to Dorchester on the Intercolonial railway train and reached Dorchester seven or eight hours before the letters arrived by the Canadian Pacific railway train which left Montreal several hours after I did.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have myself had occasion to complain in this matter. The trouble is traceable to the point at which the letters are mailed. I have posted letters in the post office in the House of Commons at night addressed to my office on the other side of the Square, and they have not reached me before the next day at 12 o'clock. It is because the clerks in the post office here leave too early. They should not leave the House of Commons until after the House has adjourned and they should take all the mail matter that is posted. That is where the fault lies and I again call your attention to that fact.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE—Mr. WILSON (LAVAL).

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. On Saturday the following question was asked of the Senate:

THE CANADIAN COMMISSIONER AT PARIS. INQUIRY.

Hon. Mr. LANDRY inquired:

Among the applicants for the position of Commissioner at Paris, left vacant by the death of Mr. Hector Fabre, is there one answering to the name of Charles Avila Wilson? If so, what qualifications did he think himself possessed of, and what competency did he endeavour to impress upon the authorities in order to obtain the said position?

That is my name. Yesterday the right hon. Sir Richard Cartwright answered in this way:

Rt. Hon. Sir RICHARD CARTWRIGHT—So far as I have been able to ascertain no application was made by this party; but as there are several members of this Cabinet who are now absent from the country, I cannot reply with absolute certainty.

It is to answer with absolute certainty that I rise now. To the first question I answer emphatically, no. To the second question, I answer in the form so often used in this House, 'answered by the answer to the first question.' I never was an applicant, I never had the slightest idea of being an applicant. Though I am very glad to take a trip to Paris and to good old France occasionally I still prefer to live in Canada. Canada is good enough for me.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Supply.

SUPPLY.

Department of the Interior—Astronomical surveys—investigations and demarcations of the exterior boundaries of Canada, and the astronomical and geodetic work of the Department of the Interior, including expenses of the Dominion Astronomical Observatory, and $1,000 for W. F. King, as boundary commissioner, $260,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The urgency of this item arises from the fact that our boundary surveys are made in conjunction with those of the United States, pursuant to an understanding between the two countries that joint surveys shall be made. The survey parties have to be started out in early spring in order to do a season's work. A large part of the work is done during the summer season; a five-twelfths vote would not carry them through their summer's work and would cut them off during the summer. Part of this expenditure is for the Alaskan boundary where the work will be done this summer some distance north of the Arctic circle. In every way it is desirable that this sum should be available.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At what time does the commission complete its work for the season?

Mr. OLIVER. The work is always done in the summer, they come in in November.

Surveys, examination of survey returns, printing of plans, &c., $965,000.

Mr. OLIVER. The committee are aware that the township surveys of Dominion lands are carried on during the summer time. The parties have to start out early in order to do a summer's work. We have assumed that the money will be voted and the parties are now out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How long have they been out.

Mr. OLIVER. They started out about the first of April.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What time do they come in?

Mr. OLIVER. In November. Their work is done by November. If we only vote five-twelfths, they will be out of money when the summer is about half through.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). One would think that five-twelfths would last until we come back again?

Mr. OLIVER. It is very expensive keeping parties in the field, and it would not be desirable to have to call them in for lack of funds.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Do they go out and remain out until the 1st of November, and then come in, and do you pay them then or during the summer?

Mr. OLIVER. The House has already voted one-sixth of the year's estimates. Out of that we have been able to arrange for the advances for the purchase of supplies, &c., always made to enable the surveyors to take the field. We now require a further sum to pay the expenses during the summer, and the wages. Five-twelfths would probably keep them going until the end of July, but would leave them actually stranded, and in the field at that time.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the hon. minister given further consideration to the petition I presented to the House for the resurvey of township 8 in range 9, west of the first. The old mounds have become obliterated, and there is some dissatisfaction as regards the location of the line.

Mr. OLIVER. In the province of Manitoba the resurveys made by our government are not recognized by the Manitoba government. This has practically tied up our efforts to resurvey lands in Manitoba. We may be able to come to some arrangement with the provincial government which will enable us to go forward with these surveys, but are tied up at present.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. STAPLES. Has there been any correspondence with the provincial government?

Mr. OLIVER. Any amount of it.

Mr. STAPLES. Can the hon. minister give any information as to the object of the large land survey done two years ago in township 9 range 10? There was an organization of surveyors working there all summer, and the minister now says that the provincial government do not recognize the surveying done by the federal authorities. Why then was such a large amount expended?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not personal knowledge of the instance mentioned, and cannot give information at the moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much was spent last year?

Mr. OLIVER. $970,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much to the 1st of September last?

Mr. OLIVER. I should say that considerably more than one-half the total would have been incurred by the 1st of September, probably 66 per cent.

Mr. PERLEY. The hon. minister says one-half would be incurred, but would it be spent? These parties are provided with supplies, and perhaps certain payments are made to their families in the interim, but the bulk of the payments are made after their return. Although one-half might be incurred by the 1st of September, I doubt if one-half would have to be paid. I think the minister will find five-twelfths sufficient for the actual cash required, and when we come back no doubt the House will provide the balance.

Mr. OLIVER. I do not wish to delay the House if my hon. friends opposite are not willing to pass the item.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Suppose we take two-thirds?

Mr. OLIVER. We do not require the whole amount, but more than five-twelfths.

Mr. MAGRATH. What proportion is required for contract survey?

Mr. OLIVER. $343,000.

Mr. MAGRATH. Is it not the case that these amounts are largely paid after the surveyor returns in November?

Mr. OLIVER. Certainly, we do not require the whole of the money, and probably two-thirds would answer, but we have not made the calculations to enable us to make that division.

Mr. PERLEY. There would be no difficulty in the contract surveys getting on

with five-twelfths before the 1st of September.

Mr. OLIVER. I am very sorry, but I have to say to the committee that five-twelfths will not be sufficient to meet the requirements of the service up to the time that that vote will expire. I say that on my fullest responsibility.

Mr. PERLEY. Will the minister also say that it is customary to pay five-twelfths before the time mentioned? While I admit that five-twelfths may be earned by that date, is it customary to pay the money before the fall?

Mr. OLIVER. We have to pay bills as they are presented, and when money is earned it is necessary to provide for the payment. We might possibly get out of paying it, or not be called upon to pay it. On the other hand our surveyors get into jail sometimes because they are not in funds to pay, and we do not want to put them in that position.

There are several sub-items in vote 272 for which I ask consideration. This is the vote for Dominion lands and parks.

One sub-item is:

Contingencies, advertising, &c., $240,000.

This is to pay current expenses, such as the work of the homestead inspector, advertising, printing, and various other matters. The position is the same in regard to this and other items. We do not require the whole amount to carry us through the summer season, but we do require more than five-twelfths.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it field work?

Mr. OLIVER. Yes, the homestead inspectors, the forest rangers, the fire rangers, and other parties in the field.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Are you asking for the whole amount?

Mr. OLIVER. We have not made a subdivision. But we are asking for more than five-twelfths. I would be glad to have two-thirds of each item, if that would be satisfactory to the committee. If that meets the committee's views, I could, if allowed, withdraw the items for the present, make the calculations, and bring them forward again for a vote of the two-thirds.

Mr. BRADBURY. There was an arrangement made to vote five-twelfths of Supply, and if you are going on making exceptions in this way you will nullify the arrangement.

Mr. STAPLES. Has the minister sufficient to put him through until September 1?

Mr. OLIVER. No, five-twelfths will not carry us until September 1.

Mr. STAPLES. How long will it carry you?

Mr. OLIVER. Probably until the end of July.

Mr. STAPLES. We are to be back here on July 18.

Mr. OLIVER. Under this vote for Dominion lands and parks, there are the following items to which the same remarks would apply as to the item I have just mentioned. If the committee will vote two-thirds of these amounts we shall be very glad to make the change.

Mr. PERLEY. Why not make it half? That would be ample.

Mr. OLIVER. It might be in some items, but not in all. The items to which I refer are:

Dominion Lands Surveys, $965,000.
Dominion Lands Contingencies, $240,000.
Protection of timber, $255,000.
Irrigation surveys, $68,500.
St. Mary and Milk rivers, $13,000.
National parks, $201,600.
Water investigations, $20,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax), Is that all the minister wants?

Mr. OLIVER. All in that item. There are also two items relating to the Yukon, the grant to the Yukon council, and to the roads in the Yukon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you want these?

Mr. OLIVER. Summer is the only time when work can be done on the roads in the Yukon. We are anxious at any rate to have the whole of the road vote.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why do you want the vote for the council?

Mr. OLIVER. That involves the general expenditure of the Yukon. However, if the committee will not agree to that I shall be glad to get the road vote, and drop the grant to the Yukon council, except that we get five-twelfths of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). And you want two-thirds of these amounts?

Mr. OLIVER. No, two-thirds of the items referred to under Dominion lands and parks, but I would like the whole of the road vote to the Yukon, because the expenditure, to be of any use, must be made early in the summer. Then there are two further items in the supplementaries:

Water investigations, $55,000.
Seed grain advances, $60,000.

The water investigation is to go thoroughly into the question of water in the railway belt of British Columbia in view of the legislation which we have now before

the House, and which we hope to have passed, authorizing the Department of the Interior to deal with that question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). How much do you want?

Mr. OLIVER. We are asking for $55,000 in the supplementaries.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What proportion?

Mr. OLIVER. As the legislation has not passed, perhaps if we took five-twelfths it would answer our purpose. Seed grain, $60,000; that money is already spent, the seed grain is in the ground, and we would like to get the whole of the money. We would like to get two-thirds of the vote for Dominion lands, the whole of the Yukon roads, $50,000. We drop the grants to the Yukon council and surveys in British Columbia.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). We are now voting one-half which, with one-sixth already voted, makes two-thirds.

Geological Survey Branch—For explorations and surveys in Canada, including ethnological archæological and palæontological investigations; and to pay wages of explorers, draughtsmen and others, $142,000.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is to pay the salaries, expenses and outfitting of the geological parties in the field. Some of them are in the field now, and the rest are going out. We want the whole item if possible. We might be able to do with two-thirds. The expenditures are entirely during the summer. The expenditures are being made now; many of these parties are out in British Columbia, and one or two in the Yukon. Excepting the head of each party, who is an officer of the Geological Survey, all the rest of the men are hired, and have to be paid their monthly wages. We will probably require the whole amount. It would be very desirable if the House would vote the whole sum.

Mr. PERLEY. I think a chance should be given to the members to make inquiries and ask questions. If we grant one-half now, as we do to the Minister of the Interior, that would give the minister two-thirds altogether. That ought to be sufficient.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. All right.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will take item 151 on page 68. I will call the attention of the committee to these items from Ontario. I think they are all upon the list which my hon. friend the leader of the opposition had. They are as follows:

Burlington channel piers, $17,000.
Blind river—repairs to dock, $550.
Cobourg—to repair and reconstruct superstructure on east pier at north end, $6,000.
Goderich—harbour improvements, $175,000.

That was not in the list but it was mentioned last evening.

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $40,000.
Kincardine—repairs to piers, $1,500.
Lake Nipissing—improvement of navigable channel in west arm leading through Shanty lake to Monetville, $3,500.
L'Orignal—repairs to wharf and freight shed, $1,000.
McGregor's creek—to pay W. F. Smith, $2,500; O'Keefe and Drew, $320, and the executors of the Poile estate, $1,500, in full and final settlement of all claims for losses sustained owing to damages caused to their properties in the city of Chatham by dredging performed in the creek by a government dredge, $4,320.
Montreal river—removal of boulders in Flat rapids, $3,000.
Pembroke—repairs to wharf and approach, $3,500.
Pelee Island—repairs to west dock, warehouse and approach, $1,000.
Port Hope—repairs to piers—to construct new superstructure on counterfort on west side of harbour and effect general repairs, $5,000.
Providence bay, Manitoulin island—warehouse built on stone embankment protected by cribwork, $3,650.
Rainy river—improvements at mouth, $60,000.

That is dredging work.

River Sydenham—second outlet from Chenal Ecarté to Mitchell's bay—protection of banks at Martin island with pile work, $1,000.
Saugeen river—repairs to north and south piers, $1,000.
Sheguiandah—Manitoulin island—repairs to wharf to make good damage by ice shoves, &c., $4,000.
Southampton—harbour improvements, $3,000.
South Nation river—improvement of waterway, $4,000.
Thornbury—repairs to wharf, $1,000.

If any hon. gentleman would state any objection to any item to which there is objection, I would be quite willing to drop it.

Mr. LANCASTER. They are all objectionable. We have no objection to giving the hon. gentleman the proportion arranged for, but we can go no further.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will you give a few of these in addition to what has been done?

Mr. LANCASTER. No, I do not think so. The hon. gentleman will not need this money until the end of July when we will be back here. There is no reason for giving more than that called for by the arrangement made between the Prime Minister and the leader of the opposition.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will not discuss the matter. Of course, if it is understood that hon. gentlemen are not willing to allow these items for repairs and work to be done by the day, the responsibility will

not be upon me. In Manitoba there is one item of $8,000 for general repairs and improvements. Repairs are needed in many places, the men have to be employed by the day, and I am sure the public interest will suffer if that work is not done. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. LANCASTER. There will not be many men employed on day work until after the 18th of July. There will be the five-twelfths of the estimates available which will provide more than is required.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I understand that is objected to?

Mr. LANCASTER. Yes, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Very well. Now in Saskatchewan and Alberta there are four items that I urgently ask for. There is the item of:

Harbours, rivers and bridges—general repairs and improvements, $20,000.

These are in remote districts where it is necessary to send men to work by the day, and it will be extremely inconvenient if these men have to be recalled.

Mr. MAGRATH. Where are the works?

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are on the Saskatchewan and Peace rivers and Great Slave lake.

Mr. STAPLES. What is the nature of the work?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Removing boulders, improving rapids, doing bridge work and making general improvements to assist navigation in the interest of the traders and settlers.

Mr. BRADBURY. Do I understand that five-twelfths of these estimates have been arranged for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. Then, of that item in Manitoba amounting to $8,000 you have authority to spend five-twelfths?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. BRADBURY. Is not that sufficient until we come back?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, and I will tell my hon. friend why. The year will not expire until the 31st March next, and while this is supposed to be for the year, this is a class of work that has to be done during the open season. The season closes about the middle of October and therefore the five-twelfths will not enable us to continue the work beyond midsummer.

Mr. BRADBURY. We will be back here on the 18th July, and if the minister will come down with anything that is special I am sure that there will be no objection to giving him whatever he wants if he makes out a good case. But, an arrangement has been entered into between the two leaders.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not asume that to be the case because when we come back on the 18th July we have special business to take up, but if the leader of the opposition will make that statement, or if my hon. friend speaks with the authority of the other side, then it will be different. I was assuming that when we come back we will not get into supply again perhaps until the autumn.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is the minister's own look-out. I think that the position that we now take is absolutely reasonable under the circumstances, and we should not be expected to make pledges from one to the other. An arrangement was made and we propose to abide by it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then I am to understand that in respect of all the items for harbours and rivers in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, the maritime provinces generally, Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and British Columbia, every item is objected to?

Mr. LANCASTER. You have the five-twelfths?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Except what has been allowed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It is not exactly that, Mr. Chairman, if the minister will allow me to correct him. We are perfectly willing to take any one of these items and consider it whenever there is time and if there is time now. But when the minister asks us to take 449 items and pass them without discussion it is rather a remarkable order particularly in view of the understanding we have had. Among the items which he has presented to us as impressed with urgency I find a great many where the whole amount now asked is a revote, the money having been voted last year, and not a dollar expended. You could hardly regard a case of that kind as a very urgent one. I observe a great many items of that kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There are some.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). A great many. For instance:

West Advocate—breakwater, $10,000.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What province is that in?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In Nova Scotia.

Poulamond wharf—renewals and repairs to superstructure, $1,600.

Litchfield—extension of breakwater, $4,000.

Liscomb harbour—wharf, $3,000.
Leonard's cove—breakwater, $1,500.
East Bay—wharf, $4,000.
Creignish—construction of landing pier, $2,500.
Central Economy—to renew stem of wharf, $2,000.

So that the items of urgency do not seem to have been very carefully selected. I told my hon. friend, as he will remember, that I would do what I could to have a limited number of these items, really of a rush character, passed in full, but a wholesale order of 450 items embracing items of the character to which I have just alluded is a very different thing indeed.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, suppose we come down to an item in regard to which that objection would not apply. It is not a revote. I refer to item 158 for dredging, vessel repairs and new plant. Hon. gentlemen know that the dredging season is the summer season, and the officials of my department inform me that five-twelfths will not carry us along until the close of the summer season. I would, therefore, ask that that item be voted in full.

Mr. PERLEY. The whole of it?

Mr. LANCASTER. The hon. gentleman will find that he has more than plenty to pay what will be required to pay before the 18th July.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, the difficulty is that we will have to stop the work before the end of the dredging season. It seems to me that with respect to a great deal of necessary work, I shall have to refuse to give orders to go ahead at all, because the time will come early in the summer when there will be a lot of people clamouring for their pay, and I am not going to be in a position of not being able to pay them. It is very necessary, and the request is not unreasonable.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister is making an effort to get political capital out of this and to try and make the people believe that we are responsible for stopping the work by not voting the money. He has had lots of time to have his estimates passed had he been serious about them. We have been discussing things in this House that were not important at all; we spent two days on a Railway Act which could very well have gone over until after the adjournment, and this morning we were two hours discussing a Grain Act which the government must have known could not possibly have been rushed through the House in the very last hours. We do not object to these votes but we want an opportunity to discuss them and to understand them. The minister brings down here three or four hundred items without drawing a distinction between those which are urgent and those which are not, and he asks us to swallow them without knowing anything about them. Well, we object to that, and we think the people of the country will say we are right in objecting.

Mr. PUGSLEY. For six or seven weeks early in the session my estimates were discussed day after day, and it was only on the special request of some hon. gentlemen opposite that we deferred the discussion on them and took up the estimates of some other departments. I have no intention of making political capital out of this; I may say there are a number of large items on page 56 which I thought were necessary, but the deputy minister and the assistant deputy minister of the department were requested by me to cut down as closely as possible the items asked for, and to report what in their judgment it was absolutely essential in the public interest should be passed. The list of items which I handed the opposition was made out by the officials without any special instructions from me.

Mr. LANCASTER. If there is urgency for these items the departmental officers knew it a month ago, and the minister could have arranged with his colleagues to give the discussion of them precedence, but he failed to do that. There is no urgency about it at all.

Mr. BLAIN. This very item before us amounts to $2,000,000, and in it is included a revote for dredging in Saskatchewan and Alberta which was not expended last year and was not then considered urgent.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for new dredging plant. I put it off until the present year, but the plant is necessary now.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask if this item includes anything for dredging at Port Credit this summer?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot say as to the details of that.

Mr. BLAIN. Does not the minister think it is urgent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not sure whether that is on the program for this season or not, but we did some dredging there last year. We are dredging at Oakville in the adjoining constituency and propose working also at Bronte in Halton county. That work is only going to cost $1,400, but if we get at it right away it will be an enormous advantage to the people of the locality. I will not put people to work and not be able to pay them.

Mr. PERLEY. The minister has shown conclusively that he is not in earnest in asking for these votes. The leader of the opposition has demonstrated that the minister made out a list of items which he knew could not be accepted, including a number of revotes for work that was deferred from last year, and for which there was no urgency then. Had he made out a list of the urgent items he would have found us reasonable in passing them, but he knew we could not accept the list he presented and he simply endeavoured to put up a big bluff. His action is unfair in that respect.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would like to believe that my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) is reasonable, but if he says I am unreasonable I am unable to believe that he is reasonable. When he suggests that I am trying to put him in a hole, I answer that it would be cruelty to assist him in getting deeper in that direction than he already is. My officers inform me that all these items are equally urgent, but I suppose if I only brought down twenty items gentlemen opposite would tell me I should only have selected six. On reflection hon. gentlemen will see that this item of dredging ought to be allowed. Dredging work is to-day as important as any work that can be done for the transportation interests of the country. Steamers are getting larger and in many cases harbours have silted in and in some cases there has been a lowering of water, particularly on the Great Lakes. But what is of the greatest importance is that the steamers are getting larger. There is a great deal of dredging work to be done. The inland waters freeze up in November and unless we can get the work done during the summer, we will be greatly handicapped and the public interest will be greatly prejudiced.

Mr. LANCASTER. As I understand, the work the hon. gentleman has in mind has not been started yet. In that case five-twelfths of the amount will not have been earned by July 15. The hon. gentleman ignores the fact that we are voting five-twelfths without discussion, he is asking for the other seven-twelfths. There is no possibility of excuse for saying that more than five-twelfths will be required before the end of July. The hon. gentleman takes care to give the opposition no credit for having voted the five-twelfths.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I suppose I may take it for granted that hon. gentlemen are not willing to pass these items now, and, therefore, I shall not move further in them.

Mr. MAGRATH. Are the recommendations of his officers as to the urgency of these expenditures made in writing?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Made in writing.

Mr. MAGRATH. Has the hon. gentleman the memorandum?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I shall send to my office for it.

Mr. SPROULE. The history of the hon. gentleman's conduct hardly bears out the statement which he makes to-day. He says these things are urgent. He got that information from the engineers of his department. I take the list handed to us yesterday, and I find Port Arthur $650,000 for dredging, and the minister expects that will all be required before we get back and vote any more. Last year when we voted $600,000 he went on and spent nearly $400,000 more without any vote, and he could do it as well this year as last year.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not a desirable thing to do.

Mr. SPROULE. I admit that, but it shows that the minister is equal to any emergency when he wishes to do a thing that we have not provided for in the regular way. If the dredges were employed every day they could not use up this amount in that time or anything like it. If urgency was the reason why did the minister discredit himself by putting forward an item like that? It tells the whole tale; it is not a desire to get through items where there is absolute urgency, but to get as many items on the programme as possible, and push them through without inquiry or anything else. The minister said some time ago that earlier in the session some members of the opposition desired that he should refrain from bringing forward his items, and should let other departments bring forward theirs. Why did he do it? Because of the crassness of human nature, that he did not seem willing to give any information to us, and only parried the questions put by hon. members on this side of the House. In our judgment he did not desire to give information and, therefore, he was kept longer than he should have been to get his items through. Had he shown the same desire as is manifested by other ministers to give all the information possible, the House would have been more amiably inclined to let items go through, even although they had not the information; but it was because of the evident desire to give no information on any question asked, and of his attitude which seemed to say: Well they have to vote it sooner or later, and I will not give the information, I will jolly them along from week to week. When he would not give the information he was delayed from day to day. He said that some of us objected, and asked to have the estimates of some of the other ministers brought on. That was because of the desire to get some one who would give information, and not

be frittering away the time of the House as the Minister of Public Works was doing in handling his estimates before the House when the opposition knew he was not sincere in his conduct, and was not making a reasonable effort to give the information.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member should not attribute insincerity to another hon. member.

Mr. SPROULE. Well then, I shall say his burning desire, and his great sincerity.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Nobody pays serious attention to my hon. friend.

Mr. SPROULE. The result was the same.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend's memory does not serve him correctly. I was not complaining of any delay in getting my estimates through, I think they went through with very satisfactory progress indeed. I was greatly pleased at the way in which my hon. friends facilitated the progress of my estimates. They asked that I should take a rest from the very great labour which they thought was being imposed on me working day after day and night after night, but I had nothing but feelings of gratification at the manner in which the hon. gentlemen facilitated the passage of the estimates. I have now the memorandum to which I referred, it is as follows:

Office of the Deputy Minister,
Ottawa, May 13, 1911.

Memorandum to the Minister:—

The department is going to be greatly handicapped in its work this year owing to the full amounts of appropriations not being available. As you will realize, it is not possible, under such circumstances, to commence works by day labour. Where work is done that way, the money must be forthcoming to pay wages, and, in addition to that, it would not be good business to employ a foreman and a number of men, buy timber and commence repairing a wharf; get half way through and dismiss the whole lot, and take them on again two or three months later to finish the balance of the work.

As you are aware, one-sixth of the harbour and river appropriations in the main estimates have been voted, and possibly before the House adjourns next week, a further portion of one-third will be voted, making one-half in all; but even so, our position as above outlined would not be much improved. Works could only be begun and left half finished, which would not be either economical or businesslike.

However, as hon. gentlemen take the view that it is not in the public interest that provision should be made for going on with these various works to which I have referred, I shall not press the matter any further

Mr. SPROULE. Hon. gentlemen have not taken that view. Hon. gentlemen believe that the works can be carried on in a business like way and successfully carried on with the amount they are willing to vote in most of these cases. An odd work might be picked out here and there where the circumstances were different, but it was because of the desire of the minister to select a great list of items about many of which there could be no urgency, and which could be proceeded with in the regular way until the House resumes, that we were faced with the dilemma of not knowing what to give or what to withhold. Many of the items mentioned by the leader of the opposition were revotes, some of them have been in for two years in succession, and now it becomes terribly urgent that the money should be voted, although the money has been voted for two or three years without a stroke being done. Yet for three years not a stroke of work has been done. These things indicate to us that the minister can scarcely be sincere in saying there is special urgency.

Mr. BLAIN. Since the minister has said that the opposition assisted him very materially in putting through his estimates in the earlier part of the session, how many estimates were put through in his department? There must be a large number.

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the early part of the session, I think all the public buildings through the Dominion were voted in full with the exception of some armouries.

To complete payment incurred in the North Atlantic coast fisheries arbitration before the Hague Tribunal—Revote, $50,000.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. I want to explain the necessity for this revote. About two months ago an item, of which this is in part a revote, was considered by this committee; and after some discussion, the committee voted $100,000 to complete the disbursements in connection with expenses at the Hague. My hon. friend fram East Hamilton (Mr. Barker) took considerable part in the discussion and will no doubt recollect the circumstances. That item was included in the supplementary estimates for the fiscal year ending 31st March last, and as a result any unexpended portion lapsed on the 30th April. There remain still some accounts to pay, and as these accounts are overdue, and ought to be settled, I have taken the liberty of asking that this amount be voted now in full.

General protection of highways, $135,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is an item for the subways and protection of level crossings on the Intercolonial railway. The urgency of the case is this, traffic must be continued, and we cannot take any chance of getting a subway partly through and then having to leave it incomplete.

Mr. PERLEY. Are these contracts all made?

Mr. GRAHAM. No, a good deal is done by our own men. This will include twelve level crossings.

Mr. LANCASTER. If this is done by permanent employees, we pay them by the month or fortnight, and will not have to pay more than five-twelfths by the time we meet again.

Mr. GRAHAM. We have to engage men in addition to our own. This is required for the protection of the public.

Mr. LANCASTER. In that case I have no objection.

Halifax—docks and wharfs at, $600,000.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is even more urgent. An estimate was made for a dock of a certain size by Mr. Kennedy of Montreal, but a deputation from Halifax, representing the citizens, and the Board of Trade has been here urging strongly that the size of the dock be increased. If we increase the size, the amount voted will not pay more than two-thirds of the cost. We are urged strongly to have the dock ready for next winter, and if we increase the size $200,000 more will be required.

Mr. PERLEY. How much will the dock cost altogether?

Mr. GRAHAM. The estimate was $600,000, but we are asked to increase the size, and that will cost $200,000 more.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). As far as the necessity of increasing the dock service is concerned, there can be no doubt. The traffic at Halifax more than doubled last winter, and there was great delay in the transmission of freight for that reason that the accommodation was entirely inadequate. I saw the delegation which came from Halifax three or four weeks ago, and which met the Prime Minister and the Minister of Railways, and some other members of the cabinet. There is no doubt at all about the necessity of increasing the accommodation, and of doing that as speedily as possible. If the minister says it is necessary to vote this for the purpose of going on speedily with the work, I would not object.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am strongly in hope that this item will go through, but I would like to call attention to the fact that in the presence of the leader of the opposition, the assurance was given that on the 18th of July, when we resume any additional amounts required will be voted. Now, it cannot be assumed for a moment that $600,000 will be expended upon this work before the 18th of July. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, and his friends have refused absolutely to permit items equally necessary with this item to go through. While I am in favour of it I wish to call the attention of this committee to the fact that when it comes to a question of getting an item of $600,000 through for the port of Halifax which my hon. friend (Mr. Borden) represents he is willing to support it, but refuses items for absolutely necessary public works in other sections of the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) had gone after his items in the same way as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) went after his, I think he would have had exactly the same difficulty. The Minister of Railways selected a few items which he declared to this committee are urgent, and he explained what the urgency is. So far as this item is concerned, if the minister says it is urgent, I am willing that it should go through. But, of course, the minister must pay some attention to the objection raised by his hon. colleague. He will have to take that into consideration. I leave it entirely to him. I have explained that, upon his explanation of urgency, I am willing that this should be done, but at the same time I think that proper consideration should be given to the protest of his colleague.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend, perhaps, did not hear me—perhaps he was quite willing not to hear me at the moment—when I expressed the hope that this item would go through, but I called attention to the inconsistent course of my hon. friend when it came to dealing with other public works in other parts of the country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I told the Minister of Public Works here, and elsewhere; select the items you regard as of the greatest urgency, and we will endeavour to have them go through.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, and the minister brought in 447 items.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But in the aggregate, outside of dredging, not one-third of this item.

Mr. LANCASTER. There is no inconsistency. The Minister of Railways says that this is an urgent matter, and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) for whom we on this side—without casting any reflections—have more respect than we have for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) happens to agree with the Minister of Railways. Knowing what he knows about Halifax, when the Minister of Railways in his tactful way presents his case, the leader of the opposition agrees with him. Having the unanimous opinion on both sides, we pass the item.

The Minister of Public Works is hopelessly alone in his opinion.

Mr. GRAHAM. The next is:

Welland ship canal—To complete survey, $50,000.

I had been in hopes of laying the report on the table this session giving some definite information as to the Welland canal route. I now hope to be able to lay it on the table when the House meets again in July. Two or three routes have been surveyed, but none satisfactory. The surveyors are now investigating another. I have urged them to use all diligence, and make as great progress as possible. When the House meets I hope to be able to report a recommendation by the engineer of the proper route to take.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not see why there is any urgency in this item. The country has a map of that section to scale of six foot intervals made by the Militia Department. An engineer knows that with a map of that kind he can pretty near pick out a route even sitting in an office. This whole thing is a big bluff hung up on the people of the Welland district to make them believe that there is going to be a new canal. If the government is going to force its new policy of trade relations with the United States through parliament, a Welland canal will be only a detriment to us, because it will mean that we will be maintaining a great public work mainly for the use of foreign ships. The time when this House will reassemble will give ample opportunity to vote any further supplies for this purpose the minister may need. It seems to me that the sum is exceedingly large for the survey of that country. The whole distance between the two lakes is only a two-hour run in an automobile; a man on a bicycle can cover it in about two hours and a half. I suppose with a vote like this every good Liberal in that district will expect to be on the staff of that survey. That is the only reason of urgency that I can see in this expenditure. The item should stand over.

Mr. GRAHAM. This is not a question of the survey of the surface. Borings have been made on several routes and must be made on another. It is too late to abandon the policy of at least completing the survey, for the men in the field are working as hard as they can, and I have been urging them to come to a definite conclusion as to the route.

Mr. LANCASTER. They have been making these surveys all winter, have they not?

Mr. GRAHAM. More or less—yes; I think so. I have been much disappointed that the practical difficulties in the way have prevented the making of a report. I am not going to urge it, but I think that in the interest of the country and for the satisfaction of everybody, it would be a good thing to complete these surveys as soon as possible. I have not been extravagant in asking heavy items, but this, I think, is urgent.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I do not think the House is pining for information on this question. As a matter of fact there are two or three factions in the House, and the country fighting over these canals and, as one who stands aside from them all, my opinion is that it will take five or ten years to decide whether they are going to build the Nipissing and Georgian Bay canal, rebuild the old Welland, or build a new Welland. The idea of this expenditure, I suppose, is to dig post holes all over the escarpment, and you may be sure that in every post hole there will be an Italian, and a good Liberal at $4 or $5 a day bossing him. Every loose fish in that district that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) has not already engaged as a special officer will be attached to this survey, judging from the large sum asked for. The work is not urgent; no lives will be lost if it is not finished. Even if we had the information before the House, it would take five or six months to consider it, and the loss of a month and a half—even if it were to take place—would not matter very much.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). I do not see much use in spending this money on investigation. We all know that over a million dollars has been spent in investigating the feasibility of the Georgian Bay canal, and it has been demonstrated conclusively not only that it is feasible, but that it is one of the best undertakings the country could possibly go into. That being the case, I do not see the use of spending money looking for another route for the Welland canal.

Mr. GRAHAM. The House has voted money to complete the surveys of the Georgian Bay route, and all I ask is the same policy in this other case—money to complete the surveys. We have spent over a million dollars in investigating the Georgian Bay canal route.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). But having done that, no commencement has been made to the canal. If you go on and spend hundreds of thousands of dollars in this kind of way, what is the good of it?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think that item should stand. When this government cannot make up its mind for political reasons what line of action to take in an important matter, and starts spending money

on investigations, by the time they have investigated the question they will have spent enough money to build the whole work. I think the government should decide what they are going to do and then spend money on it. But spending money on it beforehand is something that is going to be of no use. If the government wishes to go on with this canal, there is no reason why the money already voted will not carry them over six weeks. I do not see any urgency in the matter at all.

Mr. LANCASTER. I do not think this vote should be objected to under the circumstances. The fact that a large amount has been spent in investigations into the feasibility of the Georgian Bay canal is surely no reason why this reasonable amount should not be spent in connection with the enlargement of the Welland canal, which is such an essential link in our system of transportation.

For the decoration of public buildings throughout Canada in connection with the celebration of the coronation of His Majesty the King, $25,000.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Carried.

Mr. PERLEY. What is the plan for expending this money?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have conferred with the officials in my department, and it is thought that $25,000 will be sufficient to do a reasonable amount of decorating of public buildings throughout the country. There seems to be, as we have learned from communications sent to us, a desire in many sections of the country to celebrate the coronation of his Majesty. I have made inquiry, and find that this was not done when his late Majesty was crowned; there was no decoration of public buildings throughout the country. But I have had applications from different places, and I am sure that the people generally expect that we will take some part in the celebration in the way proposed.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Will each small town that has a public building get a portion of this money for the purposes of decoration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that any town which proposes to celebrate the coronation, and to go to some expense, will receive a part of it. We will devote a sum proportionate to the population to the different towns to assist in the celebration.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). There are three small towns in my locality that have public buildings, and I think they ought to have their share of the money, so that they may make a decent showing on that occasion, if we are to spend any money for that purpose. I do not know whether it is wise for the government to spend it, or whether it should not be the municipality. But if it is the opinion of the House that we ought to spend money in that way, I think there ought to be a sufficient allowance so that every town with public buildings might have a chance to get a portion of it for the purpose of decorating such buildings.

Mr. HENDERSON. I understand the Minister of Public Works to say that this vote is for the purpose of decorating public buildings. Now how are the people in a county that has no government public building going to show their loyalty? Are they to be put in the background?

Mr. EMMERSON. We will have to pay for it ourselves.

Mr. FIELDING. It has been understood that, as respects all the items which have not been voted in full, there shall be voted a sum which, with what already has been voted, will make five-twelfths of the whole. That is a matter involving calculations that have to be made by the clerks, who cannot complete their work until we ascertain what progress we would make this afternoon in passing the items in full. Now that that is understood, the clerks will be able to advance their work, and at the evening sitting I hope we will have the matter in complete form. I, therefore, move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again this day.

Some resolutions reported.

SUPPLY—CONCURRENCE.

House proceeded to consider resolutions reported from Committee of Supply.

Resolutions reported, and agreed to.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House again went into Committee of Supply.

Mr. FIELDING. The officials of the House have made more rapid progress than I had anticipated, and they have placed in my hands the schedules of the proportion of the votes which has been agreed to. They are very numerous, and I will ask the House to assume that the calculations are properly made by the officials.

Mr. MILLER. Is there any possibility of making such an arrangement as will enable us to meet on the 1st of August rather than on the 18th of July?

Mr. FIELDING. I think that it is rather too late now. That would necessarily involve a further vote in Supply, and I am afraid it is too late to arrange that now.

Mr. MILLER. I thought that probably it could have been arranged at this time.

Mr. FIELDING. I think perhaps, Mr. Chairman, you will not be expected to read all these items.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understand they cover the items of which a proportion is taken?

Mr. LANCASTER. Are they separate?

Mr. FIELDING. Each item is set forth for its exact proportion. It will be subject to a slight revision in consequence of the changes made within the last few minutes, but subject to that it is the exact sum which we vote.

Mr. BLAIN. Does the minister know how much was voted in full.

Mr. FIELDING. I cannot tell at this moment.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall ask the House to wait until the evening sitting for the Bill founded on this resolution.

Progress reported.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. LEMIEUX moved the second reading of Bill (No. 216) to amend the Post Office Act.

Mr. MONK. I think it is important to give an instruction to the committee, and I would move to add to this motion:

And that it be an instruction from this House to the said committee to so apportion the increases provided in section 1 of the Bill as to ensure, in the reclassification of employees referred to in said section, a salary calculated upon the duration of the services of said employees, so that officers of long and meritorious time of service should not be placed upon the same footing as officers but lately appointed.

I intended explaining this, but I shall not take the time of the committee.

Mr. LEMIEUX. This principle is followed throughout this and the other Bills, so that the motion need not be pressed forward. This principle is adopted in the department, and my hon. friend will see in considering the various sections of the Bill that it is being followed.

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend states that the principle contended for in this motion is followed, and will be followed——

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. MONK—I would withdraw the motion, but I would like it to go on record with the statement of my hon. friend.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It will be in 'Hansard'.

Mr. SPEAKER. It has been read by an hon. member, I suppose it is on 'Hansard'.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on the Bill.

Mr. MILLER.

On section 1,

Mr. LEMIEUX. The explanations that I gave in moving the resolution the other day are complete as regards the classification, the changes, and the increase. There are many minor details which add to the length of the Bill, but I shall ask the House to take for granted the explanations I gave the other day as to its general scope.

Mr. MONK. There is no doubt that the post office employees in our larger cities are suffering from a very considerable grievance on account of the difference between their salaries and the salaries of other civil servants, therefore it seems to me that the principle of this Bill cannot be opposed. At the same time we have not carried the Civil Service reform through all the branches of the service as we should have done. When we found that the excellent reform introduced by this government for the inside service worked satisfactorily, we should, without any unnecessary delay, have carried those reforms to the outside service. We did not do so because there is no doubt the government in reforming the inside service cut off from members of this House a patronage with which they were not willing to part, and we have continued for the outside service a system which is universally condemned. This has caused many inconveniences and disadvantages to the public at large, and to the Civil Service itself because the inequalities that existed for years in the outside service have been maintained, and we have found in the outside service new employees gaining government patronage and enjoying large salaries when really old and meritorious employees were less generously treated than these newcomers. That system will continue as long as we do not carry the reform from the inside to the outside service. The Postmaster General some time ago increased the salaries of the letter carriers. Their salaries were increased 40 per cent, and they undoubtedly deserved that increase. I believe that the letter carriers in the larger cities, like Montreal and Toronto, are to-day not sufficiently paid when you consider the work they have to do, the trust that is imposed in them and the expenses which have so greatly increased in our large cities. They have had an increase of 40 per cent, and yet men working alongside of them in the post offices have received no increase. The customs employees were increased some time ago 33⅓ per cent. There is no reason why they should be increase and the post office employees should not be increased. What is the increase which my hon. friend provides for in this Bill? It is an increase of $50 a year except in the case of employees who belong to a class who receive on ap-

pointment $500. Take the case of a man in a large city who has been in the employ of the country for 20, 25, or 30 years, and who receives $1,000. He belongs to a class where the increase will be only $50 a year until he receives $1,200 which will be in four years, an increase of $4 a month. It does not seem to me that that is a fair increase. I have in mind the case of a man who has been 38 years in the public service, and who has belonged to the second class since 1887. He will receive an increase of $50 a year during the next four years in order to reach the maximum of his class. Another one whose case was brought to my attention in Montreal receives $1,000 after 26 years' service. These two men have been in positions of great trust, and have always given perfect satisfaction. Their salaries are, by common admission absolutely inadequate, yet they are to get an increase of $200 extending over four years or $4 a month. That is not a fair increase, it is not at all on the same footing as the increases in other branches of the service unless, as my hon. friend has stated, I do not understand the Act, and that it is intended to take these old employees from the class in which they are and put them in another class, say above the $1,200 maximum, where they will go from $1,200 to $1,600. Even in that case it does not seem to me that the increase given to those men is sufficient unless they skip a class and are put in a class quite above that in which they have been for so many years. These old employees find themselves working alongside men who have been appointed within the last two or three or five years, who receive the same salary, or very nearly the same salary, and some, I believe I can say truthfully, even more. This is not the proper way to ensure a good Civil Service in these large post offices where the bulk of the work devolves upon these very old and experienced employees who really conduct the business of the office. With regard to post office employees in Montreal generally, they do their work excellently, the cases of dereliction of duty and breaches of trust particularly are extremely rare, when you consider the large responsibilities upon the employees.

I have no hesitation in saying that if in the city of Montreal, the system which has worked so well in the interior were transferred to the outside, at any rate in the Postal department, we would have a much larger revenue. In London, if you drop a letter into a box at a certain hour, you are sure that at a given hour it will be delivered into any other part of the city, but you cannot depend on anything of the kind in Montreal. This session, letters I have sent from Ottawa to Montreal have been detained 24 hours. I do not blame the officials because they are heavily worked and not neglectful but the system is bad. In Montreal we cannot rely on letters being promptly delivered there as they are elsewhere. Consequently when you want a letter delivered at a certain hour, you have to use other means than the postal service. Unless my hon. friend will do justice to these older employees by taking them out of their present position and putting them in a superior class, the advantages to them from this Bill will be very small. A man at $1,000 a year, who has given a quarter of a century to the service of his country, will stand to get an increase to $1,200 in four years. Of course it will be open to my hon. friend to change his class, but the time has arrived to carry the reform from the interior to the outside service. The only obstacle in the way is the desire to give a sop of patronage to members of parliament. In the United States they have carried civil service reform very much further than we have. They began with the customs in New York, where the spoils system had produced the worst results. That system is entirely done away with, and the postal service has been considerably improved also. I would invite my hon. friend to carry civil service reform into the postal department throughout the outside service, and in this way considerably increase our postal revenue.

Mr. RUSSELL. The other night when we discussed the resolution, the minister gave us to understand that the men in the service were perfectly satisfied with the increases. But since the wording of the Bill has been made known, I have received several letters and telegrams from men in the service, indicating that they are anything but satisfied. Here is one telegram which I received:

Bill much less favourable than appears. Clerks greatly disappointed.

I had another letter from a clerk who pointed out to me that in a good many cases a large percentage were receiving practically no benefit from the increase. There is no doubt that the object of these resolutions was to increase the salaries of different clerks in the post office and railway mail service; but in the way these increases are proposed, in some cases the clerks have to work five or six years before they begin to derive any benefit. Take a clerk who is now at $900, he will have to work ten years before he gets to the top of this increase or six years until he gets to the present maximum of $1,200. Then he begins to derive some benefit from what we are given to believe is an increase at present. It is not much of an increase the clerks are getting now. They are al-

ready getting $50 increase in their salary per year, and have to go on working six years before they participate in the increases given under the new Bill. After thinking this matter over, perhaps the Postmaster General will consider favourably some of these things, and make the increase from $800 instead of from $1,000. That would be some sort of an important increase. It would be something in the way of an immediate increase to the men. There is no doubt that they have the same reason to expect an increase that the men of the inside service have. I do not see why there should not be an increase to the outside service as well as to the inside service who happen to be under the Civil Service Act. All are public servants of the Dominion, and all give good returns for the salaries they receive. We should do justice to all public servants. But I suppose I need not deal at greater length with this question. The Postmaster General understands what we need. We desire some real benefit to the employees, and I think that what I have asked is not in any way unreasonable.

Mr. MONK. I desire to move, in conformity with what I stated a few moments ago, to add to the section the following proviso:

Provided that a new classification of all employees referred to in the foregoing section, whose term of employment in the public service exceed ten years, be effected upon the coming into force of the present Act, so as to ensure to said employees a salary proportioned to the duration of their services as compared with the salaries of officers more recently appointed.

I suppose the minister will have no objection to this. He says this is the principle that will guide him in the application of the law.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not think that, at the present stage, I could take it upon myself to accept the amendment. I told my hon. friend (Mr. Monk), that the Bill as framed is exactly on the classification adopted for the inside service, and no added words of mine, or of my hon. friend could perfect it so far as that is concerned. He stated a moment ago that we should carry out as soon as possible the principle that the employees in the outside service in the larger cities should come under the Civil Service Act. If my hon. friend had been here the other day, and had listened to the long discussion which took place on the Bill he would have learned that that is my policy. We take the first step this year in classifying the clerks and employees in the post offices of the Dominion as they are classified in the Post Office Department. The next step, and one that I intend to take, but to which parliament as a whole perhaps, is not yet committed, is the bringing of the outside officers under the operation of the Civil Service Act. That pledge I have given to the House, and I intend to carry it through. The Bill has been framed very carefully by the officers of the department, and I could not alter the wording of it. All I can say is that the older employees in the service will benefit by the Bill. I am told by my hon. friend from East Toronto (Mr. Russell), that the increase is very small. I heard the speech of my hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), the other night about the bank clerks; and that, and other things lead me to believe that the salaries in the post office will compare with the salaries in our financial institutions, and in other employments. The young man is appointed at $500 and gets a raise of $100 if he behaves well. He goes up to $800, to $1,000, to $1,200, to $1,600, and if he is a clever man, and knows how to make his way, if he shows some intelligence and some diligence in his readings he will soon be one of the best employees in the service. Examinations—we call them case examinations—are required every six months. This, as I said, is the first step. According to the arrangement, not by the whim or caprice of the minister, but by the reorganization of the post office system, there will be regular case examinations, and the best men in the service can have a chance to assert themselves, and to get increases. Again I say, that as a whole the increases are quite substantial, and will offer an opportunity to every diligent officer in the department. My hon. friend from East Toronto says he has heard many complaints about the increases. Well, my experience is that no man in the service is pleased when he gets $200 of an increase if he expected to get $250 or $300. But there must be a limit, and that limit is a question of policy. The government as a whole say that those employees can be increased to a certain limit, and not beyond. This is a charge upon the public revenues. I told the hon. gentleman the other day that the total increase of the employees of the post office would amount this year to over $51,000. Three years ago, we increased the letter carriers, which meant another charge on the public revenues, I made that increase cheerfully, and I think that the letter carriers as a body are satisfied. Their salaries will reach $2.75 a day. Of course, there are a few agitators who can never be satisfied, who think they are entitled to salaries equal to the indemnity of a member of parliament, or the salary of a minister of the Crown. We cannot satisfy these agitators. The less work they do the more highly they think they are entitled to be paid. But, as I have said, the great majority of these men are satisfied. Of course, if they are encouraged by gentlemen who pat them on the shoulder and

say: Why do you not have some more? You are getting $2.75, but you ought to get $3. Demand it; the minister will give it to you. If they are talked to in that way dissatisfaction may increase. Of course, I am only administering a trust for the people of Canada, but I think from the expressions of opinion I have heard, the people are satisfied. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule), spoke of young men in banks twenty and twenty-five years of age receiving $400 a year.

Why, Sir, in the Post Office Department they receive $500 on appointment, and an annual increase of $100 until they reach the maximum of their class. Then if they are diligent, if they are intelligent, if they show some ability, they are taken into a higher class. But the man who simply performs his work in an easy way, who is always looking at the clock to leave the office, that man will not get beyond the maximum of his class. Now as regards the pull, or such influences as are mentioned by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), let me tell him this: During the last five years that I have been Postmaster General I have made very few appointments to positions carrying large salaries. I have in mind two or three officers who have been appointed to the higher positions. Let me mention the post office inspector at Ottawa, Mr. Bolduc, a brother of Senator Bolduc, belonging to a Conservative family, and a Conservative himself. He had served for twenty years in the Quebec district. I did not consider his political leanings, I only knew that he was the best man in the service in the province of Quebec, and I gave him that lift. I have in mind also another post office inspector whom I appointed the other day in Quebec to succeed Mr. Caouette. He had served the public for many years in the post office, and I was reminded by some of my friends that I should have taken a Liberal. But that gentleman is a man of ability, he has had a large experience, and that is the keystone of the whole service. Then I selected Mr. Green, of Quebec, a gentleman whose politics I do not know, but everybody admits that he was by far the best man, and I believe he was also an Irishman. In the higher positions of the service, the best men always reach the top.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to ask the minister a question. Under present conditions and regulations, is the department getting satisfactory men in the railway mail service? Have they any difficulty in maintaining the service with satisfactory men?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The only difficulty I find in getting men for the railway mail service is to find those who are able to pass the qualifying examinations. Otherwise, we get hundreds of men who are ready to serve as railway mail clerks, but they are not able to pass the qualifying examination. We are obliged to take them on as labourers, in twenty-five cases out of forty, and give them a chance to learn their runs, and after a while they are able to pass the examination. But it is when the time comes to appoint railway mail clerks who can pass an examination without coming into the service first as labourers that we find difficulty. Later on they pass the examination and are appointed regularly. My hon. friend may be sure that we have hundreds and thousands of applications for the position, and the minister and the members are pestered through the applications we receive.

Mr. RUSSELL. Is there any way in which you make the position attractive enough to get men who could qualify? When you get men who are able to qualify at the start, would you necessarily send for them from among the labourers you take in and train?

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is not a question of whether the position is attractive or not. The question is whether the man is able to fulfil the duties imposed on him by the Post Office Act. That is where we find the difficulty. All young men would like to get attractive positions; they think a position in the Post Office Department is an attractive one, where they receive good salaries, and have not much to do. We do not want that class of men. We want men who are qualified, who are industrious, and who do not spend their time in agitating for increased salaries.

Mr. COWAN. When the Postmaster General institutes a comparison between a post office employee and a bank employee he cannot afford to forget the fact that a bank offers rewards for merit, and a preferment which the Post Office Department does not offer.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A man can get to the top in the Post Office Department if he possesses the necessary energy and industry. The best men in the service are those who fought their way up from the bottom, who showed pluck and industry.

Mr. COWAN. I quite agree. But I say that even if a post office employee does reach the top, the reward he gets on reaching the top is nothing in comparison with the reward a bank employee receives who reaches the top in his calling.

Mr. LEMIEUX. What is the reward of the bank employee? The hon. member for Grey (Mr. Sproule) told us the other night.

Mr. COWAN. My hon. friend from Grey was referring to the ordinary employee of a bank. But human nature is so constituted that a man is willing to take a very small salary for his labour if the goal of his ambition offers a very high one, and if the reward when he reaches that goal is a great one. I want to point out to the minister that he cannot afford to overlook that fact, and that since he is not offering that great reward to the man who attains the goal of his ambition in the Post Office Department, it is the duty of a minister, and of the country to pay liberally the men for the work they perform in the service.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

REVILLON FRERES TRADING COMPANY, LIMITED.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 158) to incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited—Mr. Devlin.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin), had this Bill in charge, but he is not here. All the clauses were passed in committee with the exception of No. 10. That was laid over because of some technical changes made in section 10, by the law clerk, not altering in the least the sense or legal effect of the Bill. Since then clause 10 has been again submitted to the law clerk, a new clause has been agreed upon, and as I was a member of the committee to which, in a sense, the Bill was referred, I was about to propose a new clause 10. Perhaps as the hon. member for Wright is now in his place he will do it.

Mr. DEVLIN. No, I would rather that the hon. gentleman should propose it.

Mr. BARKER. I would, therefore, move that section 10, as it appears in the Bill, be struck out, and that the following be inserted in lieu thereof:

10. At least two directors shall be residents of Canada and subjects of His Majesty.

As to this clause I may say that the real proprietorship of Revillon Brothers is in old France, they are a very wealthy concern, they established a large business in Canada, and they are constituting a company to manage the Canadian business. The present Bill appoints five directors, and it was considered advisable that at least two directors should be residents of Canada and British subjects. That is acceptable on all sides.

2. Non-resident directors may vote by proxy at any meeting of directors, and such proxy shall be held by a director only, but no meeting shall be competent to transact business unless at least two directors are present in person.

That was discussed fully in committee, and I am aware that its terms are strictly in accordance with what the committee desired to include in the Bill.

3. No such proxy shall be valid unless it has been made or renewed in writing within one year next preceding the time of such meeting.

That clause was not fully discussed in the committee, but it has been added in accordance with the general laws about proxies as to insurance, and all other such companies so as to prevent old proxies being held by parties, and used when perhaps all knowledge of them has expired. That simply requires that every proxy to be used shall be renewed within a year.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 202) to incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company, Mr. Martin (Regina).

SECOND READING.

Bill (No. 218) for the relief of George Mackay Sutherland.—Mr. Tolmie.

POST OFFICE ACT AMENDMENT.

House again in committee on Bill (No. 216) to amend the Post Office Act, Mr. Lemieux.

Mr. COWAN. At six o'clock I was drawing the attention of the House to what seems to me to be the fact, that the analogy drawn by the Postmaster General between the position of a post office employee and a bank clerk is a fallacious one. In the case of the post office employee at the end of a long and faithful service, there are awaiting him none of those big rewards that human nature craves, no money rewards in the sense of princely incomes, nor social distinctions such as the minister himself may attain unto in the shape of knighthood. And so to compensate for this lack of big rewards, the income from day to day should be sufficient to furnish an incentive to the employee to do his best, and at the same time to induce a better class of employees into the service. The analogy is not a fair one. Many of the post office employees are just as well equipped as bank clerks. There are no Sir Edward Cloustons and no Sir Edward Walkers amongst them, but compensation should be made them in some form. Perhaps the minister can tell us

how many 'mute inglorious Miltons are wasting their sweetness on the desert air' in his department. I draw the attention of the minister to another fact. I submitted to the House two years ago carefully collated figures which went to show that at that time the cost of living on the Pacific coast was about forty-six per cent greater than in the East. What provision is the minister making to meet this greater cost of living of his employees in the west?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I made a statement as to that the other day showing that an extra allowance was made to officials living west of Port Arthur. The leader of the House reminds me that time is precious, and that if there is to be discussion we must postpone the consideration of this Bill until after the adjournment. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. MONK. Is it the intention not to pass the Bill now?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The Supply Bill will come in a few minutes, and adjournment will take place this evening. This measure has been already thoroughly discussed, and while I like discussion, yet the adjournment cannot be delayed, as the Deputy Governor will arrive shortly.

Mr. MONK. There will be no delay so far as we are concerned. The Postmaster General took up most of the time to-day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. In answering questions.

Mr. MONK. It will only take a few minutes to put it through.

Mr. FIELDING. All right, put it through.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier announced that he had an amendment.

Mr. MONK. If the Postmaster General will carry out the idea suggested by that amendment, as I understood him to say he would, I will draw it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. MONK. I would not like the Postmaster General to be under the impression that the old employees of the post office have done any grumbling. It surely is legitimate for those officials who have given twenty years faithful service to the country to see that their rights are safeguarded.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is the object of the Bill; we both are agreed on that.

Mr. MONK. I would remark that I have done less talking than the Postmaster General. I notice that my hon. friend is developing a tendency of one of his eminent colleagues to absorb all the time of the House on his own measures.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Name.

Mr. MONK. I will not mention his name; one saturn devouring his own children is enough.

Mr. BLAIN. I have considerable correspondence, which if time permitted, I would read, but I shall only read one paragraph in one letter, which says——

I am now drawing $1,040 and have been over nineteen years in the service, so that it will be three years yet before I reach the present maximum of $1,200, and seven years before I reach the $1,400, or twenty-six years to get to the maximum salary.

I am not going to make any comments, but I hope the minister will give this some further consideration.

Mr. BRADBURY. I have a telegram from Winnipeg regarding this matter:

Re Postmaster General's statement as reported in to-day's Winnipeg 'Telegram' that an allowance is paid western postal servants of $180 to $280 per year to meet extra cost of living in the west, we beg to draw your attention to the fact that the allowance paid at Winnipeg is from $200 to $180 according to salaries. $800 and under only receive a maximum allowance of $180. An allowance under $180 per year is entirely inadequate to meet the ever increasing cost of living in the west. Press for the maximum allowance of $180 on all salaries.

I do not know what that means, but I infer from it that they do not always get the $180 allowance, and I understood from the Postmaster General that they do.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BARKER. I have frequently had occasion in my constituency to look into complaints of officials in the hon. gentleman's department. I have not taken their statements, but have obtained information over a period of years, and I do not hesitate to say that there have been many cases of very gross injustice to deserving employees. I do not propose to go into any details, but ask the House to accept my word. I have not encouraged such complaints, but rather discouraged them, but my opinion is that if the Postmaster General, or his very able deputy minister will frequently look into the operation of the changes in the staff, and take some responsibility upon themselves for what is done in their names, a great deal of injustice will be prevented, and the staff generally will be better satisfied.

On section 9,

Mr. SPROULE. Does that mean that they must pass an examination yearly?

Mr. LEMIEUX. There is a qualifying examination, and besides they must pass a

case examination. That applies to those who come up to reach their maximum.

Mr. SPROULE. Suppose a man has been 15 years in the service, surely he could not inprove in his work after that.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I have a communication from the western railway mail clerks, dated May 13, 1911, in which they point out that this Bill is not fair to them in several respects. No doubt the minister has received a similar communication.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why does he not relieve the injustice?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Post office officials are only human and poor humanity has always a grievance. Formerly they were appointed at $500 and received an annual increase of $50 until they reached $700. Now they are appointed at $500, and they reach $800 by annual increases of $100. Then instead of getting a maximum of $1,200, they get $1,400.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Here is what they say:

If you take the case of a man drawing $1,200, he is now drawing $1,200 and under the present schedule he also receives a living allowance of $120 or 10 per cent on his salary. Under the proposed schedule he advances to $1,250 by annual increases of $50 and loses his allowance of $120, making a reduction of $70 the first year and $20 the second year.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The writer of that letter is under a misapprehension. I have received lots of such letters. They receive 10 per cent as a special allowance when they reach $1,200.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then he is not accurate in supposing his salary will be reduced.

Mr. LEMIEUX. No.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Will it be actually increased?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then they speak of their expectation of a flat increase of $150 and yearly increases of $60. They think this would be only reasonable under the conditions of the services, particularly in view of the high cost of living.

Mr. LEMIEUX. When they are placed in the inside service I will seriously consider a flat increase such as the inside service received.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is the objection to putting them in the inside service receives.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no objection myself, but it takes time to commit parliament to it. This classification is based on the inside service. I hope, within a year or two to bring them into the inside service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I hope so,—perfectly willing to take time, but not willing to take to eternity.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL JULY 18.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That when this House adjourns this day it stand adjourned until Tuesday, July 18, 1911.

Motion agreed to.

INTERIM SUPPLY BILL.

House again in Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1912, the sum of $353,000 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1912, the sum of $26,642,222.07 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved:

That towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending the 31st March, 1912, the sum of $7,934,806.56 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Motion agreed to.

Resolutions reported, read the second time and agreed to.

Mr. FIELDING moved for leave to introduce Bill (No. 225) for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending respectively 31st March 1911, and 31st March 1912.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first and second time, considered in committee and reported without amendment.

Mr. FIELDING moved the third reading of the Bill.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If it is possible to keep any check upon the accuracy

of the figures, I take it for granted, as is always the case in such matters, that the computation has been accurately made, and in accordance with the resolutions which have been passed.

Mr. FIELDING. I have no doubt that it is correct. The officials are very careful.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the third time and passed.

INTERCOLONIAL—BRANCH LINES.

Mr. GRAHAM moved that the House go into Committee of the Whole to consider the following resolutions:

Whereas, by chapter 25, of the Statutes of 1910, it was provided that the Minister of Railways and Canals might, subject to the terms and conditions therein contained, lease lines of railway connecting with the government railways and operate them as a part of the government railways, but no leases have been made under the said Act: And, whereas, it is deemed advisable to make the provisions hereinafter contained for the leasing of the undermentioned line of railway. Therefore, it is resolved that it is expedient that the Minister of Railways and Canals be authorized, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to lease for a term not exceeding 99 years the following line of railway, namely:—The Bale railway, property of the Acadia Coal Company, Limited, extending from New Glasgow to Thorburn, in the province of Nova Scotia, a distance of about six miles, upon terms and conditions to be approved of by the Government Railways Managing Board; provided, however, that the consideration by way of rental for such line of railway shall be an annual rental of one dollar and the carriage of the traffic of the company, its successors and assigns, upon the line of railway to be leased and upon the government railways, and between points to be designated and at rates not in excess of maximum fixed rates for such carriage between such points, such fixed rates to be subject to a provision for revision of such rates at the end of each period of 10 years during the continuance of the lease.

Such railway so leased shall become and be operated as a part of the government railways.

He said: Of course I do not hope to get these resolutions through to-night; but as we have a few moments to wait, I think it would be the part of wisdom for me to say a few words about these branch lines, so that hon. gentlemen can find them on 'Hansard,' and have an opportunity of thinking the subject over during the recess, and be able more intelligently to take it up again when the House reassembles. The great majority of the lines that might be available under lease to the Intercolonial are placed under two resolutions. The first one referred to as the Vale railway, is a short road a little over five miles long, running out of New Glasgow, and owned by the Acadia Coal Company. It really does its own traffic, and it is very desirable from the standpoint of the Intercolonial that, if reasonable arrangements can be made, that road should come under government control, and be leased as part of the government railways. The Acadia Coal Company owns the railway, and owns the coal mines, and really does its own business, and little else. Just beyond the property of the Acadia coal mines there are other coal areas that might, so it has been represented to me, be well developed. But as one coal mine or coal company owns the railway, it does not at all encourage the development of the other coal areas by assisting them to carry their traffic. It has been represented to the department, and to the board of management that this road could be secured, not by the payment of any cash, but merely by an arrangement with them for a term of years as to the freight rates on their coal. Of course the Intercolonial would get all the traffic, as it does now, but it would be in the interest of the railway as well, to acquire that line. The reason it is put in a separate resolution is, as I have said, that it can be acquired without the usual terms of lease, by an arrangement as to freight rates, and without the payment of any cash.

The other lines can hardly be said to be paying in themselves, apart from the government railway system, if we take them as single entities. The majority of them have a surplus of receipts over expenses now, but if we were to lease them, and pay interest on a certain amount, probably there would not be any surplus, probably there would be a deficit, treating them as mere entities, each line by itself. But this much must be borne in mind, I say it on behalf of the state owned railway, that it will not be long until other railway lines must have certain rights over the Intercolonial, or they will have to build a line from St. John to Halifax themselves. The Grand Trunk Pacific has running rights, under its contract, over the Intercolonial from Moncton to St. John, and from St. John to Halifax. Merely looking at these lines as entities in themselves, as not paying much, or not paying at all, should some other line secure any of these branches that now feed the Intercolonial, it would be a very serious thing for the state owned railway. That is one side of it. The other side is the interest of the people. Now, leaving out of the question what detriment it would be to the state owned railway, and the decrease in the value of our property if these branch lines with their traffic were to be diverted to some other private owned road, there is another aspect. Some of these roads governments have aided, and their operation is unsatisfactory. I will give an extreme case, the Salisbury and

Albert road has ceased operation over a certain portion of it, the department has been advised. The people who for years have had railway facilities given them by this line, are at the present moment without any railway facilities. The government of Canada has aided that line, although it has I think a provincial charter. I presume the provincial government has also aided it, and the county itself gave aid. But notwithstanding all that, the people along that line of railway are now deprived of all railway facilities. I am bold enough to take the ground that it is the duty of some government to afford facilities to those people that formerly had them, even if it should cost some money. That is one class of line. The other class will come into the category I mentioned a few moments ago. It will be an immense detriment to the Intercolonial if they pass into other hands. I am not going into details at all, but I want the members of this House during recess to think over the situation of those lines, and ask themselves whether it is not advisable to give the Department of Railways power, under the terms outlined in the resolutions, which are very much restricted, to secure these lines, or a portion of them at least, for the reasons I have stated. On the other hand, where people are likely to be deprived, and have been deprived in some instances, of the railway transportation they have enjoyed for years, is it not our duty to do something in that respect? I submit the resolutions for the consideration of the House during the recess, so that when they come back they will be able, I hope, to support the measure.

Mr. DANIEL. I would like to ask the minister what position those lines will be in whose bonds are guaranteed by the provincial government, and I think where the provincial government holds a mortgage on the railway? What position would that railway hold after it was leased by this government?

Mr. GRAHAM. That is a question to be investigated by a judge of the Exchequer Court. My hon. friend will see in this resolution that the present condition of a line of that kind, its indebtedness, where it is, and what the remuneration ought to be, will be investigated by a judge of the Exchequer Court. It strikes me that in a case of that kind probably some arrangement might be made, but at least on most of the lines I imagine interest is not being paid to any one on the bonds.

Mr. DANIEL. What is the meaning of the words 'present owners' in one sentence, and then in the next sentence, 'owners thereof as of date of April 1, 1911.' Do they refer to the same persons? Do 'present owners' mean owners of date of April 1, 1911?

Mr. GRAHAM. As I understand it, when this Bill was introduced, if a date had not been fixed it might be possible to have the ownership revert to the original owners in order to have the conditions of taking over bettered.

Mr. DANIEL. Is that the explanation of the present wording? What is meant by the first of these two sentences when it speaks of 'present owners'?

Mr. GRAHAM. Those are the owners of April 1, 1911.

Mr. DANIEL. In regard to the owners of April 1, 1911, the judge has only to make a report, but he makes a valuation with reference to what the present owners have paid for the road?

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, I would not for a moment, at this stage, attempt to discuss the resolutions, but I have taken considerable interest in this matter. Indeed, I have had the honour of first bringing to the notice of parliament and the government the whole question of the absorption of the branch lines of the Intercolonial railway, and I think it is due to myself that I should say some few words in respect to the resolutions. If I were to evince a little exaltation with regard to the government having met my views, at least measurably, perhaps, I would be pardoned. However, my hon. friend, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham), has thrown out some ideas which he wishes hon. members to consider during the adjournment. There are a few things that I would like him consider during the adjournment, and one is this, that in an undertaking of this character it is well—and I suppose we all recognize it—that two interests should be considered; first, the interests of the Intercolonial railway, second, the interests of the communities served by these several branch lines, and you might say, third, the interests of the whole country. But, as I understand it, the Intercolonial railway interests are representative of the interests of the whole of Canada. Now, I regret that there are one or two omissions with respect to railways in the province of Nova Scotia. I refer to the coal railways in the county of Cumberland. There is an omission of the power of expropriation with respect to some of these roads, or in respect to all of them. In a word, I would like to make my meaning clear in this regard. I hold that if there were power of expropriation given the government of Canada to take over some of these roads it would only be protecting the interests of the Intercolonial railway, and therefore, the interests of Canada, and it would enable them to secure lines of rail-

way which they might not be able to secure under the provisions of these resolutions. For instance, the coal railways in the county of Cumberland are so situated. One is the Maritime Coal and Railway Company, and the other is the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company. The first named is known as the Joggins road, or coal mine. The Maritime Coal and Railway Company have a line running from Maccan to Joggins mine a distance of 12 miles, and it is known as the Joggins railway. There are five distinct coal mines on that line of railway, but the Joggins mine so called is owned by the railway company. The other mines are owned by separate corporations. One is the Strathcona mine, another is the Jubilee mine, another the Minudie mine, another the Fundy mine, and I think that there is still another tract or area known as the Boston area. These five companies, other than the coal and railway company, are placed at a very great disadvantage by reason of the fact that the railway company operate a coal mine on that same line of railway to the detriment of the other mines, and the result is a depreciation in the value of the coal mined by these separate corporations. It seems to me that in the interest of the Intercolonial railway the government should be in a position to secure that line whether the coal and railway company desire it or not. The right of eminent domain should apply and the powers of expropriation should be given, in the interests of the whole country, and in the interests of those several mines that are lying along the same route. The same condition applies to the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company which operates in connection with the Springhill mine. This is a railway running from Springhill Junction on the Intercolonial railway to tide-water at Parrsboro, in the county of Cumberland. That company operate lines, they own the railway, and there are several coal mining areas which are absolutely precluded from being developed by reason of the conditions resulting from the ownership of that railway. If the government had the power of expropriation they could secure these lines. The coal and railway companies as owners are not interested in parting with these roads. They make large dividends out of the operation of the railways, and while provision is made with respect to some of these railways there are many of them which will not take advantage of the opportunity of leasing or even selling their roads to the government of Canada in order that they might become a portion of the Intercolonial railway system. Then, there is the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, which, to my mind, commands the traffic of Prince Edward Island and is the key to the situation with respect to that traffic. The Minister of Railways has said very clearly and distinctly that to the extent to which any of these branch lines are secured by any great private railway corporation the valuable asset of the government in the Intercolonial railway is thereby depreciated. We must look forward to the fact that as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company have running rights over the Intercolonial railway from Moncton to Halifax, and from Moncton to St. John, so must the Canadian Pacific Railway Company secure those rights. So must the Canadian Northern in time secure those same running rights, and if one of these railways in the meantime were to step in and secure this New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, secure the Albert railway, and secure some others of these branch lines the main trunk line would be depreciated in value. If the Canadian Pacific Railway Company have it in mind to secure any portion of the Intercolonial railway, either by purchase or by lease, or if the Canadian Northern have any such idea in their minds, naturally, as a business proposition, they would secure some of its main feeders, and securing them they would depreciate the value of the government asset, the value of the Intercolonial railway, and, therefore, they could derive a better bargain.

They would be in a position to say to the government of Canada: We have control of the branches which supply traffic, and to that extent the Intercolonial railway would be depreciated in value, and that would be a very easy way for any railway corporation to secure for practically a song the Intercolonial for their own use and benefit. Therefore, as a matter of protection the government should take power of expropriation. There are measures before parliament to-day to build new branches for the Intercolonial railway, and power of expropriation is given with respect to the right of way, and in order to protect the interests of the people, and of the Intercolonial railway the same principle should apply with respect to these branch lines. I already have evidence that one of these railways was secured by private individuals within the last six weeks for speculative purposes; in my judgment, for the mere purpose of holding it as against the Intercolonial railway, and playing off the Canadian Pacific railway, or the Canadian Northern railway as against the Intercolonial railway. Having secured this road they would have the Intercolonial railway and the government at a disadvantage in the event of any attempt on their part either with respect to securing running rights or leasehold interest on any particular portion of the Intercolonial railway. I ask the Min-

ister of Railways to consider during the adjournment, if, in self-protection, it would not be advisable to incorporate in this resolution a clause to secure powers of expropriation. If there were a clause giving the minister power to expropriate and exercise the right of eminent domain, we would be in a better position to deal with the owners of these several branch lines. I strongly urge upon him the advisability of carrying out this idea. It seems to me that the minister should by all means add to the list of railways to be secured the railway known as the Maritime Coal and Railway Company's road, and also the Cumberland Coal and Railway Company's road, the one 12 miles long and the other 30 miles long, speaking from memory. I know the value of many of these roads. The possibilities of the road formerly known as the Baie des Chaleurs railway are immense. The great fishing and lumber resources of Bonaventure and Gaspé counties cannot fail to make that railway in years to come one of the best paying roads the government could secure. Then the International road running from Campbellton to the St. John river protects the Intercolonial railway in its American traffic, it being a short line by which to convey to the New England market the stone and fish and great natural resources of that territory. Then, the Caraquet road running from Bathurst to Shipegan and Tracadie traverses a country second to none in Canada as it runs through the county of Gloucester rich in mineral, lumbering, fishing and agricultural resources. That railway would add very materially to the value of the Intercolonial railway. Then there are the Kent Northern, and the Moncton and Buctouche railway in the county of Kent which are valuable pieces of line. Then the Albert railway traverses a district, the richest in mineral resources in eastern Canada. The great shale district, the rich natural gas and oil district of the county of Albert, and the great plaster industry predict for the future of that road as well as for the Salisbury and Harvey line great prosperity. The Intercolonial railway should secure that, and it should not be left to the whim of owners or speculators as to whether the people of Canada should or should not have these railways. It is a business proposition in the interests of the property of the people of Canada, and it should be so managed that no band of speculators, and no little corporation, or no aggregation of corporations should be allowed to hold up the people of Canada in securing leasehold rights in these railways. From a business standpoint there should be the right of expropriation, in justice to the Intercolonial railway, and to the communities which are served by these branch lines. I could give other reasons in support of my contention,

Mr. EMMERSON.

but I shall reserve them until, if it is the will of Providence, we shall meet again. I earnestly beseech the Minister of Railways and the government, and the hon. members of this House to study this question during the recess. I am not advocating it from a party standpoint; I advocate it because I believe it to be in the best interests of the Intercolonial railway and in the best interests of affording facilities for the interchange of interprovincial trade. I believe it is an absolute necessity from a business point of view that expropriation proceedings should be taken

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee on the resolution.

Progress reported.

McLEOD POST OFFICE.

Mr. HERRON. Is any progress being made on the McLeod post office? I have brought this matter to the attention of the House on several occasions. It is in a most disgraceful condition.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I shall urge upon the Minister of Public Works the erection of a public building in McLeod. That is the only way to remedy the grievances.

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—LEASE OF BRANCH LINES.

Mr. GRAHAM moved that the House go into committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Whereas, by chapter 25, of the statutes of 1910, it was provided that the Minister of Railways and Canals might subject to the terms and conditions therein contained, lease lines of railway connecting with the government railways and operate them as a part of the government railways but no leases have been made under the said Act, and whereas it is deemed advisable to make the provisions hereinafter contained for the leasing of certain of such lines of railway. Therefore, it is resolved, that it is expedient that the Minister of Railways and Canals be authorized, with the approval of the Governor in Council, to lease for a term not exceeding 99 years, any of the following lines of railway, namely:

The Quebec Oriental railway, extending from Matapedia to Paspebiac, a distance of about one hundred miles;

The Hampton and St. Martins railway, extending from Hampton to St. Martins, a distance of about thirty miles;

The Albert railway, extending from Salisbury to Albert, a distance of about forty-five miles;

The Moncton and Buctouche railway, extending from Moncton to Buctouche, a distance of about twenty-eight miles;

The Caraquet railway and Gulf Shore railway, together extending from Bathurst to Tracadie, a distance of about eighty-five miles;

The York and Carleton railway, extending from Cross Creek to and beyond Stanley, a distance of about ten miles;

The International railway, extending from Campbellton to the St. John Valley at St. Leonards, a distance of about one hundred and thirteen miles;

The Cape Breton railway, extending from Point Tupper to St. Peters, a distance of about thirty miles;

The Temiscouata railway, extending from Rivière du Loup to Connors, a distance of about one hundred and thirteen miles;

The New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, extending from Sackville Junction to Cape Tormentine, a distance of about thirty miles;

The Elgin and Havelock railway, extending from Elgin to Havelock, a distance of about twenty-eight miles;

The Kent Northern railway, extending from Kent Junction to Richibucto, a distance of about twenty-seven miles;

Including the company's rolling stock in each case.

Upon terms and conditions to be approved of by the government railways managing board, provided, however, that the rental to be paid for each such line of railway shall in no case exceed an amount to be determined in the following manner, that is to say, the value of the railway proposed to be leased shall be fixed and determined by the judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, upon the report of the chief engineer of the government railways, based upon the examination of the railway by, and the report of the engineer appointed by the Department of Railways and Canals to inspect such railway during construction, such value also to include interest during construction, the cost of equipping the railway, the cost of terminals and of right of way of the railway now in use in the operation of the said railway in any city or incorporated town, (the amount of such interest during construction, the cost of equipping the railway, the cost of terminals and of right of way of the railway in any city or incorporated town to be fixed by such judge upon proper and sufficient evidence) and deducting therefrom any aid received from the government of Canada towards the construction of such railway, and also deducting such amount, if any, as may, in the opinion of the said chief engineer, be necessary to put any such line of railway in a safe and efficient condition.

Except that in the case of railways which have, since their construction, either through sale, foreclosure proceedings, transfer of shares of stock or securities, become either wholly or substantially the property of other companies or persons, at a cost less than the original cost thereof with the deductions aforesaid, then the value of such last mentioned railways shall, for rental purposes hereunder, be determined by such judge upon evidence of, and shall be based upon, the amounts actually paid by the present owners for such line of railway, shares and securities, respectively. Such judge shall, in the case of the railways last above mentioned, make a report showing the amounts paid for such railways and their rolling stock, shares and securities, respectively, and the owners thereof, as of date of April 1, 1911. After receiving the report and finding of such judge, the Minister of Railways may, with the approval of the Governor in Council, lease any of said lines of railway and pay therefor, for the first five years of the term of the lease, an amount as rental not exceeding three per cent per annum on such value so fixed by such judge; for the next five years of the term of the lease an amount not exceeding three and one-half per cent per annum on such value; and thereafter during the term of the lease an amount not exceeding four per cent per annum on such value; such rental to be paid half-yearly.

Nothing herein shall be deemed to require the taking over of any of the said railways if, in the opinion of the Governor in Council, having regard to the convenience of the public or the interests of the Intercolonial railway, the terms and conditions proposed by the company are not fair and reasonable.

Any such line so leased shall become and be operated as part of the government railways.

Mr. TURGEON. I desire to extend to the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) my heartiest congratulations on every word he has said. I appreciate what he said on the question of expropriation. That course will avoid all possible obstruction in the future, and I hope that during the recess the minister will so amend the resolution as to provide for that means of acquiring these roads. I have on other occasions expressed my sentiments in reference to the absorption of branch lines by the Intercolonial. It is a project which has been much discussed in the maritime provinces, particularly during the last few years, and it is a proposition to which the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has devoted great attention for many years. I certainly congratulate him upon the fact that he has been able to bring to his view of the question both the members of the government and of the House in the years during which he has been advocating the transfer of these branch lines to the Intercolonial railway, and I hope that when this House meets again after recess, every member will have seen the advisability of accepting that policy and also of introducing an expropriation Act with reference to each of these branches.

Mr. SPROULE. Are all these lines now built and in operation?

Mr. GRAHAM. They are all built and in operation except a portion of one line which I described a few moments ago, on which operation has ceased recently.

Mr. SPROULE. Must they be up to a certain standard before being taken over by the government or may they be in a dilapidated condition which will involve heavy preliminary expenditures?

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact it would be impossible to take them over under a condition that they were all to be repaired up to a certain standard.

There is a provision in the resolution which says that the amount required to put them into good working order shall be taken into account in taking them over under lease, that it will be taken from the amount on which interest will be paid. That is one class. The conditions are so peculiar that after studying them it was found that the Act passed last year included provisions which made it impossible to take over some of these lines.

On motion of Mr. Graham the debate was adjourned.

ROYAL ASSENT.

A message was received from His Honour the Deputy of His Excellency the Governor General, by the gentleman usher of the Black Rod as follows:

Mr. Speaker, His Honour the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General desires the immediate attendance of your honourable House in the Chamber of the honourable the Senate.

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

And having returned.

Mr. SPEAKER. I have the honour to inform the House that when this House did attend in the Senate Chamber the deputy of His Excellency the Governor General was pleased to give in His Majesty's name the Royal Assent to the following Bills:

An Act respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.

An Act to incorporate the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.

An Act respecting International Railway Company and International Traction Railways.

An Act to incorporate the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Surety Company.

An Act to incorporate the Sterling Trusts Corporation.

An Act respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Pacific and Peace Railway Company.

An Act respecting the People's Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company, and to change its name to 'The Algoma Eastern Railway Company.'

An Act respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Canada Medical Act.

An Act respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.

An Act respecting a patent of the Goldschmidt Thermet Company.

An Act to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.

An Act for the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.

An Act for the relief of Robert William Logan.

An Act respecting a patent of Conduits Company, Limited.

An Act to incorporate the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation.

An Act to incorporate the Imperial Steamship Company.

An Act to incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.

An Act respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate The Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Western Central Railway Company.

An Act to prohibit the improper use of Opium and other Drugs.

An Act respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.

An Act respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.

An Act to incorporate the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.

An Act respecting the Songhees Indian Reserve.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act to correct certain clerical errors in the French Version of the Inland Revenue Act.

An Act for the relief of Walter Harvey Kirkland.

An Act for the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.

An Act for the relief of Pauline Winslow Saunderson.

An Act for the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.

An Act for the relief of Frances Whittington Truesdell.

An Act to incorporate The Canada West Loan Corporation.

An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto.

An Act to incorporate the Imperial Traction Company.

An Act respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.

An Act to amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.

An Act respecting the Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Railway Company.

An Act respecting a Patent of The Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.

An Act to confer on the Commissioner of Patents certain powers for the relief of Trussed Concrete Steel Company, of Canada, Limited.

An Act for the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.

An Act for the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.

An Act to provide for increasing the capital stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.

An Act for the relief of Fanny Mary Healy.

An Act for the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.

An Act respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting certain Patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited.

An Act respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.

An Act respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.

An Act to amend the Fisheries Act.

An Act to amend the Indian Act.

An Act to incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate The Ontario and Abitibi Railway Company.

An Act to incorporate The Casualty Company of Canada.

An Act respecting La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company.

An Act to incorporate The Western Canal Company.

An Act to incorporate The Continental Fire Insurance Company.

An Act respecting The Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.

An Act respecting The Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.

An Act relating to Steamship Subsidies.

An Act to amend the Bank Act.

An Act to amend the Penny Bank Act.

An Act to incorporate The Albert and Moncton Railway Company.

An Act to authorize the government of Canada to acquire, by lease, a certain line of railway in the province of New Brunswick.

An Act to incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.

An Act to amend an Act of the present session intituled, 'An Act respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.'

An Act respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.

An Act relating to the establishment and expenses of the International Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty of January the eleventh, nineteen hundred and nine.

An Act to amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act.

An Act to amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act.

An Act to amend the Railway Act.

An Act respecting Duties of Customs on Importations from Japan.

An Act respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.

An Act respecting Forest Reserves and Parks.

An Act for the relief of William Fraser Currie.

An Act to amend the Post Office Act.

An Act for granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public service for the financial years ending, respectively, March 31, 1911, and March 31, 1912.

On motion of Mr. Fielding House adjourned at 9.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, July 18, 1911.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). In what position is the taking of the census at the present time, has the enumeration been completed, and if so when is it expected that the completed census returns will be ready?

Mr. FISHER. I cannot reply off hand, but after consultation with the officers I hope to make an announcement to-morrow.

THE SEAL FISHERIES.

Mr. SPROULE. I saw it stated in the papers some time ago that the negotiations in reference to the seal fisheries had been concluded. Has the government any information to give on this important subject?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The treaty has been signed, and we expect to be able to lay it on the table at an early date.

CHINESE INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Has the report of Mr. Justice Murphy, of the Chinese Investigation Commission at Vancouver been received, and if so will it be laid on the table without an order of the House? I put the question because Bill (No. 147) has stood over at the request of members of the House pending the presentation and consideration of this report. If an order of the House to have it printed has to be moved for, of course it would not be feasible to consider the report now.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The report has been received by the Department of Trade and Commerce, but in the absence of the minister I am not able to say anything in reference to it except that it is under consideration.

THE COPYRIGHT ACT.

Mr. LENNOX. Can the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) inform us about what time he will proceed with the Act respecting copyright? I want to give that measure some personal attention, and I am reasonably busy now, so that if the minister would say about what time he would bring forward the measure it would facilitate me and others.

Mr. FISHER. I have been in communication with the Rt. Hon. Sidney Buxton who has informed me that he hopes the Bill in the Imperial parliamnet will be passed shortly. As some amendments have been introduced to that Bill it would be

well for us to delay so that our Bill may harmonize with it as far as possible in the shape in which it is finally passed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it out of committee in the Imperial House?

Mr. FISHER. I think it is still in the committee.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Will any opportunity be given to interests who are concerned in that very important measure to present their views to parliament. Since the Bill has been introduced there has been a great deal of public discussion on it in the press and throughout the country. I understand that the imperial Bill was referred to a committee of the House before which the interests affected were heard. I also understand that the same proceeding was adopted by the American Congress on their Copyright Bill and also in Germany and other European countries which are in what might be called the copyright family of nations. Does not the minister consider that the Bill should be referred to some tribunal which would receive the opinions and suggestions of those interested?

Mr. FISHER. Before the adjournment, the Bill had practically passed through Committee of the Whole, but I asked that it should not be reported. Since then I have taken great pains to send copies of the Bill and of the debate to everybody who seemed to be at all interested, with the request that they should communicate their views to the department, before parliament reassembled. We have had a few replies which will receive every consideration. The Bill is still in Committee of the Whole and can be thoroughly considered there. I am sure that the hon. members interested will be able to present to the House the views of those whom they represent.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE FENIAN RAIDS VETERANS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the chair, I desire to bring to the attention of the House a matter that has been before the government for the last fifteen or sixteen years; that is, the question of the recognition in some substantial manner of the claims of the veterans of 1866 and 1870. I do not intend at this stage to go into the merits or demerits of the claims of the veterans, but I intend to show first of all what steps had been taken by the veterans with a view to having their rights recognized in some manner by this government. In the year 1896, I think, the first deputation waited on Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government and asked for some recognition of their claims. In speaking to that deputation, the Prime Minister is reported as follows—I am reading now from 'Hansard' of the 26th of March, 1906, and quoting from the speech made by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk):

> He would like to find a few facts about the subject under discussion so that he would have a basis to work upon. To begin with, he said, I would like to know about how many men were called out at that time, and if it is the desire of the present delegation that services of all the remaining veterans who took an active part and also in what way it is considered their services would best be recognized.

Further on the Prime Minister is reported as saying:

> In making his reply, Mr. Laurier stated that he fully appreciated the strength of the reason that all should be remembered, and and that nothing would give him greater pleasure than laying the claims of the veterans before his colleagues at the next parliament, as he regretted to say it was too late at present to bring it up at the present session.

That would be towards the end of the first session of the present administration. Although between that time and 1905 two other delegations waited on the government, each of which received a favourable reply from the government, neither of which was specific, however, I understand that in 1905 a further large delegation waited on the Prime Minister and Sir Frederick Borden, a delegation evidently composed largely of veterans from the eastern townships of the province of Quebec and some from the province of Ontario. To that delegation the Prime Minister is reported to have replied as follows:

> Sir Wilfrid Laurier received much applause when he rose to reply. Two years ago he had been approached by a smaller deputation on a similar errand, but as the session was far advanced he had been unable to give them a definite answer. He had told them then he hoped to be in a better position next time they came to him. The members had evidently remembered his words, for they had now returned in largely increased numbers. He could hardly claim to be a veteran, as they had called him, for he had only been a volunteer in 1870. When the regiment he belonged to had been mustered the trouble was over. To the victors, he said, belong the spoils, was an expression most of them were familiar with. While the veterans had turned back the invaders in 1866 and 1870 there had been no spoils left. Thirty years after they come to ask from the country some recognition for their services, and he thought some appreciation should be shown. Their services then had saved the country from much humiliation, if not worse. Had the invaders not been repelled at the border

much misery would have been caused, although, of course, the country would not have been conquered. What the veterans asked was not much. He could not give a definite answer himself to their request, but he could assure them that he and the ministers with him would be very pleased to report their request to the Privy Council. The meeting closed with three cheers and a 'tiger' for Sir Wilfrid, called for by some enthusiastic veteran.

In the same year the hon. member for Jacques Cartier again brought the matter up in the House, and at page 642 of Hansard of 1905, we find the Prime Minister reported as follows:

I think it is obvious to any one, and my hon. friend (Mr. Monk) will agree with me, that if the veterans of 1866 and 1870 have a claim against anybody, it is the Dominion government, although I do not say that the veterans, from their point of view, have not done well to address themselves to the provincial government. Mr. Gouin, the provincial premier, I do not think went further in his answer than to say that they should first of all address themselves to the Dominion government. This they have done, and the matter is now under consideration. But I must say, and my hon. friend will not be surprised, that up to this moment the government has had no time to take the matter in hand and give it the attention which it will require before we can come to a conclusion.

I may just point out that although the government say they had not time to take the matter into consideration, it is exactly nine years since the veterans first presented their petition to the House. Then the Prime Minister went on to say:

The matter is under consideration, and without making any pledge, I will say that I will give an answer during the present session. When the answer will be given, I am sorry to say that I can give no indication today to my hon. friend, but certainly it will be given during the present session.

Well, the answer was not given during that session. A further deputation waited on the government in 1906 and laid their claims before it, and I find that on that occasion the following reply was made to them by the Minister of Militia, Sir Frederick Borden:

But since my hon. friend has presented his argument and suggested that homesteads bona fide should be offered to these men who might be willing to go to the Northwest as actual settlers, I am inclined to the opinion that the government would be willing to take that matter into consideration.

Mr. MONK. They have that privilege now.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. That is what my hon. friend suggested, and I am merely giving him all he asks. I said a moment ago that some advantages might be given in the way of offering them special privileges to settle in certain communities or in certain favoured quarters. I have no right, however, to speak for the Minister of the Interior, but I would be disposed to go that far and see whether anything could be done to meet their views in that respect.

In the same debate the right hon. the Prime Minister is quoted as follows:

I dare say these veterans will say to us: We could fight in 1866, we could fight in 1870, but you canot expect that we can take up a pick and shovel and perform the arduous duties of a settler to-day. I can appreciate that answer, and I will say this, that if there is a man who cannot take his homestead we are ready to give it to him. If he has a son who is ready to fulfil the conditions of settlement, the government will be only too glad to give him that recognition. But if it is intended that these lands should be given to the veterans simply for the purpose of selling them to the foreigner, to the despised foreigner who has been mentioned by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier, that is a thing which I think would deserve a little consideration.

Further on the Prime Minister used these words:

This motion comes very late after a lapse of 40 years, but yet it is not too late, and if a plan can be devised by which we can leaven the mass with our own blood and find homesteads for our veterans or their descendants and children, the government would be prepared to consider the question and do its share towards recognizing the men who risked their lives for the defence of the country upon that very important occasion.

I might here remark that the Prime Minister said that this motion came very late. I would like to point out to him that in the year 1875 the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, then premier of the country, did not think that it was too late, after a period of 65 years, to grant an annual pension of $50,000 to the veterans who had served in the war of 1812. On page 252 of 'Hansard' of 1875, I find the following:

On item 50—$50,000 to meet the probable amount required for pensions to veterans of the war of 1812.

Mr. KIRKPATRICK asked for some explanations. He desired to know whether those who had served for a shorter period, were to be placed on the same footing as those who had served for a long period, and whether all regiments would get a grant, or whether those known as the Glengarry regiment, which, he believed, had been pensioned by the Chelsea hospital authorities, were also to have a share. He also desired to know whether the widows of the veterans of 1812 would receive any consideration.

Hon. Mr. CARTWRIGHT said he feared they could give nothing to the widows. The intention of the government was to give to all men in actual service, numbering, he believed, probably about five or six hundred—of course, they could not tell the exact number, as some applications had come in which doubtless would not be fortified by the records. Those receiving aid must be at least

seventy-six or seventy-eight years of age, because the great number of those who took part in that war must now be about or over 80. The pensions would be as nearly as possible approaching the amount to those given to the pensioners of the regular army at home.

In reply to Mr. Flesher,

Hon. Mr. MACKENZIE said it was intended that the vote should be taken yearly. —Item passed.

So I would say that the mere fact that the volunteers of 1866 and 1870 have not been recognized after 40 years is no answer whatever, but on the contrary is only an argument why, if their claim is just, they should be recognized at this day, because the longer their rights are deferred the stronger their claims become. I would suggest that the Prime Minister follow the precedent of his former colleague and the former prime minister, Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who thought it was not too late, after 65 years, to recompense those who had fought in the interests of their country.

From what I have read, I think it may safely be assumed that a promise was made in 1906 by the Prime Minister and by Sir Frederick Borden that something would be done, and I believe that many members on the Liberal side who at that time voted against the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), did so, believing that the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia intended to give something substantial to the volunteers. In proof of that, I shall quote from a speech of Mr. Logan, of Hants, then a member of this House, who said:

I feel very much in sympathy with the idea of giving substantial recognition to the men who live and to the heirs of those who have died who fought at this time or who went to the front; and I might have been inclined to have voted in favour of the motion as put before the House if we had not had the assurance given by the Minister of Militia and the Prime Minister, in reference to considering certain substantial recognition of what these men have done for their country.

So it is quite evident that in 1906, when this motion was before the House, many Liberals voted against it because they believed that the statements of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia amounted to a promise to do something for these veterans. Mr. Logan said further on:

We believe the government will do its duty, with this promise which has been given by the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia.

And he voted against the resolution. My friend and opponent, the former member for North Grey, I find used words which only illustrate his sublime faith in the Prime Minister and anything the Prime Minister might do.

Mr. LANCASTER. That is why he is not here now.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. He is a very fine old gentleman, the only fault he had was that he was a blind follower of the Prime Minister, and would do anything the Prime Minister asked him. That hon. member said:

I would rather trust the somewhat indefinite promises of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) and the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) than to the belated good intentions of hon. gentlemen opposite.

That was five years ago, yet nothing whatever has been done to implement these promises.

I find that in the following years, with the perseverance and tenacity which they displayed in the rebellion, the veterans came back to the Prime Minister. In 1908, the Prime Minister replied to them as follows:

Two years ago I had the honour to receive a delegation of veterans of '66-'70 for the purpose of hearing a petition for recognition at the hands of the government. I did not then see a way of granting the petition. But I gave Mr. Patterson the injunction which I see he has remembered. Gentlemen, you have always been too kind to me. I cannot claim to be a veteran. True, I turned out with the rest, but I did so little that I am almost ashamed to wear my medal. But, gentlemen, there is an old saying that to the victors belong the spoils.

It is a peculiar thing that the Prime Minister has been holding up the spoils to these veterans the whole time, but they have not seen any of them yet. He continued:

After 30 years you come to your countrymen and ask that you may receive a little recognition at the hands of a grateful country. Something should be done. There is no doubt that by your action you saved the country from humiliation and perhaps worse. What you ask is not very much. But I am only one of the government. There are others here, the Postmaster General, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Militia, and we shall be pleased to present your request to the Privy Council and the Governor General. But, gentlemen, further than this I cannot promise.

The Prime Minister then added:

But do not trust the government.

That was in 1908. In the following February they came and in the Toronto 'Globe,' of February 5, I find this account of the meeting:

Sir Frederick Borden, after referring to the medals granted, is reported as follows:

He recognized the value of their services and would promise that the government would act on the petition in a proper manner.

Sir WILFRED LAURIER. He was very much in sympathy with their request. They were of course watch dogs of the treasury, but if the opposition would agree to spending the money he would be strongly tempted to be extravagant. He would be pleased to report to the Governor General the unanimous voice of this meeting and so far as he could discern the unanimous feeling of the House regarding the grant.

The 'Mail and Empire' the same date reports the meeting as follows:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier this afternoon promised a deputation of men who took part in the Fenian Raids of 1866 and 1870 that he would recommend their request for a grant of land to His Excellency the Governor General at the earliest possible day.

That was in February, 1909, and still the veterans are kept waiting for the spoils which had been promised. Back again they come on December 3, a larger deputation than ever, and, on December 4, I find in the Toronto 'Globe':

Veterans' requests—Sir Wilfrid's answer is very encouraging—Government already considering scheme of rewarding the men who repulsed the Fenian Raids.

One hundred and fifty Fenian Raid veterans of '66-'70 marched to Parliament Hill at noon to-day, headed by a pipe band, and met Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Sir Frederick Borden, Hon. Sydney Fisher and Hon. L. P. Brodeur. . . They asked either a land grant or pension. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in replying . . . said the government was always disposed to deal in a sympathetic spirit with the men who had stood ready to sacrifice their lives in defence of flag and country; but, while sympathizing with the movement for some tangible recognition of the veterans' claims, he thought there would be some difficulty in deciding just who were entitled to the reward, and he intimated that perhaps it would be well to distinguish between the men who actually went to the front and saw active service and those who were merely under arms at the time of the raids. The matter was seriously engaging the attention of the government, and personally he would be glad if some action could be taken soon to grant a reasonable measure of recognition to the veterans by a grateful country.

Upon that same delegation the member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey) made these remarks:

Mr. W. O. Sealey, M.P., believed that if the veterans could agree to take a land grant with the provisions that they or their children would settle on it they would get it immediately.

On the 30th of January, 1910, a question was put upon the Order Paper by the hon. member for North Ontario (Mr. Sharpe) to which the government replied as follows:

The government has not come to any conclusion but will at an early day.

Just imagine, fourteen years after they came into power and after they had had it under their very serious consideration for fourteen years, they say that they still have it under their serious consideration. In the meantime there have been three general elections, in every one of which they received the support of the veterans on the assumption that they would get substantial recognition at the hands of the government.

In 1910, during his tour in the west, the Prime Minister is reported to have said:

We have had it under consideration some months and, without making any promises, I can say that something may be done.

Not very specific I admit, but a promise that something may be done. Then from August 10 there were continual interviews by Mr. Patterson with the government for the purpose of ascertaining what the government really intended, and I have here a letter addressed by Mr. Patterson who represents the association, to the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) dated April 20, 1910, which is as follows:

Sir Frederick Borden,
Minister of Militia,
Ottawa.

Honourable Sir,—Two weeks ago to-day, in the interview I had with you in your private office, you stated you would bring the matter of federal grant to the veterans of '66 and '70 before the Privy Council on the following Saturday, lapsing our interview. You said you would push the matter to a final decision, either a grant or the government would say no. You promised to communicate the results of your intention. Up to the present time I have not had the pleasure of hearing anything from you. Won't you kindly advise me by mail what has been done, or what is the intention, if any? Your reply will be appreciated by the veterans of the Dominion.

Yours faithfully,
CAPT. J. H. PATTERSON.

In reply to this the Minister of Militia wrote as follows: And this, of course, was before the Prime Minister had taken his western trip in the course of which he said that something might be done:

Ottawa, May 9, 1910.

Dear Captain Patterson,—I must apologize for not having answered sooner your letter of the 28th August, but I am sure you will understand that I have been very busy ever since that date.

I have brought the matter of the veterans up in council on two occasions as promised, but unfortunately there was no time so late in the session to consider it. As I understood the feeling of the council, however, it was that there was a disposition to consider sympa-

thetically the claims of such of the veterans as actually went to the front and took part in repelling the would-be invaders, and with this object in view I feel sure that the Premier would be glad to receive you and any other colleagues whom the veterans might wish to associate with you and to discuss the manner in which this idea might be carried out.

I can only add that I shall be very glad at any time to join the Premier in assisting in such a discussion.

Yours very truly,

F. W. BORDEN.

Capt. J. H. Patterson.
93 McKenzie ave.,
Ottawa.

I think I am quite justified in saying, in view of the extracts that I have read from the remarks of the Prime Minister and his Minister of Militia, and from the correspondence, that the veterans were promised and had a right to expect some substantial consideration at the hands of this government. I think I am justified in saying also that the debate of March 26, 1906, when the matter was brought up by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier, showed that it was upon the express understanding that something was going to be done by the government that many members on the Liberal side of the House voted against the resolution to give some substantial recognition to the veterans.

Apart altogether from the merits of the case, I think nobody will deny that the services to the country rendered by the veterans were rendered at the psychological moment in our history. One occasion was a year before Confederation. At that time there were large numbers of disbanded soldiers in the United States only too willing to fight. And had not our veterans come to the assistance of the country against these disbanded soldiers the destiny of Canada might have been entirely different from what it is. After confederation had been in existence only three years when the second occasion for the veterans to offer their assistance arose. At that time the United States had refused to continue the policy of reciprocity in natural products with this country; and those of the older generation know that at that time there was a very considerable feeling in this country that, because of the action of the United States, Canada would be compelled to throw in her lot with the United States. And, again, I say, the veterans came to the aid of the country at the psychological moment in that respect.

And it was owing at least in part to their action that the country was directed to a different destiny. These men left their businesses, their farms, their avocation at the call of duty. Permit me to read a portion of a letter from one of the veterans of that time which will illustrate better than any word I could speak the risks these men ran, and the hardships they endured. This is a letter from one veteran to another:

Dear comrade,—It pleases me very much to learn that the veterans of the Fenian Raids of 1866 and 1870 have formed a national association and are making a fight for recognition of the services which they (or rather we, for remember I am one of those veterans) have rendered our country almost half a century ago. Think of it, Charlie, it is just 45 years and 41 years ago respectively since the word of command 'to arms' came from our beloved Colonel F. G. Marchand, the late Prime Minister of the province of Quebec. The moment that command was heard, men in shops dropped their tools, men in stores walked out from behind the counters, men in offices laid down their pens, men on the farms left their ploughs where they stood, donned their uniforms, shouldered their rifles and in less than three hours the 21st Battalion Richelieu Light Infantry was in line fully supplied with ammunition and ready to start for the front, which we did on the afternoon of the same day. The patriotism shown by the men of the 21st Battalion on that occasion was never equalled by the young men of any country, European or any other country, and the same spirit prevailed among the young men of the province. We cared not for our lives, we took that in one hand, our rifles in the other and marched out to defend our country or die. . . .

Many of us are to-day suffering from different ailments as a result of exposure and hardships experienced at that time. But, did you ever hear any one complain? No, sir, I never have met one sad or dejected heart in all that campaign. Every man felt cheerful and was happy to be where he was and he knew he was doing his duty.

I believe that expresses the sentiment of the men who went to the front at that time. We have had, since then, two precedents. The veterans of the rebellion of 1885 were given not only medals but grants of land. The veterans of the South African war were given not only medals but grants of land. If the grants made to these veterans are just and right, they create a precedent which cannot be ignored by this government. I can see no reason why the veterans of the present day should not be given some substantial recognition. It is not for me to say what form that recognition should take, whether a grant of land or a pension. If a pension, it is to be remembered that most of these men must be close to 80 years of age, and cannot live long. I think it is as little as the government can do to give some substantial recognition to these men who came to the aid of the country in time of stress. I move in amendment:

It is desirable that the government of Canada should recognize in some substantial manner the services rendered during the Fenian Raids of 1866 and 1870 by your Canadian volunteers.

I use exactly the words used in the resolution of the hon. member for Jacques Cartier in 1906 when the government promised to do something along these lines.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, I have to express my regret that my hon. friend and colleague the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) is not in his seat to-day. He would have been better able to do justice to the amendment of my hon. friend than I can attempt to do. The matter is one that I know has been engaging his attention; if my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) has at heart the interests of the veterans whose case he has espoused it would, perhaps, be preferable that he should have waited for a day or two until the Minister of Militia were in his seat.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The Minister of Militia has already given a reply stating that nothing further will be done whatever.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly. And perhaps it would have been better for the hon. gentleman to have a reply from the minister himself. But he has taken his course, and there is nothing to be done but to deal with his motion. The hon. gentleman stated that this question was fifteen or sixteen years old. He is altogether too modest—it is forty or forty-five years old. My hon. friend invited me to act upon the precedent created by the government of Mr. Mackenzie in 1875, of which government I was a supporter. If there were any argument in that, perhaps my hon. friend would find a better and more adequate argument in the precedent created by the government of Sir John Macdonald who was in office at the time these raids took place and which dealt with the case at that time. The government of Sir John Macdonald was in office in 1866, and, as he was the first Prime Minister of the Dominion his government was in office immediately after confederation, and until after 1870, the time the second raid took place. The veterans of that time did render valuable service to the country, undoubtedly. Those services were considered when they were fresh in the minds of the people of Canada and of the government of Canada. For reasons which I am not called upon to pass judgment upon, these claims were not entertained.

If the veterans of 1866 did that service for the country which my hon. friend says they did, and which they did emphatically, for some reason which I have not to appreciate—I did not belong to the party which was then in office, and my hon. friend does belong to that party—for some reason, at that time the government did not think it advisable to call upon the people of Canada to give them any recognition for the services they had performed. I think it is not to be expected that volunteers should give their services for a consideration, they do it simply out of patriotism; and if the government of that day took that position, what reason can be given to-day why we should reverse that judgment? There is, therefore, no argument in the fact that if the government in 1875 did recognize services which had been rendered to the country in 1812, we should do the same. We have adopted since then another method; we have now a more humane way of looking at those things. It is not a Conservative government which is in office, it is a Liberal government; but the Liberal government did recognize the services of the men who went to South Africa, and also, I think, the services of the men who went to the front in 1885. We gave them grants of land, and we did it out of the abundance of our heart; the Liberal party supported us in so doing. But I think my hon. friend must have heard echoes coming from the western portion of the community, especially that the policy adopted of giving grants of land to the veterans had not turned out very much to the benefit of the country, or to the benefit of the veterans themselves. That is the opinion I express; I would not be disposed to be critical in that matter. I have called the attention of my colleague, the Minister of Militia, more than once to this question. The veterans have been pressing with great persistence to have some recognition made to them. Now, I may say frankly to my hon. friend that for my part, leaving out my own individual point of view, I would not be disposed to treat the application of the veterans according to a universal system; that is, a system that should apply to all. There are degrees of merit in the veterans. Some of them did very little service, if any at all. I know a corps to which I myself belonged was called upon to go to the front, but they did not go, because the trouble was all over before they turned out. But I was given a medal, although I did not deserve it at all. We had no claim for one. But there are men who went to the front and who were engaged in a battle, who bore the burden and heat of the day, and exposed themselves to danger, and that is the class which is entitled to consideration. There were other veterans who were simply called upon to do garrison duty, or picket duty, but were never called to the front. Therefore, I would make a distinction between one class and another. At all events, this condition of things has been engaging the attention of my hon. friend the Minister of Militia. My hon. friend who has made the motion will himself understand that it is not possible to apply the same rule to all cases, and I do not think, if any recognition is to be given,

that the universal recognition implied in this motion should be adopted. The government of the day in 1866 and 1870, I know, did give pensions to those who had been disabled in battle, that was the extent to which the bounty of the government was given at that time. I speak correctly when I say that some of the men who, in 1866 and 1870, were actually engaged in battle and were disabled, were pensioned by the country.

Mr. LANCASTER. And some of the widows.

SIR WILFRID LAURIER. I am not aware that the widows received pensions, perhaps they did; but I speak of those who were in battle. I know instances in which some received recognition, while others did not. Now my hon. friend would go further. I have only to say to him, and he will agree with me, that if the only object he has in mind is to come to the assistance of these men, the manner in which he has brought it to the attention of the House, perhaps is not the best calculated to impress the House. In the absence of my hon. colleague, the Minister of Militia, I have only to ask that the motion be not proceeded with, but that it be rejected by the House.

Mr. SPROULE. It seems to me that the reason given by the Prime Minister for refusing this request is not a very strong one. He says it is not expected that volunteers should give their services for a consideration, and therefore, I presume, he intimates that they are not entitled to a consideration. Had they been regulars, they might have been entitled to it. Now, if he applies that reasoning to the volunteers of 1885 who went out to the west in the service of their country, and who afterwards received gold medals and land grants, he will see that his argument falls to the ground, or iti carries no weight. Then if he applies it to the volunteers who went out to South Africa and who received land grants, the argument is not a very strong one, nor a very sound one. The right hon. gentleman said that his sympathy was with them, and he had several times expressed his sympathy with them when speaking on this subject. But he never seemed to go beyond that though he was always desirous of persuading his colleagues that that was the right thing to do, to give the men some substantial grant. I would imagine that the Premier of the government would always bring his colleagues to accept any special request which he desired to make, because otherwise they would not be faithful supporters of the government. When he was telling us how strongly he sympathized with the veterans, it reminded me of what I heard an eminent minister say once who did not receive a very large stipend, that he was always getting the sympathy of his people. He said he remembered a friend of his once who tried to feed a cat on sympathy, and it just lived ten days. Now, I do not think that the veterans will be very grateful for the sympathy the Prime Minister has extended to them, because it will take more than that to sustain life. I was looking over some answers given in the past with regard to this question, and they are various. One was that the services were rendered before confederation and, therefore, only one portion of the country was interested in the matter. Well, 1866 was but a short time before confederation, and 1871 was after confederation, and what did the government then do? One naturally asks why we should not compensate these veterans by a land grant.

We have recognized the principle of pensions to those who have gone to the front in the service of the country; we recognized it in favour of the South African veterans, we recognized it with regard to the men who took part in the rebellion of 1885. Now, if it was a sound principle in those cases it must be sound in this one, Now, what was the first? The first case was when we made a grant of land to the South African veterans. They did not fight to keep people from invading the country, but they fought to sustain the authority of the British Empire, and to put down an insurrection in another part of the empire.

On the other occasion, in 1885, when the volunteers went to the northwest to put down an insurrection there, it was not to prevent invaders from coming into the country, but it was to maintain the authority of the British Empire and to preserve peace in the country. On both these occasions the veterans were recompensed by grants of land in consideration of their services to the country. But in both cases it was to put down an insurrection in a portion of the British Empire. Where is the difference between the action of those men and that of those who took part in preventing marauders from coming into the country to overpower the people, and break down the authority of the government? It seems to me that if merit there was in each case it was greater in the case of the men who prevented outsiders from coming into the country than in that of the men who endeavoured to put down trouble in the country. If there was a justifiable reason—and I take it for granted that there was—I believe there was—in giving land grants to the veterans who went to South Africa to maintain the authority of the British Empire outside of the country altogether, that reason, it seems to me, is doubly strong in the case of those men who prevented our own country from being invaded by marauders. No strong ground has

been given, as far as I can see, why there should not be some better recognition of those veterans than has been given up to the present time.

There is another feature of this question that has occurred to me in looking over the records of the various occasions upon which it has been before the country and the House, and it is that the government were always considering it. They had taken it into their consideration—their careful consideration—but they had never reached a decision. How long does it take a man to reach a decision? I could understand that sometimes it takes a woman a long time, but a man is supposed to be made of different stuff, to be actuated by different principles, to be able to reach a conclusion after short consideration, and to reach a conclusion that is apt to be final. But, time after time, when this question was before the Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia and Defence, they were always considering it—seriously considering it. They denied that they had given a refusal, they denied that they had abandoned hope, they denied that it was not their intention to do something for these veterans, but they were always considering it, and they have not reached a conclusion yet. The remarks of the right hon Prime Minister to-day are just about as indefinite as his previous ones. He wants to lead these veterans to believe that the sympathy of the government is with them and that it is their desire to do something substantial for them, but they believe that they cannot do it. Why cannot they? It must be because they cannot get their followers to support them. The remarks of the former hon. member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan), have been quoted here to the effect that he was disposed upon that occasion to vote for the motion but for the fact that he understood that the government were going to take the matter up and were likely to compensate these veterans. That is the statement of one of the right hon. gentleman's own following, who was supposed to be behind the scenes and to know what was taking place. He got the information, I presume, privately, which induced him to vote against this motion. Hon. gentlemen opposite voted against the motion on that ground, yet nothing has been done and the question has remained in abeyance up to the present time. The right hon. the Prime Minister told my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro), that he had not taken a very opportune time to bring this question up as the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence is not here. But, there is greater than the Minister of Militia and Defence here; there is the Prime Minister himself, the man who lays down the policy and who gets his cabinet to carry through what he wants. Surely he ought to be equal to the occasion in the absence of the Minister of Militia, who I assume would be only too willing to support any proposal that he would make. He should give these veterans an answer—yes, or no. Let them know their fate whatever it is. It is much better for them to be told that there is no hope whatever than to be led to believe and to hope year after year that the government will come to their aid.

It cannot be that the government are afraid of the opposition not supporting a proposition of this kind, because the opposition has put itself on record more than once in favour of such a prinicple. The opposition would support a grant of this kind in so far as my judgment enables me to speak upon this matter. Therefore, it is a question within the ranks of hon. gentlemen opposite, and they must be held individually and collectively responsible if nothing is done, because it is for themselves to say whether anything will or will not be done. They have the power, if they have the desire. They have expressed themselves as having the desire over and over again; why do not they make their action decisive?

Mr. SAMUEL BARKER (East Hamilton), Mr. Speaker, I said a few words upon this subject in 1906, and I spoke on that occasion simply because of words uttered then which have been practically repeated by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to-day. I will read what was spoken then and the House will see that the right hon. gentleman has hit very closely upon the same words to-day. The minister—I need not mention his name—upon that occasion, said:

> Surely we are not to establish a precedent that whenever this country is threatened by invasion, such as that of 1866, or whenever a rebellion has to be quelled, our volunteers shall demand payment in land or money.

I considered that a deliberate insult on that occasion to the volunteers. I do not think the Prime Minister has been very happy in using almost the same words to-day. The volunteers did not turn out in 1866 for the purpose of securing a reward in land or money or anything else; they turned out for their country. How different is the conduct of this government from that of the United States government? When they asked for volunteers at the time of the war with the south they made no promises of pensions or rewards of any kind. But, how did they treat their veterans? Enormous sums of money were voted and granted freely to their volunteers, some of whom enlisted for only three months at the beginning of the war, and all were treated alike. Would any politician in America dare to stand up and sneer at the volunteers who took part in that war as men

seeking compensation? The people granted the money willingly. Only a few months ago I saw in some of our papers in Ontario mention of the case of a woman whose husband had been wounded while fighting for the north and who died afterwards. The United States government granted the widow a pension. They did not draw any lines such as the Prime Minister seeks to draw now. They would not say to a gentleman who should bring forward a motion or an application or anything of that kind: You are not taking the best way to get this. That is what the Prime Minister tells my hon. friend behind me (Mr. Middlebro) who has spoken. He says that he has not taken the best way. Whose duty is it to improve upon that and take the best way? Why, it is the duty of the Prime Minister to do something for the men who turned out upon that occasion and risked their lives. It is all very well to say that they were out for only a short time and that the actual fighting was confined to a very limited period. I happened to be out at that time myself. I am inclined to think that I am the only living officer of the 7th Regiment who turned out upon that occasion. All the officers of my company and I think nearly all of the officers of the regiment are dead, and but few of the non-commissioned officers and men are living. These men worked as regular soldiers practically for months. As early as February or March of that year we were warned of the threatened attack and night after night, winter and spring, we turned out with the regular soldiers then quartered in London. The regiment to which I belonged got on the battlefield the night of the fight, and I recollect at two in the morning seeing the dead body of an officer of the Queen's Own brought in, and others wounded. On the following morning as we marched over Ridgeway I saw a number of the Fenians lying dead. Were it not that my regiment was delayed at Paris we would have been in the fight, and we would have done our duty to our country. Personally I never asked for anything not even a medal, but after I spoke on this subject once before in the House a medal was sent to me by the hon. Minister of Militia, although I would much rather that some practical recognition had been given to the men from the shops and the sons of farmers, the business men of London, the students who left their offices and all who were ready and willing to fight for their country. For the Prime Minister to say now to the gentleman who brought forward his motion that he has gone the wrong way about it is evading the question at issue; it is a poor way to treat such a subject, and it is not calculated to induce people to turn out to do their duty. From veterans now living in several states of the union I have been asked year after year why the government has not carried out its promise in this matter. Everybody assumed that the right hon. gentleman would do what he promised to do, but perhaps they did not know that the right hon. gentleman is a better promiser than a performer. If the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Middlebro) has not taken the right course as the right hon. gentleman says, why does not the right hon. gentleman suggest what course should be taken. If he wants any assistance in the matter we on this side of the House will readily give it to him. Only a month ago one of the old non-commissioned officers of the 7th Regiment now living at Westmount sent his son here and asked if we could not do something in the matter. These men feel that they have been treated very ungratefully by the government. True, there was no great loss of life on either side, but there might have been, and the Canadian volunteers were ready to do their duty, and it is only proper that the government of the country should recognize their services. The hon. gentleman has asked if it is to be supposed that volunteers will only turn out when they expect to be rewarded for it. They will do their duty, but if a paid soldier is to get a reward, surely the volunteer who, as a patriot risks his life, is more entitled to it. I feel that a great injustice has been done to the men of 1866 and 1870, and am not surprised that when many of these now living in the United States see all around them men who in the war with the south went to the front to the old tune: 'We are coming Father Abraham 400,000 strong,' and when they see these men rewarded and they themselves neglected by Canada they naturally feel disappointed and aggrieved.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). I desire to express my strong sympathy with the amendment now before the House. The town of Prescott where I live was one of the most important points during the Fenian invasion. A great many volunteers were stationed there, and while they turned out to fight for their country without hope of reward, yet, they naturally now expect the same recognition as those who fought in the Canadian Northwest and in South Africa. I remember attending one of the veterans' meetings at which the Prime Minister was present and his language then led the veterans to believe that their claims would be recognized at an early date. That was several years ago, but nothing has been done since. Some of the veterans have several times complained to me about the neglect with which they are treated, and I have never hesitated to state that so far as I was concerned, and the Conservative party as well, we would support any reasonable recognition of their services which

the government might propose. But to-day, we have this motion before us and there is not a single man on the Liberal side of the House to get up and say a word on behalf of these men who were out to fight, and to die if need be for their country.

I cannot understand why they have no sympathy with it. Surely there must be some members on the government side who have agreed to support some recognition of the services of the veterans; but so far there does not seem to be one who is willing to take any part. The Prime Minister states that the government might consider some proposition with regard to those who took an active part. The hon. member for Hamilton shows that there should not be any distinction made in that way. There may be some who were wounded, and who might be in need of a pension, but I believe that every volunteer who served for a certain length of time in drilling, and who was prepared and willing to take part in any battle that might take place, should receive the same recognition as those who did take part. I only rose to express my hearty sympathy with the amendment moved by the hon. member for North Grey, and to say that I will support any reasonable recognition of the veterans of 1866 and 1870 that may be brought down by the government.

Mr. LANCASTER. I want to say a word in protest of the position taken by the Prime Minister on this matter. I am satisfied that if he took a census of the people of the Niagara district, where the principal invasion referred to by my hon. friend took place, he would find that all those people, whether they were alive at that time or not, would be a unit in favour of this motion, because they know particularly well what great services were rendered, in a very hurried and very philanthropic as well as patriotic and intelligent way, by those veterans. We in the Niagara district have never been able to understand why something in this respect was not done years ago. The Prime Minister has been quoted as having intimated from time to time that something of a substantial nature would be done. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) quoted the language of the Prime Minister, to which the Prime Minister replied, but he made no explanation or denial of the promises he had made. Therefore, I am justified in assuming as absolutely true that the Prime Minister did make the promises that were recited against him by the hon. member for North Grey. If he did, he stands obliged to support the motion. The right hon. gentleman's only reason for opposing the motion to-day is that he does not think it opportune, and does not approve of the manner in which it is brought up. For the life of me I cannot understand what the Prime Minister does want done. He makes promises in regard to this matter, and he does not fulfil them; his ministers make promises, and he does not say they should fulfil them, and when a humble member of the opposition undertakes to help him to fulfil them, he wants none of them. He does not want his promises carried out by any one if he does not propose to carry them out himself. If he wanted some excuse for doing this long-delayed justice to these people, he has every excuse in the declarations which have been made by the opposition in this House over and over again for a number of years past, that they were willing to vote for any measure which would extend some substantial recognition to the class of patriots referred to in this motion. The application of these people no one has dared to reject on the merits. It is not only the veterans who are concerned; the nationality of Canada, the integrity of this portion of the British Empire and the integrity of the empire as a whole is concerned. If invasion were threatened tomorrow, ten times the number who enlisted on that occasion would be prepared to enlist to protect this country from any invader, but foreign countries will have very little respect for the Dominion if it fails to recognize in some substantial way the patriotism shown by these veterans on the occasions to which this motion refers. The example to the rest of the world is a bad one. This country practically insults itself when it refuses a motion such as that made to-day, after all these years. The government that undertakes to reject such a motion and offers nothing in its place, practically tells the world that it does not care anything about gratitude towards the people who may protect the country. Those of us who were not on hand at that time are just as much interested from a national point of view as the descendants of those who were. We were served by those people, our nationality, and our integrity as a part of the British Empire were protected by them, and this country owes it to itself to do justice to the veterans who served it on those occasions. The Prime Minister has not told us why this motion is inopportune. Is it inopportune simply because the Prime Minister has neglected his duty for the last 10 years? Is it inopportune in the sense that the government is to blame because it is necessary to make the motion at all? I do not apprehend that this is what the Prime Minister means. I apprehend that he wants to do other business this week instead of dealing with this motion. He does not undertake to deny the promises that were quoted as having been made by him. Therefore, the Prime Minister in 1905 expressed the opinion that the Dominion government was the right body to be appealed to, and promised attention to the matter during that session, and in 1906 his Minister of Militia,

who the Prime Minister to-day regrets is not here to make a better defence, has been quoted as saying that the Dominion government would soon do something, probably by some sort of special land grant.

Members of this government are quoted as having declared in 1909 that if the opposition would not oppose it they would recommend a grant. The opposition have never opposed such a grant, but on the contrary have declared in advance in favour of it. In this, as in many matters of public importance which have arisen during the time I have been a member of this House, and, during which time this government has been in power, the opposition have invited the government to do something in the public interest and have promised in advance to support such action to their utmost so that the government need not fear the loss of any party advantage. What does the government want? I never heard of the Conservative government of Ottawa or the government of Sir James Whitney in Toronto receiving such charitable offers and assurances. A resolution was moved in 1909 or 1910 by the opposition favouring the granting of recognition, and one of the excuses made by supporters of the government like Mr. Logan has been that they relied on the promises of the government, believing that in this way there was more likelihood of something being accomplished than if they relied on the opposition. The Minister of Militia, in May, 1910, according to the hon. member for North Grey, whose statement has not been disputed, wrote to Captain Patterson who was pressing the claims for the veterans, that it was too late to attend to it that session, although it is not disputed that shortly before that the minister had specified a certain Saturday, the next Saturday, as the date when he would put the matter through the Privy Council. He made this statement to Captain Patterson when face to face with him, but did not carry out the promise and then wrote that it was too late that session. That did not mean that nothing would be done. The Prime Minister to-day, speaking for the Minister of Militia, says that the hon. member for North Grey knew that the Minister of Militia had said that nothing would be done. So the Prime Minister, in rejecting this motion to-day is rejecting it after having quietly and without much emphasis got on 'Hansard' a statement that it is understood to-day that nothing is to be done. But we have the evidence of witnesses on the other side, including the Prime Minister, who, during the past 14 years have repeatedly said that something would be done. Now, the Prime Minister admits that nothing is to be done. Surely that is a reason why every independent gentleman in this House should support this amendment and vote for it. The Prime Minister and his colleagues and supporters have repeatedly given the public to believe that there was no question as to something being done for these veterans, that it was simply a question of what form the grant should take. To-day the Prime Minister says that he understood and the hon. member for North Grey understood that the Minister of Militia had said lately that nothing was going to be done. Then every independent man in this House should vote for this amendment even against the will of the Prime Minister in order to save his own reputation and to demonstrate that if he finds he cannot rely on the promises made by the government he will vote against it. I do not care what the subject may be that principle should apply.

What will happen in regard to this matter if this amendment is voted down? If the majority vote it down it is understood finally by everybody in this House, and by the country, that these veterans are to get no recognition. That is what is to be understood from the words of the Prime Minister when he says that the motion is inopportune. If it has been delayed it has been delayed by the members of the government, not by the veterans or by the members of the opposition, who have not hesitated to assume their responsibilities and to assure the government that they would not raise this as a political question against the government either in this House or in the country. The veterans, as well as hon. gentlemen in this House supporting their claims, have been misled into believing that by delaying and keeping quiet they would get this matter attended to, and now when forebearance and patience have ceased to be a virtue, they are told by the government that they never intended to do anything, that they do not intend to do anything now and that the claim of the veterans will not be recognized.

I must protest against the Prime Minister suggesting that these veterans are looking for remuneration.

The veterans are not looking for remuneration in the sense the Prime Minister would indicate. The patriotism of these veterans, and of their descendants and of our people generally, is as it ever was, and will be the same whether this money is paid or land grant given or whether it is not. But here is the point: These men have been led to believe all these years after having established their claim, that their services would be given some recognition. They have established their claim morally and one might almost say legally. They have not established it on the ground of technical legality, that is of making it enforcible in the courts, but they have established it leg-

ally in the sense that the government has recognized other claims that were no better legally. If precedent has anything to do with legality, if a precedent set by the government makes the law outside of this make the common law outside of this House—then the young men who might be called upon to take up arms to-morrow have been given to understand that they would have a right to compensation, because they have seen the South African veterans rewarded, not more than they deserve but at all events recognized; and they have seen the volunteers of the rebellion of 1885 recognized in the same way. And alongside that every year has been almost a promise from the Prime Minister or some member of his cabinet that the matter would be attended to and the veterans of 1866 and 1870 recognized. The House was asked to vote down this motion on the ground that it is not wise to bring it forward at this time. The Prime Minister seems to be satisfied that all he has to do is to say that and the majority of the House will vote it down. The majority of this House must take the responsibility. I am going to honour myself by voting for the amendment; and if the majority choose to dishonour themselves and this House and the veterans by voting on the other side, the responsibility rests with them.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX. The Prime Minister has made it perfectly clear, I think, that he does not intend to do anything in this matter. It is as well that the veterans of 1866 and 1870 should understand from the utterance of the Prime Minister, that, however he may have evaded the issue down to this time, he has made up his mind that he will do nothing for them, and he takes this opportunity and means of making that absolutely clear. The reference to the Minister of Militia, of course, is a mere evasion. The Prime Minister is all-powerful in this matter. There is nothing done in his cabinet which is not in entire accord with his view. He controls the whole situation, and he has controlled the situation which has brought us down to what has been announced by the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) and concurred in by the Prime Minister, namely, that as the result of cabinet deliberation the Minister of Militia says that nothing will be done. It makes it no stronger for the government to say that Sir John Macdonald should have done something, and would not do anything in reference to these veterans. The Prime Minister must recognize—the country recognizes—that this defence of the country by the veterans was undertaken at a time when Canada was in a very different position from that which it occupies to-day. If the results to the country did not amply justify our recognizing these heroes, there would be no one claiming from the government at this time that they should be recognized. Not reward, but patriotism, the Prime Minister says, should be the actuating motive of these men. I quite admit it. And of course patriotism and not desire for reward actuated these men when they went out in defence of the country. At that time they identified themselves in resources, in income, and even in their lives with the future of the country. They succeeded in defending the country and maintaining our position in Canada. And, the country having greatly prospered since, is it not a pity that a generous people should not in some way, having recognized many subsequent heroes, recognize also in some way the heroic action of these men? The Prime Minister speaks of the difficulty of discriminating—he would not reward them all. Those who got ready, those who took up arms, those who responded to the call but had not the opportunity of fighting, he would not recognize. He would reward only those who were in active service. That may be a logical position, though I do not think so; I would reward all those who came to the defence of the country at the call of duty. But if the Prime Minister—and he is all-powerful in this matter—has come to the conclusion with his government that they will discriminate, why do they not get at it? Why do they not do something? The Prime Minister says that those who were actually in action in the field of battle, and those only, he would reward; those who were only ready to go he would not reward. Well, why does he not do it? Fifteen years ago this matter was urged upon him. For forty-five years these men have been waiting and entitled to recognition. Why, then, does not the government do something? The Prime Minister has had the matter under that 'serious consideration' of his. When he was in the West last year, and during all the years since he came into power, he has had the matter 'under his serious consideration.' There is nothing to prevent him acting in the matter. Two or three years ago he said: I am in sympathy with you; I think you are entitled to something, and I would like to recognize you; I would do it if I could. I will do it if I can and I will do it if the opposition will allow me. Has the opposition ever prevented him? Has not the opposition been ready, figuratively speaking, to pat him on the back? Have not they proposed resolutions asking him to do something? What is to prevent it? He knows. He could get up and tell us, but he does not do so? I know why he does nothing. It is because there is a certain element he is afraid of. Will he say now that it is not so? He knows that it is so.

He is afraid that he may lose a certain vote. If he could be sure he was not going to lose a certain vote he would have granted this long ago. Surely it is not that he does not like these veterans. Surely it is not that he is not really in sympathy with them? He says he is in sympathy with them. But he does not and dare not act because he is afraid of a certain vote.

Now he promised an answer. My hon. friend from North Grey says he promised it in the session of 1905. Why has he not given that answer? Who held him back? Just the same reason I have already alluded to. He wanted to give an answer, but he dare not give it, and he has not given it yet. Then there is another point, which I think is the most cruel part of the whole thing, that is the argument, the suggestion, of the Minister of Militia that he would give the veterans land in the Northwest on the same terms as lands are given to the foreign immigrants who come in. Then when it was suggested that that would hardly be giving them anything, he said: I am giving it to them on the same or more favourable terms, but upon terms of performing settlement duties. Surely the Prime Minister and every other member must realize that there is no gift in that. Those men at their age are simply offered a gold brick when they are offered lands in the Northwest upon terms of settlement duties, such as are imposed by the land regulations of the west. So the proposition suggested by the Minister of Militia in 1906 is actually an insult to the men who exposed their lives for the country. As the Prime Minister says to the victors belong the spoils, but these men have got no spoils, they have got no reward. They do not want spoils, it is only the government they are following who are looking for spoils. The men want the recognition to which they are entitled; and not more earnestly than the veterans themselves is their recognition demanded by the people who are speaking on their behalf. I knew when this matter was broached what the Prime Minister would do about it. He never felt yet that he dared recognize those veterans, and we understand from what he has said to-day that he does not intend to recognize them; and whatever may be fought for by the opposition, yet, while this government is in power, there will be nothing done for the men who fought for us in 1866 and 1870.

Mr. ALLEN. This matter of the recognition of the veterans who fought in the Fenian raid of 1866 and subsequently, is one that concerns me very deeply. In the county of Shefford there is a large number of those men, and they feel that they should be recognized in some manner. I take exception to the remarks of the hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) and the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox), who say that the government does not feel that they have a duty to perform in this matter. I was not here in 1905, and therefore am not acquainted with the discussions of that time. But I remember in 1909, I think it was, a large deputation of Fenian raid veterans came to interview this government and asked that something be done in recognition of their services. One man suggested one thing, another man suggested another, and still another suggested something else; there seemed to be no common desire on their part, or agreement as to what they did want. The right hon. premier in reply to these men, said: I am in sympathy with you, and if you will formulate a demand upon which you can all agree something that we can do for you, we will do it. But we cannot do one thing for one man and another thing for another. Formulate a straight demand and we will do something. Now I think that is the gist of the whole matter. This government is ready to meet these veterans and do something for them; I am convinced of that myself. If these men will only say whether they want land or whether they want a pension, I am convinced the government will meet their views.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the hon, member not know that there has been an answer placed on the paper saying that the government will do absolutely nothing for these veterans?

Mr. ALLEN. I do not know it. But I am free to say to the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) that I think if these men will formulate a straight demand as to what they want, the government will do something for them.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). But the Prime Minister says that if they ask for a land grant it would not be acceptable to the people of the Northwest.

Mr. ALLEN. I believe, as I said before, that if this question is brought before the government in a concrete form, the government will do something for these men, I am thoroughly convinced of that. But this resolution is indefinite, it merely asks the government: What are you going to do? There is no suggestion as to what the government should do, it merely asks that something be done. The government are ready to do something for these veterans, I am thoroughly convinced of it, if they will only formulate a reasonable and concrete demand.

Mr. TURRIFF. I would like to ask the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Lennox) a question. If I understood him aright, he said that at the time the government of

Sir John A. Macdonald was in power the country was not in a position to deal liberally with these veterans. The question has been asked whether that reason was given at the time by the Conservative government. I am not posted on the question, and I would like to know. There seems to have been some reason given during the time the Macdonald government was in power why something was not done in response to the request of the veterans, and I would like to know if that was really the reason given.

Mr. LENNOX. I did not say exactly that the country was not in a position to reward these veterans at that time; but I pointed out that the country was not so well able to deal with the matter then as it is now. Our resources were not anything like what they are at the present time. The hon. gentleman asks me what answer the Macdonald government gave to the requests made at that time. I would not profess to give the various answers that may have been given, but I do not understand that the matter ever came up in the same definite and concrete form that it has come up to-day. In fact, I do not think it ever did come up in any definite form before the Macdonald government. But some fifteen years ago it took a definite form, and since that time the question has been vigorously agitated.

Mr. BOYCE. The remarks of my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Allen) clearly demonstrates to my mind the insincerity of the government in dealing with this question, and the pitiable level to which, by the action of the Prime Minister, this great national question, involving the national honour of Canada, has been dragged down to the lowest level of party politics.

What is the position, as illustrated in the very exhaustive speech of the hon. member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) in support of this motion? I believe that, as my hon. friend from Shefford (Mr. Allen) is convinced that this is a righteous claim and that these veterans are justly entitled to this recognition, the majority of this House are in favour of the principle of this resolution, and that were it not for the lash applied to them by the Prime Minister in his speech this afternoon there would be a majority in favour of the resolution of the hon. member for North Grey. What a lamentable spectacle has been presented upon a question of national importance in which national honour is involved? Here are a set of men—I do not want to recapitulate the value of the services that they rendered to this country—who left their homes, and their business, who made great sacrifices of their interests, and at great danger to themselves and privation to their families, rushed to the border to defend their country against invaders, the country of which we are now so proud, which hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House are never tired of extolling. They ask in a very moderate way for such recognition as has been given in other instances to other Canadians who have fought in Canada's interests as well as in the interest of the empire. What is the answer that is made to these men? For fifteen years, during the term of the administration of this government, they are put off with different excuses and promises, all of which involve sympathetic consideration of their case. The hon. member for Shefford prefers to believe that this government will give some relief to these veterans although it is upon the records of this House, out of the mouth of the responsible minister—the Minister of Militia and Defence—that the government has no such intention at all, and that in so far as the government is concerned the matter is closed. What a sublime faith this one of the right hon. gentleman's followers has in his government notwithstanding the fact that they have placed themselves on record as being unwilling to do anything. What position does the hon. member for Shefford find himself in to-day? He is in sympathy with the motion; will he vote for it? No, he will vote for the right hon. leader of the government and why? Because he is subject to the whip. My hon. friend believes and has sought to express the belief that this government will, and should do something for these veterans, and, notwithstanding the fact that the Minister of Militia has said in answer to a definite question that nothing will be done, he will vote to reject this motion. It is a lamentable spectacle in connection with a great national question, and a question involving national honour and duty. Not to grant this recognition would be to leave a blot upon the fair escutcheon of Canada, and it is lamentable, I repeat, that a question of this kind cannot be dealt with in this House without the whip of the party being brought into play in order to make the followers of the government vote, as I believe they will vote, contrary to their sympathies in this case.

But, there is another view of this question which strikes me as being somewhat peculiar. We have large tracts of land out in the Northwest; we have thrown these open to settlement upon liberal terms free to who ever will till the ground and otherwise comply with the homestead regulations. The lands of the Northwest have been used for other purposes, for rewards for those who have served the country and the empire, a fact which has been referred to by my hon. friend from North Grey, and other hon. gentlemen who have followed him. The right hon. leader of the govern-

ment has taken a strangely inconsistent position upon this question. He admits that the men who went to the Northwest in 1885 to quell the rebellion were properly rewarded by grants of land belonging to the government, and he further consents to the giving out large parcels of these lands to those of our Canadian boys who answered the call of empire and fought in South Africa in 1889, 1890 and the following year. Where is the consistency of the Prime Minister now in refusing to accept the resolution introduced by my hon. friend from North Grey? The right hon. gentleman does not like to see Canada mixed up in the empire's wars. In London, not long ago, he distinguished himself, (or extinguished himself) in the view of the Candian people, by laying down the proposition, shocking to the consciences and feelings of a number of the empire's citizens, that Canada should not be drawn into the empire's wars without her consent. Yet, Sir, when our boys, responding to the call of the empire, went to South Africa, reluctant as the Prime Minister was on that occasion to give his consent for them to go, and when they came back he rewarded them with federal land grants in the west. What a strange inconsistency is manifested now by the right hon. gentleman? When Canada was in the dawn of its present development, when it was in the twilight of the magnificent prosperity which now blesses it, and which we hope shall hereafter bless it, these men responded to the call of their country for the protection of their homes, our homes, our land, our heritage and rushed to the border willing to lay down their lives if necessary as good Canadians in the cause of Canada, and yet the right hon. leader of the government, out of the great loyalty of his heart, posing as a great Canadian, says that there shall be no reward for these men, no land grant of any kind whatsoever, and calls upon this House to vote down the resolution of my hon. friend from North Grey. That is a strange spectacle for the right hon. gentleman to present to the Canadian people at this time, and in conjunction with the course which he has taken in regard to Canada's position in imperial wars.

It is well to notice what the reasons are that guide the Prime Minister in taking this somewhat questionable stand. Has he given any reason why these men should not be rewarded suitably? No, Sir, he has not, but he has broken straws with reference to the case of the veterans by alluding to the inactivity of the previous government in dealing with the question. What has that to do with the case? For fifteen years the right hon. gentleman has jockeyed with the situation, has jollied these veterans, and has given them expressly to believe that they would be rewarded in a substantial manner by this government.

Why, at the last moment, should he endeavour by flimsy excuse to avoid the real issue and attempt to throw the responsibility upon his predecessors in office. The question before this House is whether these veterans are going to get long delayed justice; whether the government will recognize the moral claim of these men to recognition, as they have promised. I am strongly in accord with the resolution now before the House, and I think the non-adoption of it would leave a blot upon the fair name of Canada and leave outstanding a national debt of honour which Canada ought to pay. Large grants of land have been made to friends of the government for political purposes; men who have sat in this House have been enriched tremendously by grants of land from the government obtained through means open to criticism and suspicion. Foreign immigrants are encouraged to come here by offering blocks of free land; steamship and immigration agents have been paid by this government so much per head to induce foreign immigrants to take up the land and till it, but have not the veterans a greater claim to their own soil? Are not those who have fought for Canada in her dire need entitled to recognition before foreigners who have to be bonused to come here? I earnestly hope that the resolution of my hon. friend (Mr. Middlebro) will receive greater consideration than has been shown it by the Prime Minister. I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will vote in accordance with their principles and that my hon friend from Shefford (Mr. Allen) will vote in accordance with his expressed conviction, and by so doing free Canada from a blot on her escutcheon.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). As one closely identified with the Candian militia for over twenty years and in whose constituency a great many of the veterans reside, I am in favour of the spirit and wording of the resolution which is similar to that moved in 1906 by the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk), and which was voted down by supporters of the government on the understanding that the Prime Minister and Minister of Militia would recognize the claims of the veterans. I quote from page 643, 'Hansard,' 1906, the statement of Mr. Logan, then member for Cumberland:

> We have had the experience of some of the members related to-night by the senior member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) showing the harrowing circumstances under which they laboured. We sympathize with them and I believe that some recognition should be given them. The Prime Minister and the Minister of Militia have promised that some recognition will be given, and under these circumstances I think it is our duty on this side

of the House to vote against the motion made by the member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk).

We have in these words the distinct understanding that at least one supporter of the government believed that the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Militia would provide some tangible recognition of the claims of the veterans. But, the attitude of the government on this question since 1906 has been uncertain, indefinite, and equivocating; they have led the veterans along, pursuing a will-o'-the-wisp, without ever implementing their promises. To-day the Prime Minister wants to know why the government of Sir John A. Macdonald did not do something, but I tell him that the government of Sir John A. Macdonald looked after the widows and orphans of those killed and pensioned those wounded, and did everything then asked of them. Subsequently in 1896 a Veterans' Association was formed and they pressed their claims on the government, and the government has side-stepped the issue ever since. Deputation after deputation has waited on the Prime Minister, and the Minister of Militia without ever obtaining a definite promise, but to-day the government will be forced to say yes or no to this resolution. I regret the language of the Prime Minister in which he apparently belittled the great services these veterans have rendered to the country. He said that he himself had secured a medal, and did not deserve it, but it does seem extraordintry that he should make application for a medal if he felt that his services did not entitled him to get one. The men of 1866 and 1870 responded to the call of their country; they endured the hardships of a daily drill from the month of March till the month of June; they came under fire; they made greater sacrifices than some of the volunteers who went to South Africa, and who never set foot on the shores of that country, but whose services were nevertheless recognized by a land grant. The quick response of the men of 1866 and 1870 to the call of their country and their determined resistance to the invading enemy possibly changed the destiny of this country, so that their great services are not to be slighted. I call attention to the treatment accorded to the veterans of 1866 and 1870 by the Ontario government. It would seem to me that the attitude of the federal government is brought about in a measure by the fact that the majority of these veterans lived in the province of Ontario, and this seems another instance of unjust discrimination by the present Dominion government against that province. A great proportion of these veterans came from Ontario, and the edict goes out that their services must not be recognized. The province of Ontario appreciated the services of the veterans of 1866 and 1870 just as they appreciated the services of the South African volunteers. Cap. 6, 1 Edward VII, 1901, provides for a grant of certain lands to the volunteers who served in South Africa and the volunteer militia who served on the frontier in 1865, 1866 and 1870, and it shows that the Ontario government did not discriminate. As the Ontario government appreciated the services of the militia in 1866 and 1870 and the services of the volunteers in South Africa, there is no justification for the Dominion government discriminating between the two. Clause 1 of the Ontario Act says:

1. The lieutenant-governor in council may from time to time designate by proclamation within two years after the passing of this Act such lands as he may deem proper for the purposes hereinafter mentioned.

Clause 2 says:

2. The lands so set apart shall be reserved for location by any of the following classes of persons, viz.:—

(a) Persons resident or domiciled in the province of Ontario who, while so resident or domiciled, were enrolled or enlisted in the province of Ontario or elsewhere for active military service in the South African war, in the years 1899 and 1900.

(d) Persons who were members of the volunteer militia of Canada in Ontario and were engaged in active service in the defence of the frontier of this province in 1865, 1866 or 1870.

Surely if the Ontario government gives recognition to the veterans of 1866 for their services, there is no reason why this government should deny their claims to the generosity of the country. Now, all that the Dominion government has done in connection with this matter is to strike a few medals and hand them out instead of recognizing the claims of these men in some substantial way. As has been pointed out by the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce), we have free lands for all classes—Doukhobors, Galicians, and all the polyglot population of Europe; why should not our government have free land for these veterans who did valuable service for this country? We have free lands granted to railways as subsidies; we have handed over practically as a free gift to the Saskatchewan Valley Land Company 250,000 acres of land at $1 an acre. If the government is so prodigal in giving lands and inviting settlers from a distance, why should it not deal generously with the veterans who performed these valuable services? It is a debt of honour which the country owes to these men, and there is no reason to my mind why the government should refuse this resolution. I was more than surprised to hear the remarks of the hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Allen). He says, notwithstanding that the government has distinctly and definitely stated that they will not do

anything for these men, he does not believe them. That is an absolutely absurd position for a member of this House to take, unless he has lost all confidence in his leaders. Whoever heard of a member of this House standing up and saying that he does not believe what the government says in answer to a question of an hon. member? At last the government have come from behind the lines of Torres Vedras and announce a policy on this matter, although it has taken them fifteen years to do so; and after they have announced that policy, the hon. member for Shefford says he does not believe that they are going to carry it out, but are going to do something else. Surely that is begging the question. Surely this country is not so ungenerous as to refuse to recognize the men who have defended it. I believe the country would approve the action of the government if they undertake to deal generously with these veterans and do something substantial for them, according to the words of the resolution.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. I desire to add a very few words to the discussion that has taken place upon the motion of my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro). As I understand the situation, the veterans of the war of 1812 have already received, about the year 1875, substantial recognition from the people of this country. The same is true of the veterans of the Northwest rebellion of 1885. The same is true of the men who went to South Africa in 1900 or 1901. Now, the men for whom consideration is asked by the present resolution are those who responded to the call of their country in 1866 and 1870. My right hon. friend the Prime Minister, during the course of his remarks, was asked, what about the alleged difference between the position of these men and those who went to South Africa in 1900 or 1901, and he said that he would come later on to the question of South Africa; but, as a matter of fact, he concluded his speech without reaching that interesting difference, if any difference exists, which I am not prepared to concede. If there is any difference in the consideration which the country ought to give to the men who fought in 1812, in 1885, and in 1900 or 1901, on the one hand, and the men who came out in 1866 and 1870 to defend the soil of Canada against an invader, I think that difference ought to be made clear to the House by the Prime Minister, and he has not done it up to the present time. Whatever rights the men who fought in 1866 and 1870 in defence of the soil of their country may have or may not have, I think we will all concede that they have one right at least, that is, to be treated in a straightforward and sincere manner, and not to be humbugged; and I think it is apparent to any one who looks at the history of this matter from 1896, when a large delegation of these men came to Ottawa, up to the commencement of this session, when apparently a final answer was given by the Minister of Militia and Defence, that they have been humbugged, deliberately humbugged. In 1906, when the hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) presented his motion to the House in what seemed to me to be a very fair and commendable spirit, he was told by the Prime Minister that he deprecated the spirit in which the motion was brought forward. The Prime Minister on that occasion used such language that the then member for Cumberland (Mr. Logan) regarded it as a promise that consideration would be given to these men, and, therefore, he voted against the resolution demanding recognition for them on the ground that he was entitled to rely on the promise of the Prime Minister given to the House. I have the language of the Prime Minister under my hand. I will not read the whole of it. The important words are as follow:

> We are told that we should recognize in some substantial manner the service of these men. The government will be prepared to consider any resolution of that kind.

The member for Cumberland declared that he understood these words as a promise. He made that declaration in the hearing of the Prime Minister, and the Prime Minister did not dissent from it. From 1906 to the present time nothing has been done. We have the final answer of the government given in this House on the 12th of December, 1910, and that answer is as follows. Mr. Middlebro asked:

> Does the government intend during the present session bringing down any legislation with reference to the grant of lands or money to the veterans of 1866 and 1870?
>
> Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The government has come to the conclusion that it is not in the public interest to grant public lands except as provided by law upon conditions of residence and settlement.
>
> It is not intended to recommend a grant of money in view of the fact that pensions were granted at the time to the wounded and to the families of those who were killed in the Fenian Raid engagements.

How is it possible, after such an answer has been given, for any hon member of this House to say that he is still convinced that the government intend to give consideration to these claims, absolutely passes my comprehension. There is the plain, distinct answer of the government that they intend to do absolutely nothing in the matter, although the Prime Minister this afternoon used certain more or less vague expressions that were not of the definite character of the language used by the Minister of Militia, which must be regarded as the answer of the government.

The hon. member for Shefford (Mr. Allen) has said that this matter has not come before the government in a concrete form from 1896 until to-day. Why, it has never come before the government in any but a concrete form. The suggestion is made that the men should agree among themselves as to the character of the consideration which they ought to receive. That is not the province of the men at all, it is for the government, in the first place, to come to a conclusion as to whether or not these men are entitled to substantial consideration; when they have decided that that is the right and due of these men, then it is entirely for the government and not for the men to determine the character and amount of such consideration. It has come before the government in a concrete form and in no other form. It has been presented to the government in every possible form in which it could be presented from 1896 up to the present. The government have dealt with it in no other than a humbugging way, and like other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this side, I deprecate the attitude which the government took in 1906 and which the Prime Minister took to-day, although not in so definite and offensive a form. The suggestion is that the loyalty of these men ought to be impugned because they come to the government and to parliament now and say that they are just as worthy of consideration as the men who fought in 1812 or in 1885 or in 1900-1901. The position which these men took does not reflect upon them in the slightest degree, but the position taken by the government that there ought to be a discrimination between the men who fought in the years I have named and those who fought in defence of the soil of this country in 1866 and 1870 is in itself a reflection on the government of this country which raises that discrimination without any excuse or justification.

These men, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker), sprang to arms at the call of their country when the soil of Canada was actually being invaded, without giving one moment's thought or consideration to reward in the future. Men dropped the axe, the plough, the tool in the machine shop, seized the rifle and bayonet and went to the front without giving a thought to any such consideration. But that does not the less involve a certain duty on the part of the government and the people of this country to give those men at least the same consideration as has been given to Canadians who fought in defence of this country and of this empire on other occasions.

The Prime Minister made another argument. He said these men had fought in 1866 and 1870 and that their claims were fresh in the minds of the people of this country at that time, but that they had not been thought worthy of recognition except for a certain compensation to those who had been wounded and to the families of those who had been killed. I would point out, as has already been pointed out by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, that it is the boast of hon. gentlemen upon the Treasury Benches that this country is infinitely richer in resources and infinitely stronger in its revenues now than it was 15 years ago. That is perfectly true. Just for curiosity I looked up the public accounts of Canada to inform myself what was the total revenue of Canada in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1870, and I find it was $15,500,000. The Minister of Finance boasted this year that for the fiscal year ending March 30, 1911, Canada has a surplus of $30,500,000. It is perfectly apparent then that the comparison which the Prime Minister made is not a good comparison and that if there was any justification, which no one denies, for the recognition accorded to the men who fought in 1812, 1885 and 1900-01, there is no just reason or excuse why some similar consideration should not be accorded to the men who fought in Canada for the defence of the soil of Canada in 1866 and again in 1870.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Mr. Speaker, the fact that I am a beneficiary of the action of the government of 1885, in dealing with the so-called veterans of that year, prompts me to say a few words in support of the proposition to reward those who rendered a much greater service when the country was more in need of the armed service of her sons than it was in 1885 or on the later occasion which we have recognized by grant of this parliament. We have standing between us and the proposal for a commercial invasion of this country, a proposition to reward those who were instrumental in resisting an armed invasion at the time of confederation. We are brought here in the dog days, in the close season for legislation, because of the statement of the government that a promise by a minister of the Crown, an unauthorized promise even, is so sacred that we must go to this extreme means to implement it. We are confronted by this other promise of the First Minister and other ministers that they would do something substantial for the veterans of 1866, and when this proposition is before the House we are told in effect that the word of a minister of the Crown in Canada is of variable value, that it is something substantial when given to ministers of another country seeking to take advantage of Canadian simplicity to prey upon the resources of this country, but that the

word of a minister of the Crown, of the First Minister, is of no value at all when given simply to a private soldier of the King who has gone out to active service in defence of his country.

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that the people of this country will relish the assumption that they are willing to subscribe to the monstrous doctrine that the word of a minister given to an elector of Canada in the hope that it may induce that elector to support this ministry is not of equal value with the word of a minister given to any foreign country. There is a widely-voiced opinion in this country, that this parliament, so far as its governing majority is concerned, is dead, and that we have come to the House at this inopportune season simply to set a date for the obsequies. If anything were needed to justify that popular impression, in which I concur, it is the spectacle presented in this House this afternoon of the majority supporting the government having absolutely nothing to say in defence of the extraordinary position taken by the Prime Minister, their answers to the arguments on this side being simply that which we have had presented to us so often during the last few years—'We have more heads than you have, count them.' And the fact that the silence of these gentlemen has not been prompted by their conviction that everything has been said that should be said in defence of the position that they propose to vote for is well illustrated by the unfortunate break made by the only follower of the right hon. the Prime Minister having the temerity to address the House on this occasion. The right hon. the Prime Minister, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, told us that this matter was settled, that it had been settled by the answers that the Minister of Militia placed upon the records of this House. He says that there is nothing to be done for these veterans. Yet the only one of his supporters who attempted to take part in this debate says that the reason he intends to vote against this motion is that the matter is not settled, that he feels in his heart that the government is going to do that which his leader and the Minister of Militia have told us they have no intention of doing. Mr. Speaker, I leave it to the public—it seems to be idle to leave it to the House—whether or not this does not indicate the moribund condition of the majority of this House—whether it does not indicate that we are wasting time in doing anything except setting the date for the obsequies referred to.

The Prime Minister, dealing with this subject, referred to one or two obstacles which present themselves to his mind. He referred to the results of the grants of land to other veterans which, he said, had done little for the benefit of the country, or of the veterans themselves. With that statement I have no quarrel; I think it is about as true a summary of the effect of an important action of this government as has ever been given on the floor of this House. So far as the veterans of 1866 and 1870 are concerned, it seems to me it is idle as has already been suggested, to offer them grants of land in the Northwest upon the terms of the grants made to other veterans. But why, if we desire to reward these veterans, should we confine ourselves to grants of land in view of our experience with similar grants that we have made. It is well known to the government, and to every member of this House that when you give as a reward to a veteran or any other person a grant of land, the country pays the full value of that land whether the individual to whom it is offered gets the value or whether he is forced to divide it with some intermediary who may be in a position to deal with, if not settle upon the land. Now, since the country has to pay the full value, why not ensure that the proposed recipient of the grant should have the whole value and not have to share it with the middlemen who have done so much harm in operations of this kind? The Prime Minister, knowing the experience we have had, knowing that it will cost no more to hand out the absolute value to the veterans than to give them grants of land to be preyed upon by speculators, has before him the immediate solution of one of the difficulties that presents itself to his mind. It is only necessary for him to give to the veterans the value, instead of grants of land such as have been shown to be so unprofitable if not unpopular. The right hon. gentleman told us also that we were confronted with a serious difficulty because it would be absurd to offer grants of land to every person who was mustered in connection with the repelling of the Fenian raid. He said there would have to be discrimination. And what we were told by the right hon. gentleman would lead one to believe that in none of the other grants of this kind had we exercised this discrimination. But the record is to the contrary. When we rewarded the veterans of the Northwest campaign of 1885, we did not hand out grants of land and medals to all those who mustered on that occasion. We drew the line at a certain degree of service which should entitle the men to the grant of land. We gave the benefit of the doubt to the volunteer in every case, so that it could not be said that any fine drawn distinctions were made to deprive any man of his reward. Speaking from memory I think the line of distinction in that case was that all the troops mustered for the occasion who proceeded west of the Lakes were given the reward of a grant of land, while those who were mustered, but remained at home were not given the grant. So, this difficulty with regard to discrimination of which

the Prime Minister has spoken can easily be overcome by following the principle adopted in 1885. Yet, though the difficulties he has spoken of can thus be overcome, all the Prime Minister asks of this House is that the proposition be rejected. It is open to him, if he does not like the form of the proposal, to amend it, or to ask the mover to withdraw it on the promise made to the House that he will do something substantial. There are any number of courses open to him if he has it in his heart to make good to these veterans the promises made on so many occasions by himself and his colleagues that, in consideration of what they have done for Canada, we should make recognition of these veterans of 1866 and 1870.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the will of this House may assert itself in a substantial vote in favour of the proposition now before the House.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Middlebro).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Arthurs,	Marshall,
Barker,	Middlebro,
Best,	Northrup,
Blain,	Perley,
Borden (Halifax),	Porter,
Boyce,	Reid (Grenville),
Bradbury,	Russell,
Campbell,	Sexsmith,
Chisholm (Huron),	Sharpe (Ontario),
Cowan,	Smyth,
Crocket,	Sproule,
Doherty,	Stanfield,
Edwards,	Taylor (Leeds,
Fraser,	Taylor (New
Goodeve,	Westminster,)
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Thoburn,
Henderson,	Thornton,
Herron,	Wallace,
Jameson,	White (Renfrew),
Kidd,	Wilcox,
Lancaster,	Wilson (Lennox and
Lennox,	Addington) and
Maclean (York, S.),	Wright.—45.
McCall,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,	McColl,
Allen,	McIntyre,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	McKenzie,
Bickerdike,	McMillan,
Black,	Martin (Montreal,
Bureau,	Ste, Mary's),
Chew,	Martin (Wellington),
Clarke (Essex),	Michaud,
Conmee,	Miller,
Delisle,	Molloy,
Demers,	Murphy,
Devlin,	Papineau,
Fielding,	Pardee,
Fisher,	Parent,
Fortier,	Paterson,
Fowke,	Proulx,
Graham,	Pugsley,
Hodgins,	Rivet,
Hunt,	Robb,
King,	Ross (Rimouski),
Knowles,	Roy (Montmagny),
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Sperry,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Templeman,
Lapointe,	Todd,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Turcotte (Quebec County),
LeBlanc,	Turgeon,
Lemieux,	Turriff,
Loggie,	Verville,
Lovell,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
Low,	Wilson (Laval).—61.
MacNutt,	
McCoig,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,	Beattie,
Talbot,	Owen,
Brown,	Lortie,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Armstrong,
Macdonald,	Rhodes,
McCraney,	Magrath,
Martin (Regina),	Ames,
Congdon,	Barnard,
Gordon (Kent),	Bristol,
Guthrie,	Broder,
McAllister,	Burrell,
Harty,	Clare,
Kyte,	Crosby,
McLean (Huron),	Crothers,
McLean (Sunbury),	Currie (Simcoe),
Carvell,	Daniel,
McGiverin,	Donnelly,
Neely,	Elson,
Ethier,	Forget,
Borden (Sir F.),	Foster,
Rankin,	Hughes,
Cash,	Lake,
Carrier,	Lalor,
Richards,	Lewis,
German,	Macdonell,
Clark (Red Deer),	McCarthy,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Maddin,
Sinclair,	Meighen,
Tobin,	Monk,
Seguin,	Nantel,
Warburton,	Osler,
Boyer,	Paquet,
Emmerson,	Price,
Nesbitt,	Roche,
Douglas,	Schaffner,
Sealey,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Schell,	Staples,
Ross (Middlesex),	Stewart,
Béland,	Worthington,
Beauparlant.	Blondin.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I would like to ask if the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Conmee) was in the House and heard the resolution read.

Mr. CONMEE. I heard the motion put. I was in the House when the motion was put. I came in to the door of the

House, realized that the vote was on and heard the Speaker's remarks before he took his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER. The question is on the main motion.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I saw the hon. member for Thunder Bay and Rainy River come in after you, Mr. Speaker, had concluded reading the motion.

Mr. SPEAKER. I am afraid the matter cannot be discussed. The hon. member (Mr. Conmee) says that he heard the motion read.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. No, that he heard the motion put.

Amendment (Mr. Middlebro) negatived.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

THE PORCUPINE DISASTER.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH (East Algoma). Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair I wish to bring to the attention of the House the serious and unparalleled catastrophe that has occurred at Porcupine in northern Ontario, and I would like to ask the government if it is their intention to give any substantial relief. No doubt you have noticed in the public press that private individuals and municipalities, and corporations of different kinds, as well as the government of Ontario, have granted considerable relief to the suffering people of that district. I noticed in the public press this morning that this government had under consideration a measure of relief towards those people who have suffered so terribly in that fearful calamity that happened last week. I know that anything that this government and parliament will do will meet with the approval of every citizen of the Dominion. We have in the past, as you are well aware, contributed largely to similar catastrophes in other parts of the world. From what I know personally of the suffering that has existed and that now exists in Porcupine, I believe the government would be warranted in acting very liberally towards the sufferers. Porcupine is a very important part, not only of the great province of Ontario, but of the Dominion of Canada. Perhaps no other part of this Dominion is advertising Canada to the outside world to the same extent as Porcupine is to-day, and the men who have been the means of this advertising are the men who have suffered, and many of them have lost their lives in an effort, no doubt with personal gain in view, but also to the great advantage of our Dominion. I hope the right hon. the First Minister will give us some assurance that it is the intention of the government to aid these sufferers in some substantial manner.

Mr. FIELDING. I am sure the members of the government as well as all the members of the House have learned with the greatest anxiety of the condition of affairs at Porcupine, and have the very warmest sympathy with those who have suffered so much in that disaster. We have had representations made to us through a committee of gentlemen in Ottawa particularly but they were not able to give us a very extended report as to the nature of the disaster and the need for assistance. Indeed, it has been represented by gentlemen to whose views we are bound to give consideration, that while the disaster is one of very considerable extent, and attended by many distressing circumstances, there is no immediate need of aid; that is to say, that the aid that has already been given is sufficient for all purposes, and that several weeks perhaps might elapse before we could be fully advised as to the extent of the misfortune and the need of assistance. It is even stated by a prominent gentleman interested in that part of Ontario that every need of the community is now being attended to. However, we quite realize that the information in the possession of the government, as it is in the possession of the public generally, is of a general and somewhat indefinite character, and we think it would be well that we should await some further information before coming to a decision as to what action may be necessary, if necessary, to provide the desired relief. Relief, perhaps in the most useful and substantial form, was sent immediately, in the form of canvas tents, which are being used to cover the people. That I understand has been very useful. Indeed, in itself it involves a very substantial aid. But whether or not the need will arise for further aid is a point on which the government are awaiting further information.

THE TELEGRAPH AND CABLE SERVICES.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, as I see the hon. Postmaster General in his place, I desire to bring to the attention of the House and the country an improvement that could be made by the action of the government in the telegraph and cable services of this country. We have heard a good deal in Canada for some years about public ownership. I believe it is a great principle; I believe it has

great promise and great performance for the public of Canada. We have talked about it for quite a while, and we have realized it in a way.. In the province of Ontario we have realized that principle in a way that justifies it. Public ownership is based on the idea that it will first of all give the public a greatly improved service, and, in the next place, that it will give the public a much cheaper service. Now, that has been denied; but we have to-day the evidence of all Europe, of Australia, of New Zealand, of other countries, that the principle of public ownership is a great success. In Ontario we have tried it, and the very first result of the operation of the Hydro-Electric Commission in that province has been to cut the price of a widespread public service in two, and to improve the service. In the city of Toronto, where an electric monopoly held up the citizens and gave a very poor service, we have to-day the price cut in two, and a service owned and controlled by the people of Toronto, which promises to be an excellent service. In this House itself, where the lighting is by electricity, we make a contract with a private company for a certain candle-power. Do you ever get it? No. There is such an absence of juice, to use a technical term, in the service, that sometimes the lights are not equal to eight candle-power where we have been promised 32. In the city of Hamilton, where there was a monopoly controlled by the Cataract Power Company, the moment there is public ownership, what does the private monopoly say? It says, we will give you as good or a better price than the Hydro-Electric. And so the principle of public ownership has vindicated itself in the province of Ontario in connection with a great system of lighting for all the municipalities of that province. The province of Ontario, whether it is patriotic or not, is to-day selling or is about to sell power to the citizens of the United States for less than they can buy it for elsewhere.

Mr. GRAHAM. That is reciprocity.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes, but it is a different kind of reciprocity from that which the government is proposing. We have tried public ownership in the Dominion in connection with the Intercolonial railway, but that public ownership was never given an opportunity to make good. Put the Intercolonial railway in competition with other railways; extend it to Toronto, to the Georgian bay, to the Detroit river, and railway rates in the province of Ontario would be cut one-third in a single day, and the government railway would be a success. The Intercolonial railway should have been put into the great Canadian west, and then there would have been a reduction in rates that would have substantially benefited the people of the west. You cannot vindicate government ownership of railways unless you give the principle a fair chance to vindicate itself. And to-day, even though the Canadian Pacific railway is bound by its contracts to give the people of the west lower freight rates, we are told we must not enforce the law against the Canadian Pacific railway because it would injure the Grand Trunk Pacific and Canadian Northern railway. Now, as to the post office, the telegraph, and the cable services. True, we have tried government owned telegraphs in this country, but only in uninhabited parts on the Atlantic coast, on the Pacific coast, and up to the Yukon where public ownership had no opportunity to serve the people. The time has come when the post Office Department must take over the telegraphs, or else they must extend the existing government owned wires into a transcontinental service so as to compete with the railway monopoly of telegraphs. The telegraph tolls to-day in the Canadian west are exorbitantly high, and the telegraph company that controls the service in the west is reaping enormous profits. The profits of the Canadian Pacific Railway Telegraph service in the west ought to be reduced at once, and if we cannot reduce them by form of law we should immediately resort to the establishment of a government owned transcontinental telegraph service. The day has arrived when there ought to be a national transcontinental telegraph service throughout Canada and connecting with all the great cities of the country. Then, in conjunction with that, cable tolls should be reduced, and the effective way to reduce cable tolls is for Canada to establish an Atlantic cable. The business now offering is more than the existing Atlantic cable companies can do; there is room for competition, and I believe that the mere announcement that the government of Canada would adopt the principle of government ownership in cables would result in a reduction from the present commercial rate of 25 cents a word to 5 cents a word, and the business community of the world would be enormously benefited. You may talk of the Steel Trust and other great monopolies, but there is no such powerful monopoly in the world to-day as the Eastern Telegraph Company in England. They largely control the cables all over the world; they are probably the most influential corporation in England, and they have had more influence at government head quarters in England for the last 50 years, and especially with the late government, than any other corporation. Do what you might it has been impossible to get the Eastern Telegraph Company to reduce its exorbitant rates or to improve its service. I believe the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) has taken part in negotiations held

in England, and that a promise has been made that cable rates would be reduced, but so far the public has derived no benefit in that direction. Perhaps it may come from the present discussion in this House, but anyway, come it should. The principle of government ownership so well vindicated in Ontario in connection with the distribution of electric power can easily and cheaply be applied to telegraphs and cables, for it will not cost much to build one or two cables across the Atlantic to start with, and then will follow a cable to Australasia if that be necessary to control the service on the Pacific. It has been mentioned in the press, and in parliament that a reduction in cable tolls is in sight, but it will not be realized by talking about it; government ownership of the telegraphs and cables is the real cure for the existing evil. Great Britain has adopted the principle in connection with her inland telegraph system, she is adopting it with reference to her telephone system, and Germany, and Russia, and Japan, and China, and Australia, and New Zealand, where their system has been tried would not give up their control for any consideration. Then, government ownership of telegraphs and cables would not only cheapen the rates, but it would widen the area of the effectiveness of the service.

Where there were 3,000 or 4,000 telegraph offices in the mother country they now have 12,000 or 15,000. The improved system has been a great success. We in Canada are to-day paying exorbitant telegraph and cable tolls. We can have them reduced by the application of the principle of public ownership. We can easily get the money to establish the new system and we can insist on the mother country joining with us in the project because Great Britain is now committed to the principle and there is a great imperial reason, there is a great reason of peace behind the proposition which I urge here to-day. We are to-day discussing arbitration treaties in the world. Great Britain and the United States are binding themselves one to the other in favour of a system of arbitration in place of a resort to war. That idea, which we all welcome, is making great headway but if the principle of arbitration is to govern, it can only realize itself by having the support of a world wide public opinion and a world wide public opinion can only be created by the rapid interchange of public opinion between different countries by means of a cheap cable telegraph service. It is in the interest of this country, in the interest of peace, in the interest of business, in the interest of the empire that there should be cheaper telegraph and cable tolls and we can never get them to the full until the state undertakes to build telegraph lines and to be a party, along with other states of the empire, in the construction and maintenance of the state-owned cables. If that is the case why is not the principle recognized? It will do everything for the country. It will be a boon to the farmer of the west. Those farmers are told that they want the American market. Perhaps they do. Perhaps the Americans will give it to them off their own bat. By all means let them do so if they wish to, but let the farmers get relief from the exorbitant telegraph tolls now exacted from them. The railway commission have not yet caught up with all their work, they have not yet reduced the telegraph tolls to any great extent. But those tolls would be reduced at once by the mere threat to start a state owned telegraph system. We have had the fruit now in Ontario; the city of Toronto is about to realize it in connection with its street railway. They proposed to establish a municipal system as they have a right to do in competition with the private owned principle and the moment that was done there was an improvement in the service, a cheapening in the price and an enlargement in the area of the application of the service. My contention is that the government or the Postmaster General representing the government should tell the people of Canada what all these negotiations up to the present have resulted in and whether we are to have cheaper cable telegraph tolls or whether the government are prepared, if they cannot get it by negotiation, then to come forward and give the people and press of Canada the benefit of a state-owned system. They have given some relief to the press in connection with cable tolls because those tolls were so exorbitant that the newspapers were not able even to transmit the ordinary news of the day between Canada and the mother country. The government is committed to that principle to-day in relation to the press but they have not realized it for the public; the press get a ten cent rate and the government help to pay the difference, but if the government will establish state owned cables and land lines jointly with the Imperial government, first connecting the great cities of Canada like Montreal, Ottawa, Toronto, Winnipeg, Calgary and Vancouver, the interest on the investment would be easily paid and the telegraph rates would be cut in three. There is a substantial opportunity to benefit the people of all this country by giving them a state owned telegraph and cable service.

It is true the Prime Minister said he is afraid of public ownership. I do not know whether the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) is also afraid but if he has been afraid in the past he has that living example in Ontario that the moment they embarked in earnest on the project of public ownership applied to the distribution of electricity, one of the greatest blessings in

the world, to the people, the price was cut in two, the service was improved, and distribution was made all over the province. The work has only begun but at the very first inception of it the coon comes down. The late Attorney General of Ontario—I shall not speak of him by his present title—devoted himself to creating a great monopoly in Ontario in connection with the electric service, especially in connection with the city of Hamilton. It never would amount to anything and the special pleaders now in Hamilton and all over Ontario are saying it will not amount to anything, it will not realize itself; but it has realized itself to-day and we in Toronto have had our electric prices cut in two. We have done more than that, we have disciplined the competing companies. They are civil now to the public, they take off their hats and ask what they can do for their customers. They have to do for every city what they do for any one city and if, by competition of the government they are forced to give consideration and to give concessions in one place they must by parity of reasoning give them to other places. So the result of public ownership, this much derided principle, in Ontario to-day is that it has realized itself and yet, it has only started. It is the greatest project that any state has undertaken and is almost the widest exposition of the principle we have seen for a long while. But it has been successful from the start and it comes home to us in this House in connection with the government of Canada to see if we cannot apply that principle of government ownership to the telegraph and cable services of this country and of the empire in such a way as to bring about an improvement and cheapening of these services.

So I would like to hear some account of these negotiations, a statement of what the result has been or if no result is in sight when the government would be prepared to take up the question of improving the cable service of the country and the land telegraph lines in such a way as to afford substantial benefit to the country. we can do a great deal. We can bring relief to-morrow to the farmers of the west in connection with telegraph tolls and to all Canada in connection with railway rates, a still greater question, if we have the courage and the capacity to apply the principle of public ownership to the railway problem of this country.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred to have had my hon. friend give me notice of his intention to bring this matter up this evening. However, I will state in a few words how the question stands in regard to cable rates. First, let me tell him, speaking personally and for myself alone, that I am not so much averse in many respects to public ownership. As my hon. friend stated, in the older countries such as France, England and Germany and in newer countries from the point of view of civilization, such as Japan, the Post Office Department includes all communications and in those countries telephones, telegraphs and cables are under post office jurisdiction.

In this country, however, we have not yet reached that stage, although there is a strong movement, in some parts of the country in favour of public ownership of this form of public utility. We have, however, made a very important step in that direction by the establishment of the Railway Commission. My hon. friend (Mr. W. F. Maclean) knows that any person can bring before the Railway Commission the telegraph companies or telephone companies, or even the cable companies, if it is believed that their rates are excessive.

My hon. friend stated that there had been some discussion between the Post Office Department in Great Britain and the Canadian Post Office. That is quite true. On two different occasions, it was my duty to discuss with the Postmaster General in England the question of cable rates. There was a strong opinion in this country that the rates should be cut. I found also two friends of cheaper rates in the two Postmasters General with whom I have discussed this matter, Mr. Buxton and Mr. Samuels. Mr. Buxton, who is now president of the Board of Trade, was strongly in favour of cheaper cable communication between Canada and the mother country. Like his predecessor, Mr. Samuels, with whom I had some interviews last year, he agreed that in some way or other means should be found to reduce the rates. We even discussed what schedule of rates should be established. I may say that we reached the following basis in case we were able to bring the cable companies to terms: The actual rate of 25 cents per word was to be maintained for what we called 'urgent cables'. Twelve cents a word was to be charged for the semi-urgent messages. My contention was that we should have another reduction for the press to a rate of six cents a word. Without at all committing my colleagues on the other side of the water, Messrs. Buxton and Samuels, I may say we were practically agreed upon these rates. But in England the cable companies have thousands of shareholders and it was thought that perhaps it would injure vested rights if the government should press too hard on the cable companies in order to bring them to terms. I am passing very rapidly over the various discussions we had; but, later in the session, if my hon. friend will renew his motion, I may bring before the House the papers I have in the department relating to the subject, and from these he will gain more information

than I can give him this evening. Last year it was finally agreed that the cable companies should reduce their rates by 12½ cents on the semi-urgent messages, provided these messages were not in cipher, and provided also that a certain time should be allowed for delivery.—I think it was 20 or 24 hours. Before recess, I received a letter from Mr. Samuels stating that there remained one country, France, to join in the general agreement made by the various European cable companies. The government of Germany and of Great Britain had agreed. I have not received any further information from Mr. Samuels since that time, but I dare say that in a very short time announcement can be made that a reduction is made from 25 cents a word on ordinary cable messages to 12 cents a word. But I wish to go further than that. My hon. friend is aware that the question was brought up at the last Imperial Conference. Again I say that I am speaking on my own responsibility. I am personally in favour of a state-owned cable between Canada and Great Britain. I am not what some people call a jingo; I am a sane imperialist and I think that if you wish to forge the bonds of union among the different parts of the empire, you must have cheap electric communication so as to make the centre of the empire the nerve centre of the imperial organization. There are objections to that, of course, and I agree that we cannot overcome such objections by a wave of the hand. As my hon. friend is aware, a motion was made in the last Imperial Conference in favour of a state-owned cable. The reduction of which I have spoken was referred to by the British Postmaster General, Mr. Samuels, who said that the reduction would be made within a short time. But he committed himself and the British government to a further reduction to be obtained from the cable companies, otherwise a state-owned could would have to be established. I think that is the gist of the resolution adopted by the conference. So, if my hon. friend and the press, who are very much interested in these matters, and the public generally, will be patient, I think the day is not far distant when we shall have cheaper communication by elecricity between Canada and the motherland. I am sure my hon. friend is aware that the question of the land lines is not a great difficulty after all. We have to-day a land line leased for the Pacific cable between Vancouver and Montreal. There is a very little gap between Montreal and Quebec, and from Quebec and the maritime provinces we could use the government telegraphs. It would be a very small matter to provide a cable between the two countries. According to figures which have been verified by experts it would cost something like $2,000,000 or a little more to establish cable communication between Canada and Great Britain. Another objection which prevents the home government from committing themselves absolutely to state-owned cables at present is the outlook for Mr. Marconi's invention. Mr. Marconi has been very successful, and it is believed in England that he will go much farther and that perhaps, when he has mastered his invention it will be a much less expensive matter to establish a system of communication between England and Canada than by means of a cable.

I may say to my hon. friend that last year the Imperial government purchased all the rights of the Marconi system in Great Britain; to-day the Marconi stations in England, Ireland and Scotland are the property of the state; and it is intended, when Mr. Marconi has perfected his system, to take full control of the invention. At a later stage of the session, I hope to be able to give the House more information on this question.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman says the Imperial government owns the Marconi system and the stations in Great Britain. How is the trans-Atlantic service to be operated? The stations on both sides of the Atlantic will be necessary for the operation. I am asking for information. I was not aware that the Imperial government had purchased the system.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I may, perhaps, qualify my statement by saying that they have purchased the Marconi stations in relation to the navy, they have established a Marconi system on all the ships of the navy, and all the stations in Ireland, England and Scotland belong to the Imperial government. I read the contract not long ago. But Mr. Marconi, I suppose, has retained some rights as regards the sending of private messages across the Atlantic; but for state purposes and for the purposes of the Admiralty the stations are controlled by the government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Has the hon, gentleman a copy of the contract?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I can get one for the hon. gentleman.

Mr. THOBURN. Did I understand from the Postmaster General that in the event of the cable rate being cut from 25 to 12 cents per word, we are not permitted to use cipher or code words?

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is the agreement between the Imperial Postmaster General and the various cable companies. I regret not to have the verbatim statement made to me by the Postmaster General, but I will file a copy of it for the benefit of mem-

bers of the House. No cipher message can be used and get the benefit of the reduction.

Mr. THOBURN. Let me point out to the Postmaster General that instead of that being of advantage to the business men of Canada it will be a burden. For instance, there are many code words representing a sentence, say, of ten words. Now, that code word as it stands to-day costs 25 cents, but under the new regulation it will cost $1.20. The reduction in rates will be all right providing cipher and code words are left as they are, otherwise it will be an injury to the business men of Canada instead of a benefit.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I said this was the first agreement made between the Postmaster General in England and the cable companies. But my hon. friend will realize that after the resolution adopted by the conference another step will be taken. The delegates of the various colonies and the Postmaster General in England himself are not satisfied with this reduction, they want a further reduction; if they do not get it they have committed themselves to the establishment of a state-owned cable.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Supposing these reductions were agreed to between the companies and the government, how long, or would it for any time check the government in the application of the principle of state ownership in connection with cables and telegraphs?

Mr. LEMIEUX. The moment the reduction is accepted, the moment there is no burden on the public, there will be no necessity of state ownership.

Mr. TURRIFF. If that agreement is made between the telegraph companies and the government in Great Britain, would it do away with the present rate of 25 cents per word for code words?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I do not know if I am in a position to answer my hon. friend's question without having the papers before me. The government in England and the cable companies agreed that the present rate of 25 cents should remain as it is for urgent messages. My hon. friend knows that during certain hours of the day the cables are busy with messages from the various bourses of the world, and those people do not care whether a message costs 25 cents or even $1 a word. But for the general public, for social messages and even business messages, provided they are not in code or cipher, and provided there is no obligation about their delivery within a specified time, say within 24 hours, the cable companies have agreed to reduce the rate to 12 cents a word. But that is not thought sufficient by the parties who have made the agreement, and at the last Imperial conference the question came up, and it was decided that the British Postmaster General should urge upon the cable companies a still further reduction in their rates, and if they do not yield to the pressure of the government, there is an implied promise that there will be a state owned cable.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee on Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. FIELDING. We will take up the motion for the further consideration of the resolutions respecting reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. JAMES ARTHURS (Parry Sound). When I left this House two months ago I was opposed to this agreement, believing as I did that it would be most injurious to Canada as a whole. I believed that the average elector of Canada, more particularly of Ontario, with which I am better acquainted, was also opposed to this agreement. I still believe that I was right in both propositions. I was surprised to find in going through the country, that in many places the Ontario farmer is being deliberately misled as to the scope of this agreement. I find not one but hundreds of farmers who are being taught to believe that this agreement amounts to absolute free trade in all agricultural machinery, and some other articles the farmers use. I may go further and say that the free list as passed by the House of Representatives of the United States, commonly known as the farmers' free list, is being circulated throughout my riding as the offspring of this government, and as a reason for supporting the reciprocity agreement. Now, I will take up a little time of the House by reading over a list of manufactured articles which enter into this reciprocity agreement, and the amount of reduction in each case.

I am now reading from the official document, and will be pleased if any hon. gentleman will correct me if I am wrong.

Articles.	Reduction.
Farm wagons and complete parts thereof	2½ per cent.
Ploughs	5 "
Tooth and disc harrows	5 "
Harvesters and reapers	2½ "
Agricultural drills and planters	5 "
Mowers	2½ "
Horse rakes	5 "
Cultivators	5 "
Threshing machines	5 "
Windstackers, baggers, weighers and self-feeders therefor and finished parts of the foregoing for repairs	5 "
Portable engines with boilers, in combination, with horse powers and traction engines for farm purposes	
Hay loaders	5 "
Potato diggers	5 "
Fodder or feed cutters	5 "
Grain crushers	5 "
Fanning mills	5 "
Hay tedders	5 "
Farm or field rollers	5 "
Manure spreaders	
Weeders	
Windmills—and finished parts of the foregoing, for repairs, except shafting	
Cutlery, plated or not, viz., penknives, pocketknives, knives for household and other purposes and table steels	2½ "
Bells and gongs; brass corners and rules for printers	2½ "
Basins, urinals and other plumbing fixtures of earthenware for bathrooms and lavatories; baths, bath-tubs, sinks and laundry tubs of earthenware, stone, cement or clay, or of other material	2½ "
Brass band instruments	2½ "
Grindstones of sandstone, not mounted, finished or not	50 cents per ton.
Building or monumental stone of freestone, granite, sandstone	2½ per cent.

I think these are the principle manufactured articles except one, and that is automobiles, which are reduced 5 per cent. Now I will read a list of articles produced by the farmer on which there is a reduction. Butter, reduced by 4 cents per pound. Cheese reduced by 3 cents. Fresh milk by 17½ per cent; fresh cream, 17½ per cent; eggs, 3 cents per doz.; honey, 3 cents per pound. Then I read from the table other items, with the reductions of duty:

Articles.	Reduction by United States.	Reduction by Canada.
Cattle		25 per cent.
Less than one year old	$2 per head	
Valued at not more than $14 per head	$3.75 "	
Valued at more than $14 per head	27½ per cent	
Horses and mules		
Horses over one year old, valued at $50 or less		$12.50.
Horses, N.O.P.		25 per cent.
Valued at $150 or less per head	$30	
Valued at over $150	25 per cent.	
Swine	$1.50 each	1½c. per lb.
Sheep and lambs		25 per cent.
Less than one year old	75c. each	
One year old or over	$1.50 each	
Other live animals	20 per cent	25 per cent.
Poultry, dead and alive		
Alive	3c. per lb.	25 "
Dead	5c. "	20 "
Wheat, per bushel	25 cents	12 cents.
Rye "	10 "	10 "
Oats "	15 "	10 "
Barley "	30 "	15 "
Buckwheat "	15 "	15 "
Beans, edible, dried, per bushel	45 "	25 "
Pease, dried, per bushel	25 "	
	40 "	15 "
Potatoes, per bushel	25 "	20 "
Corn (except into Canada for distillation)	15c. per bushel.	
Sweet potatoes, per bushel	25 cents	10 "
Yams	25 per cent	30 per cent.
Turnips	25 "	30 "
Onions	40c. per bushel.	30 "
Cabbages	2c. each	30 "
All other vegetables in their natural state	25 per cent	30 "

If the farmer believes he is going to be benefited by the small reductions which are being made in manufactured articles according to this list, he is absolutely being misled. But this idea is being sedulously spread throughout all Canada to-day. We find large quantities of literature going out from the government side teaching this idea, but we do not find them sending out any literature giving the actual facts. Now, I intend to oppose this reciprocity agreement for three principal reasons. In the first place, I believe it is unwise for us Canadians to entangle ourselves at the present time, commercially or otherwise, with the United States. That country has always been our most formidable competitor commercially. I believe the United States has entered into this bargain with the idea that they are getting the best of it, and that in the end it will lead to the annexation of Canada by the United States. In the second place, I believe that no fiscal change as great as this should be entered into by Canada, making such radical change in our tariff conditions, without the people of Canada being consulted. In the third place, I believe the treaty in itself would be of no benefit to Canada, but would be most injurious to the farmers of this country and would put many of our Canadian industries under the control of the trusts of the United States, of which we already have enough of our own. Now I do not mean to say, and I do not think, that hon. gentlemen sitting on the other side of the House are less loyal than those sitting on this side of the House, but I believe they are mistaken. I believe they entered into this agreement without understanding its full import, and I believe that those of them who have studied the question carefully, if it were not for their party loyalty would be absolutely opposed to this agreement at the present time. Now there is no question as to what the Americans think of it. They have shown no hesitation in expressing their opinions, and at the risk of wearying the House, I would like to quote a few extracts from leading American statesmen showing what they think will be the effect of this agreement. First, I will quote a statement from President Taft:

One path leads to practical if not political union with Canada, and the development of the entire North American continent as the heritage and the possession of a great and free people. The other path leads to the hardening into two distinct political entities, two hostile or at least unsympathetic peoples on this continent. It leads to a closer relation between Canada and Great Britain. It means the carrying out of Joseph Chamberlain's

great dream of a British imperial federation, bound together no less by trade than by sentiment, with preferential tariffs on either side, with Canada taking the place of the United States as chief purveyor of food products and manufactures to Great Britain.

To-day England is our best customer, and Canada is our third best customer. But our foreign trade wanes, and that of Canada grows. If we push Canada into England's arms, the trade arrangements between the two will tend more and more to shut us out.

How long will our trade with these two customers last, if reciprocity fails? Our Canadian must drop off, as the east and west channels of her commerce are scoured by us. And Canada will more and more supply English needs in our stead.

Again, speaking on page 8 of the American 'Congressional Record,' we find Mr. Taft saying:

The benefit to our widespread agricultural implement industry from the reduction of Canadian duties in the agreement is clear Similarly the new, widely distributed and expanding motor vehicle industry of the United States is given access to the Dominion market on advantageous terms. . . That the broadening of the sources of food supplies, that the opening of the timber resources of the Dominion to our needs, that the addition to the supply of raw materials, will be limited to no particular section does not require demonstration. The same observation applies to the markets which the Dominion offers us in exchange. As an illustration, it has been found possible to obtain free entry into Canada for fresh fruits and vegetables—a matter of special value to the south and to the Pacific coast in disposing of their products in their season. . . The entire foreign trade of Canada in the last fiscal year, 1910, was $655,000,000. The imports were $376,000,000, and of this amount the United States contributed more than $223,000,000. The reduction in the duties imposed by Canada will largely increase this amount and give us even a larger share of her market than we now enjoy, great as that is.

Mr. Beveridge, speaking at Washington said:

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbour. That policy already has driven American manufacturers across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workmen to supply trade. That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply Canadian demands. We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, our pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada freely admitting other American manufacturing products to Canadian markets.

Then we find Senator Sherman saying:

The way to union with Canada is not by hostile legislation; not by acts of retaliation, but by friendly overtures. This union is one of the events that must inevitably come in the future; it will come by the logic of the situation, and no politician or combination of politicians can prevent it. The true policy of this government is to tender freedom in trade and intercourse, and to make this tender in such a fraternal way that it shall be an overture to the Canadian people to become a part of this Republic. . . The settlement of the Northwest territory, the Louisiana and Florida purchases, the annexation of Texas, and the acquisition from Mexico are examples of the adaptation of our form of government for expansion, to absorb and unite, to enrich and build up, to ingraft in our body politic adjacent countries, and while strengthening the older states, confer prosperity and development on the new states admitted into this brotherhood of Republican States. . . With a firm conviction that this consummation most devoutly to be wished is within the womb of destiny, and believing that it is our duty to hasten its coming, I am not willing, for one, to vote for any measure not demanded by national honour that will tend to postpone the good time coming, when the American flag will be the signal and sign of the union of all the English-speaking peoples of the continent from the Rio Grande to the Arctic ocean.—Senator Sherman in the United States Senate.

I have given you sufficient to show the opinion that the Americans hold as regards the ultimate result of this treaty. There is no question in my mind that the principal aim of the promoters of this treaty on the other side of the line is to divert trade into American channels, gradually to obtain control of Canadian trade, both export and local, and prevent Canada from asking for or receiving a preference from Great Britain. We have had many unsatisfactory experiences in dealing with the United States, and in every case the United States have had the best of the bargain. Only a year ago the United States, through their government, held the big stick over this government, over the same men who negotiated this treaty a few months ago. In passing the Payne-Aldrich treaty at that time it was threatened that they would put an extra duty of 25 per cent on all Canadian goods unless Canada made certain concessions. It is quite true that these concessions did not amount to much but the principle was and is absolutely wrong. We should control our own duties absolutely free from the United States in any way.

There has been absolutely no demand in Canada for this treaty. The people have been and are perfectly satisfied with the conditions as they exist at the present time. There are many electors in past elections, have openly said that there was very little difference between the Conservative and reform parties in so far as their policy was concerned. The Reform party had a platform which was somewhat similar to that of the Conservative party in many respects.

When they came into power in 1896 they practically swallowed the National Policy holus bolus. They kept on the same duties, increased them in some cases and in some cases decreased them a very little. The prosperity of Canada at this present juncture has been entirely owing to the policy put into effect by the Conservatives many years ago.

This idea of tariff stability has been drilled into the people not only by the present opposition—the government at that time—but also by hon. gentlemen who are on the ministerial benches now. I have an extract here from a speech made by the right hon. leader of the government in November, 1910, only a few months ago. He said:

> The people of the west are now asking for a reduction of duty on certain articles which they consume. That is a very proper subject of investigation,——

Not for any treaty, not for any resolution of this kind, but a proper subject for investigation.

> —and we intend to investigate it. But at the proper time.

The hon. gentleman who at the present time is leading the House, the Minister of Finance, in 1906-7, page 287 of Hansard, said:

> Our desire has been to encourage a larger degree of tariff stability—not a slavish adherence to every item in the tariff. But we have been desirous that the impression should go abroad that the government were not willing to make changes hastily, that they were rather slow to do anything in that line, and only when a case became of extreme urgency would we undertake to make changes.

Later on he said:

> We have, therefore, from time to time resisted many applications for changes, not because in some instances there may not have been something in the argument, but because it was not wise to make changes too often, and if in one or two cases there was some reason perhaps to justify a change I do not think anybody has suffered any serious loss by the delay.
>
> It will be the policy of the government to have that inquiry made throughout the Dominion with the utmost care . . . care will be taken to afford opportunity to every class who wish to present their views to come and state in what respect they think either that the tariff is right and should be maintained or that it is defective and what changes they believe should be made.

Speaking in another place he said:

> When the moment for tariff revision arrives, the public of Canada may rest assured that the government will undertake the work in the spirit of moderation and caution that has prevailed in their past actions in tariff affairs, avoiding the extremes which almost always find advocates, and having regard for what is best; not for particular industries or particular sections of the country, but for the interests of the people of the whole of the Dominion.

In another place, also in the year 1906, he said:

> Now that we are approaching the question of a general tariff revision, we again wish to keep in mind this idea of tariff stabilty. We do not desire to make radical changes. We feel that the general conditions of Canada today is such that no radical changes in the tariff are called for.

In spite of these declarations the Minister of Finance, on April 6 of this year said in this House:

> What we have done is no departure from the policy of Canada; it is in accordance with the policy of Canada for forty years. . .
>
> . . . There is an important difference in the position of the United States government then and now. They were proposing a radical departure from the policy of the country, and they may have needed information of that sort to support their case, but we certainly did not.

They repudiated the promises, such as I have just read, of a tariff commission, and we find the government coming down here with this proposition and asking the country to accept it offhand without any evidence, without any commission, without any knowledge as to the ultimate effect of the agreement, or what effect it will have upon various sections of the country, and we are accused of—I was going to say obstruction—because we do not let this pass without any consideration at all. The Prime Minister at one point said that this was before the country because it was one of the planks of the reform platform of 1893. I thought the reform platform of 1893 was a thing that had passed away long ago but they will revive it once in a while. It may interest some hon. gentlemen to have recalled to their recollection some of the planks of the platform of 1893 which have been allowed to pass into oblivion:

Senate reform.
Reduction of expenditure.
Lower taxation.
Free trade as they have it in England.

These are apparently the principal planks of the platform of 1893.

Mr. LANCASTER. Prohibition.

Mr. ARTHURS. Prohibition too. I forgot that. We have had three elections in Canada since 1896, and while I have had some active part in all of these elections I have no recollection of any of these planks having been brought forward in any election since 1893. I believe the Conservative elector is perfectly justified in believing them all dead.

But, there is some reason for the changed attitude of the government, and in looking around I have come to this conclusion. On November 4 of last year an election was held in the United States at which the democratic, or low tariff party, were successful. They obtained control of the House of representatives and they will, I believe, shortly have control of the Senate of the United States. Mr. Taft, President of the United States, elected by the Republican party, and desirous of a second term as president, looked around for some means by which he could obtain a second term. This bright idea struck him and it is a remarkable thing that on or about the same day an election was held in Canada. One of the strongest constituencies held by this government in the province from which they derive their principal support saw fit to repudiate the government's policy upon a very important issue and the candidate of the government was defeated in Drummond and Arthabaska, Quebec. These things occurred within a day or two of one another.

I honestly believe that the Prime Minister and the government got cold feet as Mr. Taft did and they looked around for some means to cloud the issue in the coming elections. That is the reason why the time of parliament has been taken up with this proposition. It is strange that during this long debate the members of the government side of the House have been unable to offer any reason for this policy of theirs. The Minister of Finance, though he spoke eloquently in introducing the motion, gave only one side of the story. He told the farmers of Canada about the 90,000,000 market in the United States, but he forgot to tell them that these 90 millions would invade their own home market. He did not tell the farmers of Canada that 80 per cent of their products were sold in Canada so long as the tariff continued to protect them, and he did not prove nor could he prove that the Canadian farmers would continue to sell that 80 per cent in the home market if the treaty came into force. The Minister of Finance also forgot to tell our farmers that 13 other countries as well as the United States would be able to compete with them in their home market. Then, the Minister of Customs took 25 minutes to tell the House of the great benefit Canada would derive from the free exportation of talc. I confess that when the Minister of Customs was speaking I had a vague idea of what talc was, but I was comforted by knowing that the Minister of Customs knew less about it than I did, because he told us it was something to beautify the complexion, whereas the truth is, that it is commercially used for whitening writing paper. I find, however, from the official returns that there are 27 men in the whole of Canada engaged in the talc industry, and that the averages wages paid them is $1.32 a day, which is less than we pay in Northern Ontario for men who work with the pick and shovel. I honestly believe that the Minister of Customs took up the time of the House talking about talc because he had no better argument to offer. Then again he was very eloquent on the fact that the duty on iron ore exported to the United States was to be reduced by 33⅓ per cent and as the present duty is only 15 cents a ton we are to have the magnificent concession of 5 cents on each ton of iron ore. These are samples of the argument put up by the Minister of Customs, one of the very men responsible for this Reciprocity agreement. So far as iron ore is concerned, I believe that the best thing that could happen to Canada would be to absolutely prohibit the exportation of iron ore because I believe it should all be manufactured in this country and until we are able to manufacture it we ought to keep it here. The people of Ontario have had a lesson right along this line. For years the Conservative party in that province advocated the probibition of the exportation of sawlogs, but the Liberal goverment resisted it for years until finally they were compelled to adopt that policy. We were told that if such a law went into force. timber limits would not be worth ten cents a square mile. Well, I know something about timber limits; I know something about the conditions then and now, and I know that from the day the prohibition of the export of sawlogs went into force in Ontario up to the present time the price of timber limits has continued to increase. The result of that policy was that labour was employed in Canada, that our Georgian Bay ports were built up, that the Michigan mills engaged in that industry had to be moved to the Canadian side and that the population of the Georgian Bay towns largely increased. I believe, Sir, that the same would work out in regard to the prohibition of the export of iron ore or any other natural resources of that nature. The Prime Minister, as usual, spoke eloquently in favour of reciprocity, but if you study his speech you will find he said absolutely nothing as to the merits of reciprocity. His sole argument was that Sir John Macdonald or Lord Elgin or some one else said something in favour of reciprocity away back in 1854 or 1879. I am free to confess that I do not care a cent about what Sir John Macdonald or Lord Elgin or any one else said in 1854, and I do not think the average Canadian elector cares either. But if we are to dip into ancient history we need not go as far back as 1879 or 1854 because we have the utterances of the Prime Minister and of the Minister of Finance of recent date which show that not so long ago they were adverse

to the policy they are now promoting. Speaking in 1898 the Prime Minister said:

Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself, would have given many things to obtain the American market, but thank heaven these days are past and over.

Ten years afterwards in 1908, speaking at the Imperial Conference the right hon. gentleman said:

There was a time when we were wanting, reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade, ard we now put all our hopes on the British trade.

In 1903, when he was proposing the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill we have this further pronouncement from the right hon. gentleman

Such is our duty, it is immediate and imperative. It is not for to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute. Heaven grant that it be not already too late; heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels, and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land. Upon this question we feel that our position is absolutely safe and secure; we feel that it corresponds to the beating of every Canadian heart. Now, sir, we lay it down as a principle, upon which we are to be judged by friend or foe, that we are to have a transcontinental railway, that its terminus must be in Canadian waters, and that the whole line, every inch of it, must be in Canadian territory. We say further that such a line is a necessity of our commercial independence.

What country had the right hon. gentleman in his mind then?

It was evidently the United States, because his argument could apply to no other nation.

Mr. LENNOX. He made that clear.

Mr. ARTHURS. Then, in 1899 the right hon. the Prime Minister said:

If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians would have given many things to obtain the American market, there was a time not long ago, when the market of the great cities of the Union was the only market we had for any of our products. But thank Heaven, these days are past and over now. We are not dependent upon the American market as we were at one time.

In that short extract from the speech of the right hon. gentleman lies the true secret of the difference between the period mentioned from 1866 to 1879, and the present time. At that time we had no railroads, we had little or no canals, our farmers were absolutely dependent on the United States for a market for their products; we had no other market, we could reach no other. But things are entirely changed now. We have spent millions to build up a railway system and to provide the best facilities for transporting our products, so that at the present time Liverpool is a nearer market for the Dominion of Canada than New York.

A few words in regard to the opinions, or the late opinions, of the Minister of Finance, because he has changed them very often. Speaking in 1899 he said:

Whatever our American friends may have intended by their trade policy, there is one thing that they certainly have done; they have made Canadians more independent and self-reliant and have caused them to look more steadily than before to their home market and to their markets over the sea, where there is an open door. Especially have our producers given attention to the British market during the past two years, when our trade relations with the mother country have been so developed and increased by the preferential tariff. Therefore, the market of our friends to the south of us is much less important to us than it was a few years ago, and we are better able to do without reciprocity than we have been at any previous time in the history of Canada.

That is the hon. the Minister of Finance.

Mr. LANCASTER. Not the same man who went to Washington surely.

Mr. ARTHURS. The same man, one of them. In 1906, speaking on the Budget, the Minister of Finance said:

The farmer, as a rule, is a low tariff man; but if you ask him whether he wants the duties on agricultural products abolished, he is apt to be a little careful. Some will say yes and others, no. Others will say: Take the duties off agricultural products if you take them off everything else. Well, whenever we have made changes in the schedule of agricultural duties, as a rule they are in the direction of a little increase. We do not want the farmer to say that the changes made are to the disadvantage of the things he himself produces. In fact some farmers are strong advocates of high duties although the general tendency is the other way. Therefore, we have not made any changes, and any we have made are in the way of an increase to some extent.

In spite of all these pledges given by different members of the government at different times, the government say they have pledged the honour of Canada to press this measure through parliament without delay—no investigation into prices in Canada, no report on prices in the United States as compared with Canadian prices, no report on the cost of the production of agricultural products in the 12 other coun-

tries whose product under this agreement can come into direct competition with our own in our own home markets. On this account alone I contend that we on this side of the House are justified in opposing by every lawful means the passage of this reciprocity agreement. If the agreement is a good one, it should not be difficult to prove it by a tariff commission and by a full statement of the surrounding facts, and all these facts should be available not only to every member of this House, but to every elector of Canada.

As an example of how unreliable the information sent out by this government is, I would point out that according to Part II of the Canadian Trade Report for the year 1910, Canada imported from the United States last year $12,070,881 worth of dutiable wheat. Now, I would just like to ask the Minister of Customs if he believes that himself.

Mr. PATERSON. I believe the figures are correct but what did we do with it?

Mr. ARTHURS. It does not matter what we did with it. We paid the duty on it, otherwise it should not be in that column.

Mr. PATERSON. Does it say so? What is the amount of the duty paid on it?

Mr. ARTHURS. There is no amount of duty given. That just shows the unreliability of the whole report.

Mr. PATERSON. It came in bond, was held in bond, and went out. We had the carriage.

Mr. ARTHURS. Does the Minister mean to tell me that all the wheat that went through Canada in bond in 1910 was $12,000,000 worth?

Mr. PATERSON. No.

Mr. ARTHURS. Where is the rest of it credited in this report? The minister himself told this House a few weeks ago that 37,000,000 or 40,000,000 of American wheat was carried in bond through Canada last year. Why should that not appear in this report? This column says dutiable; it does not say in bond. The fact simply remains that these returns, or some of them, are absolutely unworthy of confidence or credence. We also had the Minister of Agriculture making the statement in the House that during the past 12 years Canada had exported to the United States $11,000,000 of potatoes more than she imported. On the same day the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) asked how many potatoes were exported from Canada and imported into Canada during the same term, and the answer given by the Minister of Customs was that Canada had during those 12 years exported $253,000 worth more than she had imported. In other words, the Minister of Agriculture had stated the figures as exactly 44 times as great as the Minister of Customs did for the same period. I have here also some interesting figures which probably came from the Minister of Customs' Department. I have here an answer to a question asked by the hon. Senator Landry in the Senate on March 2 of the present year. He asked the number and the value of live stock imported by Canada from the United States during the last fiscal year. The answer given is this:

The number and value of live stock entered for consumption from the United States, together with the duty collected thereon, during the fiscal year 1910, was as follows: hogs, 2,760; value, $2,140; duty, $41.40.

That is an average value of 77c. per hog. During the same year the number of hogs exported from Canada to the United States was 205 at a value of $6,088, an average value of $29.70. The same thing applies to cattle; we imported cattle from the United States at an average value of $24.85, whereas we exported cattle at an average value of $59.40. Horses we imported at an average value of $60.80 and exported at an average value of $238. Sheep we imported at an average value of $3.67 and exported at an average value of $5.47. It is a very easy matter, with such figures as these, to make our exports look very large and our imports very small. If the Minister of Customs looks at these figures tomorrow, he will laugh at them himself. They were given by Sir Richard Cartwright in answer to the question of Senator Landry.

The Democratic party are about to succeed, in all probability, in the United States. They are pledged to lower the duties on goods entering the United States from foreign countries, Canada included, and I think it would have been absolutely wise and eminently fair to have waited until these men had reduced their duties to a fair level before we reduced ours or made any agreement with them. By so doing we would have avoided that trouble, which after all is a very serious one, of allowing goods of 13 or 14 other countries to enter Canada where we have no compensating advantage of any kind. Our tariff has been and at present is only about one half that of the United States, we collect less than one half of their average duty. We have been eminently fair in our dealings with them. I find that last year, 1910, according to our own Canadian Customs report which must be correct, we imported from the United States $118,834,173 worth of dutiable goods on which duties amounting to $29,515,836 were collected, an average of about 24.75 per cent. The free import from the United States amounted to $96,668,242 so that the total importations from the United States, dutiable and free, amounted to $217,-

502,415, with an average duty of 13.57 per cent.

During the same year we imported from Great Britain $71,822,941 worth of dutiable goods on which the duty amounted to $18,032,629 or 25.107 per cent. We also imported $73,513,846 worth of free goods from Great Britain making a total importation from Great Britain of $95,336,427 at an average duty of 18.194 per cent. Taking the dutiable articles alone we find that the duty was higher on goods coming from Great Britain, even with the preference, than on the goods coming from the United States by about 1 per cent, and if we take the total importations from the two countries, Great Britain and the United States, we find that the average duty from the United States was only 13.5 per cent while on goods from Great Britain it was 18.9 per cent or almost 7 per cent more than from the United States.

Viewing this matter from the standpoint of dollars and cents, from the ordinary commercial point of view, I wish to quote from the Congressional Record of the United States of Wednesday, April 5, 1911, and from the message of President Taft to the Congress of the United States. In this message to Congress, President Taft said:

> The agreement in its intent and in its terms was purely economic and commercial. While the general subject was under discussion by the commissioners, I felt assured that the sentiment of the people of the United States was such that they would welcome a measure which would result in the increase of trade on both sides of the boundary line, would open up the reserve productive resources of Canada to the great mass of our own consumers on advantageous conditions, and at the same time offer a broader outlet for the excess products of our farms and many of our industries.

Further on he said:

> I am constrained, in deference to popular sentiment and with a realizing sense of my duty to the great masses of our people whose welfare is involved, to urge upon your consideration early action on this agreement.

Mr. Champ Clark, Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, at page 2624 of the American Congressional Record says:

> It is my judgment that we get the better of the proceedings in this treaty.

Further on he says:

> The intelligent farmers of America know that the agricultural products of Canada are inconsiderable when compared with the agricultural products of the United States; to use a common phrase they do not constitute a drop in the bucket. They also know that wages are as high in Canada in many lines as in America and higher in labour pertaining to the production of lumber; so they know too much to be scared by the overworked cry of 'pauper labour.'

At page 2930, Mr. McColl says:

> When I scan the commerce of Canada and the United States; when I see, for instance, that of butter the United States sends to Canada more than twice as much, notwithstanding the existing tariffs, as Canada sends to the United States; when I see that we send over fifteen times as many eggs to Canada as Canada sends to the United States; that we send nearly as much wheat to Canada, notwithstanding our great mills, as Canada sends to the United States, I can see no threat to the agricultural interests of this country. . . For a third of the year the price of wheat at Winnipeg is higher than the price of wheat on this side of the line.

I have one more extract I wish to place on 'Hansard'. This is a quotation from a speech made in this House in 1903 by Mr. John Charlton, the high priest of Free Trade, and the father of the reciprocity movement in Canada:

> Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Nothing short of this will do it, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than it has already made. We can not afford any more.

This, I say, was the expression of probably the most prominent man in favour of free trade who ever sat in this House. An hon. friend near me says: 'And the fiscal brains of his party', and I think perhaps that is right. I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that the United States is largely an agricultural country. They have twelve farmers to our one; they are selling their products in the same markets as our farmers sell theirs; they export almost along the same lines as we do; and, as a matter of fact they have had, during the recent years, an average sale of more agricultural products than Canada produces altogether, and I believe they are doing that at the present time. On the other hand, our exports to them of agricultural products have been very small. In the last fiscal year, 1910 our total sales of agricultural products were as follows:

Animals and their products..	$53,926,515
Agricultural products..	90,413,747
Total from the farm..	$144,360,262

During the same period we exported to the United States of agricultural products only the following:

Animals and their products..	$10,629,614
Agricultural products..	8,204,250
Total..	$18,833,864

In other words, practically seven-eights of our agricultural exports went to Great Britain and only one-eight to the United

States. On the other hand it must be born in mind that during the same term we imported from the United States, both according to their returns and to our own for the two do not differ materially, many more dollars worth of agricultural products than we sold to them, while from Great Britain we imported practically nothing in this line. During the years 1907, 1908 and 1909, the United States exported an average of $987,771,761 worth of farm products. They have a balance of trade in favour of their farmers of almost $500,000,000. To be exact, during the past year, the farmers of the United States had coming to them from foreign countries $431,231,941 in cash, that is, after deducting from their total exports of farm products their total imports in that line. During the same years the United States exported an average of $31,000,000 worth of farm products to Canada. As our exports to the United States in this line were $12,000,000 there was a balance of trade against the Canadian farmer of $19,000,000. I am quoting the figures of the reports of the United States Department of Agriculture. In order to be fair, instead of taking the figures for one year, I have taken the figures for three years and averaged them. From these reports I find the following:

Average exports of farm produce to Canada from United States, for the years 1907, 1908, 1909:

Cattle	$ 267,185
Fowl	36,800
Horses	2,507,000
Mules	129,000
*Sheep	187,000
Total live animals	$3,185,000

*Or 53,000 sheep.

Butter, $312,000; cheese, 707,000 lbs.; milk, $97,000; eggs, 923,000 dozen; honey, $16,000; hams, $423,561—3,365,888 lbs.; salt pork, $959,192—11,536,143 lbs.; lard, $1,156,978—11,880,929 lbs.; total packing house products, $4,364,946.

Apples, $172,095—53,801 barrels; wheat, 695,173 bushels; flour, $270,053; total grain products, $6,146,821.

Hay, $155,804; vegetables, $761,412; seeds, $1,101,033 (mostly timothy and clover); extract of bark for tanning, $191,350.

To put the matter in short form, according to their trade reports, which, I may say, do not differ in totals very materially from our own, we have imported from the United States of articles coming within this treaty almost two and a half times as much as we have exported to the United States. To show of how little importance the market of the United States is to us on the average I would call your attention to one item, the item of cheese.

During last year we exported $21,481,566 worth of cheese, or an average of about $3 worth per head for every man, woman and child in Canada. During the same year we exported to the United States $63,390 worth, or an average of a little less than three-quarters of a cent per head. At the same time we imported from the United States 707,000 pounds. The list of imports into Canada as given by the Canadian Trade and Commerce Report is very similar.

I will now give the figures taken from the Canadian report. The figures which I have quoted have been taken from American reports published by the Department of Agriculture of the United States. These are the figures as given by the Trade and SCommerce Report of the Dominion of Canada for the year 1910. We imported from the United States animals living to the value of $2,416,207 and during the same period we exported $2,307,125 worth. Our other imports from the United States were as follows:

Grain	$17,525,433
Flour	565,887
Fish	601,917
Hides	1,760,420
Provisions (butter, eggs & meat)	3,928,697
Seeds	1,039,021
Wood products	10,916,532

Or a total, including animals, of $38,764,114 imported into Canada from the United States during the last fiscal year. This does not include many other items which might properly be placed under the heading of agricultural products, such as vegetable oils or greases, or anything of that kind, which I have not taken into consideration in connection with this matter.

Another point to which I would like to call your attention is the fact that Canadian exports of farm products have been and are growing steadily less every year with the exception of cheese and wheat. If these two items are taken out of the list we find that Canadian exports have been growing less and that the home market has been increasing very rapidly during the last term of years. In the matter of butter we find that in 1906, four years ago, we exported 7,086,019 pounds of butter while at the present time we are exporting less than 1,000,000 pounds. Our exports of eggs have almost ceased, our exports of lamb and sheep are practically a thing of the past, and if it were not for the matter of wheat our exports of farm produce would look very small in the list of our total exports. To show that I am not the only one who entertains this opinion I would call to your attention a remark made by the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) on December 13 last. Speaking on cold storage he said:

One thing my hon. friend did not allude to was the poultry production. There is no question whatever that to-day there is a far greater production of eggs and poultry meat than there was ten years ago, and yet the

prices of those things are much higher. Why? Because home consumption has increased more rapidly than home production, and the result is, that the home market for eggs and poultry meat is better than the export market; consequently, we have practically no export of eggs or poultry to Great Britain, and very little to the United States.

In the matter of eggs, the United States last fall exported between 6,000,000 and 7,000,000 dozens and during the same term Canada imported or bought over a million dozens. Our exports of butter have been growing beautifully less and less every year while our imports have been growing very rapidly. In order to prove that I have only to point to the fact that during the first two months of the present year, January and February 1911, our imports of butter have amounted to over half a million dollars worth from foreign countries, while we find that the United States are exporting large quantities of both butter and eggs. The sheep industry is very much on a par with the butter industry. In the report of the American tariff commission we find the following:

While the sheep industry in Canada at the present time is a minor one, the feeding of lambs for market has been an important business in Ontario, as many as 125,000 head having been exported as late as 1907 to the United States and 33,000 the same year to Great Britain. The surplus is now dwindled, however, to such an extent that practically none was received at the Buffalo stockyards during 1910. In fact it is reported that a few American lambs have been shipped from Buffalo to Toronto, indicating that Ontario at the present time is scarcely supplying her own wants in this trade. This is, however, an abnormal condition.

That is according to their report, but we find, according to the daily papers of the day before yesterday, that on the Toronto market ten cents a pound was paid for lamb, live weight, while in Buffalo and Chicago the price was 5·65 and 7 cents a pound. We find that conditions are changing in that and in many other regards and that the Canadian home market is a very much better market for the Canadian farmer than the market of the United States. As to the horse market, I think it is almost unnecessary for me to go into that question because almost any man who knows anything about the conditions knows that the price of horses especially work horses, at the present time is much higher in Canada than in the United States under the same conditions. I will quote again from the same report as that to which I have just alluded:

As to horses, Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario The agricultural development of the northwestern provinces has put prices of work stock and heavy draft teams at a premium in the territory tributary to Winnipeg. During the spring of 1910 it is stated on good authority that not less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time. The five provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta combined have but 1,863,744 head as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the state of Iowa alone.

The same thing applies to milch cows and other cattle in the United States. I have here a tabulated statement sent down with the message of President Taft on reciprocity to the Senate, document 849, in which are given the average prices of cattle, dairy cows, horses, sheep and swine in each state of the American union and also in each province of Canada.

I will not weary the House by giving details, but it gives the average price of horses in the United States covering all States and Territories as $108.19, and the average price of horses in Canada, covering all the Canadian provinces as $133.00, a considerable difference in favour of the Canadian horse. Then, it gives the average prices of other animals as follows:

	Average price in United States.	Average price in Canada.
Dairy cows..	$35 79	$43 00
Other cattle	19 41	31 00
Sheep	4 08	6 00
Swine	9 14	11 00

It may be said that the Americans prepared these figures for the purpose of passing the Treaty in their own country, but I point out that they went thoroughly into the question, that they visited every part of Canada and the United States, that they knew the conditions on the ground, and that they had the monthly reports of their consular agents, while we on the Canadian side had absolutely no means of knowing just how the Treaty might work out or what the average price of any of these commodities was. I had intended to demonstrate the Canadian ignorance on the subject by quoting from reports issued by the Minister of Labour, but suffice it to say that when a Minister of the Crown would send out such absolutely foolish reports as to the price of commodities in different parts of Canada it is quite easy to see how absolutely devoid of reliable information the Canadian government was when they entered into this bargain. At page 109 of the American Report, Document 849, the following appears with reference to American horses:

Prices of horses range from $106 to $125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho and Washington, from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices of horses range from $107 to

$139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from $107 to $156. In the great agricultural states of Indiana, Illinois and Iowa prices range from $120 to $124. In all the Canadian provinces except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Nova Scotia, the prices are higher than in any of our states.

Prices of dairy cows range from $33 to $39 a head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota the range is practically the same. In the western border states of Montana, Idaho and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50. In eastern Canada prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48 and in western Canada from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

A great deal has been said about the benefit to be derived by Canada if the United States duty on barley,—and in this connection I would like to read from the Report of the United States Ways and Means Committee:

In 1890, the barley crop of the United States aggregated 59,000,000 bushels, with the average farmer price of 40 cents per bushel, and of this total crop about 66 per cent was used for malting purposes. The crop of 1910 aggregated 162,000,000 bushels of barley, with an average farmer price of about 48 cents per bushel, and of the total crop only 39 per cent was used for malting purposes.

Where does the rest go? The American farmer does as the Canadian farmer wisely does; he feeds it and gets nearly a dollar a bushel for it in the form of pork or beef. At page 4563 of the Congressional Record, speaking of Canadian barley, Mr. E. J. Hill, of Connecticut, one of the representatives, says:

The hearing before the Ways and Means Committee developed the fact that because of its superior quality the barley of our own northwest had captured the markets of the Pacific coast and actually driven out the domestic product there to compete on equal terms with Canadian barley abroad, and in addition to that the northwest had last year shipped barley malt into Canada in excess of the entire amount of Canadian exports of barley.

In other words, according to the Report of the American Ways and Means Committee Canada actually last year imported more malt than was exported altogether of barley. In this connection, I quote a few figures taken at random from the Reciprocity Report of the United States Government which purports to give the price of barley for each year from 1900 to 1909 in Cincinnati, Chicago, St. Louis, Milwaukee and Minneapolis. In the year 1906 the average price in Cincinnati was 57 cents, in Chicago only 45 cents and in Milwaukee 53 cents. There is of course absolutely no duty between these different towns and as the freight rate would not amount to a difference of more than one or two cents a bushel the variation in price must be accounted for because of local conditions. At one period the price is higher in Chicago, at another it is higher in Cincinnati or Milwaukee or Minneapolis as the case may be, and that is accounted for by the fact that there was a local shortage of the grain on that particular day. However, we have in another report the average price of barley for the whole of the United States for the years from 1890 to 1910. Up to 1895, there was a duty of 30 cents a bushel on Canadian barley entering the United States and in 1895 that duty was reduced to 30 per cent ad valorem or an average of 12 cents per bushel, while in 1898 the duty was again increased to the old rate of 30 cents a bushel. Here is the average price of barley on December 1st in the various years named:

	Cents.
1890	62.7
1891	54.4
1892	47.5
1893	41.1
1894	44.2
1895	33.7
1896	32.3
1897	37.7
1898	41.3

The point I want to make is simply this, that during the years that the duty on barley was 30 cents a bushel, the average price ruled at from 40 to 50 cents a bushel. Immediately that the duty was reduced from 8 to 12 cents a bushel, the price throughout the United States dropped correspondingly, and during the succeeding three years the average price was less than 35 cents a bushel. Immediately that the duty was restored by the United States to the old figure of 30 cents a bushel, the price went up again. This is the argument that we have urged on this side of the House right along. There is nothing in the contention that because the price of wheat or any other grain may at some time or other be higher in the United States, it is going to continue to be so. If the United States takes the duty off, and our wheat goes in free of duty, the extra wheat that we market there will simply be reduced to the lowest price they can buy for. We find that illustrated every day. The ruling price is the price wheat can be bought at Liverpool unless there is some local condition affecting the price for the time being.

Now, I would like to say a few words on the market of ninety million people, which is being held up to the Canadian farmer as the one great thing desirable for him, that will make him happy ever after. I would like to ask hon. gentlemen opposite, who has had this market of ninety million for the past ten years? Who has been supplying it? The American farmer; and yet we find that the American farmer is selling his goods for less than the Canadian farmer is getting for his, and his farm is not

worth as much as that of the Canadian farmer, all other things being equal. We find that he has less for his labour. In the eastern states a great many going farms are abandoned—in the state of Vermont nine or ten per cent. Yet these men have had that market of ninety million absolutely for themselves, protected from encroachment by any other nation. And hon. gentlemen opposite purpose allowing these men to enter our small eight-million market, and at the same time allow the agriculturalists of the Argentine Republic, the butter makers of Denmark, the frozen mutton men of New Zealand, to come here on the same terms as the farmers of the United States, while we cannot enter their markets, because they have heavy duties against us, and our farmers must necessarily find some other market for the surplus goods which up to this time they have sold in their home market.

This leads up to what I consider to be the most important point on this whole question, that is, the question of interprovincial trade and whether or not it would be jeopardized by the binding of Canada to this agreement. It is very difficult to judge just how great our interprovincial trade is; but it has been computed by some of the best business men of Canada that it amounts to 40 or 50 times as much as our total foreign trade, and I think that is well within the mark. We sell large quantities of manufactured goods, fruits and vegetables in the northwest provinces, and buy grain and cattle from them; we buy fish, coal and other products from the maritime provinces, and in return send our products there. This trade is after all the most important thing for Canada. It does not matter much whether we sell our goods to the United States or to any other foreign country—the really important thing is the home market. The farmer of Parry Sound does not care what may be occurring in the country represented by the Minister of Customs; he has no reason to care whether the farmer of Brant is getting 35 cents or 27 cents a bushel for his oats so long as he himself is getting 50 cents a bushel. The home market is after all the most important thing to the farmer of Canada. It is the one thing he must look after, and we should take no steps that would tend in any way to jeopardize the trade between the different provinces in favour of trade between the United States and Canada; but if the contention of our friends opposite is true, this must necessarily occur. Any business man knows perfectly well that if the northwest farmer of Canada can get a cent a bushel more for his grain from the Americans, he is not going to refuse it; he would be a fool if he did. The result will simply be that the American railroad will haul that wheat, the American elevator will handle it, the American mill will grind it, and the American workman will benefit by it. To the extent that our trade goes that way there will be a certain loss of trade between Ontario or any of the eastern provinces and the west. In order to make the traffic profitable the railroads must have traffic both ways. They will naturally take a return cargo cheaper if they are taking grain to Minneapolis than they would from Port Arthur. This is true not only of our own grain trade, but of many other branches of our trade. With regard to the cattle trade, the conditions in the adjoining state of New York are entirely different from those in Ontario. The cattle trade of the United States to-day is almost entirely in the hands of the meat trust. If the tariff is removed, if we have free trade in cattle between Canada and the United States, I have no doubt that Canada would in a short time be under exactly the same conditions as the United States. If the farmer on the other side of Lake Ontario wishes to sell cattle he must go to Buffalo or New York, there is no home market, there is no such thing over there as the small butcher, the local butcher, who handles three-fourths of the cattle of Canada to-day. The local butcher there buys his meat dressed out of a refrigerator car, and if the farmer wants to sell cattle he must take them many miles from home and accept the going price.

I have already referred to the other countries that would come under this agreement without granting to Canada any compensating advantage. We find that Russia, Argentina, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and most of the British colonies, including Australia and New Zealand, would enjoy all the benefits of this agreement, the free access of their agricultural products to the markets of Canada, and we could not send one dollar's worth to them without paying heavy duties. Speakers on the other side of the House make very light of this question, and say it does not amount to very much any way. I will quote some of the principal exports of these countries. Denmark, during the year ending December 31, 1909, shipped 196,639,220 pounds of butter of a value of $48,320,668. She shipped upwards of $31,000,000 worth of meat. Australia shipped over $15,000,000 worth of meat, and over $11,600,000 of butter. New Zealand shipped $18,000,000 worth of meat, $8,000,000 worth of butter, and $6,000,000 worth of cheese. Argentine shipped upwards of $40,000,000 worth of meat alone and about $1,500,000 worth of butter, and so on. This shows that these countries are actual shippers to the markets of the world. Then it costs just as little to send a pound of meat from Argentine to Halifax as to send it to Liverpool and meat can be delivered in Mon-

treal about as cheaply as in Liverpool provided there is not an adverse duty. On the other hand we cannot ship to Argentine partly because we have no boat lines, no proper channels of communication and partly because we have to meet a heavy import duty. For instance if we wished to ship wheat to France we would have to pay $3.51 a hundred pounds duty, and on lambs 77 cents each. On wheat we have to pay 61.4 cents per hundred pounds, and on barley 26.3 cents a hundred pounds, on potatoes 3.5 cents a hundred pounds, and on butter 2.63 cents per hundred pounds. If we wish to ship to Italy we would have to pay on cattle an average duty of over $6 per head; on wheat 65.80 cents per hundred pounds. Shipping to New Zealand we would have to pay on wheat 18.2 cents per hundred pounds, on barley 48.6 cents per hundred pounds, on beans 18.2 cents per hundred pounds, on potatoes 21.7 cents per hundred pounds, on butter 20 per cent, on cheese 20 per cent, on eggs 20 per cent, on hay 20 per cent, and so on through a long list of duties which are charged by all these various countries upon Canadian imports, and would continue to be charged should this agreement go into force.

I wish to point out that the abrogation of the old reciprocity treaty of 1854-1856 was a blessing in disguise for Canada, although the Americans abrogated it with the intention of driving Canada into annexation or starvation according to their newspapers. It is true that during the term of that treaty Canada enjoyed a short period of prosperity, but I would point out that during the earlier years of its existence the Crimean war was at its height, and prices reached a level not reached since at any time. Shortly after the close of this war, the American war occurred beginning in 1861, and ending in 1865. In 1866, the year after the close of the war, American conditions having become normal, the treaty was abrogated by the United States, and Canada was told that she would be forced into annexation or starvation. It is quite true that Canada at that time was in pretty bad shape, but it was probably the best thing that ever happened to Canada as a whole, and I firmly believe that had it not been for the abrogation of the treaty in 1866 the federation of Canada would be still in the distant future. Canada was driven to fall back on her own resources. The men who were then at the head of affairs in Canada, some Conservatives and some Reformers, were forced to consult together, and to devise some means whereby we could trade with one another, benefiting one another instead of being scattered provinces as we were at that time. The building of the Intercolonial railway and the Canadian Pacific railway, the acquisition of the northwest territories by Canada are, I believe, directly attributable to the abrogation of that treaty, and our prosperity from that time to the present, has been through that means. We have spent hundreds of millions of dollars in building the various railways and canals. The cost to Canada as a whole has probably exceeded $600,000,000. We have, according to our Reform friends, spent many millions building up industries. They have now arrived at a stage where they are practically self-supporting, and yet we would apparently be willing to cast away all these advantages to go back to the condition of affairs which existed in 1886, and depend almost entirely, because that is what it amounts to in the end, on the market of the United States.

I believe that this treaty or agreement, if it does what is claimed for it by its friends, must inevitably lead to the loss of our commercial independence, and ultimately to annexation to the United States. The fact that some hon. gentlemen opposite are acting in good faith, and do not see any danger does not prove that that danger does not exist. The man who rocks the boat never sees any danger, and the gun that is not loaded is always the most dangerous. I believe that we should look into this matter more thoroughly, that we should have more time, and that the whole thing should be placed in the hands of an independent commission, a commission of business men, who would discuss it thoroughly among themselves, and bring before parliament a finding which, I believe, would be acceptable to the people of Canada.

I believe it would be wise to postpone this treaty until the Americans have formally settled their tariff matters and until the people of Canada have had an opportunity to thoroughly digest the proposal. As far as I am personally concerned, as I said in the first place, I believe we have no mandate from the people to pass a matter of this kind or to accept such a treaty as is proposed. I believe that in all these great changes the people should be consulted before anything is done. I am prepared to vote against the resolution and to do anything that lies in my power to defeat it until the people have been consulted. If the people say they are prepared to stand behind the agreement my opposition must necessarily cease, and will cease. But I believe that the true solution of the whole question would be an independent commission. We have got along for fifteen or twenty years very well without reciprocity, and I think we can get along for fifteen or twenty years more without it just as well. I believe the people should have a true statement of the facts. Let the whole matter be laid before the people; let them have an opportunity to form an independent judgment,

and they will come to a wise and independent decision. And I believe their verdict will be that the best course is to allow Canada to go on as in the past and to work out her destiny as part of the British empire with independent control of her own affairs.

An hon. MEMBER. Go on.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). 'Go on,' says an hon. gentleman on the other side who has nothing to contribute to the debate except such a bald remark. While I have something to say on this subject, yet, as I have been travelling for six days to reach Ottawa and arrived here only at five o'clock this morning, I do not think it reasonable to ask me to begin an address to the House at twenty minutes to eleven. Therefore, I ask that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure that my hon. friend (Mr. J. D. Taylor) will not find it extraordinary if we cannot agree to this motion. After a delay of two months we ought surely to proceed with the business of the session.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If I am forced to proceed, of course, I will proceed, but I think this demand upon me will be recognized by the people I represent as a most extraordinary one. I would call the attention of the First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson)—who seems to regard this as a joke, but I can assure him that the people I represent do not at all regard as a joke the change he proposes to inflict upon us—to the fact that the Minister from Victoria, British Columbia (Mr. Templeman) is not present, and it seems to me he should be present while the interests of his province are under discussion. The only other member from British Columbia on the government side of the House who has taken part in this discussion is not present. And I think it is unfair to him and to us to ask us to discuss here the statements he has made while he is not here to take his part in the discussion. But, meanwhile there are some subjects which can be laid before the House at the present time with which these hon. gentlemen are not very immediately concerned, but to which it would seem to be advantageous for them to give attention. I have a very valuable text here which should afford food for thought on the part of every member of this House. It is in the shape of a pamphlet prepared by the Canadian National League and going very fully into this subject. A good many members of the House, no doubt, are familiar with the origin of this Canadian National League and with the literature which it has put out. Hon. members will recall that when this matter of reciprocity was sprung upon the country no persons were more shocked at the attitude of the government and what was generally regarded as the folly of our ambassadors extraordinary to Washington than were some of the men who, up to that time, had been in the front ranks of the Liberal party in Canada. We found this feeling taking shape in Toronto in a manifesto signed by no less than eighteen leaders of the Liberal party at that important centre, eighteen prominent members of the Liberal party who thought it worth while to declare to the public that this action on the part of the government had finished them with the Liberal party, that they could no longer assist in perpetuating the reign of a government that had proved so false to every principle which it would have led its supporters to believe it professed, that had proven recreant to its duty to the people and that had so shamelessly, I may say, betrayed the trust conferred upon it. So, we have these eighteen Liberals promoting the formation of the Canadian National League and taking part in the dissemination of literature to show the people of Canada precisely what this arrangement means to us. The object of the league is stated in their prospectus:

> To oppose the adoption of the proposed Reciprocity Agreement between Canada and the United States of America and to support such measures as will uphold Canadian nationality and British connection, will preserve our fiscal independence and will continue to develop our present national policy of interprovincial and external trade, under which the Dominion has achieved its present prosperity.

The basis on which the league has been formed is: Canadian nationality, British connection and fiscal independence.

Three objects which I am sure must commend themselves to every man in this House, objects worthy of the position which these gentlemen have occupied up to the present in the ranks of the Liberal party of Canada. The league declares that it is non-partizan in character, that it is opposed to the Laurier government because it believes that in negotiating this agreement with the United States and in endeavouring to have it adopted by parliament, the government is not upholding Canadian nationality and British connection, and is not preserving our fiscal independence. They would be opposed to any government, whether Liberal or Conservative for the same reason, and so I am convinced will the great majority of the electors of Canada oppose any government, whether Liberal or Conservative, which proposes to surrender to the United States our fiscal independence. While opposed to this agreement for the reasons stated, they are opposed to it on patriotic grounds also, because they say:

We believe that our government failed to appreciate properly the present position and condition of Canada, contrasted with its position and condition when reciprocity would have been welcomed, and that it lost sight of the fact that the principles underlying its own policy for years past are utterly inconsistent with the principles underlying this agreement.

In the present pamphlets, and in those to follow, nothing will be said intentionally to wound the feelings of any one, and no offensive personal allusions will be made. The subject is above party and persons, and will be so kept and treated.

Of this fact we have seen tonight the most convincing evidence read by the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Arthurs), evidence which fully justifies the position taken by the league.

The opposition will be kept up until the people have pronounced upon the question.

Until we have the opportunity we desire of going to the polls, and putting before the people of Canada the question whether they wish for a reciprocal arrangement of this kind, or whether they are content to be bludgeoned by any government in continuing this debate with the idea of forcing this House to consent to something which they would never consent to willingly. This league takes as its first text the significant statement of the President of the United States that Canada is at the parting of the ways, and it submits evidence to show that this statement is unfortunately only too true. As this pamphlet says:

Shall we continue along the path which has led us to our present prosperity and to our proud position as the keystone in the arch of a united British Empire; or, shall we take the path that leads to Washington?

Facts which indicates the answer which should be made to this question are set forth in this pamphlet.

When the Hon. Mr. Fielding announced to parliament the reciprocity agreement he alleged, as the chief reason for making it, that ever since confederation Canada has been committed to the policy embodied in the agreement, and earnestly desires it at the present time, that the Conservative party, as well as the Liberal party, was committed to it. He did not attempt, by facts and figures, to prove that upon economic grounds it would be beneficial to Canada; he assumed that it would be so.

Now Mr. Chairman, I would like to call your attention to the fact that not only is the statement true made by these protesting Liberals that the hon. gentlemen who arranged this agreement have presented to the house no satisfactory reasons why we should adopt it, but that their failure to do so has been accentuated by the extraordinary course of their followers in parliament who are content to sit still and swallow this, as they have swallowed every other nauseous dose presented to them while they have occupied their present benches.

An examination of the pages of history shows the damaging effect of this arrangement. It is recalled to us how reciprocity damaged the St. Lawrence exports .

From 1854 to 1866 a reciprocity treaty existed between the old province of Canada and the United States of America. This province at that time comprised only Upper Canada and Lower Canada (now Ontario and Quebec). Confederation did not take place till July 1st, 1867.

When this treaty was made the province of Canada had a population of approximately 2,100,000; when the treaty was abrogated it had increased to about 2,650,000. Settlement had extended but a few miles, comparatively, north of the United States boundary in either Upper Canada or Lower Canada. The Grand Trunk railway from Toronto to Montreal was the only railway connecting the two provinces. The Great Western railway from Niagara to Windsor (now part of the Grand Trunk) was the only railway running through Ontario's western peninsula. There were no large factories, and but a small home market, while the population of the United States in 1854 was 26,500,000, and in 1866 it was 36,000,000. Communication across the Atlantic was meagre and expensive.

Showing that under the former reciprocity arrangement the population of the United States made the extraordinary increase, notwithstanding the disturbance of the war of secession, in four years, from 26 millions to 36 millions; while Canada, which, we are told, should benefit so much by reciprocity, made the insignificant increase of from 2,100,000 to 2,600,000. Now Mr. Chairman, I would like once more to call attention to the fact that the minister representing British Columbia in this government is not in his place. I protest that it is unfair for the government to force the members from British Columbia to continue this debate when the minister representing that province feels himself physically unfit to occupy his place in the chamber. I say that in a matter of this kind there should not be one rule for a minister and one rule for a private member, that it is a rank injustice to me that after a six days' trip on the train I should be asked to speak now while the minister from my province, the man who, with his colleagues, proposes to saddle this burden upon us, is reposing in his bed. I would ask the government again whether they cannot produce here the body of the Minister of Inland Revenue or else consent to adjourn. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the first minister or any of his colleagues to say whether they do not think it is a reasonable request that when a matter

of this kind is being discussed of such great interest to our province the minister from that province should at least be present.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Go on.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The First Minister says 'go on'. That is the only answer he will make. I may say that the service rendered by the minister from the province of British Columbia at the present moment is probably equal to the service that he usually renders to that province and his colleagues have made it apparent that in a matter of this kind his value to the province is regarded as a mere nothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Now, to resume, if any of those hon. gentlemen who are making those remarks on the other side of the House wish to get on the floor for a while I will have much pleasure in yielding it to them. If they have not the courage to stand up and occupy the floor I would ask that they observe the rules of the House and not make what they intend to be disconcerting remarks disturbing to the trend of thought that I am applying to this discussion. We are led to believe from a study of the results of the reciprocity arrangement of 1854-66 that its effect upon the east and west traffic was a warning which should be a lesson to us. Here are some of the results. The House will pardon me if I spend some time in reading because it is impossible for a man to carry in his head the number of valuable figures which I propose to present during the course of my argument:

Following the treaty, business in and out of the port of Montreal declined.

I would commend that to the consideration of those hon. gentlemen now representing the city of Montreal, who, without giving any reason at all for the faith that is in them, propose voting for this agreement for no other reason than that it is presented to them by the government which is their master.

The carrying trade of the St. Lawrence in 1854 was valued at $33,633,128. In the next year it dropped to $15,208,600.

That is it had shrunk to less than fifty per cent of what it had been before.

The ships' tonnage going to the sea from Montreal and Quebec decreased from 1,487,097 to 870,794 tons, and the value of the exports from $42,000,000 to $28,000,000. On Canadian canals in the first year of the treaty the tolls fell off by 32 per cent.

An examination shows that there was an advance in the price of farm products.

This advance we have often heard of during the course of this discussion, but it was not entirely, or even to a large extent, due to this treaty with the United States:

The Crimean war . . . began in 1854 and continued during 1855 and 1856, and the price of food stuffs in Europe increased rapidly and persistently—wheat in England went up to $2.50 per bushel. When peace was made, prices fell, until the Civil War in the United States broke out. From 1860 to 1865, because of this war, farming in the United States was considerably curtailed, and the market for Canadian products was correspondingly enlarged.

This in a large measure, if not entirely, accounts for what increase did take place in the prices of Canadian commodities during that period. But no sooner was the war over than a demand arose in the United States for the abrogation of the treaty which some farmers, through jealousy, thought was conferring some benefit upon their Canadian neighbours. This demand was not only from the farmers, but, as on the present occasion, trade relations with Canada were made a foot-ball by the politicians of the United States who entered upon a political cry for the termination of the arrangement, so that by pursuing Canada with a hostile tariff policy they might drive her into closer political relations with them if not indeed into annexation.

In 1866 the United States put up the tariff wall again, and the Canadian farmer was worse off than ever.

The existence of the reciprocity treaty had disarranged the channels of trade just as the adoption of the arrangement or pact now before the House would disarrange all our avenues of trade. Having ceased to look to the British market in the endeavour to cultivate that of their nearer neighbour, Canadian producers had come to rely almost entirely on the United States market. They were sending everything they could across the boundary and impoverishing their land and capital. They received many warnings that they might be shut out of the market which they were told was to be for them a continuous and continuing blessing. Many of them thought that they were ruined for life and a decided leaning towards annexation arose in many minds. This is the record from history. It is not the vain prophecy of any person attempting to frighten his fellow citizens into opposing something which otherwise they might be inclined to try. But we have the lesson from history that many Canadians were so fearful of the consequences of the abrogation of this treaty that a decided leaning towards annexation with the United States arose in many minds. When we draw this lesson from history it cannot be said that we are reflecting in any sense upon the Canadians of that day. It is not

regarded as a reflection upon a Canadian or a British subject from the old country, that when he goes to the United States and takes up his residence there, he shortly after takes the oath of allegiance to the American Republic and forswears his allegiance to the British Empire.

That is done by the most loyal of British subjects as a measure of self-protection. Having gone to the United States to make their living there, it would be unfair to themselves, it would be unfair to their families, to persist for a sentimental reason in remaining apart from the people amongst whom they made their living. As with these individuals so it may well be with the Dominion or with a province of Canada. Thus if by an alliance of this kind with the United States we hopelessly commit our trade arrangements to their hands, the time may come when they will be in a position to put such pressure on us that it may become an issue with us as a nation whether we shall do what so many citizens, quite our equals in loyalty to the British Empire, are forced to do as individuals. I commend that to the consideration of these gentlemen, who, when they say anything at all upon this subject, are fond of sneering at what they call the waving of the old flag and professions of lip-loyalty. I ask them whether they see any reason why we as a community should not be proof against what our equals, who have gone to the United States from England, instead of coming first to Canada, have been unable to resist as individuals. I for one do not wish to take the risk; I do not wish to defy the lightning, but while I have a chance I would prefer to take precautions against being struck.

The abrogation of the treaty was a blessing in disguise. It stopped the fatal drain of fertility from the soil. At the very time the movement for confederation was fructifying, it turned the Canadian people once more to the British market, which had grown enormously through the expansion of trade in manufactured goods all over the world.

We were referred early in this discussion to the lectures delivered under the auspices of the Minister of Agriculture—who, also I regret to say is not in the House—in which the people of the Province of Quebec were warned that it was the most disastrous kind of farming to export hay, instead of raising cattle and enriching the land. Up to the time the minister had started this crusade the farmers of Quebec had been exporting to the United States this hay which they should have fed to the cattle on their own farms. A similar state of affairs existed during the continuance of the Reciprocity Treaty of 1854 and we are told that the abrogation of the Treaty stopped the fatal drain of fertility from the soil.

And now, as a parting gift to the province which has kept them in power this government proposes to facilitate the export of hay. I ask them if they have no higher regard for the interest of that province than to attempt to prolong their term in office by a catch-cry such as reciprocity, upon which they hope to be judged in a rush by the people, to the exclusion of all the sins which otherwise would have been arrayed against them, and as to which they fear condemnation from their fellow-citizens in Quebec as well as their fellow-citizens in the other provinces. The Prime Minister laughs.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The Prime Minister has no fear of the consequences. He has adopted the motto of his distinguished predecessor who said 'After me the deluge.' The Prime Minister laughs, and provided he can persuade his people to give him another term in office it is a matter of indifference to him how many years of repentance will follow their sad experience.

In 1867 confederation came, and with it the hope which had previously been confined to a few ardent patriots—that Canada would become a nation within a nation, and would work out her destiny as such—spread to the mass of our people; and there and then began one of the most courageous and difficult and patriotic enterprises which has ever been witnessed, viz.: the building up upon half a continent, by a handful of people, of a great Dominion, and the overcoming of enormous natural difficulties and disadvantages.

Consider, for a moment, the difficulties to be overcome. The British North America Act, Canada's constitution, first united Ontario, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and provided for the union of Prince Edward Island and British Columbia and the vast territories between British Columbia and Hudson bay and extending from the United States boundary to the Arctic ocean. Canada's task was to weld all these into one Dominion and to provide for its government, and to preserve its autonomy and British connection.

The first part of the task has been accomplished. The great territories referred to were added, and the province of Manitoba was formed on the 15th of July, 1870. British Columbia came in on the 20th of July, 1871, and Prince Edward Island on the 1st of July, 1873. This first part was comparatively easy.

These were the days when there began to arise in Canada the feeling that we should renew our relationship with the United States our only near neighbours, and that it might be more profitable to us, than to attempt to establish connection with the scattered provinces of Canada across the great gaps then existing. While the people of Nova Scotia for instance, the province represented by the hon. gentleman respon-

sible for this pact, were still lamenting to a large degree their union with Canada—and if the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) was doing anything at all at that time no doubt he was helping to voice the plaint of their union with Canada and to satisfy them then as he would satisfy them now that it was more to their profit to trade with the United States than to trade with their sister provinces in the newly formed Dominion. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) will excuse me for saying so, it is one of the most sinister features in connection with it, and tends to induce the people of Canada to regard it with suspicion, to regard it as recommended to them, not by one who has at heart the welfare of Canada, but one, who hopelessly biassed as to the impossibility of a happy union of his province with the rest of Canada, would like to round off his career by showing that he has been right all his life, and that those of us having more hope, greater courage, greater confidence in our ability as Canadians to make all the provinces benefit from the union, have been wrong in our contention of all these years, that we are happier as a united people trading east and west, than we would have been had we followed the advice of the Minister of Finance and his friends in Nova Scotia, and had cut adrift from Canada and continued to trade as before on the best terms his province could arrange with the United States.

The House will pardon me, I hope, if I do not speak with utmost fluency on this occasion, because, while I hope to proceed for a very long time yet on this very interesting subject, as I would be loath to drop it without doing justice to it, yet it is not conducive to eloquence of ideas or fluency of diction to speak after travelling across the continent—to be called upon to speak up to midnight or afterwards on the very day one has accomplished this journey of 3,000 miles.

I was referring to how nature has favoured trade between the north and the south, and how the fathers of confederation, of whom there are none in this House, had attempted to introduce the east and west principle. While we have never heard much in support of that principle from the hon. Minister of Finance, the right hon. the First Minister has taken a much larger view of the country in which he has risen, and deservedly risen, to so high an eminence, and has at times striven to do the very opposite of what this legislation of his would perform; he has striven to the best of his abilities to develop the east and west principle in Canadian trade. What Canada has accomplished in this direction so far has been accomplished because reciprocity with the United States has not existed Canada could not have accomplished this had reciprocity been in force. The lessons of history enable us to speak with certainty as to the past, while we can only predict the future. This prediction, however, voiced by the best people in Canada after the most careful consideration, is that the result of the proposed reciprocity agreement will be to check the growth and development of the east and west trade, and the trade between Canada and Great Britain, to weaken our British connection, and to render our task of consolidating the scattered provinces of the dominion and preserving our fiscal independence and autonomy, much more difficult. I would like to call the attention of hon. gentlemen opposite to a statement made by their late colleagues, the 18 prominent Liberals who signed the manifesto to which I referred at the beginning of my remarks. These gentlemen are not Tory politicians aching for office; they are not waving the old flag or shouting loyalty because of any affection for the Tory party or because of any desire to put any other party out of power in Canada. They must be credited with speaking the sentiments of their hearts, as representing the best thought in the Liberal party, the thought that we confidently hope to see indicated when the people get a chance to pronounce on this subject. These gentlemen, speaking in advance of their fellow Liberals who have not yet been heard, said:

> We believe that this reciprocity arrangement will eventually result in our losing our autonomy and in becoming politically a part of the American Union. We are aware that opinions honestly differ on the points; but we ask, why take the risk?

A pertinent question, Mr. Chairman: why take the risk? I am very sorry that our minister from British Columbia is so little interested in this subject that he is not present, that if a messenger was sent for him, he has not been able to get him away from his couch; because I would like to recall to him in this connection what occurred in my own little city only a couple of weeks ago. The pertinent question asked in this pamphlet reminds me of it. Our minister was spellbinding in British Columbia, and the gentlemen on the other side who have been so often thrilled with his eloquence in this House will realize with what tremors we witnessed his approach on our several constituencies. However, we could not control his movements, as we cannot control them now. He was accompanied by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clarke), to whom the unfortunate fact that he is still engaged in his patriotic mission and is also absent from his place in this House. The hon. minister was a little unequal to the task set before him in the riding of New Westminster. The First

Minister I know admires that riding, because we gave him a great welcome there last year, and he was pleased to speak with his customary eloquence in the kindest and most flattering terms of the progress he had observed in New Westminster. I am sure he had a high opinion of the intelligence of the people of that district, except that he might regard it as a blot on their intelligence that they made the unfortunate choice of their representative at the last election; so he will realize that there was not much encouragement for these two federal spellbinders without drawing in the unwilling services of the deposed leader of the Liberals in British Columbia, the gentleman who for so many years represented the district in the legislature and who, no doubt, would at the present moment be a candidate for election to this House were it not that he recognizes that this arrangement makes the prospect of the election of any Liberal there altogether hopeless.

This gentleman, Mr. John Oliver, a farmer, possibly the best informed man in the whole district as to conditions in the district was brought forward to give the best comfort he could to the two spell binders from Ottawa and the best he could say for them was this, that he was losing no sleep because of the issue of reciprocity. It was a matter of indifference to him, the chief witness they could produce from the district, whether or not this reciprocity campaign succeeded, because, he said, we are too prosperous to be affected by it. He said the farmers of this district were never in their history so prosperous, so happy and so contented as they are to-day, and supplementing what he said, I ask with these pamphleteers, why take the risk? That question can produce only one answer from the farmers of the district of New Westminster, from the farmers throughout the length and breadth of British Columbia who see the livelihood of themselves and their families menaced by the proposition, that they shall be delivered over to their comparatively poverty-stricken neighbours across the American boundary. Why take the risk? and echo answers, why? There is no other answer in this House or out of it, except that in a moment of panic the Finance Minister of Canada promised President Taft that if President Taft would forbear imposing the American surtax on Canadian products he would go down representing this government and make the surrender in which we are now asked to assist.

Reviewing the history of the position of affairs we find that the British North America Act, by section 145, declared that the Intercolonial railway was essential to the consolidation of the union of British North America. This principle of east and west transportation ran through the agreement with British Columbia for it was made an essential part of the union that the Canadian Pacific Railway should be built. And here it is opportune to say that British Columbia had, before the time of her union with Canada, ample experience of free trade with the United States to settle her in advance in opposition to the arrangement now before us. These pioneers of British Columbia who know by their own experience or by what they have heard from their fathers of the results up to 1871 need no other argument than the lesson of their own history for their present opposition and hostility to this arrangement. We had at that time in British Columbia a system of free ports, the idea being that if we could produce the wares of the world free of duty at the ports of Victoria and Nanaimo these ports would develop into great trade centres and would become very great entrepots of commerce. In a way that worked well but it was soon realized that since everything grown in the United States would come into these two thriving Canadian settlements and that nothing grown on Vancouver Island, then the centre of population of British Columbia, could be admitted to the United States, the whole settlement was drawn over to the American side, and after the Island had become depopulated as a result of the experiment, the people decided that they would depart from their position of isolation from the rest of Canada, that they would invite Canada to make terms of union with them, that they would cease their efforts to trade north and south as this government now invites them to do again, and would begin to develop trade east and west with their fellow-Britishers in the Dominion of Canada. So there came about the union of British Columbia with the rest of Canada. I referred to the help given by the First Minister for a long time in developing this east and west trade. I am reminded that this principle more strongly than ever before, actuated the Laurier government when they committed this parliament and this country to the gigantic task of building the Grand Trunk Pacific and National Transcontinental railway. Upon that occasion Sir Wilfrid said to the House of Commons:

> A railway to extend from the shores of the Atlantic ocean to the shores of the Pacific ocean, and to be, every inch of it, on Canadian soil, is a national as well as a commercial necessity. That such a road must be built, that it is, in the language which I have used, a national and commercial necessity, that it is a corollary of our status as a nation, that it is a requisite of our commercial development is a proposition to which, up to this moment, I have heard no dissent. . . .
>
> We consider that it is the duty of all those who sit within these walls by the will of the people, to provide immediate means whereby the products of those new settlers may find an exit to the ocean at the least possible cost, and whereby, likewise, a market may be

found in this new region for those who toil in the forests, in the fields, in the mines, in the shops of the older provinces. Such is our duty; it is immediate and imperative. It is not for to-morrow, but of this day, of this hour and of this minute.

Let me interrupt the reading of the right hon. gentleman's eloquent words to point out that while we were warned of the momentous necessity of the construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific, while it was not for to-morrow, but of this day and of this hour and of this minute, a pressing and imperative duty on the community, in which we could brook no delay in the construction of this road, and the investment of $200,000,000 in its construction, up to this time the road has failed to accomplish its purpose in any degree, it is not yet finished and the construction of the British Columbia portion of it has barely commenced. It therefore seems to me a most extraordinary thing that, having committed us to an expense of $200,000,000 in order to promote the patriotic principle of trade between east and west, the right hon. gentleman should be found apparently forgetting the principles which animated him at that time, and asking us to forget that it is our patriotic duty to encourage trade between east and west; inviting us to send our trade south to Washington, Oregon and California and to draw north from those states the trade which we would so willingly draw from Saskatchewan and Alberta into British Columbia. However, I have been digressing. I trust, Mr Chairman, that you and the Committee will pardon the digression and will not take it amiss that this interruption has taken place in reading the eloquent remarks of the right honorable the first minister. The right hon. gentleman invoked Divine assistance:

> Heaven grant that it be not already too late; heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels, and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land.

Was the right hon. gentleman mistaken when he assumed, as he then did assume, that he was a favourite of Providence, that Heaven had granted his prayer even before it was uttered, and that his influence had been such that this calamity had been averted? What are we to think of the pressure which must have been put upon the right hon. gentleman by his colleagues returning from Washington when he was induced to adopt the proposition they brought, notwithstanding the record that he had addressed the House in this language, that he had warned us against the folly of doing that very thing to which they say they have committed what they call the honour of Canada. But I say the honour of Canada is not so committed. When two ministers so far forget the duties they owe to Canada, and the responsibility of their office, as to take upon themselves to abandon the principles of their party, to betray their leader, to offer to a foreign and dangerous competitor freedom in our markets which we cannot enjoy in theirs, —I say that when two ministers make a promise of that kind they do not pledge the honour of their country. And I am astonished that a man so astute as the Prime Minister did not do what he had the courage to do in other cases when his colleagues made mistakes—tell them that their connection with the government must forthwith cease. I have been looking at the right hon. gentleman in the hope that he might commit himself, if no more than by an involuntary nod of approval. I am sorry to say I have not seen it, but I am quite sure that in his heart he does feel that that course would have been the course of wisdom and that if he had adopted that course it would not have been necessary for him to adopt, as we are told by the chief party organ he has had to adopt as his rallying cry for the next campaign, a motto which, perhaps is misconstrued in the 'Globe' and which it seems to me might be more fittingly put, 'follow where the white feather leads.' Some hon. gentlemen asked me what it says. I wish I had the 'Globe' here; it puts it more precisely and significantly than I can remember it. But it says we are likely to have in the ensuing election as a substitute for the rallying cry 'Let Laurier finish his work' the motto 'Follow where the white plume leads.' Everybody knows that a plume is a feather. I think it would be proper therefore to say 'follow where the white feather leads.' For, if ever there was a white feather brigade in Canadian politics we have it in these men who have no argument except political force to advance against the reasons laid before the House by hon. members on this side. Now, I am happier than I was, because I have brought a smile to the countenance of the Prime Minister. The right hon. gentleman was not the only one who wished to build up Canada from east to west at the time of the proposal of the Transcontinental Railway. He had sufficient force to draw with him one who must have been in his heart an unwilling colleague. A significant heading in the pamphlet to which I have referred reads, 'Mr. Fielding for another transcontinental.' It says that Mr. Fielding was equally emphatic as the Prime Minister in his declaration of the prinicple that our trade must be built up from east to west. Hon. members who are familiar with the history of the Finance Minister will realize what an effort it must

have been on his part and will realize also what pressure must have been brought upon him by circumstances and his right hon. leader. Perhaps it was upon the principle of tit for tat that he was able on this next occasion to lead his leader. I do not expect however, to learn the mysteries of that Council chamber where, as one of the right hon. Prime Minister's distinguished colleagues once remarked they continue to 'fight like blazes.'

I am glad that there is a fairly good congregation present of hon. gentlemen opposite—even though the minister from British Columbia is not among them—and would call their special attention to these remarks of the Minister of Finance, and would ask them to realize what they mean. He says:

It is desirable that we should give our American brethren to understand that Canada is resolved to work out her independence in these things, that the present proposal will promote this object, and that even if still another railway should be necessary we shall be prepared to construct it.

Now, if I may be permitted to destroy the continuity of this splendid confession of new faith on the part of the Finance Minister, I would like to remind him that his first railway has not yet been finished. It is true that he has consented to the construction of a second railway to foster the underlying principle of trade between the east and the west. But while he has placed on this country so huge a burden to promote trade between the east and the west, he comes to this House, forgetting, or ignoring, or not deigning to explain, why the conditions of six or seven years ago are so different from the conditions of today, and tells us that these railways are a mistake, that what we want is not railways between the east and the west, but a new chain of railways to carry the trade of Canada north and south, away from its natural channels, for the benefit of our grasping neighbours in the United States. I will read the rest of that confession of new faith of the Finance Minister:

The attitude that the government has taken upon the subject has already attracted much attention across the border, and there is much keener appreciation of Canada's independence than ever before.

I wonder who told him that. I wonder if he had a private communication from President Taft which inspired him to use this language. I wonder if, since he realized the keenness of the American appreciation of Canadian progress without American assistance, it would not have been logical for him to think that it would be a good idea for Canada to proceed on the course which, according to his own statement, had aroused the admiration of our neighbours to the south. I wonder if it did not show a lack of perspicacity on his part that he did not resist the appeal from Washington to walk into the spiders web which the shrewder politicians of the United States had set for him. Now, to show that these gentlemen were in earnest at the time of the projection of the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, I would refer to the steps which they took to ensure that the views they laid before the House might be carried out. In the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway there is this provision in section 42:

It is hereby declared and agreed between the parties to this agreement that the aid herein provided for is granted by the government of Canada for the express purpose of encouraging the transportation of goods through Canadian channels.

'Of encouraging the transportation of goods through Canadian channels.'

The company accepts the aid on these conditions, and agrees that all freight originating on the line of the railway or its branches, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall, when destined for points in Canada, be carried entirely on Canadian territory, or between Canadian inland ports, and that the through rate on export traffic from the point of origin to the point of destination shall at no time be greater via Canadian ports than via United States ports, and that such traffic, not specifically routed otherwise by the shipper, shall be carried to the Canadian ocean ports.

This, Mr. Chairman, shows an intention, at least, to make an arrangement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company that would secure for Canada the maximum benefit from the construction of that railway, but what are the conditions now? As is recognized everywhere, the main trade to be carried over the Grand Trunk Pacific is the grain trade of the Northwest. Eliminate that and you have no justification, either for the Grand Trunk Pacific or for the succeeding railway indicated by the Finance Minister at that time, and since realized by the bonusing of the Canadian Northern. Now what becomes of all these arguments with respect to the necessity of this railway to carry this grain east and west, to export it by our Pacific ports on one hand, and by Fort William and Port Arthur on the other? The hon. gentlemen now propose the diversion of that traffic from our own heavily bonused railways to the ports of the United States. I would like the House to consider another aspect of this arrangement in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. As they well know, there is a very general suspicion that if there were any possibility of doing it the whole burden of the Grand Trunk Pacific would be shifted to the shoulders of the Canadian people by the philanthropic gentlemen who have projected it for the

benefit of the nation. Now if ever there was a provocation to them to raise any quibble as to their payments promised to Canada, that provocation is supplied by the action of the government, taken even before the completion of the road, tending to destroy all the trade which it was intended should earn for the road the money to pay its obligations to Canada.

It seems to me that this is a subject as to which these ministers should deign to say something to the House, for surely this phase of the case impressed itself upon the cabinet when it was considering this arrangement with the United States even though, as we have been told, it was put through, for better or for worse, in about the time that it takes to perform a marriage ceremony. It would seem that they should have thought of the momentous effect this diversion of trade would have upon their agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, that they should have realized that it would of a certainty have the effect of saddling upon Canada not only the enormous burden which we have assumed in that connection, but the whole burden of the enterprise. That is a subject which might very well be discussed for a day by itself, as to which I feel wholly unequal at this late hour when the hands of the clock stand at midnight. However, no doubt, before this debate finishes, we will hear from some hon. gentleman on the ministerial benches their views of this aspect of the case, their statement as to the liability, if any, which they expect to have to assume towards the Grand Trunk Railway Company because of the breach of contract and of faith involved in diverting the trade from that road.

Now, as I said at the outset, there are matters connected with this arrangement affecting the province of British Columbia which I have not touched upon so far, and which I do not desire to touch upon until the minister from that province is in his place in the House. Unless my failure to come up to the standard of parliamentary oratory under the painful circumstances surrounding my speaking to-night has so annoyed hon. members that they do not wish to hear a continuance of my argument, and therefore wish them wound up before the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue awakes from his slumber and returns to his place. I would suggest to the right hon. leader of the House now that as I most earnestly desire to address myself to the minister from British Columbia when he is here, it being now midnight, it is an opportune time to move that the committee rise, and therefore, with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I would renew my motion that the committee rise and report progress.

Progress reported.

On motion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, House adjourned at 12 o'clock, midnight.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

WEDNESDAY, July 19, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS PRESENTED

Summary Report of the Geological Survey; also Report of the Chief Astronomer.—Hon. Wm. Templeman.

List of Vessels registered in the Dominion of Canada.—Hon. L. P. Brodeur.

QUESTIONS.

THE STEEL COMPANY OF CANADA.

Mr. MACDONALD:

1. When was the Steel Company of Canada incorporated by letters patent?
2. What was the amount of capital stock of said company?
3. What amount of bonds have been issued, and what is the amount of preference stock and common stock respectively?
4. What were the names of the companies and their places of business which were combined together under the name of the Steel Company of Canada, and what was the value of each of the companies that went into the combination?

Mr. MURPHY:

1. Letters patent dated 8th June, 1910, were issued incorporating 'Canadian Steel Corporation, Limited.' Supplementary Letters Patent were issued dated 22nd June, 1910, changing the name 'Canadian Steel Corporation, Limited,' to 'The Steel Company of Canada, Limited.'
2. The authorized capital of the company is $25,000,000 divided into 250,000 shares of $100 each.
3. The department has no knowledge as to the amount of bonds which have been issued by the company. Of the capital of the company, one hundred thousand shares were authorized to be issued as preference shares.
4. The department has no information upon this subject.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, before the orders of the day are proceeded with, I would like to ask when we shall be privileged to see a report of the last Imperial Conference. I presume that the notes have been extended; probably my right hon. friend has brought them back with him. Nothing could be of greater interest for us than to see exactly what has taken place at that important gathering. Also, will we

have a full report of all the proceedings of the conference, and not, as in the last instance, a very much reduced report for most of us, while a privileged few saw a verbatim report of all the proceedings. In this instance the conference is not one of a special nature, a conference of defence, but a general conference, and I hope we shall have the full report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I hope the same thing, and I suppose the report will be published at an early day. I understand that it is now in the hands of the printer.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What printer —of this House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. No. It is printed in England and is to be distributed as soon as it is printed.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Of course, it is very difficult to get any general supply if we are to rely on the British bluebook. I think on some occasions at least the book has been printed here in order that members of this House and of the Senate might have full information of what has taken place. Has the Prime Minister taken that into consideration?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. On previous occasions we have had it reprinted, and there is no objection, if it is so desired, that it should be reprinted this time. I have nothing in my hand. The report is in the hands of the printer, and I expect it from day to day. We shall have a certain number of copies for distribution here and if they are not sufficient, we may have to reprint the report.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think the document has been printed in Great Britain, because a copy came to hand to-day I do not know from what source it came.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The proceedings of the conference were printed from day to day, but the report is not finally struck until it is revised by each member of the conference. I sent my proof sheets just before I left England.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The document to which I allude purports to be a report of the conference. I do not know whether it has been revised or not, but it has an index of the various subjects at the commencement.

Mr. MONK. I understood, from what appeared in the newspapers since my right hon. friend returned, that a copy had reached this country, that my right hon. friend in fact had brought back with him a report of the conference, and I am a little anxious to know if we have to wait for the printing in England.

Mr. MONK.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that, as often happens, my hon. friend has been misinformed. I brought nothing back from the conference; I am no more privileged in that respect than my hon. friend. All I saw was the proof sheets and my last proof sheet was sent to the printer the day before I left England.

THE RECENT GRAND TRUNK STRIKE.

Mr. BLAIN. May I ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) if it is correct that there are still out of employment a large number of the men connected with the recent strike on the Grand Trunk railway, and is it my hon. friend's intention to communicate to the House the report of Judge Barron in regard to that strike?

Hon. MACKENZIE KING. A few days ago I communicated with Mr. Hays, asking if Judge Barron's report had been received, and what action he proposed to take on the report. In a letter of June 26, Mr. Hays replied

> As to the investigation conducted by His Honour Judge John Barron, at my request, will say, he has concluded his report, but it is very lengthy, consisting of several hundred pages of testimony, and I have not as yet been able to thoroughly consider it. I may add, however, that any recommendations therein will receive our most careful and favourable consideration.

Mr. Hays further intimates that he has made a similar intimation to the representatives of the employees who have been communicating with him.

Mr. BLAIN. That is not quite an answer to my question. What I would like to know is whether the members of the House will have an opportunity of examining that report?

Mr. KING. The report is not made to parliament or government. It is a report made to Mr. Hays himself. I cannot say whether Mr. Hays intends to make the report public or not. I have no assurance from him on that point.

Mr. BLAIN. The other question my hon. friend has overlooked, as to how many of the men are still out of employment.

Mr. KING. I understand that there are several. I could not give the exact number.

Mr. BLAIN. What is my hon. friend doing towards getting these men reinstated, as he took an active part in the settlement?

Mr. KING. The government has kept in touch with the company, and has intimated to it that it hopes that it will see its way to reinstate any man who may still be out.

Mr. BLAIN. Has anything been done by my hon. friend or his department since the adjournment of the House a few weeks ago?

Mr. KING. Yes. The communication which I have just read is an answer to a communication which I sent to Mr. Hays; and other officers of the company have been communicated with as well.

MINORITY REPRESENTATION.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL. Mr. Speaker, has the First Minister observed the remarks made in his absence quite recently in the city of Toronto by his Minister of Trade and Commerce, in which he may fairly be taken to have advocated minority representation as applied to cities? His utterance would appear to have been inspired, and I would like to know if the government has any intention, in the Redistribution Bill, which will doubtless be brought down in consequence of the new census, of introducing the principle of minority representation in urban municipalities, or if the matter has been considered by the government, and, if so, what action will be taken?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think my hon. friend had better put a motion in writing.

THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called I would like to inform my right hon. friend in connection with what I mentioned a moment ago, that the document to which I alluded yesterday seems to be a report of the proceedings of the recent Imperial Conference. It is a blue-book entitled 'Imperial Conference 1911;' precis of the proceedings presented to both Houses of parliament, by command of His Majesty, June, 1911, printed by the government printers; and it begins with the proceedings on the 1st day, Tuesday 23rd May, 1911, on which day a resolution was passed presenting a humble address of the conference to His Majesty, and it ends with a record of the proceedings on the 20th June, 1911, setting forth the concluding speeches of certain members of the conference.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. When was it presented to parliament?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). June, 1911, the day of the month is not mentioned. The conference seems to have come to the conclusion, according to this document, on the 20th of June, and evidently was presented to parliament some time between the 20th and the end of June.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I left England on the 1st of July, and it may have been presented the day before. If so we shall have it in a very few days. Perhaps it has come already, I shall make inquiries. If received, it shall be put on the table of parliament immediately.

Mr. MONK. I would ask my right hon. friend to have the document translated as soon as possible so that we may get it in both languages at the same time.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Certainly.

Mr. MONK. There was considerable delay the last time which, I hope, will not take place again.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As far as I can see this blue-book is the precis which was issued to the press every day, and is not a full record of the proceedings.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). There will no doubt be a fuller record.

THE CENSUS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). My hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) promised a statement regarding the census.

Mr. FISHER. I was to have had one in writing, and it was to have been here at three o'clock. It may come in a few minutes, and I would not like offhand to make a statement.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE PORCUPINE FIRE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I consider it my duty, having been up in that locality, to say a few words regarding the great fire at Porcupine. The conditions there are simply heart-rending beyond description. The town of South Porcupine was totally wiped out, also the town of Pottsville. The town of Golden City fortunately escaped severe disaster, but the town of Cochrane is practically utterly destroyed, and that of Kelso has been destroyed to the extent of three-quarters at least. In the vicinity of Matheson, nearly all the settlers—and there are quite a number of them—have been burnt out. Further south in the district of Nipissing, but not from the same fire, Sellwood was practically annihilated, and in that vicinity 25 families are to-day destitute. Up to the present the sufferers are being cared for as regards food and clothing, but it is absolutely necessary that the people in the district should be furnished with a considerable supply of money. They cannot possibly get along without it. Food and clothing have been distributed to the relief parties at work there, but up to the time I left—Monday night last—they had not been in receipt of any money, and I am sure all will agree that it is most neces-

sary that they should be supplied with some funds. No one who has been in that locality, as I have been, could fail to be impressed with the conviction that no stone should be left unturned in order to help these people out. Many sad cases have I witnessed, cases of heart-rending misery, but I shall not attempt to enter into details because you have had that information already through the press. I am glad, however, to find that the loss of life will not be as great as we feared. Up to Monday, so far as I could ascertain, 63 corpses had been recovered, and many people who were thought to have been lost are continually being found out at other points. There is no doubt, however, that the loss of life was considerably more than can be judged by the number of bodies which have been recovered.

I have information from the clerk of the town of Cochrane that the last assessment of that town was $913,000. The rate of taxation was 25 mills on the dollar. The town owed $75,000. It issued debentures to the extent of $50,000, which have all been sold, and there is on hand about $40,000 in cash. The corporation loss through the destruction of town property was $21,000. The total insurance will only be in the vicinity of $200,000, while the total loss in Cochrane alone the assessor estimated at $2,000,000. In this condition of affairs, you can easily see that the town is in very bad shape for the purpose of rebuilding, because those who may go there to build will find themselves at once saddled with a very high taxation. I, therefore, am of the opinion that the government should at a very early date do something towards relieving that town as a whole. For this we have a precedent created lately in the case of the conflagration at Campbellton.

I would suggest, and I trust that the suggestion will meet with the approval of the government, that something substantial should be done in that connection, and that a very liberal amount of cash should be at once provided to be handed over to a central committee for distribution throughout the district for the benefit of the settlers. In this one district I have spoken of in the townships of Capreol and Hanmer, of which we have heard very little in the papers, there are to-day 25 families of settlers homeless and destitute. I am sure the government have this matter at heart, and I simply urge them to make a liberal grant to alleviate the sufferings of these people.

Mr. ARTHURS. I wish to endorse briefly what has been said by my hon. friend (Mr. Gordon, Nipissing). I come from a district somewhat south of the fire region, but many people from my own home town were unfortunately in that fire at Porcupine. I have their description of the scene there, and of the results of the fire. Some few men are still undiscovered, and it is feared they have been lost in the fire. These towns are not in a position to help themselves, they have now large debts, they have been built up very quickly, and it is almost impossible to get new settlers to go in there, and assume the old debt created previous to the fire. It would be only reasonable that the government should do something to help out the corporations in that way. It is supposed too that a large number of men have been killed or burned in the woods and there is at present no means of searching for their bodies. Many sufferers from the fire are absolutely blind from the effect of smoke and heat, and some poor unfortunates thus afflicted may be still in the woods around that settlement. The Ontario government has been very generous in this matter, so far at least as the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railroad is concerned. They are moving the men out free of charge, and carrying in supplies free and in fact doing everything possible to help the settlers. It is only right that this government should do as much for these people as they have done for settlers in foreign countries, as, for instance, at the time of the earthquakes in San Francisco and Italy.

Mr. FIELDING. I will only remind the hon. gentlemen that this matter was brought up in the House yesterday when a brief statement was made as to the action which the government had taken, and the present position of the whole matter. If my hon. friends will be good enough to read that statement they will see that the matter has already been engaging the attention of the government, and will engage their further attention.

WESTERN COAL MINERS' STRIKE.

Mr. A. S. GOODEVE (Kootenay). I would ask the Minister of Labour when he intends to bring down the report of the conciliation board appointed to enquire into the trouble between the miners and operators in southern Alberta and the Crowsnest district of British Columbia, and also what action is being taken or has been taken by the government since the reception of that report? I am sure that he as well as other members of the House recognize that each day the seriousness of the situation increases. In a very short time now we will have cold weather throughout the prairie provinces, and the railways will soon commence to move the large crop of grain so that all cars will be in use, and the difficulty of getting the necessary supply of coal through to the prairie provinces will be very great. Every day the seriousness of that danger increases. I saw it stated

in the press that the assistant to the first vice president of the Canadian Pacific Railway had made the statement that undoubtedly numbers of settlers would be frozen to death in the prairie provinces, unless some immediate relief was given. We have been inviting, and are taking in very large numbers of settlers, and it is important from every standpoint that there should be an ample supply of fuel. I have here a number of references to this matter from different western papers, most of them couched in very strong language indeed. If I read an extract or two I only do so to impress on the minister, and other members of the government how earnestly the western people feel in regard to this particular matter. Whether rightly or wrongly there is a strong feeling throughout the west that the government has not done its whole duty in this matter; they feel that there has been unnecessary delay. It is true that, just before the recess, the minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King), in reply to a question in the House, said that the government had offered their services, and he intimated further that it was possibly because neither the operators nor the miners desired publicity that they had, up to that time, refused to avail themselves of those services. I ventured at that time to state that it was possibly not from fear of publicity, but because they had lost confidence in the Lemieux Act that this refusal had been made. I think all subsequent events go to prove that the suggestion I made at that time was correct. Whatever has been the past history of the Lemieux Act in the settling of various disputes, certainly in this case it has been a lamentable failure in every particular. Instead of assisting in any way it has been the means undoubtedly of preventing both parties coming together because, relying on that Act, they have waited from day to day until it drifted from week to week, and finally into months before that report was completed. I shall not criticise the members of that board nor their appointment, but I wish to read an editorial from one of the western papers, which I think voices largely the feeling and the sentiment of those people. As I say the language is strong, but it is because they feel very strongly on the matter, and feel, as I have said, that there has been neglect on the part of the government. This editorial which appears in the Calgary 'Herald,' is as follows:

THE COAL STRIKE.

If for no other reason than its deplorable handling of the coal strike the federal government should be rejected and condemned by the people of western Canada. It is not only that the Department of Labour has utterly failed to reach a settlement but also that it has displayed an indifference to the situation that is nothing else than shameful. Reciprocity versus anti-reciprocity is a debatable question, but the need for coal next winter, and the suffering which will come to western Canada for lack of it, are not matters of debate but of common knowledge.

For nearly four months the mines of southern Alberta have been closed through a difference between employers and employed. After a delay that was in itself reprehensible, a conciliation board was organized and a man put at the head of it who, in the opinion of those best qualified to judge, has shown himself a lamentable failure.

Meanwhile, what of the young Minister of Labour who, when he was a deputy, used to go around hunting trouble in order that he might settle it. Have the sweets of office clogged the wheels of his industry, or has he grown too great to hearken to a public cry? In the press dispatches we read that Mr. Gordon's report has at least reached Ottawa, but that it cannot be opened until Mr. Mackenzie King chooses to come back and do so, while we also read that Mr. King is delivering political speeches before a Quebec audience. What cares he for Alberta and Saskatchewan? A minister of the Crown must not be bothered with trifles.

And here in the west are a million of people who will suffer because of Mr. King's selfish carelessness and Mr. Gordon's laziness. Here homes are without coal, here manufactories are hampered for lack of fuel. Here the steam ploughs on which the development of our country largely depends have had to cease operations on account of the strike. Here we have three great provinces whose people depend on coal for their winter warmth, and we know that however the strike is now settled there will be suffering and privation in thousands upon thousands of western homes during the coming winter. Is it not scandalous that a lazy and surfeited government should sit calmly by and watch its people robbed of the use of their natural heritage? Such a strike as this first impels one to believe that all coal mines should be controlled and operated by the government. But on the other hand if the government were as inefficient as the Department of Labour has shown itself to be, the last stage might prove to be worse than the first.

Then there is a long article in another paper, in even stronger language, which perhaps I had better not read.

An hon. MEMBER. Read it.

Mr. GOODEVE. This is from the Lethbridge 'Daily News,' a paper published in the centre of the affected district. I will read an extract.

Must the coal mining industry of this country be tied up to suit the convenience of the cocksure and bumptious youth who presides over the Department of Labour?

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I am not responsible for this language, but I trust the minister will thoroughly understand it.

The interests of thousands of people, the lives of some of them, perhaps, are at stake. Already there has been great inconvenience if

not actual suffering by the cause of this strike. These mines which are the source of such great wealth to Alberta should be humming with activity. The transportation and industrial concerns of the country need coal. The householder needs it and cannot get it. The miners need the work. The merchants in the affected districts need the money for the goods that they have supplied the miners. Must all of these multifarious interests languish because Mackenzie King is in Berlin gratifying his vanity and boring his constituents.

The Lemieux Act specifically states that as soon as the award reaches Ottawa it shall be made public and that a copy be given to any newspaper in Canada that asks for it. The 'News' representative at Ottawa has made this request and no doubt all of the other newspaper representatives have done the same, but Mr. King is not at home.

I admit that the language I have read is somewhat strong, and I have only read these editorials from western papers because they are published in this immediate district, and I think correctly reflect the views of the people of that district. Some portions of the affected districts are in my own riding of Kootenay. There are three great smelters depending on the output of coal from the district. They consume probably on the average 1,150 tons a day, or 34,500 tons a month. One of these has been shut down for some time; fortunately the others, by making an arrangement with the transportation company for a special rate, have been enabled to import coke from Pennsylvania and to continue running. How long that condition will last, they are unable to say. If, as is more than likely, the fight continues much longer, and they also are compelled to shut down, then many other dependent industries will be closed, and many more thousands of men, just at the season when work is most needed, will be thrown out of employment. For these reasons I think that the Department of Labour should inform the House and the country what steps they are taking to bring about a settlement of these difficulties.

Mr. KING. Through the courtesy of my hon. friend in communicating his intention to bring up this subject in the House to-day, I am able to hand him a copy of the report of the board which has investigated this dispute. I may say by way of explanation as to why a copy was not laid on the table before, that it is not customary to lay copies of reports of Boards of Conciliation on the table of the House; they are given out to the press as soon as received, and they are also published in the 'Labour Gazette.' But it has not been a customary procedure to lay them on the table of the House. However, I am glad to present this report to the House, though it has already been published in large part in the press, and I have no doubt the details are familiar to my hon. friend.

Mr. GOODEVE.

I must say that I expected, when my hon. friend began his remarks, that he would deal with this question from the point of view of the interests concerned, and the public welfare, and that he would not have introduced into the discussion editorials from party journals that have been written certainly for political purposes, and not to alleviate the situation in the west at the present time. If there is one thing above another which to my mind, is all important in connection with the western situation at the present time, it is that it should not be made a matter of party politics. The moment it is attempted to make political capital out of the serious industrial situation in the west at the present time, that moment the difficulty of settlement is going to become increased, and a heavy onus will rest upon those who take that course in approaching this question. The government, through the Department of Labour, has tried to deal with this question in a fearless and a direct manner. When the cessation of operations took place, the first step taken was to endeavour to get the parties to agree to allow the dispute to be investigated, so that the public might know what were the causes of the dispute, and what would be a fair basis of settlement. As a result of the method by which the department approached the question at that juncture, we were able, without any act of compulsion, to get the parties voluntarily to agree to refer the matter to a board. I admit that it took a little time. But I may say that any other method would not have accomplished the result at all, that the parties would not have willingly referred their differences to a board if we had tried to coerce them. By adopting the method of voluntary conciliation, we were successful in getting the parties to go before a board, and in having a board investigate the conditions. That board has gone into the matter fully, and the report which has been presented by the board gives to the public I think an intelligent idea of the causes which are at the bottom of this dispute. It does more than that, it outlines what, in the opinion of the board, appears to be a fair basis of settlement of the dispute. It is true that it has taken the board a considerable time to get through its work; but hon. gentlemen must remember that the dispute in British Columbia and Alberta at the present time is one of the largest mining disputes that has ever taken place on this continent. There are some 18 different mining companies affected; there are 18 locals of the United Mine Workers affected. The dispute is not one which could have been dealt with quickly, if it were to be dealt with intelligently and thoroughly.

The chairman of the board has very wisely taken the view that if this western situation is to be satisfactorily solved at all it will not be by going superficially into the matter, but by investigating the difficulty thoroughly and giving to the public as full an account of the situation as it is possible to give, at the same time making recommendations which, in the light of all the information, he has reason to feel will furnish a fair basis of settlement The board's report has been given out. It is not unreasonable to hope that the parties, having before them the report of the board, although up to the present, they have not seen their way to reach a settlement, will now use that report as a basis for coming to an agreement.

Mr. SPROULE. Would the minister tell me when he received that report and when it was given to the press?

Mr. KING. It was given out just a week ago. It was received on the 11th, I think, of this month, and it was given out either the same day or the day following. It is very easy to criticise a government, or to criticise any one in regard to a dispute of this kind. My hon. friend said, in the first instance, that the government was to blame for the dispute going along such a length of time because the parties were waiting for the government to have the difficulty investigated, and that if the government had not been promising an investigation they would have got together and settled the difficulty. When the investigation takes place he says that if there had been no investigation there would have been an earlier settlement. Well, now the investigation has taken place and I presume, if my hon. friend is true to his own line of argument, he will now take the view that the best thing to be done is to let the parties understand that they need not look further to the government for intervention, but that it is advisable for them to do that which, he says, it would have been better for them to have done at the outset, namely, get together and try to come to a definite settlement of their differences.

Just in this connection, I think it is well to point out to the parties involved in this dispute and to the country also, that some persons, for reasons best known to themselves, are trying to create an impression in the west that if this dispute is kept up long enough the government will take over the mines, probably operate them and guarantee a certain rate of wages to the men. Rumours of this kind can be nothing other than prejudicial to the situation. They give rise to false hopes, and they only help to prolong a condition of affairs which has already gone on at too great length. A resolution was adopted, for example, by the Nelson Board of Trade on the 19th of June, and I find it contains this clause:

It has been generally understood that it was the intention of the government to conduct the operations of the mines, with guarantee to the workers, during the settlement of such questions as those at present involved.

I think it only fair to say that the government has no intention of the kind, and to hold out to any body of men the idea that if they keep up the dispute for a certain length of time the government will undertake to guarantee them certain rates of wages is to put them in a false position, and to put both parties to the dispute in an unfair position towards each other. I think the parties should now take this report which has been concurred in for the most part by one of the members of the board along with the chairman, take it into consideration with the minority report which has been presented by one other member of the board, and see if they cannot, by mutual conference, having the facts before them, come to some definite settlement. I notice that in the report the board says:

> It is, however, the conviction of the board, that after due consideration of the equity and of the effect of this decision, the parties will come to an agreement upon the basis suggested.

The board may be mistaken in its view, but I think we are only right in assuming that inasmuch as it spent nearly a month and a half in going into the whole situation, its opinion is one entitled to consideration. The report mentions that:

> In conducting this work, the board placed itself entirely at the disposal of the parties in seeking to possess itself of the fullest data upon every point. Every mine was visited, every witness called, every grievance probed as each party desired. Sworn documents taken from the company's book were presented, pay rolls were examined, mine officials and union officials were put on the stand. Sanitation was inspected; the cost of living; the cost of coal production; the tonnage output of mines; the selling price of coal; markets; the relation of coal companies to railway companies; these and all cognate matters at the instigation of the parties and on its own motion, the board faithfully and fearlessly investigated.

The situation having been gone into in that fashion, it seems to me that the parties are now at the point where all the data are before them. Everything has been brought to light and all this information has been made available in order to assist in the solution of the question. In these industrial disputes there are often three stages which it is necessary to go through. First, it is necessary to get a board of conciliation to investigate, secondly, it is necessary to have an investigation made and a settlement suggested, and then it must be referred to the parties to see if, on the basis of the settlement

suggested, an agreement can not be come to. We have reached that third stage and I think that if hon. members will unite with the government in expressing the view that it is desirable to keep party considerations out of this question altogether and advise the parties to try to come together on the basis of the award, they will be helping in bringing about a speedy termination of the dispute.

Just one word more before I sit down. I think it is well that my hon. friend has brought up this question, for this, if for no other reason, that the people of the provinces in the west which are likely to be affected by this matter ought now, while it is summer to take some steps themselves to see that if we approach winter without this dispute being settled, provision is made for coal for the people there. When the strike took place in Lethbridge some five years ago, on which occasion I intervened myself, the strike had been going on for nine months, we were then in November, snow was on the ground, and those provinces were face to face with a very critical situation. But, it is different in this case. This strike has lasted now for not quite four months. We are still in the early part of the summer, it is possible for those who see danger ahead to make provision, in the event of a settlement not being speedily reached, and I think it would be in the interest of all companies and individuals concerned not to pin their faith too much on an immediate settlement, but to make provision for themselves against any contingencies. The reason that I advise them not to pin their faith too much on an immediate settlement is that the main question concerned is as to whether there shall be an open or closed shop, or as to the degree of recognition which is to be given to the union. I must frankly confess that I do not know of any means that can be used to end a dispute upon that question so long as one body of men take the view that they will work only with union men on certain conditions, and so long as the employers take the view that they will not allow their mines to be operated on those conditions. It comes then to a test of endurance, and it is well for the country to know the facts and face them squarely. However, I believe if the parties do that, with the advance which has been made by this investigation, it may be possible for this dispute to be speedily terminated.

In conclusion, let me say that the thanks not only of the government, but of the whole country are due to Mr. Gordon, chairman of this board, for the exceptionally able manner in which he has performed his work. Mr. Gordon went into the whole question with the other members of the board patiently and exhaustively, and those who have been present have felt that he has rendered a very great service to the Dominion, notwithstanding what hostile political critics may have to say.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). The Minister of Labour has been at any rate candid with the House and the country and like the candid doctor who is not afraid to tell his patient the truth he announces to the people of Canada that there is no remedy to be had. The minister has enlightened the House with a long recital of the facts, but what the country wants to know is what relief the government is going to afford. This strike is more particularly one in which the public has a very much greater interest than it usually has in conflicts between labour and capital. Here is a section of the country that for six months in the year is practicably inaccessible to the carriage of bulky commodities such as coal and being destitute of wood for fuel purposes the inhabitants are face to face with impending disaster. The first minister is responsible for the doctrine that the government as a whole is responsible for everything that takes place in any department of the government and I commend to the right hon. gentleman that sins of omission as well as sins of commission in any department shall be shouldered by the entire government. Had not this present government been laivsh in giving away the fuel areas of that country for little or nothing in bygone days there would have been to-day a weapon in the hands of the government which would have prevented a strike. In entering a conflict of this kind both parties look to the chances of ultimate success and they know that is measured by the amount of public pressure that can be brought to bear on either side of the question. The American government in their administration of the coal fields, especially in Alaska now retain in their own hands large coal areas for public purposes, and had the Canadian government retained only a fractional part of the vast coal lands in this very region these coal lands would now be capable of early development in the public interest and the dire consequences resulting from this strike would be minimized if not obviated. I understand that coal is being shipped into these provinces for months past by interests that know there will be a great scarcity of fuel in the coming winter, and no doubt the Minister of Labour in his capacity as regulator of combines and trusts will be called on to interfere just as soon as the winter comes. The government is well aware that the conditions on the prairies are different in this respect from those in well settled parts of the country where there are means of rushing in a fuel supply in an emergency and altogether it seems to me that from beginning to end the whole matter has been inadequately

handled by the government. Immigrants are rushing into that country daily and hourly and if it be found impossible for them to obtain fuel during the coming winter disaster is bound to overtake them. The government has allowed the thing to drift along until at this late date all that the minister can do is to hand in a report and say to us, 'What are you going to do about it?' It is the business of the government to do something about it so as to protect the people of the west from hardship.

Mr. TURRIFF. It is unfortunate that the speakers on the other side of the House pay more attention to trying to blame the government than to suggesting a remedy. The question of how the people of the west are to get fuel during the coming winter is a serious one. Let me point out to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Macdonell) that this government has done just exactly what he says they should have done. Several years ago they withdrew absolutely from sale all the coal lands of these western provinces and for years back no one has been able to purchase an acre of coal land from the government.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Because it was all sold.

Mr. TURRIFF. I may tell my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) that there are thousands and tens of thousands of acres of coal lands the equal of any that have been disposed of available to anybody who is willing to develop them, and to pay a yearly rental of $1 per acre and a certain royalty per ton on the coal. My hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) or anybody else can get some of the richest coal lands on earth for a specified rental and royalty and without having to invest one dollar on capital account. In addition to that in the Crowsnest Pass on the British Columbia side, the government has 50,000 acres of the finest coal lands in the world ready for development. At present there are hundreds of thousands of tons of coal coming in from the United States to southern British Columbia and all through the Calgary district and the railways are using American coal now. That very report which was tabled to-day states that the minimum wage paid in one of these mines during the past year amounted to $4 per day for the miner, that the maximum wage was $12 a day, and that the average earning of the miner in that mine was $6 a day. Under these conditions the men have struck and they demand that none but union men shall be employed and the operators contend that they cannot afford to operate their mines if they have to meet the demands of the miners. I do not know which party is right, but there is the condition. Will some one suggest now a means by which the Minister of Labour can end that unfortunate strike? In dealing with it I think we should deal with it as a coal strike, and not bring in party politics for the purpose of blaming the government for something for which they are not to blame at all.

Mr. GOODEVE. In view of the quotation from the resolution of the Nelson Board of Trade, may I ask the Minister of Labour if he has notified both parties to the dispute, as well as the public, that they have no intention of taking any further action in the matter, and that they will leave the parties to the dispute to work out their own salvation?

Mr. KING. The purpose of my remarks to-day was to acquaint the public as well as the parties themselves with the fact that for the present the view of the government is that, the matter having been fully investigated and a report brought down, the parties should now feel that they themselves must try to get together and settle this difficulty. If they believed that the government were going to intervene further, what my hon. friend said at the beginning of his remarks would probably take place: they would wait for that further intervention before coming to a settlement. But I would not like my hon. friend to believe that because the government takes that position it is not watching every phase of this situation and taking care to see that the interests of the public are duly protected.

Mr. BLAIN. After listening to the discussion I do not think there was any justification for my hon. friend from Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) charging members on this side of the House with introducing party politics. My hon. friend is very ready to make charges against members on this side of the House when they are discharging their duty. For my part, I would like to know if it is not the duty of members on this side of the House, particularly gentlemen coming from the west, to direct the attention of the Minister of Labour and of the government to a condition of affairs that is threatening the western development. I notice that my hon. friend had no suggestion to the government or the House for the settlement of this case; but he is seeking from the opposition side what the Department of Labour is unable to give. When the Lemieux Act was introduced, we were told of past strikes and the suffering that the public of this country had endured in consequence of them, and we were assured that when the Lemieux Act was put on the statute-book, strikes would be at an end. Now we have, as the Minister of Labour states, the most far-

reaching strikes ever known in the history of this country, and still we have the Lemieux Act on the statute-book. What is the matter? Either the Minister of Labour or his department are unable or unwilling to enforce the Lemieux Act, or else the Lemieux Act is not sufficient to meet the difficulty. I would like my hon friend the Minister of Labour to state which side of this question he is on, and which side the department is on. In the early part of this session, when a matter of this kind was up, my hon. friend pointed out that the difficulty was whether unions should be recognized or not. I asked on which side was my hon. friend and his department, and my hon. friend said, 'we are on neither side'. When we have a Labour Department, and a full-fledged minister, and a Labour 'Gazette', and correspondents all over this country, it seems to me that if that is the essence of the difficulty, my hon. friend should be able to say, after years of experience and investigation, whether it is in the best interests of this country that labour unions should be recognized or not. It is not enough for my hon. friend to say, I am not on one side or the other, I have not made up my mind whether labour unions should be recognized or not. We had all that information before my hon. friend was put into the government, and when we had this labour legislation, we were told that before labour disputes reached the stage of strikes, the Lemieux Act would be applied and everything would be settled. The duty does not rest on the opposition to settle these strikes. The opposition is not responsible for the Lemieux Act. We questioned when it was introduced whether it would be sufficient to meet the case; but we were told, and the country was told, and the labour organizations were told, that in future there would be no strikes. And now we are confronted with strikes lasting for several months, and a supporter of the government asks, what has the opposition to suggest for the settlement of this difficulty? My hon. friend the Minister of Labour has been criticized for delivering political speeches. It strikes me that my hon. friend is more of a partisan than a Minister of Labour, or he would have been out in the west looking after this difficulty himself. It hardly becomes my hon. friend to suggest that it is the duty of the opposition to make suggestions how this matter could be settled, and I don't think he will do it again.

Mr. SPROULE. It rather amused me to hear the statement of the minister that this matter should be kept out of the domain of party politics. That is very good advice, but I would like to remind him that from time to time on the public platform, and sometimes in this House he tells the country how many strikes have taken place and about the important part taken in their settlement by the Labour Department and the Minister of Labour, and how many were settled by his intervention. He is quite willing that this matter shall be in the arena of party politics when there is anything to be made out of it; but when he sees danger ahead, he wants it to be kept out of politics. I was very much amused to hear the minister give the history of the operations that have been carried on since the appointment of the commission was made, and then to find, after it was all cleared up, that the Minister and the Department of Labour had nothing to do and did not intend to do anything—they only intended to stand aloof and let the parties fight it out. This reminded me of the story of the Irishman who met the bear. He was not very pious, and did not know what to do. It occurred to him that as he was face to face with trouble he ought to pray. At last the situation became very dangerous, and he said, 'I am not much at praying, but, good Lord, if you don't help me, don't help the bear, but just stand aside, and you will see one of the damnedest rackets you ever saw'.

He said we are not done with it because we are watching it carefully and are waiting patiently what will be the outcome. That reminds me of a story I heard of a celebrated Scotch grit away up near Owen Sound who had a little rat terrier. That terrier one day caught a small rat as it came out of its hole, and having chewed it up, watched that hole steadily for years but never another rat came out of it. In like manner the minister is going to watch that rat hole and will continue to watch it all year to see if anything will come out which he can turn to political advantage.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Might I ask the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) when did the government come to the decision to sit tight, and did it advise the parties to the dispute that it had come to such a decision?

Mr. KING. The government is taking exactly the same position in this dispute as it has done in all disputes. When the board makes its report, it is not necessary for the government to make any statement. That report is submitted for the consideration and action of the parties.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Evidently the Department of Labour is absolutely useless in the present instance. The minister says the question is one of endurance, but that is the case in every strike, and he is practically admitting that the Department of Labour, to which we grant an annual subsidy of some $30,000, is pracically of no use whatever. Evidently the minister hopes

that by sitting tight and looking wise he is going to hatch out a solution of the difficulty. He reminds me of a hen sitting for weeks on an empty nest and expecting some results. To-day the hon. gentleman hopes that by looking wise and sitting tight on nothing, he will accomplish something. That seems to be his policy. I was rather struck by the remarks of the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). To my mind these remarks were a corroboration of the general opinion that the western members on the government side have control of the government. The other day when we offered a resolution to grant some substantial recognition to the veterans of 1866 and 1870, that proposal was turned down because it did not meet with favour among the western members on the government side. They said they were not in favour of granting any recognition to the veterans of 1867 and 1870. Although they were in favour of granting similar recognition to the veterans of 1885 and to the South African volunteers. A similar control is evident in the matter we are now discussing. While we are told by the Minister of Labour that his policy is to sit tight and do nothing, we have had the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) telling us that the operators are getting too much pay as it is.

Mr. TURRIFF. I did not say that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The hon. gentleman said, speaking of the pay they were getting, that they were still dissatisfied, and I took that to mean that, in his opinion, they were getting sufficient pay to-day. He apparently also thinks it is good policy to have the coal which is being used in our west taken from the mines in the United States, transported by American railways and delivered in this country, thus encouraging our neighbours to the south. That is a policy on the lines of reciprocity, and the hon. gentleman thinks it is a good policy. We on this side do not agree with him. And I think that it is up to the Minister of Labour (Mr. King) to take some steps for the purpose of settling this strike.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Was there not a commission appointed by the minister last year to visit the different countries throughout the world and find out the conditions of labour in each?

Mr. KING. My hon. friend must be thinking of the commission on technical education.

Mr. REID (Grenville). At all events the minister himself visited a great many foreign countries in order to find out how they settled their labour troubles. He went to China and even to Japan to find out how strikes were settled in those countries. He was then in the position of deputy minister and had full power to go to all those countries and see how the labour unions were working there and how strikes were settled. Therefore, if there be anyone in this government qualified to give some information regarding the settlement of strikes, that one should be the minister himself. The minister, however, and the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) want information from this side on that point but there has not been any member on this side who has had the opportunity the Minister of Labour has had of finding out what has been done in China, Japan and other countries. When this Labour Department was first created, I understand, the object was to put into the hands of the government a means of settling strikes, yet not one has so far been settled by this government.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Yes ,the telephone girls of Toronto.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister may have been able to settle that strike but he could not settle that of the Grand Trunk Railway operators. Beyond doubt it was understood that the Labour Department was to have settled that strike so as to give satisfaction to the men or give them the terms on which they understood the strike was settled. I have heard of a great many strikes, but I fail to find that any have been settled by the government. They have all been settled by the parties themselves. In the case of the Grand Trunk railway strike, the minister undertook to settle it, but to-day some of the men are walking around yet, doing nothing within 12 miles of where I live. The hon. minister knows that on the Grand Trunk railway some of the strikebreakers are still occupying the very best positions in charge of the trains or as conductors, and men who served for years have not been put back in their former positions. If that is the way the Labour Department is going to settle strikes, of what use is it?

Mr. BRADBURY. Abolish it.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It should be abolished and the minister superannuated and I believe that the strikes would then be settled a good deal quicker. Although we have a minister in charge of the Labour Department, who has been all over the world inquiring into labour conditions, the department is evidently useless.

Mr. PERLEY. This is only another example of the incompetence of this government. From some remarks of the Minister of Labour this afternoon, it seems to me he ought to have been a supporter of the leader of the opposition in his policy in regard to the lands and natural resources of the Northwest provinces during the last ten years. The Minister of Labour tells

us to-day that the Dominion government has practically made up its mind that it can do nothing to settle this difficulty, and that the people of the Northwest will have to freeze this winter, so far as this government is concerned. At the same time he says the provincial governments out there ought to take proper steps now.

Mr. KING. My hon. friend misunderstood me. I did not mention the provincial governments at all in this matter.

Mr PERLEY. The people of the northwest provinces, I understood him to mean that the people of the northwest as a whole, and as a body ought to make preparation for this trouble and to provide themselves with coal for the coming winter. If the policy of the leader of the opposition had been carried out the provinces of the northwest would have had control of these lands, and these coal mines, and could then have taken proper steps to see that they were operated in such a way as to be of benefit to the people of the northwest. We know that years ago many of these lands, the best of them, were practically given away and that there were many frauds in connection with applications for these lands as has been brought out in discussion in this House many times, and if the provinces had had control of these lands they would have been able to find some other method of administering them, and would have better control over the coal mines themselves.

THE CENSUS — OMISSIONS IN ENUMERATION.

Mr. PERLEY. In connection with the question asked by the leader of the opposition before going into the orders of the day yesterday with regard to the census, it seems to me very necessary that the Minister of Agriculture should hasten his explanation and statement regarding the census. Many reports have appeared in the newspapers as to the incompetence of the census officials, the incorrectness of their reports and their failure to enumerate all the people. In that connection I would read an article which appeared in the Ottawa 'Evening Journal' yesterday:

CENSUS TAKING IN OTTAWA AN EXAMPLE OF COLOSSAL INCOMPETENCE OR WORSE.

Conditions Prevailing in Other Cities seem to be much more Serious in the Capital.

Ottawa seems destined to lose considerably in Population owing to very many families being overlooked—Most Glaring Example of Carelessness in connection with the Census that Canada has yet witnessed—Numerous complaints being registered daily by families and individuals who have been overlooked.

Whatever grounds there may be upon which to base the numerous protests in other towns and cities of omissions from the census records, of one thing at least a great number of Ottawa citizens are perfectly satisfied. In so far as the capital city of the Dominion is concerned, the census taking has proven to be a colossal farce.

The question asked by the average citizen in the streets of Ottawa to-day is not what gains in population the city will show, but what success has attended the apparent efforts of the enumerators to make its population appear smaller.

Facts are Supreme.

It is not merely a question, as claimed by the census commissioner, 'that it is quite possible that, in some instances, persons and families have been overlooked.' It is a demonstrated fact that very many families have failed to attract the wandering eye of the casual enumerator long enough for census purposes, and it should not be forgotten that the numerous instances which thus far have been reported must merely represent a small portion of the entire number.

Whether or not the deplorable situation, or conditions, which prevail in Ottawa, so evident in the daily and almost hourly complaints from families and individuals, it at least lends colour to the complaints being registered all over the country.

Not a Political Question.

And in face of the bare proven facts it is difficult to understand how certain newspapers, and persons, can find ground upon which to base the charge that the complaints made so far are registered merely for partisan and political purposes.

Every citizen is, or at least should be desirous that Canada should show a large increase in her population. The same applies to the citizens of Ottawa and of every other city, town, village and hamlet, throughout the whole Dominion. The public spirited citizen of any community is anxiously awaiting the returns to ascertain whether or not his district is showing the growth, which he believes it must. It is hard to understand what any one party could possibly hope to gain through certain families or even districts being 'passed up.'

Therefore it must be taken that any complaints which have been made were not prompted by a desire, for political purposes, to show that enumerators, who 'omit persons or families,' are doing so under orders from their superiors. It can only be said that they are registered because of a desire on the part of citizens who take a just pride in this city to have their names entered in the census.

Negligence Astounding.

Although, it is pointed out that no census, that has ever been taken, or that ever will be taken in the future will be absolutely correct or infallible, it is yet astounding and almost unbelievable that so many prominent and well known citizens of Ottawa should have been overlooked.

Almost every day cases are coming to light where the entire households, and in some cases the entire staffs of offices have aparently been overlooked with almost studious care.

In the face of the fact it is not surprising that the bulk of Ottawa citizens should disagree with the census commissioner when he

says that 'the work of enumeration has been well and thoroughly done.'

Ottawa will Feel Loss.

It is very easy to see that it is in cities like Ottawa, Montreal, Toronto, Winnipeg, &c., where the loss will be felt the most through the inefficiency or carelessness of the enumerator or of the officials in charge. They have the largest population without fixed and permanent abode, or domestic relations, and it is this class that is more likely to be neglected or overlooked.

The enumerator received 5 cents per name, and was not altogether likely, if not closely watched to chase all day after illusive people who could not be discovered on his first or second visit.

Many enumerators have complained of a lack of co-operation on the part of the people which they consider they were entitled to. While this complaint may be just in many respects on the other hand, business men do not think it was their duty to remain at home from their offices in waiting to accommodate the enumerator when he was pleased to call at their homes.

Some of the Causes.

They declare that this census man had a right to hunt them up at their places of business for the necessary information. And just here is the cause of a great number of persons being overlooked.

Enumerators have undoubtedly refused to do this as it made their work more onerous and unremunerative. What the results have been is daily being demonstrated.

Of the whole piece of business only one thing can be said, to quote a well known citizen yesterday:

'It is the most glaring and serious example of incompetency, through lack of proper organization, that Canada has yet had to contend with.'

The system of payment by the department of 5 cents per head is one that may lead to many abuses and that, as this article points out, will not induce the enumerator to take the trouble of going to the house more than once or twice in order to enumerate the people. In June, when the census was taken, many people were out of town, and I know myself how difficult it would be for the enumerator to get track of them all. I have been told by several persons that they were not enumerated in this census. I mention that in case the minister may think that this article is not definite enough. I also find specific charges contained in a telegram from Montreal appearing in the 'Citizen' of July 11. That article reads:

MISSED BY CENSUS.

Many Complaints as to way Numbers were Left Out.

Montreal, July 10.—Complaints as to the manner in which the 1911 census has been conducted are coming in by the score, not only from individuals who have been overlooked, but also from whole districts.

'Not a householder in Rosemount has been called on by the census enumerators, as far as I can learn,' said Ald. Drummond to-day.

'No enumerator called at my house, although I represent the ward in the council of Montreal. But I was not the only one treated in this way. I have received scores of complaints from residents of the ward that no enumerators called upon them. This is remarkable. In my ward there are some three thousand houses, so you would think that the enumerators would not have been so careless as to neglect the place. It is most remarkable.'

Whole parishes, streets and corners have been similarly neglected. While a canvass of business men shows that in very many cases the enumerators, finding the head of the houses away, jotted down what information they could obtain from servants and children, completing their work by the use of imagination.

This is a matter of great importance. In the first place, we are all naturally anxious that the entire population of Canada should be enumerated in order that we may make as good a showing as possible in that respect, and on this census will be based the representation for this House of Commons for the next ten years, in the Bill which, I presume, will be brought down in the House before long. Now it would be an unfortunate thing if the census should not be reliable. I am not bringing up this matter as a political question, but simply to call the attention of the minister to this state of affairs, and to ask him for an explanation.

Mr. FISHER. In reply to the hon. gentleman I would say that the statement which he has just read, taken I believe from the 'Journal' of last evening, is about as reckless, and as unfounded a statement as I have read in a newspaper. It is an exaggeration in every way, shape and form. It happens that in the city of Ottawa the chief census office is situated; and if any such condition of affairs has existed as described in that paper, it is extraordinary that the people who were concerned did not make their complaints to the census office. It was the easiest thing for them to do. My hon. friend shakes his head. They are not bound to do it, I grant; but at the same time the public were asked to co-operate with the census officials in taking a correct census, and if such a state of affairs existed as described, it seems to me that the people affected would have made their complaint to the census office, either by telephone or verbally.

Mr. LANCASTER. Could they not make their complaint in the public press much more effectually than by communicating with the officers of the department?

Mr. FISHER. Yes, if the public press gave names and places. But when a reckless article of this kind is published, giving no name or place, it is evidently not the best way of making complaints. But

if any one makes a complaint in the press giving name and place, it will be investigated at once. But here in Ottawa there was an easy opportunity for people who are thus described, as numbering scores and hundreds, according to the tenor of that article, to notify the census office, and have matters set right. That would not be the case in Montreal, Toronto, and elsewhere, I grant; but at the same time the public have been invited to make any complaint of that kind to the census office, free by post, and such complaint would be investigated. Now as a matter of fact in the city of Ottawa we have had a few complaints, not a score in all have come to the office. A majority of these complaints have been investigated, and have been discovered to be unfounded. As a matter of fact there have been a few cases where people have not been enumerated, and immediately on representations having been made, the enumeration has been properly done. There have also been a few such complaints in other parts of the country. Many of those coming from the cities are owing to a fact which the complainants seem to have overlooked. This census has been taken as of the 1st of June, during which month a large number of people left their residences for other parts of the country. We have, however, provided machinery for looking after them. They are enumerated in the place where they are found, and a special card is sent to the department here to indicate that these people, while enumerated at their temporary residence, at Britannia or up the Gatineau, for instance, are residents of the city of Ottawa, and the enumerator in Ottawa who has not been able to find the individual in his house, or to get information, sends a card into the general office to that effect. We compare the two, and when the final revision of the enumeration is completed, the corrections will be made, and all these people will be counted in the place where they are properly resident. That has all been arranged for, and I have no doubt whatever, that the people who have made the complaints spoken of have all been enumerated as inhabitants of the city where they live. I may say that in the census of 1901 we had such complaints as are now being made. Every complaint where a name was mentioned was investigated immediately, and according to my memory, it was discovered that a large majority of the complaints were unfounded. The people had been enumerated. An instance was given to me the other day. A gentleman resident of the city of Montreal said that his household had not been enumerated. His household was away for the summer, he himself was away, but he had left in charge of the house a confidential servant, and that servant had given full details of the entire family. She had made one mistake, however, in giving the age of the proprietor, reporting him as two years younger than he actually was. That gentleman came to the census office about the matter, and on investigation we found that his complaint was absolutely without foundation. That is a kind of thing which has occurred in a few instances in different parts of the country, and that is a kind of thing on which reckless journalists are basing absurd accusations, such as are contained in the article read by the hon. member for Argenteuil. I venture to say that the census is being accurately taken, that it is being taken with the greatest care, that proper machinery has been provided to take it effectively, and that when the returns are finally revised the actual population of Canada in its various parts will be known. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked for a statement which I had not at the moment, and which I now have. The census was taken as of the 1st of June, and we expected the last enumerators to get through their work in less than three weeks. That has been done to a large extent, but not altogether. In some instances where the enumerators have made omissions they have been directed to go over their work again. In one instance I know of a half street being left out. The census enumerator was sent back by the commissioner to do that half street, and it has been done, and the return is in. I will now make an answer to the questions of the leader of the opposition yesterday. The returns have been coming in very rapidly. At the present date there are 9,322 enumerations. I may say that that number will be slightly added to, because some of the outlying districts have been subdivided, but the actual number as reported to us at the time of the taking of the census, was 9,322.

We have received the returns from 6,556 of these districts leaving the balance of 2,761 to be received. Of those that have been received the first compilation has been going on since they were received, and out of 6,556 about 6,500 have been gone over up to the present day for the first count. I say clearly for the first count, because we have to revise all these schedules and compare them after the first count. Then we go over them a third time, check them and see that they are correct. That provision includes the compilation of these cards I have just alluded to, and a comparison and correction where any indication exists that a person may have been counted in two places. For instance, the other day I was counted here. I found when I went home to my farm in Brome that I had been counted there also. Therefore, this checking and revision have to take place before we can issue any figures which would be reliable or correct. After that is done we

have to go over the whole of them again and check them, this being largely done by the machines, to see that they are accurate before we can issue any statement of figures. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition asked if we were going to issue statements of the returns as they came in. In former censuses we issued statements when we had finally concluded what was the actual population, but I would not like to undertake to issue a statement until that final revision and checking have taken place so that no misconceptions may arise, and so that nobody may be misled by what may turn out to be not absolute accuracy. My hon. friend also asked when the final figures would be given out. I am not prepared at the moment to say, but we think that the final figures should be completed in the month of October. It is possible we may be able to get them out earlier, but I would not like to hold out any hope that it would be at an earlier date than some time in the month of October.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to have one point cleared up, and that is to ascertain whether I am enumerated in this census. I do not know whether I have the honour to be included in this census as a citizen of Canada. I do know this: that up to the time I left on the 15th of June for the west I had not seen anything at all of these enumerators. I have been informed since my return that inquiry was made at my house as to whether the head of the house was at home, that the person who made the inquiry was informed that the head of the house was absent, and that is the last that has been heard of him. No papers were left at my house to be filled in there as far as I can ascertain, and I do not know whether I have the honour to be included in this census. I would like very much to find that out.

Mr. FISHER. I will find it out.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I know that a memorandum was prepared giving the particulars, as far as they could be foreseen, that would be required for the census enumeration, and if a call had been made at any time when any person was at home who would be prepared to hand that out, these particulars would have been available But, that has not been handed out as no one has called whatever, except on the occasion to which I have alluded at which time he got no information on the subject. That does not seem to me to indicate that care which the minister is so confident has been taken in the city of Ottawa. I was here for fifteen days of June, ready and willing to give all information available and I heard absolutely nothing of any census enumerator having called; nor was any application made to me. I do not know the method of taking the census. Is it not customary to leave some papers in which the person being enumerated will find out certain statistical information?

Mr FISHER. No. That might be done in case several calls had been made and a person could not be found or something of that kind The duty of the enumerator is to see somebody in the household.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am absolutely confident that if the information is of a character anything like that which was asked for in the census of ten years ago they did not obtain it in my case unless the enumerator has put it down by mere conjecture, because no one who was seen at my house would have been capable of giving any of the information. I think that the Minister of Agriculture may find that the taking of this census has not been of that almost perfect character which would be indicated by his remarks this afternoon. It is almost impossible to believe that the complaints that are coming from every city in Canada, or almost every city in Canada—I have seen a great many of them—are simply raised without any real foundation. I heard them in the west when I was there, I have heard them since I came back to the east, and I am inclined to think that the character of the census taking on this occasion ought to be the subject of a very strict and careful inquiry. The census enumerator has not taken the pains to obtain the information in regard to myself; is it not equally reasonable to believe that that has been the case in a great many other instances? It was perfectly available to him if he had seen fit to come to me and ask for it and obtain it. It would have been available to him in some degree at least if he had gone to my house during my absence. I do not know whether all the information could have been obtained in my absence, but certainly the most important part could have been, and that has not been given. I would like to know how many persons have been enumerated in my household. I do not see how any correct enumeration could have been made of my servants if there has been only the one visit to which I allude. The whole proceeding so far as that particular instance is concerned does not lead me to conclude that there was very great care in Ottawa, and if care has not been taken in Ottawa it is equally reasonable to conclude that the complaints which have been made to my own knowledge in western and eastern cities, are not entirely without foundation.

It seems singular that the enumeration should be so long delayed. In 1901, if I recollect correctly, the enumeration was completed on the 1st of September, or the latter part of August. That was mentioned in the House on a previous

occasion, and I think the Minister of Agriculture in reply to that said that ten years ago the enumeration commenced on the 1st of April, and this year it commenced on the 1st of June. If it could commence on the 1st of April ten years ago there seems no good reason why it should not have commenced on the 1st of April this year.

Mr. FISHER. Only the law.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Why was the law changed?

Mr. FISHER. It was changed by this House six years ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Upon the initiative of the government, and upon a government measure.

Mr. FISHER. Unanimously passed six years ago without a complaint or a suggestion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Very good; suppose that was the case, what was the object or reason of it?

Mr. FISHER. That was explained when the law was passed, and my hon. friend was in the House and did not object.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think it should be explained now. I did not introduce the measure; I am not responsible for it. The minister did introduce it, and he is responsible for it. As a matter of fact the Australian census has been announced already, the announcement having been made two or three weeks ago in the public press of this country. The enumeration has been completed there. It cannot be completed here for some three or four months according to the minister's statement.

It has been completed in Great Britain and in other countries who have undertaken the work this year, and Canada seems to be coming along at the end of the procession. I would much like to ascertain whether I am really to be excluded from this census. I am prepared to give any information that may be necessary for the purpose of enumeration, and if it is not too late I would like to enjoy the privilege of being included in the census of 1911 which I believe I enjoyed in 1901.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the minister seen the definite statement in the newspapers concerning Rosemount?

Mr. FISHER. I have. It has been investigated, and I have received a report with regard to it.

Mr. HERRON. I am surprised at the statement made by the Minister of Agriculture, and judging by it he cannot be well informed as to the manner in which the census is being taken. In one instance, near where I live several heads of families went to the enumerator for their district and complained that they were not included in the census, and they were told by him that as he had no authority to go outside certain lines he could not include them. I have heard very general complaints of the same sort from people who are perfectly reliable.

Mr. FISHER. Was there not another enumerator to take these people in another district?

Mr. HERRON. They were not taken by any enumerator.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Probably the gentleman from Montreal who complains about not being included in the census will find that he was taken by another enumerator at his summer residence so that he will be counted twice.

Mr. FISHER. He will not.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). An American gentleman who resides on the Canadian side of the Thousand Islands asked me recently what business the census enumerator had to come to his house and threaten to fine him if he did not answer a lot of questions.

Mr. LENNOX. Reciprocity.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). This American gentleman whose family resides there during the summer and who himself only comes there for a visit for a very few days in the year, was asked what his life insurance was, and what was the age of his wife and a lot of nonsense like that. He told them it was none of their business, and that as an American citizen he did not want to be included as a Canadian. I wish to ask the minister if all the Americans who reside during the summer months on the Thousand Islands are to be counted as part of the Canadian population. The enumerator for my district met me on the street and asked me what life insurance I carried and I told him to call at my office where I could get my papers and would answer him, and I have never seen him since. My wife told me he had called at the house and asked a few simple questions, but nothing about life insurance. Anyway it is an impertinent question to put on the paper, but nevertheless, if the enumerator had come to me I would have given him the information.

Now, with regard to the coal miners' strike in the West, I can tell the member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that I sent suggestions to the Minister of Labour some years ago which if he had carried out would have prevented any trouble. I was president of a coal company in the Crowsnest Pass and there was a strike which lasted

from March until April, and I proposed to the Minister of Labour that he should appoint a commission similar to the railway commission before whom parties could be heard and that when that commission gave its award it would be binding upon the parties, and it would be illegal to have any strike or lock-out.

Mr. KING. My recollection is that the hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) suggested that the government should drive the men back at the point of the bayonet.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It would be better to drive them back at the point of the bayonet, than to let innocent people be frozen to death as they are likely to be in the Northwest this year. Is the government going to let the settlers on the prairie suffer and die? There would be no point of the bayonet about it if we had a commission whose findings would be binding on both parties. I think the hon. member (Mr. Turriff) is quite astray when he says that there is any quantity of coal lands in the west which have not been taken up by speculators. If the government has coal mines let them notify the operators and the miners that if coal is not supplied in time to save the people from death the government will open up these lands, and let any one who wants to, work the mines and distribute the product, and that no charge will be made for it. At all events I advised our company to sell out the coal mine owing to the labour conditions in the west. The Minister of Labour talks about interfering in politics, but I tell him that his Labour Bureau is nothing but a political machine from head to foot, and every one of his correspondents throughout the country is simply an agent for the government. The 'Labour Gazette' is nothing but politics from start to finish. I throw the thing into the waste paper basket every time I get it, and I would be obliged to the minister if he would stop printing it at the expense of the country.

Mr. EMMERSON. Do you read it?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No.

Mr. EMMERSON. How do you know it is politics then?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I read a few copies of it until I found out what it was, and I got disgusted with it. If my hon. friend (Mr. Emmerson) will speak the truth he will say it is a political production from beginning to end.

Mr. EMMERSON. Not at all.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then my hon. friend gets up and and asks us not to talk politics in reference to this coal strike. Let the hon. gentleman adopt the plan I suggest—appoint a labour commission, and let the verdict of that commission apply to both employers and employees.

Mr. LENNOX. In reference to the census, as a matter of justice to the press, which has been pretty violently abused by the Minister of Agriculture I do not know that it was far out. I believe, if there was an investigation, there would be found to be a good deal of ground for what the 'Journal' has said. Although the minister has had the good luck as an unmarried man to be enumerated twice, and his wife was not asked any questions as to her age, I may tell him that as far as I know I have not been enumerated at all. I have been living in a place where I have lived for many years, and since the adjournment of the House two months ago I have been pretty regularly at home, and I have never had a suggestion in reference to the enumeration. My house has been constantly occupied, and I feel quite confident that if any inquiry had been made at my residence I would have been told of it. I will inquire, however, to make it absolutely certain. I do not think this is an isolated case. I think numerous instances will be found all over the country in which enumerations have not taken place, and the minister need not get violent about it until he knows the facts better than he does at present. In some respects I know the enumerators have been very active. I was at some public gatherings where discussions of a political nature took place, and the South Simcoe enumerators were very active in interrupting and contradicting and making themselves offensive. That is the only knowledge I have at the present time of the duties performed by the enumerators in South Simcoe.

Mr. DOHERTY. I understood the Minister of Agriculture to say that the case of Rosemount had been investigated, but I did not gather what the result was.

Mr. FISHER. I have not got the report.

Mr. DOHERTY. The minister is not in a position to say that the statement of the reckless journalist in that case was not correct.

Mr. FISHER. I am not in a position to say positively.

Mr. DOHERTY. Rosemount in my section is a very large district. Another large district, Villeray, I believe, was entirely omitted, and attention was called to the fact by a paper which the minister would not characterize as reckless because it has the great prudence of supporting this government, and if I am not mistaken the commissioner himself admitted that it was overlooked. Then, it is stated generally

by the newspapers that Hampton Court, a large apartment house, had been entirely overlooked. These cases seem to justify me in asking whether there is any method provided for checking the work of the enumerators, or does the department consider that its duty is done when it sends out enumerators and only concerns itself with their possible omissions when newspapers or individuals take upon themselves to call attention to them? If that is the position, it occurs to me that it is a very loose method of getting at the census. What is the provision for checking the enumerators?

Mr. FISHER. It is the duty of the commissioner to go over every schedule that comes in, and check it by his general knowledge of the district, and see that all the houses are included. If several houses were omitted, that would be evident from the fact that the numbers of those houses were not scheduled.

Mr. DOHERTY. As I understand, he only does that from his general knowledge of the locality. That will not enable him to go any further than to say that every house number has been counted up. There is no means of saying that the enumerator has made a correct return of the number of people in each house. The matter seems to me to be of sufficient importance to require some more effective check over the work of the enumerators.

Mr. FISHER. That would simply mean another enumeration by somebody else.

Mr. DOHERTY. I do not think it would be absolutely necessary to have a second enumeration. But we have now before us evidence of the fact that there are omissions, and I would think that would be something to be anticipated. I do not know the enumerators of the city of Montreal, but I would think that a check might be got at by making some sort of test which would enable one to arrive at a conclusion as to whether in a general way the work had been carefully done. It seems to me a very unsatisfactory answer to say that if an individual complains, the matter will be looked into and rectified. The department is charged with getting this work done. People of public spirit, when they find that they have not been enumerated, may come forward and point it out, but there are a great number of people who are careless about such matters or who do not really know that a census is going on at all. This is not a case in which there is a grievance on the part of a person whose name has been omitted. The work is being done for the public benefit and it transpires that the department charged with finding an effective way of getting it done correctly, sends out people to make the enumeration of whose qualifications or responsibility it is quite impossible for the public to have any knowledge.

Without casting any reflection upon the commissioners, there is no method given them whatever by which they can check the enumeration. Without proposing that another man should be sent out to do the enumeration over again, I submit that some means could be devised which would enable the commissioners to conclude whether the enumerators generally were doing their duty. For instance, somebody might be sent afterwards to inquire generally whether the enumerator had gone from house to house in that locality. The matter is one sufficiently important to warrant every precaution being taken. On the correctness of the census depends the right to representation of the different sections of this country. This important work has necessarily to be trusted to a class of our people who have no other occupation at that moment, and we are consequently depending upon the unchecked and uncontrolled action of enumerators of whose qualifications and responsibility we have no means of being informed and whose work we have no means of checking. Without proposing two separate enumerations, it seems to me that some method could be devised of finding out whether these men were doing their duty properly or not.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am rather surprised at the character of the complaint. In as much as the pay of each enumerator depends on the number of names he secures, one would think that he would show a good deal of zeal in securing a large number.

Mr. DOHERTY. Would it not be just as bad if too many names were enumerated? The complaint is not that we do not get as many as we should but that we have no guarantee of accuracy.

Mr. EMMERSON. So far the complaints we have heard are to the effect that a great many names have escaped the attention of the enumerator. I have not heard many complaints that too many names were entered except the complaint of the hon. member for Leeds (Mr. Taylor) who says that American citizens were entered in our census. I can quite understand that American citizens who own property in this country would have their names taken down as the enumerators would require to know who were the owners of the property. The hon. member for St. Anne (Mr. Doherty) says it would be desirable to have a sort of review of the enumeration. He would like to have a supervisor to supervise the work of the census commissioner and enumerator in

each county or district. As we are dependent upon individuals for the enumeration there must necessarily be inaccuracies, but I think that in the main we can fairly conclude that the census has been pretty accurately taken. In the section from which I come the commissioners, when they got their schedules from the enumerators took special pains—I know that to be the case at Westmoreland—sought to go through the several districts and inquire as to whether, generally speaking, there had been a correct census. The commissioner of course does not travel from house to house or from community to community, but he makes inquiry as to whether the enumerator has attended generally to his work. I am bound to admit that we did, in some instances, find some inaccuracies—one in particular because of a misunderstanding regarding the boundary of a district. As a result of the supervision thus taken by the county commissioners, the correction was made and the census properly taken with respect to that section. We must deal with this matter practically. There may be errors here and there as in the case of my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden); and I am sure it would be a very unfortunate circumstance if his name were omitted as it would be if any man's name were omitted.

Every one counts one and we are all anxious to have as accurate a statement of the actual population in our respective sections as can be had. I think that an accurate census has been taken. I hope the enumerators have not omitted any names in the maritime provinces for I am sure that with the numbers we have been sending to the west during the past two or three years, we have suffered very largely in the matter of population and I trust that the enumerators throughout New Brunswick have not been negligent and have not failed to take the names of every individual. I had the honour of a call from the census officer; I was permitted to give him my name and age, and he took them down. I think we should deal with the matter practically and I hope there is no ulterior object in bringing to the notice of the House and the country any of these slight mistakes or inaccuracies or want of attention on the part of the officials that may have occurred. I think a sincere effort has been made to get the best men. I found it in Westmorland very difficult to secure men, people are not free. While it was difficult to get officials there was a splendid selection.

Mr. BLAIN. Did my hon. friend make the selection?

Mr. EMMERSON. I did not but I knew some of the names and had an opportunity of judging the character, capability and qualities of those engaged in the work and I only hope that throughout Canada they had an army of enumerators equal to those in the County of Westmorland.

Mr. BLAIN. Did the census commissioner in 1901 send out a letter similar to the one sent out by Mr. Blue this year asking that people who had not been enumerated would communicate direct with him as chief census officer?

Mr. FISHER. I do not remember such a letter being sent out.

Mr. BLAIN. Why was it necessary to send such a letter if the census was being taken correctly?

Mr. FISHER. Because of the remarks in certain newspapers.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the census commissioners in the counties are asking that question generally.

Mr. SHARPE (Lisgar). Has the minister seen an article in the 'Winnipeg Telegram' of July 13, dealing with the taking of the census at Calgary. That article reads:

CITIZENS DECLARE CALGARY CENSUS A PUBLIC SCANDAL.

Hundreds of persons assert they haven't been counted—Dominion Government scored for its neglect—Eighteen men in City's Fire Hall not counted at all.

Calgary, Alta., July 12.—The manner in which the census is being taken in Calgary is now approaching a public scandal. To-morrow is the day which the census commissioner has set for the completion of the work, yet it is safe to say, declare citizens, that there are thousands of names which have been left off the lists.

In response to appeals in the newspapers hundreds of persons are coming forward declaring they have never seen a census enumerator.

Liberal Machine Agent.

Appointed commissioner for Calgary because of his faithful attachment to the Liberal machine, John W. Dingle has not even placed a telephone in his office.

The Dominion government is being roundly scored and it is even hinted that the present situation was designed for the purpose of a general scheme to cheat the west out of its proper parliamentary representation.

It was discovered to-day that no enumerator had visited the Central Fire Hall, where 23 men were employed.

Fear for Correct Count.

In another office where there are 23 employees, 12 have never seen the enumerators. Fears are expressed to-day that Calgary will not receive credit for anything like its proper population.

If that description of the state of affairs is at all accurate it would be the duty of the minister to direct the attention of his officials in that important city to their omission, and to have the remedy applied

It appears to me that a lot of census enumerators have been appointed for their political zeal rather than for their ability to take the census. The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) said that the men were financially interested in getting as many names as possible but an incompetent man would be negligent in his duties and incompetent men have been appointed on account of their political activities rather than for their ability to do the work. The taking of the census is a matter of great public importance, it has to do with the representation in this parliament and every constituency is vitally interested in the accurate taking of the census. It seems to me the minister has been derelict in his duty in appointing incompetent people to do this work.

Motion agreed to and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. URIAH WILSON (Lennox and Addington). Mr. Chairman. I have the honour to represent a very old agricultural county in the province of Ontario, a county which I believe understands this question perhaps as well as any agricultural county in this country. The electors of that county elected Sir Richard Cartwright in 1863 and he continued to support Sir John Macdonald until Sir Francis Hincks was taken into the cabinet as Financial Minister. Then Sir Richard became very independent and when Hon. Alexander Mackenzie offered him the position of Financial Minister in his cabinet he took the position and in 1873 was elected by a majority of 800. It will be remembered that the members of the cabinet went to the country before the general election and were returned. At the general election of 1874, he was returned by acclamation and in 1878 the gentleman whom he defeated in 1873 by 800 defeated him at the polls and Sir Richard, so far as I know, has never held a public meeting in the riding since that time. I feel that he was driven from the county because he opposed the National Policy.

I shall perhaps not again be a candidate for this House but I feel that I would not represent the feeling of the county of Lennox and Addington did I not oppose in this House what I believe will be injurious to this country. It is all very well for the government to place before the county through their speakers, as I believe they do all over the country, the 90,000,000 market. They never tell us a word about what the 90,000,000 market will do in the way of sending in their produce to our market. They do not tell the farmers that while we will have the privilege of sending eight men to sell goods in that country they will have the privilege of sending into our country 90 men; that while we have a surplus of farm products to sell perhaps representing $140,000,000 they have, according to an article in the 'Toronto News' on the 8th of this month, a surplus of $956,000,000 of products of a similiar character to dispose of.

I wish to discuss briefly the old reciprocity treaty of 1854. The conditions in Canada to-day are very different from what they were then as is known to every member of this House. We were then a few scattered provinces, having little if anything to do with each other. Our transportation system was very poor, we were practically a poor people and a small people in those days, a little over 3,000,000 people and our trade, which was very small, was principally with the United States. I do not believe that that treaty did as much for this country as many of its admirers pretend, because shortly after that treaty was signed we had what is known as the Russian war.

The price of farm products, as every body knows, went up higher, I think, than they have ever been since. Wheat went as high as $2 or $2.25 a bushel. The result was that we were prosperous for a time. I know a firm of three brothers that lived in our district. They said they could have cleared $60,000 on what wheat they held had they sold it at the right time. But unfortunately they held it too long, and they went to the wall, and became bankrupt on that one speculation. Well, I think the older men in this country will remember that in 1857, notwithstanding that we had this treaty in full force, we saw as hard times as had ever been seen in Canada up to that time, and that condition continued until about 1860 and 1861. But in 1861, you remember, the American rebellion broke out, and the war, as a matter of course, took away a great many men from the ordinary pursuits of life. The country had not the men to perform the ordinary avocations of life, and of course prices went up, and that was a great advantage to the people of Canada, because they were able to supply the food stuffs for the American people. But unfortunately for us, and I think for the American people, they took umbrage at the sympathies which some of our people manifested towards the rebellion. I myself was a very strong northern sympathizer, but there were some people in this country who sympathized strongly with the south. The American people took umbrage at that, and gave notice in 1865 that they would abrogate the treaty at the end of one year. That was done. We had been in the habit of dealing largely with them, and we depended largely on them to take the farm produce we raised. But nothing

would persuade them to continue the treaty, or to deal fairly by us. It looks to me, and it always has looked to me since I have thought the matter over, that the American people have always treated us unfairly. They have always acted like a big boy bullying a little one. I do not think that is the kind of usage we had a right to expect from them, but that is the kind of usage we got.

We remember that in 1876 Sir John A. Macdonald introduced his resolution for a protective tariff, either reciprocity in trade or reciprocity in tariff. When he introduced that resolution in the House of Commons it was opposed by the then Mackenzie government, and the Liberal party, and although the times were very hard, and they had to increase the tariff on a general scale, I think, of about 2½ per cent, they did not alter, so far as I remember, the duties to any extent, they appeared to think that the tariff was as nearly perfect as it could be made. This resolution of Sir John A. Macdonald was introduced year after year, until 1878. Then the government dissolved the House and went to the country, and I do not think any gentleman occupying the treasury benches need information from me as to what the result was. The country went strongly in favour of protection, and protection has been continued from that day to the present. I know that in our riding the question was fully discussed, and the farmers were just as enthusiastic supporters of protection as the manufacturers were. We had it discussed by Sir Richard Cartwright, the Finance Minister of that day. He was opposed by a young man named Rowe, who had taken great pains to inform himself on the question, and he made it so hot for the Minister of Finance that he would not allow him to come to one of his meetings unless he spoke first. But Mr. Rowe made himself so familiar with the speeches of the Minister of Finance that he could repeat them, and answer him. The result was that Sir Richard would not allow him to come to his meetings at all. On that occasion the government was beaten. We did not believe it was possible to defeat Sir Richard, because he had large interests in our county, and because of his great wealth, and because he belonged to an old family. I recollect that the first vote I ever gave was against him, although he had been a Conservative. But I have always been one of the people, and I never believed in aristocracy, and do not now, and I never supported him. I have no sympathy with men who are not willing to associate with the people, and live with them. I have nothing personally against Sir Richard Cartwright, but he thought we had nothing good for him, and he went to live in Kingston. I recollect one little instance that occurred, and I was told this by the man himself. He was going to support Sir Richard, but he thought he would chaff him a little on his lack of ability to represent the riding, and Sir Richard replied: 'I want you to know, Daly, that I was educated to represent Canada.' 'Well,' said Daly, 'I would not have known it if you had not told me.' That is the way things were going then.

Now I want to speak a little on the action of the two parties when they came to power. When Sir John A. Macdonald came to power it was not believed by the Liberals of that day that he would put in force the National Policy as he had promised. But he did so. He thoroughly investigated the matter by a commission, and brought down such a measure of protection that the Liberals were greatly astonished at it. I believe the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie said that he had trotted out the whole white elephant. Now they carried out their pledges, and that is what I think every public man ought to do. I do not think any man has the right to ask the people to vote for him under certain conditions and then, when he comes to this House, to go back on his pledges. Now what was the difference between the course pursued by Sir John A. Macdonald, and his government in 1878-9, and that pursued by this government in 1896-7? Everybody supposed that the Liberal party was in favour of free trade, by the course they took in 1891, when they stumped this country from one end to the other in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, when they said they had nailed their colours to the mast, and they would never come down until their policy was carried. I think everybody remembers that, I remember it distinctly. Now when they came to power we expected, I think naturally expected, that they would make at least some changes in the tariff. I want to call the attention of the government to the changes they did make, which were very few. This tariff was revised in 1897 when this government was fresh from the country. They made these pledges, and told the people that they were being robbed by the manufacturers, that they were going to cut the head off the monster of protection, and trample on its body, and all that kind of thing. Now in 1897, when they revised the tariff, the first group of items was ales, beers, wines and liquors—10 items. These were let severely alone, save that one was changed and increased.

Agriculture, animals and dairy products; 93 items under the tariff of 1894. Of these, 93 items, 81 were left unchanged, 5 were decreased and 6 increased. One was changed from specific to ad valorem.

Fish and products of the fisheries, 19 items under the tariff of 1894. The duties

on these 19 items were left unchanged under the tariff of 1897.

Books and papers; 18 items, all left unchanged.

Chemicals and drugs; 14 items; 9 unchanged, 4 increased, one lowered.

Opium; 3 items; all unchanged.

Colours, paints, oils, varnishes; 21 items; 14 unchanged, 3 increased and 4 decreased.

Leather, rubber and manufactures thereof; 11 items; 8 unchanged and 3 increased.

Jewellery and materials thereof; 8 items; 6 unchanged, one increased and one decreased.

Textiles, furs, etc.; 51 items; 22 unchanged, 17 increased, 6 decreased and 6 readjusted as between specific and ad valorem.

Sundries; 26 items; 21 unchanged, 3 decreased, one increased, one new.

Sugar, syrups and molasses; 7 items; one unchanged, 6 increased.

Excluding the items of iron and iron manufactures, there were 348 items in the tariff, of which 244 were unchanged, 54 were increased, 34 decreased and 16 readjusted as between specific and ad valorem.

I will appeal to the First Minister if he thinks that he carried out his pledges to the people when he made that tariff. I remember the statement that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) made in his speeches in the House and in Montreal, that, although he had talked so strongly in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, he had converted himself to the belief that it was not right, that when they came to form a government and he entered it there was an understanding that they would have a reasonable tariff and that they would not go in for reducing the tariff as had been advocated by himself and his colleagues. I think we have made it pretty plain that the government have not done as they agreed to do. It is true that since 1907, from time to time, they have made some slight changes in the tariff, some items they have increased and some they have decreased. The most noted change they made was in giving the British preference. If I remember correctly they raised the duties on almost all goods that came from England before they gave the preference. But there was a great difference between the preference they gave and the preference advocated by Sir Charles Tupper and his supporters. Sir Charles Tupper believed in a mutual preference; that is to say if they would give us a preference in their markets we would give them a preference in ours. I think that the right hon. Prime Minister said in Toronto that he was just as capable of getting that kind of a bargain from Great Britain as was Sir Charles Tupper, and that he would endeavour to do it. But, I am afraid that when he went to England he changed his tactics. He said that it was a free gift and that we did not want anything in return. That is not the way England deals with us. England does not give us any preference in her market that she does not give to every other nation under heaven as far as I know. If we give her a preference—and I would be in favour of giving her any reasonable preference we could—I think she should give us something in return. I do not see why she should treat her own children as badly or no better than a stranger who sets up a high tariff against her, who does not treat her fairly, but who simply takes advantage of her position to impose as high duties against her as possible. I may come to the treatment that President Taft is prepared to give to England before I get through. He seems very desirous that this pact should get through before we can make any arrangement with Great Britain because he says as a matter of course that when preferential trade leaves England and goes around the world it will make a tariff wall against the United States which they will not be able to get over. That is the trouble and I would think that the government would see it. I think it would be much better to have closer trade relations with the motherland than that we should try to cultivate trade relations with a nation that does not produce anything but what we produce. A great bulk of their surplus is exactly like our surplus, and while we have a large surplus to export they have a much larger one. According to a statement in a newspaper that I read the other day the United States have $956,000,000 worth of goods to dispose of in other countries. How can we expect to sell profitably to people who have such a surplus? There was a transaction in our town the other day. A man got sick of business and wanted to sell out. If he could have sold to some man who wanted the business as a going concern he could have got pretty nearly par for it, but unfortunately he had to sell out to a man who did not want the business as a going concern and, therefore, he had to sell at sixty cents on the dollar. That is about the way I view this reciprocity business. We are dealing with people who do not want our surplus. If we send our surplus over to the United States we displace just so much of the surplus of the United States, and they will, therefore have to find a market for it. I noticed a statement in the 'Globe' the other day to the effect that they were going to give the farmers better prices for their products, and that at the same time they were going to make cheaper living for the mechanics and working people. How it is possible to do that is something that I have not been able to find out, and I would be very glad to sit down if any man would get up in this House and tell me how it can be done.

I do not know and I do not anticipate that I will be able to find out from any person now present in the House.

As far as protection is concerned, we all know that both parties have been in favour of it. The party at present in power claim to be the low tariff party, but they have given us no indication of it. They claim that the Tory party, as they call it, instead of the Liberal Conservative party, is a high tariff party and that their policy is to increase the tariff. That is not true, and any motion that has been made by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) has not been specially for an increased tariff, but for an adequate tariff——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox)——in order that we may equalize the tariff, in cases where changes have to be made. My right hon. friend says 'hear, hear. I see that he is in favour of that. But, he has not done much for the poor farmer in the way of providing a revenue tariff for him. They have been here in great numbers to see him, and while he was out in the west he said that the tariff would be investigated by a tariff commission and that they would make such changes as they thought desirable after getting the information.

But is that the course he pursued? Did he not send two of his ministers to Washington, who when they presented their programme to Taft and Knox, these astute Americans said: 'Why, we will not only give you all you ask, but will give you free trade in everything.' That is what the Liberals wanted in 1891, but in 1911, I think they were wise in refusing it. True, the Liberals went back on their principles by not accepting free trade, but that is a good thing for the country and it does not trouble the Liberals much. They have got the habit of breaking their solemn pledges and a thing like that does not worry them.

At six o'clock, committee took recess.

After Recess.

Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Mr. Chairman, at six o'clock I was referring to the tariff policy which the government had placed before the country. The changes they made in the tariff were so slight that they were almost imperceptible. With reference to this reciprocity arrangement, Mr. McKay, the leader of the opposition in the Ontario legislature, saw fit to pay a visit to my riding, and addressed a meeting at the village of Tamworth, about 20 miles from Napanee. I have it on reliable authority that there were present about 250 people, 75 per cent of them Liberals, and when it was asked that those in favour of reciprocity should stand up, only 27 stood up, and they were wise enough not to ask for a contrary vote. What I wonder at is the great effort the government is making to get rid of about 20 per cent of our farm products. It is stated on good authority that we consume in this country 80 per cent of the products that we raise on the farm. It is also reported that England takes 10 per cent, leaving only 10 per cent to be disposed of to other countries. Under such circumstances, when we were doing so well, it does seem to me that it was unwise for the government, especially in such a hurry, to send representatives to Washington without even taking the trouble to inquire what the needs of the country were. It is said that President Taft had his experts go all over the United States and Canada to gather information which he submitted to the Congress of the United States, and that he had this information when our representatives met him. I understand that our government took no such pains. If they did, they have not laid the information before this House as far as I am aware. They, therefore, were not in as good a position to deal with the question as were the representatives of the United States. It is stated that very few even of the cabinet knew what arrangements had been made until the day they were presented to the House. They had a cabinet meeting just before that, and the Finance Minister came direct from that meeting to the House and made the announcement to the public. Under such circumstances is it any wonder that the leading business men of Toronto, of whom 18 or 20 were prominent Liberals, should issue a manifesto protesting against such a course as that, especially as they had the promise of the First Minister that before any changes were made in the tariff there would be a commission to investigate the whole tariff question? These people held a public meeting in Massey Hall in Toronto, at which all the speakers except one, I believe, were Liberals, men of high standing as business men, and men who have been life-long Liberals. I want to refer to a few remarks that were made on that occasion by Sir Mortimer Clark, a gentleman whom this government appointed lieutenant-governor of the province of Ontario, a man who has spent 50 years in this country and a man of more than ordinary intelligence. 'Not here for the party, but for the country'—that was one of his statements, and it is a motto that might well be followed by any man in public or private life. 'A mere handful of men changing the whole policy of the country and compelling us to accept.' This is what he protested against. He did not see, and I do not think anybody sees, why two men should go to Washington and change the

whole policy of this country without any notice being given to the country or to parliament. That is a matter well worthy of the attention of the whole country. He said further: 'A United States railroad magnate told me that he approved of the agreement because it renders impossible closer relations between Canada and Great Britain.' If there is anything we should desire in the matter of trade, it is to make the very best possible arrangements with the mother country, which is the great consumer of the surplus products of the world. There is no posibility of our selling profitably our surplus to the United States, because they have eight or ten times as much surplus as we have, and anything we send to the United States must be sold to speculators, who must sell it to other people to get profit out of it, while anything they send to us only displaces so much of our own product, for which we are obliged to find a market elsewhere. Everybody knows that the home market is very much better than a foreign market, because somebody has to pay the middleman his profit as well as the freight and other charges on the goods that are shipped abroad. Taft says: 'We are at the parting of the ways.' There are only two ways for Canada—the way to Washington and the way to the greater empire beyond the seas. Is it any wonder that strong men like Sir Mortimer Clark protest against any such statement as that? I have greater faith in my fellow-countrymen than to believe that they are at all in favour of closer political relations with the United States. In fact, I think it is a mistake to have very much to do with them, because in other days, when it would have been to our advantage to have reciprocity with them, and to their advantage, too, what did Blaine say? He said: 'If the Canadians want to trade with us let them join us; we will not give them the benefit of our market while they stay apart from us.' That is the spirit in which they received us at all times. In 1898, when representatives of the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier went to Washington, were they treated kindly? Were they met as they expected to be met? In the old days, when the other government was in power, the present Minister of Agriculture said: 'If you just change the government you will have no trouble whatever in getting reciprocity with the United States.' We changed the government and we did not get reciprocity when we wanted it, and it seems to me that the government themselves got so disgusted that they threw up the sponge and said: 'We do not want to have anything more to do with those people.' Sir Mortimer Clark said further: 'The United States have always been hostile to Canada. I have been 50 years in this country, and have never seen any friendly act on the part of our neighbours to the south.' That is a pretty strong statement on the part of a leading man in this country, but it is probably true. Mr. Lash and several other gentlemen made speeches on that occasion, but I do not purpose to quote them at the present time. I see that Mr. McKay is very glad to lose millionaires in this country, but I think he is very glad to get other millionaires from the United States.

Mr. LENNOX. He does not object to a dredging contract himself.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Has he got one?

Mr. LENNOX. He used to have one.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Well, I do not know anything about Mr. McKay, and therefore, I am not going to say anything about him, because I think a man should be very careful when talking about public men not to malign them in any way.

Let me now contrast some of the exports of Canada to the United States with some of our imports from that country. We are told by the Liberal party that the United States is the great market for our products and that if we had access to that market of 90,000,000 people we would get better prices for our goods than we do at home. Let me show the absurdity of that contention by the figures taken from our trade returns. Take the article of butter, we exported to the United States:

1906	$ 36,167
1907	35,078
1908	43,045
1909	54,894
1910	201,968
Total	$371,152

Or in the whole five years we exported butter to the United States—and I have taken these figures from the return of trade and commerce—$371,152. That is all we exported to that market of 90,000,000 people.

Take the article of cheese we exported as follows:

1906	$16,389
1907	6,918
1908	27,247
1909	28,936
1910	63,309
Total in five years	$142,799

Then take the article of eggs, about which we have heard a good deal of talk from hon. gentlemen opposite. We exported eggs to the United States, as follows: ,

1906	$11,924
1907	9,047
1908	9,846
1909	14,952
1910	13,896
Total in five years	$59,665

Now let us see what we imported from the United States of the same articles. If we

imported a good deal more than we exported, surely that would indicate that our market is really better than theirs. Our imports of butter from the United States, were as follow.:

1906	$54,426
1907	87,997
1908	77,794
1909	156,443
1910	18,075
Total	$394,937

That is quite a little more than we exported to them. Take the next article of cheese. We imported cheese from the United States, as follows:

1906	$ 45,904
1907	84,084
1908	116,851
1909	55,030
1910	48,739
Total	$350,608

As contrasted with $142,799 which was the amount we exported in the same period. Take the next article of eggs. We imported eggs from the United States as follows:

1906	$ 92,172
1907	142,868
1908	216,278
1909	238,842
1910	179,408
	$869,568

Thus our total imports of eggs in these five years was $869,568 worth, and all we exported to the United States in the same period was $59,665 worth, showing a balance of trade against us in eggs alone of $809,903. It certainly does seem to me that in that case we got decidedly the worst of the bargain.

Let us now look to our exports of cattle. Cattle, over one year old, shipped to the United States:

1906	$ 185,213
1907	471,620
1908	532,523
1909	508,416
1910	619,995
Total	$2,317,767

Contrast that with what we shipped to the old country—that country whose market, if this pact goes through, we will lose to quite an extent, because it looks as though the Americans would do everything they could to break up the connection that now exists between the mother country and Canada. To Britain we exported of cattle over one year old:

1906	$11,074,199
1907	10,200,137
1908	8,584,806
1909	10,115,793
1910	9,976,918
Total	$49,951,852

Comparing that with our exports of $2,317,000 to the United States, we have a difference of over $47,000,000 in favour of the English market and against the United States market—that market which the government are now making such great efforts to get.

Our total imports from the United States in 1910 amounted $239,070,949, and our exports to $106,026,137. These figures are taken from our trade and navigation returns and they show a balance of trade against us of $152,944,412. Of these goods we allowed to come in free of duty from the United States, $79,257,600 as against $23,480,217 allowed to come in free from Great Britain. So that from what I can see our best policy is to stick to what we have and not make this leap in the dark when we are doing very well as it is. Should we go into this reciprocal arangement, we do not know what will become of us. I never yet heard that the Yankees when they wanted to make a bargain, did not do their level best to get the best of it.

An hon. MEMBER. As they will in this instance.

Mr. WILSON (Lennox). Yes, but I do not believe that the country will ratify that policy.

I can say with the greatest emphasis that I believe the county I represent will, in the next parliament, be represented by another gentleman who has pronounced himself strongly against reciprocity. If he had not done so I do not think he would have received the nomination in our county.

Canada's exports of wheat for the last five years to Great Britain and to the United States were as follow:

Year.	Exports to Great Britain.	Exports to United States.
1906	$30,622,824	$ 298,160
1907	20,710,973	630,349
1908	42,911,610	102,849
1909	51,350,211	602,661
1910	58,538,772	1,883,637
Total in 5 years.	$204,125,390	$6,201,114

According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, we imported from the United States a great deal more wheat than we exported to them. The wheat imported into Canada from the United States for these five years was:

WHEAT IMPORTED INTO CANADA.

Year.	
1906	$ 578,622
1907	1,167,402
1908	5,138,455
1909	9,431,346
1910	12,070,811
Total in five years	$28,387,706

We, a small people of eight millions, took from them $28,000,000, while they, a large people of 90,000,000, took from us $6,200,000. Does that look as though we were getting a great market where we

would be able to sell our surplus at a great profit? When you want to sell goods, you must find the man who wants to buy them for his own use; the speculator always wants a profit.

The American Bureau of Statistics estimates the value of Canadian farm produce for the year 1907 at $532,992,100. That is quite a large amount, and from that amount I wish to pick out some of Canada's specialties.

I do not think any one who has studied the pork business can believe it possible for us to compete with the American corn fed pork, they can outdo us every time if they try, and I think they have been doing it. Our exports of these products to the United States and their exports to Canada, for the same period were:

BACON AND HAMS.

Year.	Canadian Exports to United States.	American Exports to Canada.
1906	$ 59,551	$ 782,336
1907	19,190	650,235
1908	5,211	851,807
1909	208,915	744,694
1910	8,589	829,242
Total, 5 yrs.	$301,466	$3,858,298

Or, our imports of ham and bacon from the United States exceeded our exports to that country by $3,356,832.

Where do we sell our bacon and hams, for we have quite a surplus of them, and you can see that we do not sell them to the ninety million market? We send them to Great Britain, our best customer. According to the Trade and Navigation Returns, our export of hams and bacons to Great Britain were:

EXPORT BACON AND HAM TO GREAT BRITAIN.

Year.	
1906..	$12,119,804
1907..	9,196,305
1908..	11,153,749
1909..	8,625,005
1910..	6,836,392
Total in 5 years..	$47,931,255

These figures, I think, demonstrate that the market which we want is the English market.

The Americans, of course, produce a great deal more of agricultural produce than they know what to do with. For instance, the United States exported in 1909 5,207,151 dozen of eggs valued at $1,199,522; of butter 5,281,261 pounds valued at $1,268,210; of cheese 6,822,842 pounds, valued at $857,091; of condensed milk, $1,375,104; of lard, $52,712,569; of pork, $4,599,431; ham and shoulders, cured, $23,525,307; beef, fresh, $12,698,594; beef, salted and pickled, $3,438,048. The total value of the meat and dairy produce exported by the United States in 1909 was $166,521,949. It does seem to me that a country with such an abundance of everything that they exported over $166,000,000 worth of goods exactly similar to what we are raising does not afford a market for our surplus products, because the American who buys the surplus from us in this country must be a speculator.

He certainly will not want it for use in his country; he must have a profit, and our people who raise these articles must pay the freight to take the articles to their destination, as well as the middlemen's profit.

Now I want to take up a little more time on the pork question. I have a circular here issued by the Ingersoll Packing Company, signed by C. E. L. Wilson, manager and director. I will read what he says before I give the figures:

> This is absolutely correct as taken from our books and open to inspection by any government officer for verification.

That seems to me to make it very strong, because the books are open for verification if the government see fit to send any of their officers there to look at them. He gives the prices for ten years:

MEMO showing the Total Receipts and Prices of Hogs at Chicago Market and the price paid by Boyd, Lunham & Co, Chicago, and the price paid by the Ingersoll Packing Co., Ltd., Ingersoll, from 1901–1910.

Year.	Chicago. Total Receipts.	Chicago. Average Price. Delivered at Chicago.	B. L. & Co. Average Price Delivered at Chicago.	I. P. Co. Average Price Delivered at Ingersoll.	Ingersoll Price above Chicago.	Chicago Price above Ingersoll.
1901.....	8,290,494	$ 5.85	$ 5.71	$ 6.70	$ 0.85	$
1902.....	7,895,238	6.85	6.76½	6.68	.....	0.17
1903.....	7,325,923	6.00	5.88	6.07	0.07	
1904.....	7,238,746	5.15	5.04	5.32	0.17	
1905.....	7,725,738	5.25	5.18	6.41	1.16	
1906.....	7,275,063	6.25	6.23	7.17	0.92	
1907.....	7,201,061	6.10	6.09½	6.85	0.75	
1908.....	8,131,465	5.70	5.36⅞	6.87	1.17	
1909.....	6,619,018	7.35	7.53¼	8.04	0.69	
1910.	5,586,858	8.90	8.59¾	9.11	0.21	

Now, I think I have read enough to satisfy most people that the American market is not better than ours for most of our goods. I think that our pork is a better pork than the pork they raise, because our pork is fed on barley, pease and other hard feed, while theirs is fed, I believe, on corn; and as a matter of course, their cheap corn-fed pork and beef will come into competition with our business, and interfere seriously with the farmers of our country.

Now, there are some other things this government did not take into onsideration when they made this arrangement. It does not seem possible to me that a government with its eyes open would go to Washington and make a contract to regulate the duty on goods, and have that contract apply to ten or twelve other nations from which we get no compensation whatever. It seems to me absurd, and I am going to read some of the duties. I think if we are going to have reciprocity at all, we ought to have it all round. We ought not to be made a dumping ground. In fact, our government has already passed a law some years ago against allowing the Americans to dump cheaply bought goods in our market. But they did not seem to take any notice of these other things. If it is necessary to prevent men who go to the United States and buy goods at low prices to put them in here at the same price they pay, why should we allow other countries to come into our markets and sell their products without paying any duty, while we have to pay a large duty to get into their markets? Now there is the Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Venezuela and Bolivia. That list does not include the British possessions. As I understand it, this contract applies to all the British possessions as well as those countries I have mentioned that have the favoured-nation clause. If that is the case, let us see what some of these countries do. Take New Zealand. Barley, 48·6 cts per 100 lbs. Butter, 20 per cent, cheese, 20 per cent; eggs, 20 per cent. That is the duty we have to pay to get these articles into their market, while we will allow them to bring their articles of the same character into our market free. Then take Australia. Butter, 6 cents per lb; cheese, 6 cents per lb; eggs, 12 cents per doz.

We will allow them to bring in their eggs, butter and cheese free under this arrangement.

Austria-Hungary:

Wheat, 58 cents per 100 lbs.
Butter, natural, salted, $3.22 per 100 lbs.
Other fine cheese for the table, $5.52 per 100 lbs.

Denmark:

Butter in hermetically sealed vessels, $4.86 per 100 lbs.
Cheese, $2.43 per 100 lbs

France:

Calves (live weight), $3.51 per 100 lbs.
Pigs (live weight), $2.20 per 100 lbs.
Fresh butter, $2.63 per 100 lbs.
Fine cheese (affine), soft, $1.75 per 100 lbs.

Italy:

Oxen, $7.33 each.
Wheat, 65·8 cents per 100 lbs.
Salted butter, $1.75 per 100 lbs.
Soft cheeses, $1.32 per 100 lbs.

Japan:

Swine, 25 per cent.
Butter, 10·02 per 100 lbs.
Cheese, $6.40 per 100 lbs.

If necessary I can go over this whole list, but I think this will show us what we are doing. Now, I come to the list of exports of farm produce from the United States. United States exports of farm produce have increased from $370,000,000 to $490,000,000 in a year, as follows

Animals from	23,000,000	to	47,000,000
Breadstuffs	161,000,000	"	216,000,000
Provisions, including meat	134,000,000	"	180,000,000
Fruits and nuts..	17,000,000	"	18,000,000
Hides, about..	1,000,000	"	1,000,000
Hops, from..	1,000,000	"	4,000,000
Vegetables, about	3,000,000	"	3,000,000
Tobacco, unmanufactured	30,000,000	"	31,000,000

These are the people that we are expected to deal with and it is in their country, that we are asked to find a market for our surplus at a profit. Mr. Taft, that genial gentleman who captured the two ministers who went over to meet him accepted their proposition at once and said: 'Boys, here is more; you can have it all if you want to, but do not take more than you can get through.' Here is something which appeared in the Montreal 'Star' on the 28th April, 1911, to which I desire to call the attention of the House. It is a comment on the speech made by President Taft in New York on the 27th April, 1911. He met there the American Newspaper Publishers' Association:

In New York last night, speaking before the American Newspaper Publishers' Association whose president, Mr. John Norris says that they would save $6,000,000 a year on their paper mills if they could only secure access to Canadian pulp wood, President Taft again put in a stout denial that reciprocity means annexation. He said that 'the talk of annexation is bosh,' and that to present it as an objection to reciprocity should be treated as 'one of the jokes of the platform.' He denied as well that the Americans desire to annex Canada, giving as proof his belief that they already have all the territory they can possibly govern.

A robust denial is a fine thing; but the big President of the United States should take

note of the fact that it is possible for a denial to deny too much.

However, there was the denial, big, bold and all-embracing—almost amounting to a denial that the Americans are human like other people and desire to extend the boundaries of their beloved Republic—but, side by side, with this denial, were such statements as these:

'There are other natural resources which I need not stop to enumerate which will become available to us as if our own if we adopt and maintain commercial union with Canada.'

'But there are other—even broader—grounds than this which should lead to the adoption of this agreement. Canada's superficial area is greater than that of the United States between the two oceans. The government is one entirely controlled by the people, and the bond uniting the Dominion with the mother country is light and almost imperceptible.'

I am not going to read the whole of this but there is a paragraph at the bottom that I would like to have placed on record.

Then, again, the President makes no bones of saying that the timber resources of Canada 'will open themselves to us inevitably under the operation of this agreement.'

How?

The agreement does not open them. It leaves our Crown lands still protected by the provincial governments. What does the President mean? He probably means what Mr. John Norris meant when the latter told the Congressional committee that, once they obtained the leverage of free access to our privately-owned forest lands, 'the pressure will be irresistible' upon the provincial governments to throw open the rest.

There are other speeches here about annexation and all that, but I am not going to refer to them just now. There is one thing that I particularly would like to call the attention of the House to and that is tnat for every $6 worth we export to the mother country there is $5 worth grown on the farm. That is well worth considering. If we are going to try to help our farmers the country that wants the product of our farms is the country that we should deal with.

It is a stale story to tell of the value of the British market to the Canadian farmer. But it may be as well to remind ourselves of a few facts. First, the British market is largely a farmer's market. Out of every six dollars' worth of Canadian products that we export to Britain, five dollars worth come off the Canadian farm. The figures are these: Total Canadian exports to Great Britain for 1909—$126,384,726. Food products exported from Canada to Great Britain—$101,992,448. Our other markets are not of this character. Out of every six dollars we export to foreign markets, only a little over one dollar comes from the Canadian farm. And out of every six dollars exported to other British possessions, less than three dollars are Canadian farm produce. They may talk just as much as they like about their 90,000,000 market, but they have now a market in England that takes five dollars worth of farm produce of every six dollars we export. It seems to me that is the market we should cultivate. It is easy to see how little of this enormous market Canada has supplied when we remember that the total Canadian exports to Great Britain this same year were $101,992,448 of farm produce—less than half the British imports of wheat alone. Both Argentine and the United States beat us. Argentine sold the British people £37,717,295 ($184,900,000) worth of farm products; and the Americans sold them £118,-353,893 ($574,000,000) worth.

It seems to me that the Americans would have more difficulty in getting rid of that immense amount of stuff if we had preferential trade as we should have instead of trying to make a reciprocal treaty with the United States. We know that the Americans are very anxious for this arrangement, one reason being that their manufacturers have invested their money on this side, already to the extent of 226,000,000 dollars, and what they want to do is to keep that capital in their own country, give employment to their own people, and sell their goods to us. That's the trick they are up to. There was a considerable amount of evidence taken before the Ways and Means Committee of Congress—although no evidence has been considered necessary by the Canadian government—and Mr. Aaron Jones made the following statement before the Congressional Committee.

The principle on which the protective policy has been defended during the past twenty years (20) is that all classes and interests of the country, should receive equal protection against the competition of foreign products. It was to carry out this principle that the duties on farm products were imposed by the McKinley law, and reimposed by the Dingley and Payne Tariff Act. Had it not been for the tariff on farm products the protective system would long ago have been abolished.

The purpose of the tariff on farm products has been to exclude those of Canada from our markets, and if this Bill becomes law it means the end of protection, so far as the farmers are concerned.

Is it possible that they believe that 6,000,-000 farmers will tamely submit to free trade in farm products and high tariff for manufacturers?

Why are cattle, sheep and swine on the free list, while meats, fresh and cured are taxed 1¼ cents per pound? Are not the farmers as much entitled to protection as the millers or great meat packers of Chicago?

Against this proposition we earnestly protest, and we insist that there shall be no free trade for farmers and high tariff for manufacturers, but that if farm products go on the free list, manufactured articles must also be made free, and they will inside a very short time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have spoken longer than I ought, and in conclusion I will say

that I am fully persuaded in my own mind that this trade arrangement made by two cabinet ministers with the United States government is not in the best interests of Canada. I am strongly opposed to it, and what little I am able to do in my constituency and elsewhere I shall willingly do to defeat this pact. I believe with Sir Mortimer Clark, ex-governor of Ontario, that we should put country before party, and that if we are loyal Canadians desirous of building up an empire on this northern half of the North American continent, it becomes us to stick close to the mother country because we need her protection and her capital, and we need her markets in which to sell our goods at remunerative prices.

Mr. E. GUSS PORTER (West Hastings). At this late stage of the debate upon this very important question misnamed reciprocity, the members of the government seem to be exhibiting an insatiable desire for information and an undying interest in their country, by, with the exception of three ministers out of fourteen, all being absent from the House and these three ministers being supported by the presence now of fourteen Liberal members out of a total of 135, the remainder of the government members being represented by empty chairs. That is not a very inspiring thing for the member who is addressing the House, and I am sure if the people of the country knew of the lack of interest the government is exhibiting in this important question it would not inspire confidence in the government or faith in it. Why this government should with such undue haste endeavour to force this measure through parliament at this unseasonable time of the year, and, to use a crude expression, cram it down the throats of the people of this country, one is at a loss to understand. It suggests, to put it in the mildest form, that there must be some sinister motive behind the whole thing; something more than an interest in the welfare of the country that is actuating the government to press this measure with such undue haste now.

The opposition have taken occasion as it was offered, to criticise, as appeared to them to be just and warranted, this measure when it has come before the Chair; and because they have had the boldness to express their condemnation of it, hon. members of the government and the press supporting the government have seen fit to apply to us the name of obstructionists. Well, Sir, if the fair discussion of this measure, and the offering to the people of this country of the honest conviction of the opposition in this House, and pointing out in their judgment the disastrous effects which the passing of this measure through parliament will inflict on this country, entitles the opposition to the appellation of obstructionists, then, Sir, I for one am perfectly willing to be called an obstructionist. I think, Sir, it is preferable to be called an obstructionist under these circumstances than to be called by a name that would fittingly characterize the conduct of any government that would try, as this government is now trying, to force such a measure through parliament and upon the people of this country, against their wish, and without affording them an opportunity of expressing their opinion upon it. I have had the privilege of occupying a seat in this House for a period of upwards of ten years, representing during that time a constituency containing a population of upwards of 40,000 people. I have always believed it to be the privilege of those 40,000 people, in common with all other loyal citizens of Canada, to express through their representatives in parliament their opinion upon any legislation that might be introduced here. I do not mean simply that the voice of the representatives of the people should be heard, but that it should be effectively heard, accordingly as the arguments adduced by that hon. member, the reasons given by him for his opinion, might meet with favour from the hon. members of this House and the country as a whole. I have always understood that to be one of the first principles, the main spring as it were, of representative and responsible government. But, Sir, when this trade agreement was introduced in this parliament, in the manner in which it was, the opinion which I had held for so many years received a very rude shock, and I was almost inclined to ask myself, are we living to-day in the dark ages, when responsible and representative government was unknown, or are we living in the twentieth century, which has been said to belong to Canada? If one would yield to the feeling imposed upon him by the action of this government in relation to this matter, I venture to say that he would feel that we were living in the dark ages. It has been the proud boast of the Canadian people, it is the proud boast of the Canadian people to-day, that we have the freest form of responsible government; and, Sir, when without warning and in a single instant almost, there is forced upon this parliament and upon the country a bargain, an agreement, a pact, or what ever it may be called, made by two hon. members of the government, without a mandate from the people, without a warrent from this parliament, then I say that our proud boast of responsible government has just about diminished to the vanishing point. A great deal of time has been taken up by hon. members of the government, and particularly by the hon. Minister of Agriculture, in the speech which he addressed to this House some time ago, in

an attempt to convince parliament and the country that the opposition members of this House were opposed to any negotiations being carried on with the United States with a view to improving the trade relations between Canada and that country. I have listened during the course of this debate to a great many of the speeches that have been made by hon. members on this side of the House, and I have read a great many more, and I say without hesitation that I have never heard nor have I read in any of those speeches any expression of opinion or idea to justify that statement. On the contrary, it is not the desire of the opposition as I understand it, speaking for myself at any rate, that negotiations with the United States should not be carried on for the purpose of bettering trade relations between these two countries. That is not what the opposition object to; but what we do object to is the making of a hard and fast agreement with the American people, and that without warrant from parliament, and then bringing that agreement before parliament without affording an opportunity for amendment or for the alteration of a single line, a word, or even a letter; telling the hon. members of this House that that agreement must be given effect to, in every word, every line and every letter, just as these two hon. gentlemen have seen fit in their wisdom to make it with the United States. It is, however, in view of these circumstances, somewhat refreshing to know that all hon. members on the government side have not felt themselves bound to such an extent by party allegiance as to sacrifice what they believe to be in the interests of this country for the sake of advancing the interests of the political party to which they belong.

Those hon. members on the government side who had the courage to stand up in this House, and denounce this pact deserve credit, and the thanks of the people of this country.

Nearly every hon. member who has spoken on this question has referred to the language used by the President of the United States in discussing this matter before his people as regards its relation to Canada. The president, Mr. Taft, said that Canada stood now at the parting of the ways. In view of the history of the last forty-two years, it seems to me that Mr. Taft chose very unhappy language in which to express his ideas. And if I were to compare him to a second Rip Van Winkle, I think I would not be far from the truth because apparently he has been asleep for a very long time if he imagines that Canada is now only at the parting of the ways. Why, Canada was at the parting of the ways some forty-two years ago when the old reciprocity treaty between this country, and the United States was abrogated. Then was the time when the Canadian people had to make a choice between adopting a policy which would lead them into a stronger, and a firmer alliance with the mother land—a stronger federation with Great Britain—or whether they would choose the opposite course which would lead them into freer trade relations and ultimately into political annexation with the United States. Then was the time when Canada was at the parting of the ways. She then made her choice, and subsequent events during the past forty-two years have fully demonstrated that the choice then made by the Canadian people was a wise and patriotic one. It is true that when that choice was made it did not promise very much for the Canadian people; and perhaps if they had been actuated by the sole desire to benefit from trade relations they might have made a different choice, but there was something more in the Canadian mind, and heart, than mere commercial advantage, and a simple desire for pecuniary benefit. Canada, therefore, chose to stand by the mother country. True for a long time the course which Canada then adopted was not an easy one. True it was beset by many obstructions—not only natural obstructions, but artificial ones placed there by the American people in the endeavour if possible to wreck the Canadian confederation, and destroy the connection between Canada and Great Britain. During that forty years Canada has passed many mile-posts, not ordinary mile-posts, but monuments of progress that are bound to last forever to the glory of this Dominion. During all these years we received no encouragement, not a bit of assistance, from the American people who are now so anxious to bring us into a closer alliance with themselves. Throughout all these years, the Americans, instead of holding out the hand of friendship to us in return for the hand of friendship we offered them, steadily opposed Canadian interests, and endeavoured to force Canada into such a position that we would be obliged sooner or later to join our fortunes with those of the republic. It is certainly something which Canadians may well be proud of that they were able, in spite of all these obstacles, and obstructions placed in their way by the United States, in spite of all these coercive efforts, to steer clear of these obstructions, and go ahead on a firm, and solid foundation with full steam upon the engine of prosperity, and with that engine headed towards the motherland, in the endeavour to bind still closer the ties that have always existed between us and Great Britain. Canada, at the time of the abrogation of the old reciprocity treaty in 1866, was not in the position she occupies to-day. Con-

ditions then were very different from what they are now. At that time we were not a united Dominion as we are to-day, and had not then the vast extent of productions from the farm which we now have. We had not then the means of transportation we now enjoy nor had we the population or the wealth. In fact our position was such that the total revenues of this country were insufficient to meet its wants.

When the reciprocity treaty first came into force there were special reasons why the United States desired a closer trade relationship with Canada. The fast approaching civil war in that country made it most desirable that it should have a friend close at hand, and a source of supply. Canada then offered the greatest inducements in this respect. At that time also was effected the change of policy in Great Britain, under which the corn laws were repealed, and free trade inaugurated. All the advantages that previously existed in favour of the British colonies were practically wiped away, and Canada was not in a position to compete with other countries in the markets of the world through her lack of transportation facilities. The conditions then were such that reciprocity with the United States was about the only thing that could help Canada.

Although the conditions were such as I have described, yet it took eight years of constant negotiations between these two countries to bring about the treaty of reciprocity that went into effect at that time. A great deal has been said in this debate of the advantages that Canada derived from that reciprocity treaty. There were special reasons for that. Prices during a part of that period were inflated. Prices in the United States were better than could be obtained in Canada, but that was owing to the civil war in the United States. The effect of that struggle was to take from the fields of agriculture and production, a very large portion of the workers and to put them into the field of battle with the result that production in the United States fell off so that the wants of the people could not be supplied and the products of the Canadian people were at a premium in the United States. But it was not a continuous period of prosperity by any means. During the time that that reciprocity treaty was in force, the first bank failure in Canada, that of the old band of Upper Canada occurred, That was not due to the prosperity brought to Canada by the United States, it was owing to the circumstances in which Canada found herself at that time. But the moment it appeared to be necessary to the Canadian people and they undertook to exercise their undoubted right of putting on a duty and raising a revenue, just that moment, when it ceased to be to the interest of the United States to have that treaty continued with Canada, they repealed it. It did not take eight years to repeal it as it did to introduce it; notice was given just as soon as their interest in reciprocity and in Canada ceased. Sir, history is about to repeat itself, in my judgment. If this treaty comes into force it will be taken advantage of by the American people, just as they took advantage of the old reciprocity treaty it will be continued only so long as it is to the advantage of the American people alone. The moment it is perceived that the American people cannot derive from it the benefit that they anticipated, we may rest assured that the Americans will serve notice that this agreement shall no longer be continued in force between these two countries.

It appears to me, after giving this question considerable consideration, that the government of the day in introducing this agreement is reversing not only its well known and adopted policy of protection, but is also reversing its often declared policy upon this very question of reciprocity. It will be remembered that only a few years ago the Liberal party in presenting this policy of reciprocity began by introducing it at the big end, under the title of unrestricted reciprocity. In 1887 the gentlemen composing this government were advocating as strongly as they possibly could and asking the people to approve of a policy then known not as unrestricted reciprocity, but as commercial union, another attempt to introduce the same principle by the big end. The dangers to Canadian nationality, the danger of destroying British connection, the danger of injury to the trade of Canada was then made too apparent to the people for them to be induced by the arguments of the Liberal party of that time to adopt either of these principles, in 1887, when the policy of commercial union was urged upon the people, or in 1891 when it was urged under the title of unrestricted reciprocity. It is to be noticed that in the endeavour of the Liberal party to force those policies upon the country that party was not in a position to have such a policy forced upon the people, by reason of the fact that they were in opposition, and they were obliged, owing to these conditions, to submit the matter to the will and opinion of the people. At that time the expression of opinion was not at all uncertain, the sentiment of the Canadian people was clearly and without hesitation or doubt expressed and both times the Liberal party, forced to appeal to the people of Canada, were defeated. I venture to think that the right hon. gentleman who leads the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has profited by the experience of those two efforts.

He must be convinced that any policy which has a tendency to lead to annexation with the United States, or to weaken

the bonds existing between Canada and Great Britain, is not a safe policy in the hands of the Canadian people. I am persuaded, too, that with the right hon. leader of the government taking advantage of the position which he holds to-day, and recognizing how futile it would be to submit such a policy as this to the electorate of Canada, is now trying to force this resolution through parliament and denying to the people the right to pronounce their opinion upon it. At the time when those two policies of commercial union and unrestricted reciprocity were being advocated by the Liberal party in this country, some very interesting literature was circulated by them amongst the electors. I have in my hand one of the pamphlets issued at that time entitled 'facts and figures for farmers' and I propose to read from that campaign literature a few extracts to show the feeling of the Liberal party at that time upon this question. At page 12 of 'facts and figures for farmers', they say:

The growth of manufacturers in the states as the result of protection makes it absolutely necessary that goods must be sent outside instead of money in exchange for natural products.

That expression shows, I think, the drift of this agreement as respects the interests of the American people is to get the natural products of Canada into the United States for manufacturing purposes and for the employment of American laborers, and send into Canada their manufactured goods in exchange, instead of money, to the ruin of the manufacturing industries of Canada. It proceeds:

These goods cannot be sent freely so long as the tariff wall shuts them out. The growth of the agricultural areas in the United States would also oppose the introduction of free agricultural products unless the manufactures were admitted free into Canada also, for in the creation of these latter a home market is maintained for the American farmer.

The Americans are always anxious to preserve the home markets for the American people, but just as anxious to destroy the Canadian market for the Canadian people.

The stimulus to manufactures as the result of protection in the United States has resulted in the creation of many lines of cheap goods, cheaper than elsewhere can be had in the world.

Then, discussing the question of annexation, this pamphlet proceeds to say:

But supposing that a better relation with the United States did contribute towards a growth in the annexation sentiment, suppose that England, denying the right of Canada to trade with whom she chose, hesitated to grant the privileges sought and thus gave a check to the relations that exist between them. Suppose if, on the one hand, she consented to a commercial union between her children on this side of the ocean and the result was an enlarged emigration from the United States, and a changed political condition in parliament by which an annexation resolution should pass—what is there to be horrified at in that prospect? . . If in the future the people of Canada desire to join the great constellation of commonwealths that so illustrate the greatness of this continent, what possible objection could there be? Annexation is a bugbear which a weak sentimentality has clothed with features that are repulsive, but which, upon examination, might be found to be the most attractive and most winning of events.

An hon. MEMBER. What is that ?

Mr. PORTER. This is the campaign literature of the Liberal party at that time.

This we certainly can do by breaking down the commercial barrier between the two countries, learn to understand each other better, and if the winning forces of commerce and their attractive institutions make the great continent of North America one nation, then God will bless the union. . . To achieve a commercial relation with the American people is an object therefore, of the highest duty, worthy of the noblest efforts of the best men of the country.

Note this particularly:

The great Liberal party which to-day represents a majority of the voters of the Dominion in parliament, but which is in opposition to the existing government, has adopted as the main plank in its platform this question of unrestricted reciprocity, and it will go to the polls within eighteen months with that cause inscribed upon its banner.

Now I do not think it would be possible to find anywhere a better expression of the policy advocated by the Liberal party at that time and now than can be found in the extracts I have read from the campaign literature they used. In endeavouring to discover the true object and scope of this proposed agreement, one must remember, in addition to the language contained in the agreement itself, the surrounding conditions and the surrounding circumstances. One must take into account the conditions of the United States in regard to her raw materials, her manufacturing interests, her natural products, her facilities for transportation, her population, and also her aspirations; and one must also consider the same elements from the Canadian point of view if he would arrive at what I conceive to be the real scope of the agreement now under discussion. It is only upon a proper comparison of the conditions existing in the two countries and the surrounding circumstances, that you can arrive at a fair conclusion as to whether this trade agreement will be in the interests of Canada or not. These considerations cannot be dealt

with alone, but one must also consider the national or patriotic view of the question. There are two points of view; one the material or commercial view, the other the sentimental or national. I do not believe it possible, under the adoption of this trade agreement, for the Canadian people to preserve either their commercial interests or their national status.

I do believe that by following the policy and the principles that have been followed during the last number of years in this country it would be possible at the same time to preserve and strengthen our nationality and our empire connections and to increase and stimulate the trade of Canada. I have already made reference to the conditions existing in Canada at the time when the old reciprocity treaty came into force, and I have also stated that the conditions to-day are very different from what they were at that time. I think that difference will be apparent to any hon. member of this House, or to any Canadian citizen who will give a moment's reflection to the question. Instead of Canada occupying the position of a few scattered provinces, as it did then, Canada presents to the world to-day a bold and united front extending from ocean to ocean. Canada exhibits to the world to-day a production per head of population that is unexcelled by any other country in the world. Canada offers to the world to-day a position in regard to her transportation facilities, both by land and by water, that is a marvel to the world when the population of Canada is taken into consideration. Instead of the ocean ports of Canada as they were in 1854, being unequipped and unable to handle the trade going out from Canada or the trade from any part of the world coming into Canada, we find these seaports fully equipped and able to handle the trade that may be offered by or to Canada. We find here transportation facilities overland by railway to be equal to the increased production of Canada from year to year, and rapid progress and extension being made along these lines as the prosperity and production of Canada increase. We have to-day a revenue more than sufficient to meet all the requirements of the country and to enable the government to carry out these improvements in transportation and other facilities that tend so greatly to increase the trade of the country. All this is a decided change from the condition of the Canadian people at that time. Instead of a population of 2,000,000 odd people we have now, it is estimated, about 8,000,000 people. All these things combine to place Canada in a position where instead of the United States, as in 1854, being the market by necessity of the Canadian people, Canada has, by the progress she has made along the lines I have indicated, converted the world to her markets and it may be truly said to-day that the wide world is the market and the natural market for Canada rather than is the market of the United States alone. A very good illustration of the effects of reciprocity is contained in a statement issued by the provincial treasurer of Ontario for the year 1910. At page 8 of his financial statement he makes reference to the effect of reciprocity upon Canada when it was in force, and says:

> Now, what was the result of the reciprocity treaty in 1854? What happened then is likely to happen again, because the conditions are similar. Quebec at that time lost most disastrously, Montreal lost heavily, the bulk of Toronto's traffic came in through New York, and so, in the same way our Northwest traffic will go by Minneapolis and Chicago, and I am doubtful about the result.
>
> Here are the figures as to the effect of that treaty at that time. The treaty was formed in 1854 and adopted in Canada towards the end of 1854, after navigation closed. The exports from Quebec in 1854 were $10,047,068; in 1855, $6,234,808; the decrease in exports being $3,812,260. The imports in 1854 at Quebec were $7,017,316, and in 1855, $2,930,224, a decrease of $4,089,092 in the first year of reciprocity. Quebec suffered most disastrously by that treaty for Toronto and the west brought in their goods through New York instead of through Quebec.
>
> The shipping outwards at Quebec in 1854 was 1,558 vessels, carrying 693,588 tons; in 1855, 877 vessels carrying 408,994 tons; a decrease in one year of 681 vessels and 284,594 tons.
>
> At Montreal the exports in 1854—these are entirely different from those of Quebec—were $2,290,058; and in 1855, $1,914,412; a decrease of exports of $375,645. The imports at Montreal in 1854 were $15,264,328; in 1855 they were $12,256,245; a decrease of $3,008,083. The exports in 1866, that is the last year of the treaty ending 30th June, 1866, were $6,831,635, that is from Montreal. In 1867, the year after the treaty expired, the exports were $8,104,622, an increase of $1,272,987. Imports in 1866 at Montreal were $24,241,217. After the treaty expired, in 1867, the imports were $28,139,283, an increase at Montreal after the treaty expired of $3,898,066. At Quebec in 1867 the exports were $167,000 less than in 1866, and the imports $186,586 larger.
>
> At Quebec, in 1867, our total foreign trade was $2,750,000 less than in 1854, and although the foreign trade of Canada in 1867 was only $60,000 more than in 1866, the trade via Montreal was $5,000,000 more in 1867 than in 1866, so rapidly was the direction changed, both on the coming into force of the reciprocity treaty and again on its termination, the decrease of exports and imports at Quebec in 1855 being nearly eight millions out of a total of seventeen millions, and of shipping from 1,588 vessels in 1854 to 877 in 1855.

If, under the conditions existing when the former reciprocity treaty was in effect, such results were produced, what may

we expect under the conditions existing in Canada to-day? If the effect upon our shipping and transportation was so detrimental then when our trade was small, what may we not expect it to be when the trade of Canada has grown to its present enormous proportions. It has also been urged by members of the government that the adoption of this trade agreement will have the effect of largely increasing the exportation of Canadian products into the United States. and that the Canadian farmer will thus get a higher price for his products in the United States than he could get in the home or any other market. On that point, Mr. M. O. Hammond, writing in the Toronto 'Globe,' puts the situation more clearly and concisely than I could hope to do. He appears to have given the subject a very great deal of consideration, and the fact of the article being written from the American standpoint commends it all the more strongly to the consideration of the Canadian people, as it unintentionally exposes what will be the result in Canada if this pact goes into force. Mr. Hammond writes:

The situation comes down to this, therefore, under the free list Bill, if it becomes law: the imports on many things to this country will not materially increase, but these will be what Mr. Underwood calls honest competition, and the producers of this huge amount of every-day necessities of life will be compelled to take a slice off their price. The 'New York World' estimates that the saving to the consumers of the country by reason of this would run up to no less than $300,000,000 per year. That is worth saving.

If the American people are going to make a saving of $300,000,000 per year because of the importation to their country of the products of the Canadian farmers, and it is going to have the effect prophesied by Mr. Taft of reducing the cost of living in the United States, I would like to know how it can be figured out that the Canadian farmer is going to obtain higher prices for his products in the United States than he could obtain in Canada. Now, in Ontario the industry of horse-raising has of recent years grown in importance until it is now admitted to be one of our leading agricultural industries. And the 'Live Stock Journal,' a non-political paper, in its issue of the 2nd of March, 1911, publishes the following:

Mr. C. A. Burns, of the firm of Burns & Sheppard, and the writer, figured out that not less than ten million dollars worth of horses are handled in eastern Canada every year.

So brisk has been the demand for horses all through Canada during the past few years that prices for blocky and heavy horses and good express horses are higher in Canada to-day than they have been in the past forty years, and so keen has the market been in the west that it has not been unusual for a single horse to sell for $350 and teams for $650 and $700. One buyer paying the sum of one thousand dollars, the other day, for three heavy horses in Toronto, while ordinary horses run $200 and $250 a piece.

These prices are far in excess of the prices in Chicago, St. Louis, Buffalo or New York markets.

Buffalo is the best horse market in the United States at the present time, but even in the Buffalo horse market neither the quality nor the price is at all equal to the Toronto horse market.

In the Chicago horse market, the class of horses is inferior and the prices are not at all to be compared with the Canadian prices.

In St. Louis the principal run of horses is the range raised horses, bronchos and mules and the prices are more than twenty-five per cent lower than in Toronto.

The reciprocity agreement would injure the horse business of Canada in two ways; first, it would reduce the price; second, it would lower the quality.

If the duty was taken off horses coming into Canada, the west would soon be flooded with inferior range horses from Chicago and St. Louis markets and the western farmers, while getting horses cheaper, would be supplied with horses far inferior in quality to the Ontario horses.

To allow cheap, mongrel-bred and inferior horses from the United States to be shipped into Canada free of duty would be nothing short of ruin to the horse breeding industry and ruin to the horse handling business of both east and west.

Now, I will submit to the House a few illustrations of the benefits that the boasted big market of ninety millions of people offers to the Canadian producer. It must be apparent to any one that if the ninety-million market of the United States is to be such a boon to the Canadian people as to afford then an opportunity of all becoming rich, then by parity of reasoning it ought to be just as apparent that the farmers of the United States, who have had every advantage of that market during many years, ought at the present time to be rich enough themselves, or at least to be in as good or a more favourable condition than the farmers of Canada. They are nearer to the market, it costs them much less for transportation, and before a single Canadian can get into the American market with the products of his farm, or at the same time, 90 of the United States producers will be coming into the Canadian market to destroy the home market that he has here. Let me make a comparison of the production and the profit per acre of different classes of grains of the American farmer as against the Canadian farmer. I do that for this reason. It is almost impossible to find in any state in the Union an acreage exactly as near the exact number of acres of the different classes of grain under crop that I can find to be

under crop the same in Canada, and I have therefore been obliged to take the production per acre in the respective countries for this purpose. Let me compare the production of one acre in the banner state of New York with the production of one acre in the banner province of Ontario. In wheat, in Ontario the average production was 24.1 bushels per acre and the average price per bushel 88.2c, so that the value of an acre of wheat to the Ontario farmer was $21.15. In New York State the average production of wheat was 21 bushels per acre and the average price 94.3 cents per bushel, yielding to the New York farmer $19.74 per acre, or a difference in favour of the Ontario farmer of $1.41 per acre. In oats the average production of the Ontario farmer was 23.5 bushels per acre and the average price 37 cents per bushel, realizing to the Ontario farmer $12.21 per acre. In New York State the average production per acre was 28.2 bushels and the average price 41 cents per bushel, giving a total of $11.48 per acre, a difference in favour of the Ontario farmer of 73 cents. In barley, the average production per acre in Ontario was 27 bushels and the average price 54 cents per bushel, making the value per acre $14.58. In New York State the average production per acre was 24.8 bushels and the average price 60 cents per bushel, making a total value per acre of $14.40, again in favour of the Ontario farmer to the extent of 18 cents per acre. Take potatoes: in Ontario the average production per acre was 149 bushels and the average price 40 cents per bushel, or a total value per acre of $68.54. In New York State the average production per acre was 102 bushels and the average price 48 cents per bushel, or a total value per acre of $48.96, showing a balance in favour of the Ontario farmer of $19.58 per acre. According to the latest statistics that I have been able to have access to, I find that New York state produced of wheat and corn in the last 8 years for which statistics are given, from 1900 to 1908, 1,224,000 bushels at a value of $26,510,000. Ontario produced during the same time 1,028,240 bushels valued at $27,769,000. So that it will be seen that although in wheat and corn Ontario produced 96,000 bushels less than was produced in New York state, yet the Ontario farmer received for his product $1,259,000 more than the New York farmer. Let me offer another comparison, one between the state of Michigan and the province of Ontario, in regard to farms themselves, the value of and the encumbrances upon the farms and the value of and encumbrances on the live stock of the farms. In 1898 there were in the province of Ontario 177,000 farms valued at $556,246,569, exclusive of buildings; and in 1908 there were 183,000 farms, an increase of 6,000, valued at $671,431,018, an increase in value in ten years of $115,285,449.

Let us look at the records of the state of Michigan, which is the nearest approach to the province of Ontario in the number, and value of its farms. I find that in Michigan in 1898 there were 175,000 farms, and 177,000 in Ontario. Ten years later, in 1908, the number of farms in the state of Michigan had increased from 175,000 to 178,000, whereas in Ontario in the same period, the number had increased from 177,000 farms to 183,000. In other words there was an increase of 6,000 in Ontario as compared with an increase of 3,000 in the state of Michigan, and both are about the same area. In 1898, the value of the Michigan farms was $623,911,200, and in 1908, their value was only $621,297,000, showing an actual decrease in the value of farms in Michigan in these ten years of $2,614,000. While there was an increase in the province of Ontario during the same period of $115,285,000. In 1898, the value in Ontario was $556,246,569, and in 1908 it was $671,531,018.

If the market of 90,000,000 people is going to make the farmers rich, why has it not increased the number of farms in the state of Michigan and their value?

Lest that one test be not considered conclusive, let me call attention to another comparison—a comparison in respect of the live stock. In Ontario, the live stock in 1898 was valued at $103,744,223; and in 1908, ten years later that value had increased to $186,014,756. Thus in the ten years there was an increase in Ontario in the value of live stock alone of $82,270,433.

Now let us look at the mortgage debt upon that live stock in the province of Ontario. In 1898, the mortgage debt upon the live stock of Ontario was $3,110,543, and in 1908, it was only $2,730,119. In other words there was a decrease in the mortgage debt upon the live stock in the province of Ontario of $280,424.

Let us make a similar investigation into the figures of the live stock in the state of Michigan. The live stock in that state in 1898 was valued at $97,042,380, and in 1908, at $123,265,031, so that in ten years the increase in value was only $26,022,651, as compared with an increase in Ontario of $82,270,803.

Then take up the mortgage debt on this live stock. The mortgage debt in the state of Michigan in 1898 was $4,626,211, and in 1908 it was $6,922,210. In other words, while there was during the same period a decrease in the mortgage debt in Ontario, of $280,424, there was an increase in the state of Michigan upon the live stock of that state of $2,295,999. Yet during all this time the farmers of Michigan had been enjoying the benefit of the market of 90,000,000 people.

Let me make a still further comparison with regard to the debt upon the land itself. I find that the Ontario farmers in 1900 had a mortgage debt upon their farms equal to about 29 per cent of their value, or in round numbers $166,800,000. In ten years that mortgage debt had decreased from 29 per cent in 1900 to 17 per cent in 1910. Or the total mortgage debt on the farm lands of Ontario was only $102,000,000 in 1910, as compared with $166,000,000 in 1900, showing a decrease in ten years of $65,000,000.

Contrast that with the condition in the state of Michigan. The mortgage debt in that state in 1900 on the farms was $193,812,241, or an equivalent of 31 per cent on the total value. In 1910, the total debt was $216,209,750. So that while in ten years in the province of Ontario the mortgage debt on the farms had decreased by $65,000,000, in the state of Michigan it had increased by $77,602,491.

I shall not weary the House with further comparisons although I have them under my hand. But I wish to repeat what has been so well said by my hon. friend from Lennox (Mr. Wilson) to-night, regarding the articles of cheese and butter. In these articles the very same results figure out, if one will take the trouble to ascertain the amount of money received by the Canadian farmer as compared with that received by the American farmer for these products per pound.

There is still another test which I would apply. I have taken the trouble to look into the statistics of savings bank deposits, and life insurance. Either one of these is a very fair illustration of the progress which the people are making; and I find, comparing the province of Ontario with the state of New York or Michigan or Minnesota, that the life insurance which has gone into force upon the Ontario people per head of population within the last ten years is nearly twenty times greater than what has been affected upon the American people in any one of those states. I find also that the number of lapsed policies—and hon. members will understand that policies taken out upon life are not allowed to lapse unless the insured are not able to pay the premium—I find that in Ontario, the number of lapsed policies is very much less than that in either New York or Michigan.

I find also that the same results with regard to savings bank deposits, and both bank deposits, and life policies are things which indicate pretty clearly the progress and prosperity of a people. And if, with this boasted market of 90,000,000 people, the American farmer has not been able to pay off the mortgage debts upon his chattel property and land, if he has not been able to increase the value of his lands or the number of his

farms, and if he has not been able to meet his life insurance premiums or make his bank deposits, while at the same time, under the policy pursued in this country the last twenty years, our Canadian farmers have been able to not only to pay off their mortgage debt, but increase the value, and number of their farms and live stock, and pay the premiums on their life insurance, and deposit besides a handsome sum in the bank, it must be evident that we have nothing to gain by this reciprocity pact.

That being so, is it not the height of absurdity to urge upon the Canadian people that they should barter away such a privilege as they now enjoy, the advantages they have been reaping during all these years, and cast in their lot with the American farmer who has not been able to show anything like as great progress as the Canadian farmer?

Coming to the question of our trade relations with Great Britain, it seems to be the reverse of one of the first principles of business policy to adopt this agreement. Great Britain is to-day the best customer the Canadian people have, and it is admitted by every business man that he will give the greatest advantages to the man who is his best customer. As in dealings with individuals so it should be in dealings between nations and where Canada finds Great Britain her very best customer, I think that it is up to Canada to show some favour to Great Britain, to increase, if possible, our present favours to Great Britain and enlarge the British market for Canadian products. If we are to pursue the policy laid down by this agreement, if we are to enter into this pact, we will not only be violating that first principle of business, but will be offering to the United States a premium to send their goods into Canada and shut out the goods of our best customer.

During the course of this argument the constant theme of supporters of the government has been the great advantage this agreement is going to bring to the Canadian farmer. When did this government become so solicitous for the interest of the Canadian farmer? It certainly has not been their history in past years that they were looking after the interest of the farmer rather than of any other classes, but they profess to be doing so now. What is the reason for this sudden manifestation of interest in the farmer? Is it because the farmer is considered by this government to be so mercenary that with the argument that he will make a cent a pound more on cheese or a few cents a bushel on grain he is going to be carried away altogether from his sentimental feeling towards his own country and the mother land? It must either be that or the government must think that the farmers of Canada are the

only class of people in this country who can be deceived by such a policy as that. I believe there is a sentiment in the Canadian people far and away above any mercenary interest. There is a sentiment in the breasts of the Canadian people that would actuate them to support a stronger and more binding relationship between Canada and the mother country even if it were at the loss of a few dollars in trade between this country and the United States. It cannot be possible that the Canadian farmer will in a moment and without sufficient reason forget the action of the two political parties in Canada in regard to the great agricultural interest. I can remember very well speeches by members of this government when the want of greater prosperity on the part of the Canadian farmer was attributed by them to his slovenly methods of farming and his want of intelligent direction; in fact I recall an expression used by the Minister of Trade and Commerce when he was appealed to upon the question of want of prosperity of the Canadian farmer, he said that if the Canadian farmer wished to be more prosperous than he is to-day, he must work harder and eat less. The Liberal party was not then exercising the same feeling of interest towards the Canadian farmer that they profess to be exercising to-day and surely the Canadian farmer will not forget which political party it was in the past that has been responsible for the greater part of the prosperity with which they have been blessed. Under which party were the experimental farms and the dairy schools of Canada established for the benefit of the farmers? Under which government was it that the millions of acres of the great west were opened up for cultivation and for settlement by Canadian farm boys? It was not the Liberal party by any means. It is true the Liberal party have adopted the Conservative party's policy of protection, and I think I might truthfully say that it is the only policy pursued by this government that has brought any advantage to the Canadian farmer. But as against that they have not directed all their interests in that way. I remember an organization known as the Grangers. This government was successful in reducing that society, established for the benefit and advantage of the farmers into a political machine. Then, phœnix-like, there arose from its ashes the Patrons of Industry, and the government succeeded in reducing that organization almost to a political machine.

To-day we have the Grain Growers' Association which this government is endeavouring in every possible way, and with no little degree of success, to convert into a political machine, too. I have given a brief comparison of what the Conservative government and party have done for the Canadian farmer, and also a brief illustration of what the Liberal government and party have not done for the Canadian farmer. It seems to me that the Canadian farmer, in view of these facts which he certainly will not forget, will ponder carefully before accepting this policy, the tendency of which is closer trade relations and closer political relations with the United States, with a weakening of the bonds uniting Canada to the mother land. He will hesitate long before adopting the policy that is now being advocated by the Liberal party, in view of the history of that party, and the way the farmers have been treated by that party. Now, if it is true, and it is true beyond any question, that the policy of protection has been the chief element in the success of the American people while it has been in existence in that country, and if it is true that the same policy has to a still greater degree, during the time it has been in operation, brought prosperity to Canada, if it is true that the adoption and carrying out of that policy has brought prosperity to both countries, why should Canada, in this twentieth century which is said to be hers, hand over to the United States to exploit her natural resources, her national products, to feed the American factories, and furnish labour to American workingmen, to the loss and detriment of Canada?

During the course of this debate hon. members on the government side have told us that we need not be alarmed that the ultimate result of this policy will be to lead to annexation, or the absorption of this country by the United States. They ask what evidence there is that such a result can be brought about. I think it will be admitted that the more dependent one country is made upon another in regard to its trade relations, the more difficult it will be for that nation to maintain a separate existence, or to resist political absorption. In our case this tendency will be accompanied by a weakening of the sentiments of union with the empire, in consequence of a diversion of our commercial interests. It is the well known desire of the American people, as has been expressed over and over again, both before this pact was proposed and since it has been made, to coerce Canada into annexation. They have failed in their efforts, and just as they made a reciprocity treaty in 1854, when the pinch of necessity drove them to it, so in 1911 they have turned their attention to a country to whom they have hitherto refused to extend the hand of friendship. They have turned to Canada at this time because Canada is the only country that offers the United States any opportunity for exploitation. Sir, can any one be so far deceived as to believe that the sentiment in favour of the absorption of Canada, which has hitherto pervaded the people of the United

States during the last forty years, does not still exist? Does any one suppose that it has faded away in a single night? I believe that feeling is just as strong in the United States to-day as it ever was. This reciprocity agreement is only a disguised method of accomplishing their desire, and I am sorry to say that it appears as if this government was willing to lend assistance to the American people in achieving their object. It seems to me there never was for the Canadian people such an opportunity of exhibiting their independence, of showing their nationality, of protecting their country, of protecting their homes, as is offered them on this occasion. The time had arrived when, of necessity, the American people were bound to lower their tariff wall between Canada and the United States; the time had arrived when they were bound to take down the barriers they themselves had erected; the time had arrived when they became convinced they could not coerce Canada into annexation, or at least into what I was almost going to call a position of slavery which they would have us occupy. And so they have set about making a bargain with Canada with that object, and I am afraid they have succeeded pretty well in introducing what has been called the thin edge of the wedge. This is not the first dose we have had. We all remember very well when only two years ago, the right hon. gentleman who leads this House was appealing to the people of Canada for a renewal of their confidence by asking them to give him an opportunity to finish his work. Well, it appears to me that the greatest unfinished work of the right hon. gentleman is now about to be finished, if this pact goes into force, for by it he will hand over this country into the lap of the United States, and then his work will be accomplished. We have evidence of that all along the line from the expression that has been used by the right hon. gentleman in discussing this question.

We have evidence of it in the selection of the man to form this pact—the most influential man of this Dominion who had the tendency to destroy confederation as he has, a very fitting tool, if I may use the expression not offensively, with which to finish the work which is the sole desire of the premier's heart; that is to see Canadian independence brought about or to see Canada drop into the lap of the United Staes just as the ripe fruit would drop from the parent tree.

In conclusion let me say that I am unalterably opposed to the passage of this trade agreement through parliament. I am unalterably opposed to it because I do not believe it can, in any substantial manner, work out in the interest of the people of this country. I am satisfied that it will not work out to the advantage of the people of this country but that there is a positive danger in passing this agreement in so far as the people of Canada are concerned. There is the danger that it will hand over to the United States the natural resources of Canada to supply the American factory with material and the American workman with labour. There is the danger that it will destroy the usefulness of the great transportation lines built east and west throughout Canada at such an enormous cost to this country. There is the positive danger that it will frighten away from Canada the money of foreign countries that is so lavishly being poured into this country at the present time, and upon which so much depends for the future development of Canada. There is the positive danger that so soon as we hand over the natural resources of Canada and tie ourselves up in an alliance with the United States the inducements for that class of immigration, which means the building up of this country, will be removed and the capital which now finds safe investment here will be frightened away or turned into other channels. These and other dangers threaten the Canadian people as a result of the adoption of this agreement and for these, as for other reasons I could give, I again express my unalterable opposition to this agreement, and further express the opinion that if this government will only afford the Canadian people an opportunity of declaring their views with regard to it, they will do so with no uncertain sound, and the government will have an opportunity of regretting that they ever adopted such a high-handed and tyrannical course as that which they have adopted in introducing and supporting this agreement.

Mr. WILLIAM THOBURN (North Lanark). Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion which has taken place in this House upon this Reciprocity Bill now before us. I have to confess that at this late date it is difficult to add anything new to what has already been said. However, I hope, as I proceed to touch upon some phase of the question not yet dealt with. Sometimes we come to too hasty a conclusion on great questions, and we do not consider them as they should be considered by this House before enacting them into law. As an illustration, take the question that was before the House yesterday in reference to the government ownership of cable, telegraph and telephone lines. I pointed out to the hon. Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) that if the proposal that is now before the different governments became law it was going to cost the business men of this country five times as much to send a cable message to the old

country as it is costing now. That will be the result if we are not allowed to use the cipher and the code as we use them now. We can send a message composed of a sentence of ten words for 25 cents. In the event of this new proposal becoming law, even at the rate of 12 cents per word, such a message would cost $1.25 or $1.30. In other words, it would cost nearly five times as much to send a cable message to the old country as it costs now.

If there ever was a time in the history of Canada when this government should have remained silent on the tariff question with regard to the United States it was at this very time. It is well known to us that in the last United States election the great issue before the country was the tariff question. We know that the Democrats of the United States are the free trade party, that the Republicans are the tariff party, that the issue before the people then was a lower tariff and that the lower tariff party were elected. They were in duty bound by the voice of the people to lower their tariff, and if they did see fit to come to Canada to confer with the Canadian government as to rearranging the Canadian tariff our Canadian government could very justly have told them: Gentlemen, your tariff as a rule has been fifty per cent higher than our Canadian tariff; bring your tariff down to the level of the Canadian tariff and then we will enter into negotiations with you as to lowering our tariff. Our government might very justly have said to the American government: You have had a mandate from your people to lower your tariff; we are perfectly satisfied to enter into negotiations with you, but before the result of these negotiations becomes law we want to submit the question to the people of Canada, and let them have a say as your people have had a say whether such a free trade policy as you are asking for now in natural products shall be placed upon the statute books of Canada. To me this is the most important Bill that has been before this House since 1878, the year the national policy became the fiscal policy of this country. This question is causing more unrest in the minds of the business men of Canada than any other question since the national policy came into force. What is the cause of this great agitation? They are affected by this reciprocity agreement. Two reasons are given why we should adopt this measure: first, Canada has wanted reciprocity for years, and second, that Canada wants the larger market of the United States.

Then, if Canada wanted the larger market of the United States there must have been some excuse for it. I ask: 'Has the market for Canadian farm products fallen off in Great Britain?' No, the market there is as good as ever. Has it become necessary for the Canadians to seek a market in the United States? No, but the Americans have found it to their advantage to seek our market; and, for whose benefit? Do you suppose for one moment that the United States would be so determined to have reciprocity unless they were sure that they were going to get the best of the bargain. A few years ago, we are told, Canada wanted reciprocity with the United States, but did they give it to us then? No, Why? Because it did not suit them to do so, it was not to their advantage then to do so. The first reciprocity treaty in the United States was that with Canada in 1854, and it was abrogated in 1866 on the ground, as the resolution of Congress set forth, that it was no longer for the interests of the United States to continue it. Hon. gentlemen opposite are very fond of quoting precedents as a reason for their actions, but, Mr. Chairman, I believe in every tub standing upon its own bottom. Times have so changed that what might have been good for Canada years ago would not be good for Canada now. We have spent time and money in securing the markets of Great Britain—the best markets in the world—for the Canadian farmers—but, these hon. gentlemen opposite say: there you have a market of 90,000,000 people. Are they aware, when they speak of that market, that the world's wheat production is 2,651,866,000 bushels, of which Russia produces 766,000,000 and the United States comes second as the greatest wheat producing country? What benefit to the Canadian farmer is the 90,000,000 market if these 90,000,000 people grow more of every kind of farm produce than they want for their own use, a fact proven by their exports? As to the argument of the government that reciprocity would open out a market for the farmers of the west, let me point out that last year the United States exported 156,000,000 worth of animal products and $216,000,000 worth of breadstuffs. That is the market in which we are told the Canadian farmer can find an outlet for their surplus production. Would any reasonable man think for one moment that a country that exports a total of $372,000,000 worth of farm products to the extent the United States does is a country in which the Canadian farmer can find a profitable market? I quote from the 'Farm World,' an American publication printed in the interests of the farms of the United States, the following:

AMERICA AS A PROVIDER OF MEAT FOR THE WORLD.

The United States shows a greater increase in cattle and swine during the past ten years than any other country in the world.

While the number of cattle in all countries has increased faster than the number per thousand inhabitants, this increase is larger

in the United States than any other, while the number per thousand in Europe, our nearest natural market, has decreased.

The interesting feature of these figures is the relation of the increase of live stock to the increase of population. In this country, where the proportionate increase of cattle and swine has been larger than the increase in population, the result will be large exportations of our surplus to those countries where the facts are exactly the reverse.

The proportionate increase of sheep in America has been less than the increase in population, although the total increase in the number of sheep in this country is greater than any other, and this fact would indicate that the industry is in anything but a hopeless state.

Another important fact gained from the study of these figures is that through improved methods of feeding, the same number of animals now produced will turn into the market a very much larger total number of pounds of meat than the same number produced ten years ago.

The greatest increase in the number of cattle is in the United States. In 1900, the total number was 43,901,000, while in 1910, the total number was 69,080,000. This is an increase in round numbers of more than 25,000,000 head.

The greatest increase in the number of swine in the ten-year period is in the United States, the total being 10,732,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if it is a fact that the United States produced more of every kind of agricultural products than they can possibly consume what can be the advantage of shipping Canadian farm products into that country? Suppose, for the sake of illustration, that the United States grow 250,000,000 bushels of wheat and that they consume 200,000,000 bushels, they then have 50,000,000 bushels for export. I do not think that any gentleman opposite will for the moment contend that the people of the United States do not produce a surplus of every single commodity that the Canadian farmer has to sell.

For these 50,000,000 bushels of wheat for export they buy 50,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat, which they must also export; so that. instead of 50,000,000, they have 100,000,000 bushels to export. But I may be asked, why do they buy the 50,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat? It is a well known fact that we grow a better grade of wheat in Canada than is perhaps grown in any other country in the world. There is nothing that I know of to equal our Northwest No. 1 hard wheat. Now, where the trouble comes to the Canadian farmer is this. The Americans import 50,000,000 bushels of Canadian wheat which they mix with 50,000,000 bushels of their own wheat which they have to export, and they thus improve the quality of their own wheat at the expense of the Canadian farmer. Then the Canadian farmer has to compete with that 100,000,000 bushels of wheat in the Liverpool market. That is as I see the matter. If any hon. gentleman opposite thinks I am wrong, I would like him to put me right. Although the United States has a population of ninety millions, it is safe to say that they raise produce of all kinds sufficient for 130,000,000 or 135,000,000 people. What applies to our grain applies also to our cheese and our bacon. The Americans know that we make a better quality of cheese and also of bacon than they do, and their sole object in buying our Canadian product is to take it into the United States and sell it as an American product; so that our Canadian product loses its identity in the Liverpool market.

Now, you will have noticed, in some of the speeches made by hon. gentlemen opposite, that there has been a tendency to array one class of the electors against another class—to array the farmers against the manufacturers. No greater mistake could be made than that. It is well known that there are no better customers of the farmers than the manufacturers and labourers of this country. Do not the labourers create the home market for the farmers which is the best market they have? I was very much interested in some figures that were given to us by the hon. Minister of Railways in dealing with the question of labour and wages. His remarks will be found at page 5142 of 'Hansard,' as follows:

> The question of transportation is very important as regards the men who are working with their hands as well as with their heads in this work throughout the Dominion. It is customary, in discussing transportation problems, to refer to them as being the property of capitalists, and dominated by them. They are to a certain extent, but the development of our railways, the development of our waterways, is of vital interest to the men who find employment on these railways and on these waterways. Here are the figures: There were in the service of Canadian railways on June 30 last 123,768 employees, whose wage bill amounted to $67,167,703. In addition, there were 16,709 employees engaged in outside operations such as steamers and hotels, whose remuneration amounted to $5,169,923. The aggregate would therefore be 140,477 employees, with a total wage bill of $72,337,626.

Now, where does that vast amount of money go to? I think every member of this House will agree with me in saying that a very large proportion of it is spent in Canada in purchasing breadstuffs, the products of the farm. I just give this as an illustration to show what the manufacturers are doing for this country, for it must be remembered that building railroads is manufacturing just as much as any other article. I think it is a mistake for hon. gentlemen opposite to try to array the manufacturers against the farmers or the farmers against the manufacturers. Remember, I am not here as the representative of the manufacturers only; I am here to represent the electors of North Lanark

to the best of my ability. But are the manufacturers opposed to this treaty? True enough, a delegation of manufacturers waited upon the government when this question was brought before the House and presented a memorial, a clause of which reads as follows:

Although the prospect of reciprocity has already caused some unsettling of business, our confidence is still unshaken. But lest there should be a disposition on the part of our neighbours to stiffen their demands on your government in the expectation of finding on this side of the line any considerable element of our population favourable to their view, we welcome this opportunity of assuring you that the interests for whom we can fairly claim to speak, representing approximately $1,200,000,000 of invested capital, $1,000,000,000 of annual output, furnishing direct employment to 435,000 artisans and workpeople, and distributing annually $250,000,000 in wages, are opposed at the present juncture to any reciprocal tariff arrangement between the two countries that would necessitate a lowering of the Canadian customs tariff on manufactured products. They are convinced that any reduction would prove injurious to the industry directly affected, and indirectly detrimental to the interests of Canada and consequently to the empire as a whole.

As Canadians they regard the present an inopportune time for the negotiation of a reciprocity treaty.

They do not say that as manufacturers they regard the present question an inopportune time, but as Canadians.

United States enterprises are developed to the highest state in point of capital, specialization of product and magnitude of operation; Canadian enterprises, because of their restricted markets, are not yet so developed and it will be obviously impossible for them to withstand the competition that would inevitably follow reductions in the present Canadian tariff.

The appendix to that reads as follows:

An examination into the trade statistics of the United States throws an interesting side light upon that country's present overtures for reciprocity with us. For the nine months ending September, 1910, their exports of domestic merchandise of every kind were $1,193,321,512, of which $210,490,966 were manufactures for further use in manufacturing, and $401,684,694 were manufactures ready for consumption. The sum of these two, $612,625,660, accounts for 51 per cent of all their exports put together. But this is not crediting the exports of manufactures with a class known as 'foodstuffs, partly manufactured,' which are valued at $180,159,193. If we regard this also as legitimately forming a part of the exports of manufactured goods, it means that of everything the United States exported for the nine months ending September last, manufactured goods amounted to over 66 per cent.

Applying the average for the nine months to the last three, the figures for which were not available when this statement was prepared, it indicates that the exports for the year of manufactures ready for consumption and manufactures for further use in manufacturing will pass the $800,000,000 mark. This is an enormous amount for which to find an outlet, and there can be little doubt that underlying the present agitation in the United States for reciprocity with Canada is an earnest desire to open wider the markets of this country for exploitation by their manufactures, at the same time it enables us to catch a glimpse of what the future may hold in store for us if we continue to work out our own industrial destiny along independent lines.

To further prove that the manufacturers of this country, as a body, are not opposed to that treaty, let me point out—and I suppose there is as fair a representation according to numbers of the manufacturers in this House as can be found anywhere in Canada—that I have not heard the representatives of the manufacturers in this House stand up in their places and oppose this treaty. For instance there are the hon. the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), the hon. member for St. Lawrence Division Montreal (Mr. Bickerdike) the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty), the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), the hon. member for Kent (Mr. Gordon), the hon. member for Ontario (Mr. Fowke) and the hon. member for West Peterboro (Mr. Stratton) besides the hon. member from South Renfrew (Mr. Lowe)—all these are manufacturers, and I do not think any hon. gentleman on the government side will say that they have uttered a single word in protest against the treaty now before this House.

Now we come to the other side of the question. Is there not a large number of the farmers of Canada opposed to this pact? True, we had a deputation of farmers from the northwest to ask for free trade in farm products and freer trade in manufactured goods, but we have also had other farmer delegations, and what did they ask for? Some of them asked that the tariff be left as it was, and others that it be increased. Would you believe it, if I were to tell you that there was a deputation of farmers who waited upon the government—to my personal knowledge, and who asked, not that the tariff should remain as it is, but that it should be increased by 25 per cent or 35 per cent or 45 per cent—nothing less than 55 per cent would satisfy that deputation of farmers who waited upon the government. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) will bear me out in that statement because I happened to be present and I repeat that that deputation asked for a tariff on farm products of 55 per cent.

Then there was a farmer deputation from the counties of Kent and Wentworth who presented a memorial to the Prime Minister which reads as follows:

As there has been recently before you a large deputation of farmers from the west, and also a few from the east, claiming to represent the Canadian farmers' views on the tariff question (or at least that inference is being drawn by the press of the United States and Great Britain), we wish to say here and now publicly and emphatically, that they do not. Having consulted a great many farmers engaged in mixed farming in our different and several localities, both Liberal and Conservative, we find that the great mass of unorganized farmers are well satisfied with the present tariff as it is. At the last general election, stability of the tariff was the principal issue, and we, as farmers, think that no government should enter into such a large measure of reciprocity or free trade with the United States without a mandate from the people.

We also think that such extravagant language as was used by the speakers has a tendency to bring farming into disrepute, and at a very inopportune time when the eyes of the whole world are focused upon this country. At a time when the cost of eatables has been so high and the cry of 'back to the land' is being sounded, when so much money is being spent to induce immigration to this country, it seems ridiculous to have such sentiments spread broadcast over the land, claiming that such is the farmers' view.

We wish as farmers who are proud of our calling to again say that we deprecate the language of agitators who would stir up strife in this new country by setting up one class against another. Being engaged in mixed farming, we also believe in a mixed community in this country composed of manufacturers, merchants, craftsmen and artisans of all kinds, thus building up an ideal state.

Our opinion is that the great majority of farmers do not think that the manufacturers' heel is upon their neck, that they are ground down by oppression and are a down-trodden class that every body's hand is against them, but are well satisfied with their present condition and are against commercial union in any guise whatever.

Prices for everything we have to sell have been abnormally high, while machinery, implements, tools, vehicles, etc., have never been cheaper. We would, therefore respectfully urge that no radical change in the tariff be effected at the present time. We are pleased to see our cities, towns and villages prosperous, thus creating a convenient home market for what we have to sell, and also for what we have to buy. We are not enamoured with the idea of a strictly agricultural country but wish to see manufacturers attend to manufacturing, bankers to banking, storekeepers to storekeeping, farmers to farming, and Canadians to building up a strong united Canada.

The memorial further asked that the tariff be raised high enough to shut out American farm products and that employees of Canadian factories should be fed by Canadian farmers.

We believe that the principle expressed in the following motto is a good one; keep your money in circulation at home by having goods made in Canada. When you can't get what you want in Canada buy within the British Empire. If American manufacturers wish to sell their goods to Canadian people they should build branch factories in Canada.

Such sentiments have a real Canadian ring about them.

The Canadian tariff should be high enough to make them do so. We favour a policy of thorough protection for the products of Canadian farms, mines and factories.

David Jackson of Grimsby declared that the delegation represented unorganized farmers. They had no particular grievance but represented a silent voice. They were well satisfied with the tariff as it is and opposed to any radical change. Some of the western farmers he declared to be agitators. Canada had not alone been built up by farmers.

Bruce Johnson of Peterboro county stated that a canvass showed 80 per cent, of farmers favouring maintenance of the present tariff.

That was a memorial from the farmers of part of the province of Ontario. I have here one from the province of Quebec.

Following is the text of the Quebec resolution, just as it was handed to the newspapers, ready for use, to add to the report of the general deputation:

The farmers have no reason for complaint against the present tariff. Their products are selling well, and in view of the constantly increasing demands of the Canadian people, their markets are increasing from year to year.

The prices of hay, of corn, of vegetables, of butter, of cheese, of eggs, of live stock, have been materially increased and in certain cases have been doubled. Agricultural conditions are with us better than they ever were.

The prices of the articles which the farmers have to buy but especially that of agricultural implements, etc., have not increased in the same proportions; in certain cases they have actually diminished, and it can be said without contradiction that the position of the farmers as sellers have been very considerably improved, while their position as buyers has remained the same as formerly.

We attribute this satisfactory condition of the agriculturists to the increase of the population of the towns and villages where industry has been developed to a remarkable degree. In Montreal especially the workshops and the factories have for many years sprung up as though by enchantment, and now furnish work to a large number of heads of families. If the tariff on the manufacured articles should be reduced we believe that a large number of their employees will be forced as formerly to go to the United States to gain a livelihood for themselves and their families.

The sugar refineries employ 2,000 men, and if the tariff removes the protection which they now enjoy they would probably be compelled to stop their operations, to the benefit of American factories. A lowering in the purchasing power of this working population would certainly produce a decrease in the price of our agricultural products. We could put forward the same argument in regard to a number of other industries. The manufacture of cement in Montreal gives work to more than 1,000 men and we have no reason to doubt that without a protective tariff the

manufacturers of this article would not be able to compete with the manufacturers of the United States.

The province of Quebec is satisfied with the present tariff and does not ask for any revision. It is becoming more and more a manufacturing centre and is attracting to its large centres a population which makes a constant demand for agricultural products.

We believe that it is the duty of the government to protect our markets against American competition. The farmers of the West can hardly desire to injure those of the east, when they ask for a reduction of the tariff which would mean the ruin of our markets and of our industries. This is not a fight between the two sections of Canada; it is a national question.

Similar petitions were presented from some half-dozen French agricultural societies of Quebec.

Here are three good reasons given from another portion of Canada why the tariff should remain as it is.

The undersigned farmers of North Monaghan township, in the county of Peterborough, believe that no reciprocity treaty should be agreed upon which will allow American farm products or American manufactured goods to come into Canada more freely than they do at present. We believe that the home market for farm products is better than any foreign market, for the following reasons:

1. The farther the consumers are from the farmers the more it costs to carry farm products to them, and the more middlemen there are to share the profits.

2. Many kinds of farm products command the best prices when they are fresh. If they are shipped to distant markets, they lose their freshness before they reach the consumers, and consequently the farmer gets a lower price for them than he would get if he could sell them while fresh in a market near at hand. Some kinds of farm products are so perishable that they cannot be profitably shipped to distant markets.

3. A workman employed in a city of the United States, or any other foreign country, consumes only a few cents' worth of Canadian farm products in a year. Workmen employed in British factories consume much more of Canadian farm products than those of any foreign country do, but even British workmen buy a very small proportion of what they eat from Canadian farmers. Workmen employed in Canadian towns and cities will, under a proper system of tariff protection, buy nearly everything they eat from Canadian farmers. At present, owing to the low Canadian tariff on farm products, large quantities of American farm products come into Canada.

The undersigned farmers believe that the Canadian tariff should be raised high enough to shut out such American farm products and preserve the home market for Canadian farmers.

Great quantities of manufactured goods also come into Canada from the United States because the Canadian tariff is not high enough to keep them out. The working men employed in making those goods are fed by American farmers. The undersigned farmers of Peterborough county believe that the Canadian tariff should be so framed as to cause the manufacture of such goods in Canadian towns and cities by workmen who will be fed by Canadian farmers.

A few days ago the following despatch appeared in all the eastern papers, from Victoria, B.C.:

The Central Farmers' Institute submitted a resolution viewing with alarm the movement of the grain growers for reciprocity in natural products with the United States.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there was another very large and influential delegation of farmers waited upon this government, begging them very earnestly not to enter into free trade relations with the United States in the farm products in which they were interested; I refer to the fruit growers of Ontario. I do not know of any class of people in the Dominion of Canada who would be more severely injured by the adoption of this agreement than the fruit growers of Ontario. They put their case before this government very ably and very fairly. They stated that, owing to climatic reasons, it was utterly impossible for Canadian fruit growers to compete with the American fruit growers. They pointed out to the government that, owing to American fruit ripening so much earlier than Canadian fruit, the Americans could sell their fruit in this market at the highest price obtainable; and they contended that they were only able to remain in the business by the price they got for their earlier fruit. I remember one man making the statement that in the earlier part of the season tomatoes were sold at $1.90 a basket, whereas this same class of tomatoes, at the end of the season, would only bring about ten cents a basket. They had, however, to sell them, even at ten cents a basket, or else let them rot on the ground. But it was only because of the better price they got for their fruit in the early part of the season that they were able to make a profit in the business. They claimed that if the duty is taken off fruit the United States fruit and vegetable growers would come into the Canadian market and would ruin the business of Canadian fruit growers. I well remember the reply the First Minister made to that delegation who were pleading so earnestly for fair play; he told them he was sorry for them, but that they came too late. Does the right hon. gentleman not know that it is never too late to mend? Does the right hon. gentleman not know that their case was placed before the government when it was not too late? I want to tell him that two years ago that case was placed before the government by the hon. member for Wentworth (Mr. Sealey). On page 4171 of 'Hansard', Mr. W. O. Sealey said:

I desire to draw the attention of the House to a notice of motion which has been on the

Order Paper for some time back, but which, owing to various circumstances, could not come up for consideration according to the rules of the House. This resolution proposed by myself, to be seconded by Mr. Turcotte, the hon. member for Quebec county, is as follows:

That in the opinion of this House, so long as the Canadian tariff affords, incidentally or otherwise, a considerable degree of protection to manufacturers, some protection may fairly and properly be afforded by our tariff to Canadian agriculturists and stock raisers upon hogs, hog products, garden vegetables and such other items as it may appear possible to so protect with advantage to the agriculturists, and without undue injury to the Canadian consumer.

That resolution was introduced by the hon member for Wentworth two years ago, and still the First Minister would tell that delegation of fruit growers who waited upon the government that they came too late, and he was sorry for them. Well, the hon. member for Wentworth, amongst other things, went on to say:

I am anxious to see them go further still. The growing of vegetables is an industry which is of increasing importance, and I believe that without serious inconvenienec to the consumer an increase of the tariff along some lines would benefit the producer. . . But we suffer seriously from imported cabbages when their crop is nearly finished and they ship them in by the carload at as low as $6 a ton, which, with the duty of 30 per cent, amounting to $1.80 is added, makes a total cost of $7.80 a ton.

Now if the hon. member for Wentworth was right in stating that the Ontario fruit and vegetable growers were at a disadvantage with a duty of $7.80 a ton on vegetables, at how much greater disadvantage will they be when that duty is taken off? Mr. Sealey also dealt with another question:

The American corn-fed pork of an inferior quality has been going to the British market to such an extent that it has dulled the taste of the Britishers for the Canadian pork, so much so that we find to-day that Canadian pork has backed down to about the level of United States pork, and in some cases less.

That only goes to illustrate what I was trying to show some time ago about the lowering of the quality of our grain, that is, they would increase the reputation of their grain at the expense of the Canadian farmer.

By the introduction of American pork here we have lost the splendid reputation we had built up and enjoyed for a number of years, and I think our western friends could afford to join in this movement to protect the enviable reputation which they enjoy at the present time. They are producing in the west large quantities of wheat fed pork. That wheat fed pork makes the sweetest hams and bacon, being equal to the pea fed product, with which we built up such a reputation,

and perhaps surpassing it to some extent. Unless that reputation that they are building up in the west is safeguarded they will perhaps meet the same fate that we have met here in Ontario.

That was the statement made by the hon. member for Wentworth two years ago. But, on page 7684 of 'Hansard' of this year the hon. member for Wentworth makes the following statement in behalf of the fruit and vegetable growers of Ontario:

The latest Trade and Commerce report for the year ending March 31, 1910, shows that we imported during that year to Canada from the United States, fruit to the value in round figures of $6,500,000, while during the same period we only exported from Canada to the United States, fruit to the value of $500,000, or one-thirteenth of the imports. True, it may be said that $3,500,000 worth of our fruit imports were bananas, oranges, pine apples, and other varieties of fruit which we do not produce in Canada, and which therefore, come in duty free. But $6,000,000 of it, or six times more than we exported to the United States, was dutiable, and of exactly the same class of fruit as we produce in Canada.

Now, the Canadian tariff on peaches is one cent per pound, while the United States tariff on them is only one half cent per pound. The Canadian tariff on strawberries is two cents per quart, while the United States tariff on them is only one cent per quart. Our tariff on much of the fruit is twice as high as theirs; and if, under these conditions, they have been able to invade our markets to the extent of $3,000,000 a year and we have only been able to invade their market to the extent of half a million, or one-sixth that amount, during the same time, with only half as much duty against us as we have against them, the result under free trade in these articles would seem to be apparent to every one; they would swamp us in our own market, while we would be unable to meet them in their own market.

These are the words of the hon. member for Wentworth. It remains to be seen how that hon. gentleman is going to vote when this question comes before the House. Is he going to stand by the statements he has made in this 'Hansard' or is he going to swallow these statements and vote with the government? These are his own words and they appear as witnesses against him.

When the farmers of the Northwest waited upon the government they were clamouring for freer trade and direct taxation. They never made a greater mistake in their lives. I do not think there would be a greater howl go up from any section of the country than that which would go up from these Northwest farmers if they had direct taxation. What that country wants is manufacturers. If that deputation had come to this government and asked for an increase in her number of manufacturing industries in that coun-

try, it would have been more to the point. If this country is already consuming eighty per cent of the total product of the farmers it would not want a very great increase of the manufacturing industries to consume the other twenty per cent. I have here an article from an Edmonton newspaper which carries out the idea of the want of manufacturers in the Northwest. It says:

The secretary of the Edmonton board of trade has issued the following article dealing with the Buying-at-home Campaign, which is to be inaugurated in the Twin Cities:

It is pretty generally recognized that Edmonton and Strathcona are in need of greater industrial activity and the increased payrolls which would ensue. The board of trade, the city council and other organizations, as well as many individuals, have been very active in endeavouring to secure development along these lines, with some measure of success; but much is still to be desired in that direction. Industrial activity not only put into circulation a lot of money in the shape of wages, but it also creates a better market for the raw material, and there is no person making his living in Edmonton, no matter what his occupation, who is not benefited directly, or indirectly, by development of industries in the city.

The board of trade, in considering this matter, recognized that if the business of existing factories in the city could be doubled, this would be about as desirable as doubling the number of factories. With this object in view, steps have been taken to inaugurate a Buying-at-home Campaign, with a view to suggesting to the citizens of Edmonton and Strathcona that preference be given to goods of local manufacture, so far as their wants can be supplied locally. It is believed that if every citizen of the two towns will loyally and persistently insist on their dealers filling their orders with goods of local manufacture, an enormous impetus will be given to local industrial development.

Is it not a fact, Mr. Chairman, that all kinds of farm stock and farm produce sell higher in Canada than they do in the United States? Why, in my own town, talking with one of our livery men a few days ago, he told me that only a few years ago he could buy a livery horse suitable for his purpose for from $75 to $100, for which he has to pay now from $125 to $150. A carter in my own town corroborated that statement by telling me that a good draft horse that he could purchase a few years ago for from $100 to $125 costs now $200. Speaking about the price of horses, I have an article here written by a well known dealer in Toronto:

Toronto, March 21.—Mr. C. A. Burns, one of the best known horse buyers in Ontario, has addressed a letter to the press in which he declares that reciprocity will ruin the horse business in Ontario. He says in part:

The large increase in the number of automobiles used and auto-trucks in the United States, has put a damper on the horse trade and several of the large sales stables in New York have absolutely closed down, and with a reciprocity agreement Canada will be an outlet for these horses. And then again, the ranch-bred horses have lived out nine or ten months of the year or the whole year round, while our horses are fed five or seven months on hay in the stables. How on earth can we compete with the horses of the United States?—for it costs more to breed horses in Canada.

The buyers from western Canada would go to St. Paul, Minneapolis, Chicago, St. Louis, or Texas markets. On the three first-named markets they would get a clean-legged Percheron bred horse for less money than they could buy a Clyde horse of the same class and weight for in Toronto or anywhere in Ontario.

The only protection now of the Ontario farmer is the duty. On a $200 horse, the duty is $65, and on a $150 horse there is a $30 duty at the present time. Remove this duty and let American horses come in here, and make it easy for Canadian buyers to go to the United States markets, and the Ontario farmer will get fully $40 to $90 per head less than he does now for his horses.

Some people might think that the western farmer wants reciprocity, but I am convinced that it is the American element alone that is crying for reciprocity, and there are a large number of American farmers in the Canadian west. We must preserve Canada for Canadians, and the Ontario farmer will make a big mistake to think that he is going to benefit by reciprocity.

During the year ending March 31 last, 33,853 head of live stock entered the western states, and of this number 12,853 were horses. I have here the message from President Taft to the United States Senate, and dealing with the question of horses in Canada he says:

As to horses, Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario. The agricultural development of the northwestern provinces has put prices of work stock and heavy draft teams at a premium in the territory tributary to Winnipeg. During the spring of 1910, it is stated on good authority that not less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time. The five provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta combined have but 1,863,744 head as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the state of Iowa alone.

Dealing with the price of live stock generally in 17 states of the union, he gives the following figures:

Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of prices is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.

Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada, due to the fact that Ontario specializes on pedigreed flocks, as appears later on. In the United States they

range from $2 per head in Texas to $5.30 in Illinois and Iowa, while in Canada the range is from $4 in Nova Scotia to $7 in Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

The average price of live stock in these 17 states as compared with the average price in Canada is shown by the following table:

AVERAGE PRICES.

		Less in U.S.
Horses—Canada..	$130 00	
Horses—United States..	108 19	
		$24 81
Dairy cows—Canada..	$43 00	
Dairy cows—United States.. ..	35 79	
		7 21
Other cattle—Canada..	$31 00	
Other cattle—United States.. ..	19 41	
		11 59
Sheep—Canada..	$6 00	
Sheep—United States..	4 08	
		1 92
Hogs—Canada..	$11 00	
Hogs—United States..	9 14	
		1 86

And still in the face of that declaration made by the President of the United States, and in the face of such figures as I have quoted the government are advising Canadians to seek a market for their products in the United States. I want for a short time to deal with another phase of this question, namely, what has a reasonable tariff done for Canada? Has it not helped to make it one of the most progressive nations on earth, has it not increased our manufacturing industry; has it not compelled large industries to come from other countries, and locate in Canada? On this point I quote from the 'Monetary Times,' one of the leading financial authorities in Canada:

United States Capital in Canadian Industries.

As the result of some investigations conducted by 'The Monetary Times' (Toronto), and subsequently verified and added to by officers of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, it is known that at the present time at least 200 United States manufacturing companies are operating branch factories in Canada, representing an aggregate investment of $226,000,000. For this influx of capital, with all the benefits accruing to the Dominion therefrom, we must thank a tariff which made it worth while for those who hoped to sell us goods to come to this side of the line to manufacture. Had the tariff not been a protective one, those United States manufacturers would probably have enlarged their home factories to take care of Canadian business instead of building on this side, in which case we would now be using goods made from United States material with United States labour, instead of goods made from Canadian material with Canadian labour.

Hon. Eugene N. Foss, Governor of Massachusetts stated that the policy which has been in force for many years in the United States 'has resulted in sending approximately $300,000,000 of American capital to Canada, to build up branch industries which compete with our own in foreign markets. It has also resulted in stifling the growth of Massachusetts and New England industries and kept us out of the business and commerce which belongs to us by every right. It has kept the great Canadian railways from our ports. It has ruined our coastwise shipping interests and made our wharf property of little value.

Now, I want to deal with a phase of this question that has not been dealt with by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, though it has been alluded to several times by hon. gentlemen opposite. It is a delicate subject, and I am asking now, not on behalf of this side of the House, but purely from my own personal standpoint, in regard to the preferential clause in our tariff. But as it is past the hour of 12 o'clock, I would very respectfully beg to move that the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.10 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, July 20, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

WATER-POWERS ON ST. LAWRENCE.

Mr. LORTIE:

1. Has the government made, during the past year, any concessions whatever relating to the water-powers on the St. Lawrence rapids in the county of Soulanges, rights to use the shores and of passing along them?

2. Has the government made any concessions of water-powers in the St. Lawrence? If so, to whom and on what conditions?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. No.

CORONATION AND CONFERENCE EXPENDITURE.

Mr. MONK:

1. What amount has been expended by the government in connection with the reception of the First Minister on his return from England after the Coronation and conference?

2. What government vessels took part in the said reception?

3. To what account have the expenses incurred by the said reception been charged?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Nil.
2. The C. G. S. 'Druid' conveyed the Prime Minister and several of his colleagues from Quebec to Montreal.
3. Answered by No. 1

ROSS RIFLES.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. How many Ross rifles were issued to the Queen's Own, Toronto Regiment, which have been declared unfit for service?
2. (a) Has a new issue been made to this regiment? (b) If so, in what quantities?
3. (a) What has become of the defective issue, and (b) what claim has the government in respect thereto against the Ross Rifle Company?
4. What was the cost of the blue jeans issued to the Canadian militia for use at their annual drills?
5. Were they ever used by the militia? If not, why not?
6. (a) Has the Karki overall been issued in place of the blue jeans? If so, (b) why, (c) what was the cost of the new issue, (d) the name of the contractor who supplied the latter and (e) the quantity issued and contracted for?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1. 703 issued. Defects reported in two which are now under consideration.
2. (a) Yes. (b) Full strength of unit.
3. (a) The two rifles are now undergoing expert examination. (b) Not yet settled.
4. The last price paid for blue drill shirts was 71 cents each, and for the blue drill overalls 73¾ cents per pair.
5. Yes.
6. (a) Service clothing consisting of shirt and trousers is now being issued for camps to replace blue overalls as fast as the latter become worn out. (b) Is more serviceable than the blue. (c) The contract price for the shirts was at first 70 cents each, which was later on increased to 78 cents, and again to 82 cents each, owing to increases in the cost of the material and slight changes in pattern. The price of the trousers was at first 80 cents per pair, which for the same reasons was increased afterwards to 87 cents, and again to 98½ cents per pair. The price of the pantaloons, or breeches, was at first $1.97 per pair, afterwards increased to $2.02 owing to an increase in the cost of the material. (d) Shirts and trousers have been manufactured and supplied by Messrs. Woods, Ltd., Sparks Bros., and Mackenzie & Co., Ottawa; trousers also have been supplied by the C. Ross Co., Ottawa. The pantaloons have been supplied by the Mark Workman Co., Montreal, and the W. E. Sanford Mfg. Co., Hamilton. In all cases the material has been issued by the department to the contractors at cost price. (e) Quantity issued—all available. Since July, 1909, the following quantities have been contracted for, and for the most part delivered:

Shirts	47,398
Overalls, prs	35,479
Pantaloons, prs	15,000

UXBRIDGE POST OFFICE.

* Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Have tenders been received for the construction of the Uxbridge post office?
2. How many tenders were there, what are the names of the tenderers and the amount of each tender?
3. When is it proposed to start work, and when is it expected the work will be completed?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1 and 2. Yes, two tenders have been received, but as they have not been acted on, it is not customary to give out the detailed information asked for.
3. The lower tender being considered excessive, new bids will be called for.

POINT PRIM FOG ALARM.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. What are the names of the tenderers for the construction of Point Prim fog alarm, and the amount of their respective bids?
2. When were the tenders opened?
3. Has the contract been let? If so, to whom and at what figure? If not, when will it be let?
4. What is the estimated cost of the completed work?
5. Does the contract call for the building and equipment of the fog alarm station?
6. What is the character of the alarm proposed to be supplied to the station, what is the size and cost thereof and the estimated carrying capacity in miles, under ordinary weather conditions?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Gilbert Ellis, Digby, $4,600.
2. June 1, 1911.
3. No. The department proposes to do the work by day labour.
4. $2,800.
5. Building only.
6. 3-inch diaphone. Diaphone and machinery cost $6,000. From 5 to 10 miles.

LEAMINGTON POST OFFICE.

Mr. WILCOX:

What was the cost, in detail, of the post office building at Leamington, Ontario?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

Site, survey, legal expenses, &c.	$ 2,270 50
Adervertising and printing	557 74
Construction of building	18,606 00
Heating apparatus	1,082 00
Electric wiring	620 00
Fittings and furniture	3,170 32
Cement walk	695 65

Clerk of works, supervision and inspection	$ 2,683 88
Minor items	42 60
Total to date	$30,028 69

Note.—Of the above sum, there has been paid $26,382.69, while a balance of $3,646 is held pending certain settlements by the late contractors.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. MONK. Before the orders of the day are called, I would like to ask a further question of my right hon. friend in respect of the Colonial Imperial Conference. I have had occasion since yesterday to look over the precis of the proceedings alluded to by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) and would like to ask if this document, which the government intends communicating to the House, is the report of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference, or whether there is something more to lay before the House in connection with the conference, and if so when it will be laid before the House?

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). The document which is in the hands of my hon. friend is the precis, so far as I have been able to judge, of the proceedings of the conference, which was issued from day to day to the press, and which has been put in pamphlet form.

At the opening of the conference, a motion was made that the press should be admitted to the proceedings. This motion was not carried. It was determined at this conference, as at the last, that a precis of the proceedings should be issued from day to day to the press, and this was done accordingly. So far as I have been able to judge, this precis, which has been issued from day to day, has been issued in published form and put upon the table of parliament, but that is not the official document which contains a verbatim report of the whole proceedings of the conference, and which is the document intended to be communicated to the public.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think this must be an official document inasmuch as it has been presented to parliament.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. It is, but my hon. friend will understand that the discussions were not given verbatim in the precis. This precis was prepared by an officer of the Colonial Department, I think, Mr. Hughes. That was given to the press, but it would not be satisfactory to my hon. friend. What the public wants to know is everything that took place, as was suggested by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) yesterday. That is the document which it is intended to lay before parliament.

Mr. LEMIEUX.

Mr. MONK. Might I ask how soon my right hon. friend expects the House will be in possession of the document?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I have no more information than my hon. friend upon this subject, but I should expect it from day to day.

MR. COURTRICE.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I noticed in the 'Evening Journal,' of Wednesday, July 19, that a civil servant, named Howard Courtrice, who has been employed in the Department of the Interior for some time has been put in charge of the Liberal party's bureau for the superintending of the distribution of campaign literature. I would like to ask the government if this man is still employed by the Department of the Interior, or if he has severed his connection with the department.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry to say that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is not in his seat at the present time, but I will ask him as soon as he comes in.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds) Before the orders of the day are called, I would rise to a question of privilege. I see by the unrevised copy of 'Hansard' that in speaking yesterday, I made use of the following language:

> I proposed to the Minister of Labour that he should appoint a commission similar to the Railway Commission, before whom parties could be heard, and that when that commission gives its award it would be binding upon the parties, and it would be illegal to have any strike or lock-out.

I find that in reference to this, the hon. minister (Mr. King) said:

> My recollection is that the hon. gentleman from Leeds (Mr. Taylor), suggested that the government should drive the men back at the point of the bayonet.

I wish to say that that statement is a wilful and malicious——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).—mistatement of the facts. If the Speaker wishes to call me to order for making use of language which is not in accordance with the rules of order, I shall withdraw it.

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the use of the word 'wilful' is not parliamentary.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The hon. minister made that statement yesterday, and I would now repeat that I never made a suggestion to him with reference to that matter verbally in my life. I wrote to him, and he has my letter and I challenge him to pro-

duce it, and if it be in accord with the statement he made here to the House, then I am willing to acknowledge the corn. But until he produces that letter and proves his statement, he must lie under the charge of having made a statement in this House which is not in accord with the facts, and be branded, as he should be, with trying by misrepresentation to injure a political opponent. I wrote to the hon. minister that I had gone out and visited the coal mines where the strike was, and after conversation with the mine owners and with the men, I wrote the hon. minister and suggested a plan, and he wrote back thanking me for the suggestion, and saying that he would consider it. My suggestion was that the government should appoint a permanent commission, similar to the railway commission, to which employers and employees could appeal if they had grievances. If the men had a grievance in reference to not getting sufficient pay or anything of that kind, they could make a complaint to the commission and the commission would hear them. The employers would have a similar right, and it should be unlawful for the men to strike.. If a man wanted to leave his employment he had a perfect right to do so, but no right to prevent another man from taking his place. This was my suggestion. Why, therefore, should the minister get up here and say to the House that I wanted the government to drive the men back to work at the point of the bayonet? I say that a minister who would make a statement of that kind, which is not correct, is not qualified for the position he holds. And if the Prime Minister finds that a minister would make statements which are not true, he should expel him from the government immediately.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) may call 'order,' but until he reprimands his Minister of Labour for making a statement such as I have quoted I do not think he can call me to order. I intend to vindicate my character in this House as well as outside of it, and the Minister of Labour has no right to make such a statement as he made, having no grounds for it. He made the statement that I said it would be better to drive the men back at the point of the bayonet rather than allow innocent people to be frozen to death, and so on. If we had a Labour Commission to whom parties who had grievances, either employees or employer, could resort—

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds)—and whose decision would be binding upon both parties—that is the solution of this question, instead of the humbugging law we have. The whole country is on strike, and the Minister of Labour rises, and attributes to me a suggestion that I never made. Let him produce the correspondence. And until he does, he must lie under the charge of having made a statement in this House that is not in accordance with the facts.

Mr. KING. I had no desire to misrepresent my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor, Leeds).

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). But you did it though. And I challenge you to prove it.

Mr. KING. The hon. gentleman refers to certain correspondence which he sent to me with regard to the industrial disputes. My recollection was that he thought it would be well to have the troops called out, and the men forced to return to the mines if necessary. But I have his letter, and will produce it, and let the House judge for itself.

WAYS AND MEANS—CHINESE INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Before you leave the chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a matter which was mentioned two days ago in this House, namely, the Chinese Investigation Commission. This commission was appointed last December to take evidence, took evidence from December until March, and presented its report to this government nearly, or over, two months ago with the evidence upon which the report is presented. These matters are common property of the public in British Columbia, particularly in Vancouver where the people are greatly concerned as to the outcome of that investigation. It is necessary, if parliament is to have any voice, any chance to know during this session what has been the result of that inquiry, that the report should be voluntarily laid on the table by the government without awaiting the ordinary procedure of an order of the House for its production. I had thought that the report would have come in ordinary course on the reassembling of parliament, judging particularly from the fact, that, two or three weeks before the holidays I inquired about it in the House in conjunction with the Bill to amend the Chinese Immigration Act, suggesting that the report should be brought down before we proceeded with the Bill, and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) in charge of the Bill stated that the request was a very reasonable one, thus signifying the consent of the government to produce the report at an early day. Having these facts in mind I asked the other day:

Has the report of Mr. Justice Murphy of the Chinese Investigation Committee at Van-

couver been received, and if so will it be laid on the table without an order of the House?

The answer to this was as follows:

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The report has been received by the Department of Trade and Commerce, but in the absence of the minister I am not able to say anything in reference to it except that it is under consideration.

Two days have elapsed since then. It is plain to me that if the government intends to give us the benefit of the information contained in that report the minister responsible would have taken action before now, but we have no report, and no information as to the report.

To show the gravity of the occasion, I may mention that at the lowest estimate the frauds dealt with by this commission have caused a loss to the revenue of Canada of fully $1,000,000, that they involve a widespread conspiracy extending from Canada across the Pacific to China, and involving not only government officials, but consular officials in China; they involve the Customs Department in opium smuggling, and other smuggling frauds as well as those in relation to Chinese immigration. The circumstances were explained during the course of the trial to several members of this government by persons in a position to know whereof they speak. The ministers to whom they have been explained as shown by the evidence, being the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright), the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). These gentlemen at various times, have been put in possession of the details of these startling frauds as to which it was thought they might show some personal interest. Yet, having appointed a commission, and having received the report of the commission, we find that none of these gentlemen seemingly have had the curiosity to examine the report or determine upon any course of action to be taken with respect to it. That is a position of affairs, which, I submit should not be allowed to continue without protest. And, if I make the protest to-day it is because, in the present perilous condition of this parliament there is no knowing from day to day that further opportunity will be available to place the facts before the public, we must take any opportunity that offers. Now we are entitled, I think, to have that report and the evidence laid upon the table of this House, and placed in the possession of the members. In the absence of the report I have some well authenticated facts which we can present, thanks to the enterprise of the newspapers of Vancouver. We have some indication of the scope of the inquiry in a letter sent to this government by a person in a very responsible position in Vancouver, selected by them to be a judge of the county court, a man of well known integrity and probity, who wrote during last fall to this effect, and I quote from the evidence as taken in Vancouver:

Judge Grant, who had written to the Minister of Customs suggesting that 'the microbe of graft was evident in the ranks of the Liberal party in this province,' and expressing satisfaction that the inquiry was to take place and also asking that the matter be thoroughly investigated in spite of the social prominence of some of the parties implicated, was on the stand.

The following paragraphs are culled from that letter:

We observe with great satisfaction the feeling of the Dominion government in deciding to appoint a commission to investigate alleged frauds in connection with the importation of Chinese through this port and Victoria. There is no doubt that there exists a large scheme to defraud the government, and that certain parasites of the Liberal government have profited thereby.

I understand that these same parasites are doing all in their power to prevent the appointment of a commission, but I trust that the government which has done so much in the past to ferret out graft, will see that this also is looked into and that the facts are made public, notwithstanding the high social and party standing of its perpetrators.

The microbe of graft is evident in the Liberal party in this province, and no serum is more effective than the light by way of a searching investigation.

The report proceeds to say:

Judge Grant, in his evidence yesterday said that the allegations he had made in his letter were based on what he had been told by old members of the Liberal party. He declared that the questions referred to were not only Chinese immigration, but the fishermen's licenses and the Japanese element.

He had been told that a number of men in Nanaimo, who were not bona fide fishermen, apply for licenses and sell them to Vancouver men, who again dispose of them at a considerable profit to the Japanese.

The reference to the attempts to stop the investigation were also based on hearsay, said the witness. He did not propose to disclose the name of his informant.

Mr. Justice Murphy—I must insist that you disclose the name.

But My Lord, I'd rather——

Mr. Justice Murphy—As long as I am sitting on this commission I must insist on going into matters fully as they come up. I must insist on hearing his name.

The witness explained that he would prefer to give it privately to the commissioner or the counsel. He had just met the man on the street a few days after the death of Collector Bowell's daughter.

Mr. Judge Murphy—I am very sorry, but I cannot allow the name to be given in private. This is not a star chamber proposition.

There is quite a lot of testimony from the same witness, but the names referred to are not disclosed, so I shall not read further. The report proceeds:

Mr. J. C. Senkler, K.C., President of the Liberal Association, was the next witness. He said that as chairman of the patronage committee, he had not come in contact with any fraud in connection with Chinese immigration. He admitted that when a vacancy occurred in the Customs Department it had been the custom for the patronage committee to recommend a man. The name was submitted to Ottawa and acted upon. He claimed that Controller of Customs Bowell had made appointments on his own responsibility of a temporary character.

He said that the patronage system was common throughout the Dominion. He believed that money had been made out of Chinese immigration but claimed not by any members of the Liberal Association.

Here we have a belief stated by a gentleman high in the confidence of this government, a gentleman who has been a candidate of the party in Vancouver, and who now holds the responsible position of president of the Liberal Association in the great city of Vancouver, who says:

He believed that money had been made out of Chinese immigration, but claimed not by any members of the Liberal Association.

During his absence from Vancouver he discovered a telegram had been dispatched to Sir Wilfrid Laurier protesting against the inquiry. Mr. Senkler said on his return he at once informed Sir Wilfrod that the patronage committee had met and wished the inquiry to proceed. He did not know who had sent the telegram or who had signed it.

So we see that this inquiry has been conducted under the most august auspices, that is under the auspices of the patronage committee of the city of Vancouver, whose consent, apparently, had to be obtained before a million dollar fraud could be investigated.

As to this mysterious telegram, I am informed, although I have not under my hand that portion of the evidence, that it turned out afterwards to have been sent by the secretary of the Liberal Association after a meeting held in the office of the gentleman who repudiated it, and that the secretary of the Liberal Association was in the habit of sending official telegrams of this kind attaching thereto the name of the president of the association; so that we may take the gentleman's disclaimer of any knowledge of it as personal only and as not absolving the Liberal association there from the desire first of all to stop a revelation which they feared to have made and their later consent to it as merely forced by the knowledge that the facts would come out anyhow.

At the risk of taking up valuable time of this House I wish to read from the evidence as reported verbatim in the Vancouver press, some of the most striking passages. I regret that I have not the document itself which is now in the possession of the government, and which I should have, especially because the finding of Mr. Justice Murphy might throw some different light upon what seem to be cloudy passages in the evidence. But since the government refuse to give us this information we must do the best we can with what we have at our disposal.

I have here now the evidence which I said I had not under my hand, as to this mysterious telegram, and I shall read a portion of it. In the 'News-Advertiser' of Vancouver of December 30, I find this:

The patronage committee of the Liberal Association was again 'on the grill' at the morning session of the commission, when Mr A. M. Pound was exhaustively examined concerning the telegram sent in the name of Mr. Senkler, K.C., chairman of the commission.

Mr. Pound admitted that the draft of the telegram produced was in his own hand-writing, but he did not admit that he saw the actual telegram that was sent to the officials of the department at Ottawa. At the request of Mr. G. E. McCrossan, Mr. Justice Murphy agreed to issue an order for the telegraph company to produce their file for inspection.

The sending of a telegram on the matter had been discussed at a meeting, said the witness, and the reason they had decided to ask for the reinstatement of Yip On was that the customs officials stated that nothing had been proved against him, and that they had every confidence in him. Asked whether he thought that was a sufficient reason to go to Sir Wilfrid Laurier above Mr. Foster's head, witness replied in the affirmative.

He had no reason for supposing that Mr. Foster, or the department which sent him did not know what they were doing, but the information given was conflicting, caused, he thought, by one tong being against another.

This is the telegram, dated September 23:

Recommend reinstatement Yip On approved by our friends and customs officials; charges not proved; our friends object to drastic action of O'Hara in suspending collector Bowell.

I was wrong in saying that the meeting was held in the office of the chairman of the Liberal executive. I read here:

Who remained in the room of Messrs. Kelly Douglas' office when you left?

Witness was not very clear in this point, but he felt sure that Mr. Kelly was there.

You agreed with the sentiments of the draft?

Yes, at the time.

Witness was pointedly asked whether there was anything in the telegram suggesting that a probe was wanted.

In reply he stated again that all the Liberals were in favour of it, and he had never heard of any objection to the investigation.

'And the sole desire for this,' exclaimed counsel 'was shown in two telegrams—the reinstatement of Yip On and the leaving of the appointment to the patronage committee. Anything else? he satirically concluded.

'Yes', responded witness, 'I spoke to Mr. Templeman on his way from Ottawa. I met him at the station and told him personally that we would like to see the matter probed to the bottom. I said also that I was satisfied that Mr. Bowell had not done anything irregular.'

'When was that?'

It was shortly after the Drummond and Arthabaska election.

It was shortly after the Drummond and Arthabaska election when the fear of God was in the hearts of these Liberals in Vancouver, that they reluctantly consented to an investigation which just before that momentous event they had resolutely set themselves to prevent if they possibly could.

Now, as to the origin of these frauds. As I said, it is no new matter, but this has been going on ever since 1907, shortly after the Chinese Immigration Act was amended by this parliament for no honest purpose that any one has ever been able to discover, but under circumstances which gave ground for protests at that time, and for the assertion that the amendments were made with the sole idea of facilitating the frauds which have occurred. These protests were made locally to my knowledge when the amendments were before the House, and they have been fully borne out by subsequent developments which have shown nothing but fraud to have resulted from the larger scope given for the importation of so-called Chinese merchants and students. I read from the evidence in the 'News Advertiser' of January 5, page 5, second column:

When, asked Mr. McCrossan, did the new merchants from China begin to come in under passports? Witness could not tell exactly.

About 1907? I think about 1907 or a little of 1906.

'You had been interpreter the year before that?' 'It was about three years after my appointment as interpreter.'

'Did it strike you as peculiar that these passports should be presented by Chinese merchants? They never did that before. What did you think about it?' 'Mr. Bowell asked me the meaning of the passports, and I just read them from the translation. Mr. Bowell said: 'I think these passports will be all right. They have got the signatures of the consul.'

'Did Mr. Bowell think they were all right?' 'Well, one first time there were no seals on the photographs and Mr. Bowell said: 'Perhaps some other man get in.' Mr. Bowell wrote to Ottawa about it.' In addition explained Yip On, there must be an examination and information about the immigrants last business and why he came here.'

If I delay the House finding my references I wish to explain again that it is solely the fault of the government, because they have all this evidence in proper order in Judge Murphy's report.

An hon. MEMBER. Hurry up.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I observe one of the beneficiaries of these proceedings exclaiming 'hear, hear.'

An hon. MEMBER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). 'Hear, hear,' or 'hurry up,' or some other interruption. It will be my painful duty to remind these hon. gentlemen every time they interrupt me that they are the beneficiaries of this million dollar fraud which is now engaging the attention of the House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Order, order.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am speaking by the book, Mr. Speaker. This passage, is from the Vancouver 'Daily Province,' of January 6, page 20. Yip On, the dismissed interpreter is under examination, and he says:

The witness admitted a large number of new merchants had come in in the last two years. He did not know where they had gone to; he did not know of any who had started up in Vancouver.

I would like to explain the significance of that, Mr. Speaker. Immediately after the amendment of the Act providing an easy means of access for supposed merchants, there began to come in by scores on every vessel—merchants with no money, no credentials, unknown, who did not start up in business any where, and yet no person in the employ of the government thought it his duty for the moment to question why they came in, and this notwithstanding that the collector of customs at Victoria had written them an official letter calling attention to the extraordinary discrepancy between the number of merchants coming in at Victoria where the department is honestly and rigidly administered, and the number coming in at Vancouver under the auspices of the Patronage Committee.

'They come looking for business; any one would know that,' he declared.

'But they did not find any, eh?'

'I don't know.'

Yip On said his duty was just to ask questions put through him to the passengers by collector Bowell. He said that he did not think about the matter at all.

Mr. Justice Murphy.—He thought it was a dangerous subject and he had better keep away from it.

In the Vancouver 'News Advertiser' January 7th, on the 1st page, we read the proceedings of the previous day:

The balance of the day was taken up investigating Lew's connection with the department at Ottawa, how it commenced, and the work that had been done in Vancouver last September.

Unlike Yip, David Lew furnished information in the very best English, was definite and decided in his statements, and not at all afraid to express his own views. In fact,

he was decidedly aggressive, and during the whole of the time gave profuse answers to all the questions.

It was, he said, a topic of conversation on the coast that a certain amount of smuggling was going on, and following an interview here with hon. Mackenzie King, he had a talk at Ottawa with Mr. O'Hara and furnished information regarding the system, and exempts.

In the same paper on page 4:

Yip Suh Foy was called, and not being in the hall Yip On went out to telephone to him. In his place David C. Lew was sworn and took the witness chair. His occupation, he said, was that of a Chinese agent.

Could he tell how the Dominion government suspected that there were frauds going on at this port?

'I cannot say who was the first,' said David Lew. 'It is probably a few months ago, and I was requested to furnish information. It was a topic around the coast that a certain amount of smuggling was going on, and I furnished the information to the department in the east.' He had given information to the United States Immigration Service.

'I mean, said Mr. McCrossan, 'information to the Dominion government.'

'Well, Mr. Mackenzie King was around and I mentioned the matter to hom. Nothing was done at the time.

'I did not bring the matter up. There was an indirect request from the general immigration department (the Minister of the Interior's department) at Ottawa, through Mr. McGuinness.' Mr. McGuinness was not an official, but witness knew he was down here on official business. He got the information from Mr. McGuinness that he was representing the department at Ottawa.

'Mr. McGuinness, then, was the starting point, as far as you know, of the inquiry?'

'He gave me to understand that he had a certain amount of information, and he got information out of me.' Witness met Mr. McGuinness about a year ago.

'What information did you give him?'

'As far as my knowledge of the local department here, things were very slack. No system at all.'

'What other information? Anything definite at that time?'

'No.'

'When was the next time that you were officially requested to give information?'

'I think the next time was on my holiday trip to the east, when I called on Mr. O'Hara in June or July last. I had previously called to pay my respects to the Chinese consul, and I dropped into Mr. O'Hara's office.'

'What was the matter that you discussed with him?'

'He said he would like to get some information out of me, and a conversation went on.'

'What information did you give him?'

'About the system and exempts. I said that the exempts should receive better treatment. The United States immigration law was much stricter and yet the system was better than ours. I also said that I hoped it was not the Canadian law to shut out trade and commerce. Those who were not bona-fide men made the bona-fide ones suffer.'

'What did you say about the ones that were not bona-fide?'

'I can't recollect exactly. I think it was as to the influence of passports. I think the chief controller brought that up himself.'

'Did you give any information as to Yip On?'

Not very directly, said witness, nor did he then discuss his suspicions of Yip On.

'Did anything you said at that time cause Mr. Foster to come here?'

Witness thought that Mr. Foster got here about August.

'And the conversation was in June or July?' 'Yes.'

'Did anything then transpire between you and Mr. O'Hara.'

'Not at that time. The chief controller, on the 2nd or 3rd, had sent for me at my hotel. He asked me to be very frank with him, and he would consider it a favor if I would give him light on the subject. I told him I did not think I could, but I said that there were some complaints amongst the merchants.'

'He asked if he sent an officer out will I assist him and I said I would do my best.'

He then said that he contemplated sending out an officer to inquire into the matter. I told him I was leaving on that day, and then he said he would like to introduce me to Colonel Sherwood. It was at the time of the printing-house scandal, and Colonel Sherwood was pretty busy.

So you see, Mr. Speaker, that there was some reason at the time for not getting diligently after this, because scandals crowded so fast one upon the other that it was impossible for the ministers to attend to them all at the one time. But since then ten months have passed so that the reason existing in September 1910 for lack of diligence is no longer a reason in July 1911.

Witness said he had had some trouble in connection with his C.P.R. ticket, and that caused him to stay a further two or three days. He did not meet Colonel Sherwood, and when he returned to Vancouver the matter slipped out of his mind.

It was again brought up to him by a letter from the chief controller, which he regretted he had not kept. The reason why he had destroyed it was because both the Chinese and the white people all threw the matter up at him, and he wanted to destroy everything in connection with it.

Before it happened, said David Lew, they were all his friends but afterwards he was called 'a dirty spotter' and a 'traitor.'

Judge Murphy—By whom? Give us the names of the Chinese and we will have them up here.

Lew said that he was sorry that he could not furnish their names. But he had heard the words spoken in public places.

The letter stated that Mr. Foster was coming and asked him to assist him. Mr. Foster, he thought, was quite a long time

here before he called on witness. He did not know whether Mr. Foster or Mr. McGinness first called on him.

He was recommended to Mr. Foster by Inspector Campbell of the Provincial Police, and by the United States Immigration Service, for which latter he had done a lot of work. Mr. Foster also mentioned that Magistrate H. O. Alexander had spoken well of him.

'We started on the waterfront,' said Lew, 'with the stowaways, and then with the smuggling. We got something of that sort, but nothing we could pin down. Then we started on the passports.'

'And what did you find? Did Yip On and his friends know then that you were working for Mr. Foster?'

Well, I think he would. A report was made by me to Mr. Foster that the Chinese were meeting the boat, and I said that that was dangerous work. The practice of sending an interpreter down to Victoria was, he thought, unwise. The department at Ottawa then asked Mr. Bowell why he did it. That was one of the first communications Mr. Bowell had. Lew said that he could not give the exact day he started on the secret service work.

Mr. McCrossan quoted from letters from the department at Ottawa with regard to Yip On's absence from work, and the fact that some of his work had been done by his brother Yip Fong. From copies of letters to the department from Lew it appeared that, according to the poll-tax, Victoria received more Chinese than Vancouver, but acording to exempts Vancouver had more than Victoria.

That is to say, the Chinese who had to pay came in much greater numbers to Victoria, but the Chinese merchants who were to come in without paying for some mysterious reason made their way in overwhelming numbers to a place where there was the least prospect of entering into mercantile business.

In another letter there occurred a sentence which Judge Murphy took occasion to comment upon.

This sentence was: 'Mr. McGuinness has already told the government about the graft.'

'If there is any graft we are here to find it out,' he said.

'What did he tell you about this?' asked Mr. McCrossan.

'He told the government there must be graft in some place. He did not say that suspicion pointed to any one. He made a general statement,' replied the witness.

Then again, on page 11 of the 'News Advertiser' of the same date:

Yip On continued to state that all the letters were not addressed to him, but to Yip Hing Jang. Then he was asked to read another letter. This letter created an impression. It was as follows:

'We have received letter. Everything carefully noted. Lee Foon Soon spends money just like getting rid of dirt.'

This was one of the Chinese conspirators who was doing so well that he is reported as spending money just like he was getting rid of dirt.

This matter is true. He has taken $50 of the money left in Hong Kong and went home for a few days. He came back to Hong Kong and he drew another $100. He has nearly got all his money back. According to my experience this fellow is no good. I have guaranteed Mah Yoh, Yung Sing, Lee Gee, Gong Sun, Dun Kong and Tam Fung coming on this steamer and when they arrive look after them.'

I have drawn $134 from Mam Moy Co. for Tun Fung's passage. Please make note of this in your book. I have sent $100 to Quo Ho Long and told them to give Yong Sing $8 every month for his home expenses, and also give Yip Fee $20 for board, according to your request. Please note these two items as I have paid them and charged to you.

I read this letter in order to show that these things were accepted by the Chinese as ordinary routine in the Canadian customs service, as indicating that this thing had been going on for a long time, was well recognized as a regular occupation, and was likely to continue for a long time in the future. This was no accidental smuggling such as is bound to occur anywhere when a particular ship comes in and a contraband passenger is landed. But these letters, which are only a sample of many received, show that the thing was recognized by many Chinese, as well as by the conspirators in Vancouver, as something regular which there was no probability of stopping for a long time to come. These letters continue:

If Lee Fook Soon has sufficient passage money later on I shall guarantee him to come. Your cablegrams of Chinese eight month, third day, stating 'Strictly stop and wait for letter,' received and fully understood.

I should have obeyed your order but as I had purchased previously second class passengers tickets for them, $100 will be lost. I was obliged to send two pieces of provincial goods named Yung Yong and Chang Foon, who is a relative of Chang Hok Chow's cousin on 'Empress of India.'

I may say that this thing was so well organized that they had a regular cable code covering each phase of these smuggling operations, and 'two pieces of provincial goods' were shown by the cable code to be two exempt Chinamen.

That cablegram was the one following the explosion in Vancouver, the publication of the announcement that these things were going on, and the suspension of the interpreter so that a new interpreter might be put on by the Dominion police to intercept the contraband goods.

I delivered the merchants' passports and $300 in gold. Please receive them accordingly and enter in book, each man being given seven $20 gold pieces and one $10 gold piece to take with him. You look after them to

be landed safely. When everything is settled all right write to me and let me know at once, and relieve my worry.

This letter was from Gat Won, dated August 24, and was sealed with the stamp of Lem How. It was addressed to Yip Hang Sang, which is one of Yip On's names. That letter was for you, said Mr. McCrossan.

Yip On slowly shook his head. 'No, I don't think so,' he said. This letter was not sent from Lem How. Only his seal.

Is the address on the letter correct? Yes. The letter was put in as an exhibit.

Now, Yip On, is not this letter for you? No, no.

You told us yesterday you often had letters on boats coming in from Lem How, addressed Yip Sing Sang. Sometimes, yes.

Now, when you think over this letter and when you remember the cable therein referred to, 'Strictly stop and wait for cable,' tell me, is not the writing of that cable yours? Did you send those cablegrams? No.

Mr. McCrossan—In view of the serious nature of the charge of dumping of emigrants—and this is a keystone if such a conspiracy exists—and also the statement made that there was a conspiracy to forge all these cablegrams and letters, I would suggest that the witness should be sworn on the chicken oath, an oath which has been administered by Mr. Justice Hunter in China.

I will read next from the 'News-Advertiser' of the 10th of January, 1911. This has a sensational heading showing the impression held by the citizens of Vancouver as to the part the government had in this, an impression which, if not correct, no doubt has been dealt with by Mr. Justice Murphy, so that the government, it would seem, owe it to themselves and to the honour of one of their members, to put that report on the table at the earliest possible day, and let us know whether this impression was justified or not. The headline says:

Ottawa and the Chinese inquiry—Hon. Mr. Templeman, according to evidence of Chinese agent, was anxious to stop progress of investigation.

The report proceeds:

Startling statements were made yesterday afternoon by David C. Lew in connection with a conversation which he said took place in September as to the position adopted by Hon. Mr. Templeman with regard to the inquiry then being instituted into Chinese immigration.

Lew had sent, on 21st September, two telegrams to Mr. E. T. R. McInnes, at Ottawa, one stating that Mr. Burrell had walked into the detention shed and dismissed him. He had replied that he took his orders from Mr. Foster, after which Hon. Mr. Templeman had telephoned to Yip On to come down at once as he was reinstated, whereupon Lew left.

The other telegram stated that Lew was done. That Hon. Mr. Templeman had wired to Paterson and Cartwright to reinstate Yip On, and that Hon. Mr. Templeman tried to deceive, perhaps intended to dismiss, Mr. Foster last night.

Further, Lew stated that Mr. Foster had told him there were several complaints against them. This admission was made most reluctantly, as witness stated he had given his word of honor not to speak of the matter, and he only supplied the information on being informed by Judge Murphy that he would be exonerated from his blame.

Following this exemption from his promise, Lew stated that he had been told that Hon. Mr. Templeman told Mr. Foster he wanted him to call off the investigation, and further had stated that he had wired to Ottawa, and that he would modify things when he got back there. In the meantime the matter of the inquiry was to stand over.

These things concerning the position of the Minister of Mines were told him, he said, by a young lawyer, with whom witness and Mr. Grant had been in communication. Judge Murphy requested Lew to make every effort to discover the name of that lawyer, as the commission desired to question him.

This witness proceeds—this is from page 8 of the same paper:

Witness also stated that the matter was too serious to be in the control of party politics and it hardly seemed proper to him that a minister from another department should step in and interfere.

There was, he said further, a general feeling of approval amongst the Chinese when Yip On was suspended, which immediately vanished upon his reinstatement. This was not only his personal complaint, it was also that of his people, and he trusted Mr. O'Hara would be able to read between the lines, and whether things had been honest and above board or otherwise. In concluding he pointed out that during the past fifteen months only six viceroyal certificates had been admitted at Victoria, of which three were rejected, while at Vancouver there had been about an average of fifteen each trip.

In reply to a question as to why he sent the telegram to Mr. McInnes witness explained that he did so to let him know what he was doing.

Judge Murphy—Is that the first communication you had with Mr. McInnes since he left here?

Witness said he thought it was. He wanted Mr. McInnes to know that his work was carried out and what the trouble was.

'Did you have any conversation that led you to send the telegram?'

Witness asked Judge Murphy if he must reply to the question, and was answered in the affirmative.

Witness—But I gave my word of honour I would not repeat it.

Judge Murphy—That cannot be helped. We will exonerate you from it.

Lew then stated that Mr. Foster told him, on the same day, that there were several complaints against him. He did not know who was present besides Mr. Foster, but the conversation took place at the post office corner. He did not know whether he came across Mr. Grant, he said, or some young lawyer in town. Coming back he was told that Hon. Mr. Templeman told Mr. Foster he wanted him to call it off.

Judge Murphy—Call you off, or call off the investigation?

'The investigation.'

Judge Murphy—Make an effort to find out the name of the young lawyer. We would like to have him here.

Witness declared he said he was not going to stop it, as it would look as if he did not go in to see the finish. 'They can "knock" all they like,' he said, 'the evidence and the facts would speak for themselves.'

Mr. Senkler, he said, had a personal grudge against him, and he had said he would tell about it some time before the public.

Hon. Wm. Templeman had said he had wired, and the telegram had gone, and he would modify things when he got back to Ottawa. In the meantime Lew might let the matter stand.

Judge Murphy—Do you know if Mr. Foster did any work after that?

'I cannot remember.'

Then the witness gave evidence of the modus operandi of the fraudulent Chinamen. He said:

These sworn declarations told how Lin Dong was given certain instructions before leaving China by the War Yick firm. Before he left he paid $950 in Mexican money to 'cover second-class passage and of landing by the customs interpreter.' Afterwards he entered Canada as a merchant, with gold and a draft lent by the Chinese interpreter, who afterwards took the money back again.

Now, Mr. Speaker, these Chinese merchants were absolute paupers, coming in, not only against the Chinese Immigration Act but against every other immigration Act, with money lent them by the interpreter, who took it from them as soon as he received the paupers on the Vancouver shore.

During the examination witness stated that he was told by a Chinese miner at Comox that there was 'no trouble at all in getting Chinese off there.' He also said that the result of his inquiries satisfied Mr. Foster that Chinese 'got off all right here' from the 'Kumeric,' one 'old-timer,' as Lew called him, being stated to have been caught no less than three times trying to get in on the 'Oceano.'

Another curious letter was the unsigned one to Mr. Fat Som, asking the receiver to look after five Chinese who were coming. He had sent Look Tuen to discuss the matter with Fat Som, he said, and finished up by saying that if the matter was not a success a large amount of money would be lost. . . .

A letter was then read from Lew to Mr. O'Hara, in which the witness stated that he had decided to do all he could for Mr. Foster. After this he went into the whole business with the latter gentleman. Asked whether he could give any information as to the identity of 'Julian Roy,' who seemed to be working with Mr. McInnes and with Lew, witness could not say, and returned the same reply when asked whether it could be Mr. Gordon Grant, the latter smiling at the suggestion.

The position and the antecedents of this witness having been questioned before the commission, evidence was taken on the point as follows:

Mr TAYLOR (New Westminster.)

Lew had lived thirteen years in British Columbia, was born in Canton, and was twenty-four years old. He was a Christian, a member of the Baptist church, and the Christian oath was binding on his conscience.

'Was he an official of the Dominion government prior to the trip to Ottawa?'

'No.'

'Was Mr. T. R. E. McInnes, then or now, an official?'

Witness could not say. Mr. McInnes might be an official without witness knowing it. He had a strong opinion that Mr. McInnes was a confidential agent of some department, what department he could not say. It might be the Immigration Department.

* * * * * * *

Lew was, notwithstanding, going on to tell how he was introduced to Sir Wilfrid Laurier and so on, when Mr. Taylor again stopped him and pressed for a definite reply.

The object of his trip was by no means principally concerning Chinese immigration, he said. Mr. Taylor endeavoured to find out why, therefore, Lew made Ottawa the principal object of his trip, and the place where he had stayed the longest, and inquired minutely as to whom he knew there kept him interested.

He knew Alec Johnson, he said, a Chinese boy who had been at McGill, and beyond this he met Mr. McInnes and Mr. Mackenzie King. He visited all the departments. He was introduced to Mr. O'Hara's office by Mr. McInnes.

Then the evidence goes on to show how Inspector Foster, of the Dominion Police ran down evidence of the conspiracy by visiting Victoria and boarding vessels there instead of at Vancouver.

Instructions had been given to introduce Lew on board as a man who had come in the place of Yip On. They went first, he and Mr. Foster, to the intermediate cabin, where Lew was introduced as the man who had come in place of Yip On. Everybody lined up for the manifest to be gone through. The first were returned merchants, and Lew knew them by sight and told them to stand on one side. After receiving the identification cards, they asked the men for letters, which were thrown on the table and marked by witness and by Mun Kow for identification.

Judge Murphy—Did each man have a letter?

Mostly, but I think in one case one man covered three letters. The first letter, said witness, addressed to Yip Ting Sam ('Ting' being evidently a mistake for 'Hing'), was marked, 'Important, and deliver personally,' and had the seal of Lam How of Hong Kong, and the seal of the writer, Gat Wow. The first letter was read. It was as follows:

Dear cousin,—Your letter that Chinese 'domestic goods' received understood, contents carefully noted. You say that Lem Quick Sun has been spending money not as gold but as dirt. That is true. **The money** he left with me he has now drawn. This fellow is no use at all.

I have guaranteed Man Yick, Yoo Sich and Tan Foop coming on the steamer. I have drawn $134.50 for the passage. Please see that these 'provincial goods' are landed. I received your cablegram of eighth month say-

ing 'strictly stop and wait for letter' and same was fully understood, but as I had already bought a ticket, they had to go forward or else I would have lost a good sum. Please see, therefore, that they are received and landed all right. If not, from now on I will only send you 'one piece of goods' by each steamer.

Quite modest. One piece of goods by one steamer, which, compared with the scale on which these undertakings had been going on, is very little indeed.

I have given those now going forward seven big pieces and one small piece of gold. Please keep memo. of this.

The next letter referred to Lee Foop Soon, and also to the Chinese who had been guaranteed by the writer, to the money matters between writer and receiver, and to the request to 'look after' the arrivals and relieve the writer's worries. This letter also has already been published. Witness went through and agreed with the interpretation of these letters. Witness explained, in addition, that after he got up to the top deck of the ship he handed all the letters, which he carried in one bundle, to Mr. Foster, and Mr. Foster initialled them. These were exhibits 93 and 94 and these bore Mr. Foster's initials.

Dealing with passports, Mun Kow was, said witness, doing the interpreting in connection with the landing at Victoria. A sworn declaration made there, before F. W. Davy, in connection with an admitted bogus and rejected case, stated that the passenger was stated to have paid $1,100 Mexican money to Yip Gat Won in China, and that $150 was to be paid here to Yip Hing Sam. The passenger was fully instructed how to act and tell the 'merchant' story.

So that, bit by bit, it was developed that this conspiracy had been carefully organized. These men, of course, were detained.

They were provided with a meal, and Mr. Foster and Mr. Davy and the witness came back after supper. The men were then examined and, in the main stuck well to their story until it came to Chang Foon and Lung Moon, who broke down and confessed. These men took their confessions in the shape of sworn declarations made before Mr. Davy.

How did you get their passports?

They went, said witness, to one of the gentry in the village, and then prepared applications with photographs. Some said they went to Hong Kong and saw the British consul, but on cross-examination it would come out that they had certainly been no nearer the consul's office than the outside door.

A telegram of September 21st sent to Mr. T. R. E. McInnes at Ottawa in witnesses' name was read as follows:

Citizen Building, Ottawa.

Mailed a copy of transcript to-day and confidential report to O'Hara. Copy to you. Boy lost confidential message from Sherwood to Foster, did not receive until six o'clock. Cannot understand your word 'Brock.' D. Lew.

Another telegram of October 2nd, was also read. It was as follows:

T. R. E. McInnes, Ottawa.

Inquiry proceeded yesterday. Wong Ching (see last transcript) examined now stated that he wrote letter to Fin Ting Sam at David Lew's direction. Under examination witness admitted gave David Lew facts in letter as message of Yip On, but David Lew told him to write instead. Decoy letter addressed like intercepted letter reached Hong Kong, although same denied. Satisfied, proved Bowell at least negligent and incapable. Gordon writing and confirming. Result encouraging, but we have free hand to move quickly to prevent. Worshop acting better since telegram yesterday. Foster and I intend meeting next boat, but orders must be obeyed regarding Yip On's relations visiting boats. D. Lew.

In the 'News-Advertiser' of January 12, on the first page, we read something further as to the character of this correspondent.

Among the correspondence read in the afternoon was a letter from T. C. Tom, a Chinese missionary from Nanaimo, who wrote to the department at Ottawa stating that the department would find out that they had a thief——

The thief, I presume was not Lew.

—and further recommended Lew as one who had done good service to the government which no other Chinaman would do.

And then, at page 11, the interpreter said:

It was true that the Canadian Pacific railway had excluded him from the wharf. He was told by one of the Canadian Pacific railway employees, a tall stout man, in the detention shed, that the company had given strict orders to keep Lew out of the shed, as he was getting too much information. The next day he was told by a constable not to go near the 'Empress' as they had strict orders to keep him away. He could not say whether the Canadian Pacific railway were 'in on the game.' It was because he was stirring up the deportation that he was being excluded. Judge Murphy said these men must be brought before him as witnesses.

Then later on:

Lew said that he was told by T. C. Tom that Yip On was introduced by Mr. Kelly to Mr. Ralph Smith at Mr. Kelly's office, who said that Yip On was not such a bad fellow. On examining passports Mr. Taylor said: Was it suggested that the transport was a failure?

Lew said he did not say so.

Mr. Taylor said that the suggestion would mean that the consular seal had been forged.

Lew explained that there was no way for the consul general at Hong Kong to make sure, but Mr. Taylor was of opinion that it would be an extremely difficult thing to forge a passport. He could not, however, induce witness to say that the passport shown was an apparently genuine document.

Lew's strong point was that every one of the men, about twenty-two in number, admitted that they had never been in the vice-consular office at Hong Kong, and another man at Victoria had also admitted it.

This number, twenty-two, I may say, was a single consignment, for these fellows came in by scores.

How did they say the seal was obtained? We did not get that far.

Then you suggest that some person in the consul general's office in Hong Kong was in the ring? Lew said that what he thought would not benefit the commission.

Judge Murphy pointed out that the passports appeared to have been prepared in blank as the handwriting was different. It did not necessarily follow, however, that there was any fraud in this. It was clear that the consul general had no knowledge that the passports were to be used for customs purposes. Apparently they might have been given just for travel purposes.

And further on:

Who took the responsibility of the statement beginning, 'I may be wrong and indiscreet'?

I am responsible for that, said Lew.

Mr. Foster and Mr. Gordon Grant had given him the information, but he could not remember who were the other two men who gave him the information against the minister of the Crown. He remembered that Mr. Foster told him that Hon. Wm. Templeman took a trip to his bedroom after midnight and had then told him to stay his hand. He thought that this was told him at a lunch table at the Carlton, and the statement was afterwards repeated in the presence of Mr. J. B. Ferris and Mr. Grant. Mr. Foster gave him the information which led him to make the statement.

I may say, in justice to the minister named, that later on he appeared and declared that he had made no such statement. Now, we have some further evidence about the patronage committee.

In connection with some further questions, Judge Murphy said in justice to Mr. Lew, that he must say that it had been proven independently that more trouble was experienced in getting a bona fide man in than those others who were possessed of passports.

As regarded Hon. Mr. Templeman he could not say whether he was subject to subpœna, but he was very sure that if Hon. Mr. Templeman was wanted he would attend. He was not, however, going to bring a minister of the Crown here on an assertion.

The 'News-Advertiser' of January 13 comments in its head lines on the proceedings reported that day as follows:

Strange doings on water front.

Ease with which smuggled Chinamen could enter Vancouver is described before Royal Commission.

New light thrown on Mr. Templeman's action.

Cabinet Minister is declared to have been anxious for investigation—Lew's life said to be in danger.

The report gives the evidence of Dr. A. G. Munro, medical examiner at the port of Vancouver:

Did he, he was asked, have any conversation with Hon. Mr. Templeman regarding Mr. Foster?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster.)

Witness said he did. One evening he called in at the Vancouver Club and there he met Mr. Kelly and Hon. Mr. Templeman.

Mr. Kelly asked him did he know anything of this matter of Mr. Bowell's suspension, and he replied that he did not.

Mr. Kelly then asked where Mr. Foster was staying, and witness said he was going home, and as Mr. Foster was staying near to him he would call and tell him.

'I then went out,' continued witness, 'and walked to Mr. Foster's place and the others went in an automobile. I walked upstairs and told Mr. Foster that Hon. Mr. Templeman wanted to see him. Mr. Foster said he was just going to bed, and he thought it might be better to come in the morning. About that time Hon. Mr. Templeman and Mr. Kelly and a third party arrived in an automobile, and Hon. Mr. Templeman was coming up stairs. I called out to him and said that Mr. Foster was going to bed, and would he see him in the morning?'

Hon. Mr. Templeman said: 'Tell him to meet me at the Hotel Vancouver at ten o'clock,' and then he and Mr. Kelly entered the automobile.

Later Mr. Foster told witness he had an interview with Hon. Mr. Templeman at the hotel. He said that Mr. Templeman had told him that he wanted the whole matter gone into thoroughly, and that he would do anything to assist. Mr. Foster expressed himself as pleased with what Mr. Templeman told him. This conversation took place a few days later. Mr. Foster did not tell him specifically, it was only in general terms.

Was Mr. George Macdonald the third party in the automobile?

Witness could not say.

By Mr. Gordon Grant—Whose automobile was it?

Witness said he did not know.

The House will observe that all through this story everything leads up to Mr. Kelly. As one report said, there was a music machine outside the court room and it played 'Has anybody here seen Kelly?' Every witness called at some stage of the proceedings led the conversation around to Kelly, who, it is well known, is the head and front of the Tammany at Vancouver.

Mr. George Macdonald, who is mentioned in this evidence, is another leader of the Liberal party whose name has appeared in public records as a beneficiary to a large extent from peculiar transactions of this government.

Mr. Edward Foster, inspector of Dominion Police at Ottawa, being called, was asked about the character of these witnesses.

In his report of September 8, witness stated that customs officials knew of illegal landing of opium, and that Lew, he was told, had been used for years to get information, although the ways he had got it might not always be approved.. . . . He understood from Lew that there were one hundred (contrabrand Chinamen) on board the 'Kumeric' when she left Hong Kong, and only 53 were

accounted for. How many got off was a question.

The opium traffic was also referred to in this day's evidence. The report says:

Opium, he heard from Lew, was sold in Vancouver at a lower price than anywhere else. It was $18 here against $25 in Seattle.

Then in the 'News-Advertiser' of January 14, on the first page, there is further evidence from Inspector Foster. I quote from the report:

Mr. Foster stated that at the interview at ten o'clock in the morning at the Hotel Vancouver, Mr. Templeman wanted to encourage him in his inquiries, and stated that he was sorry that he had not met Mr. Foster before, as he would not then have sent his telegram to Ottawa.

This is significant in view of the reply that we will have that the overwhelming testimony of Inspector Foster and others is that the minister from British Columbia sought to have the inquiry, because, if Inspector Foster is to be believed on one point, he must be believed on the other, and he says that Mr. Templeman told him that he had sent a deterrent telegram to Ottawa. That is the telegram referred to in the early part of the investigation which I have read. This shows how carelessly the ministers of the Crown under this government, administer their departments when a minister will deliberately advise his colleagues to stop investigation into a fraud of this kind on evidence so flimsy that a single conversation with an honest official causes him to regret that he had butted into the affair, and had sent a deterrent telegram.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. gentleman will permit me to say that he has no right to make the statement that I had advised my colleague in Ottawa to suspend the investigation. That is not according to the facts or according to the evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I regret that the minister from British Columbia did not see fit to put this evidence on the table, so that I might see the judge's report on this incident. I have no right whatever——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster)——to contradict a statement made by any minister in this House, nor have I desire to do so.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My evidence is published there.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If the minister will permit me, that is what I am going to read. I have already read the heading, which says that the minister sought the inquiry. I may point out that we have evidence early in these proceedings from other witnesses that Mr. Templeman, being appealed to by the Patronage Committee at Vancouver, did send, according to them, a telegram to Ottawa asking that the inquiry be stopped.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no such telegram and there is no such evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Then Inspector Foster has given false evidence.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Foster never gave such evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think it would be in much better taste if the minister would produce this evidence on the table of the House instead of giving us piecemeal such parts of it as he thinks suit his case. I have been reading the most damaging evidence for an hour and a half and this is the first contradiction I have had; so that from all appearances everything else is absolutely justified by the evidence in the possession of the government. Inspector Foster is on the stand and is examined by Mr. McCrossan, counsel of the government.

Going back a little, Mr. McCrossan asked whether witness had any correspondence with Hon. Mr. Templeman.

Witness said he had no correspondence, but he had a conversation with the minister.

'I had a conversation with him at the Hotel Vancouver at 10 o'clock in the morning.'

'What was the substance of the conversation?'

'I went very fully into what I had done and was doing at the present time.'

'Did Mr. Templeman suggest to you in any way that the inquiry should be stopped?'

'No, he did not.'

'And he made no remarks which could in any way give that impression?'

'No; he seemed rather to want to encourage me. I gathered that he wished me to go ahead. I had explained to him that it was fraud, and he said he was quite satisfied that such was the case.'

'Then the conversation related by Lew was incorrect?'

'He may be wrong.'

'To the effect that you told him that Mr. Templeman had used words that he wanted the investigation stopped?'

'I do not remember anything that would make him think so.'

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This is Mr. Foster, a material witness.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Yes, that is what I said.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He swears that it is not true.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminister). This is the same Mr. Foster, a material witness. I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the

'News Advertiser's' report, but it is a reputable newspaper and this purports to be a verbatim report of the proceedings and this verbatim report of the proceedings makes this witness, Mr. Foster say:

Judge Murphy.—Lew went further. He said it occurred at 12.30 o'clock at night, and that Mr. Templeman went to you at that time and asked you to stop the investigation.

I can only corroborate Dr. Munro. I never saw Mr. Templeman then. The only interview was at 10 o'clock in the morning, and when I was leaving Mr. Templeman told me he was sorry that he had not met me earlier; that he fully understood now, and that he was sorry that he had sent the telegram to Ottawa the night before.

I would ask the minister whether that is a correct report of the evidence.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Yes, that is very nearly correct.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). It is very nearly correct that the minister was sorry that he had sent this telegram of the night before?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). And why was he sorry?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Was he sorry because it was not strong enough?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. No.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If it were not strong enough it would be the most natural thing in the world to follow it up next day with another expression based on further information. The only reason that can be suggested why a man would be sorry for sending that telegram to his colleagues is that he had asked them to do something that he should not have asked them to do.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What was the telegram?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The telegram ought to be produced on the table of this House.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It was printed in the evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Why then do we not have the evidence? I have not got it here. I am reading everything connected with the case except matters personal to the minister which I have left out. Here evidence of one of these so-called merchants is offered by Inspector Foster:

One of the men admitted he was not a merchant, had never been a merchant, that he had $150 in gold which he was to hand over to the interpreter here, that his passport had been secured for him, and that he was a cook by trade. Another man also made full confession, practically corroborating the statements. These were Chang Foon and Yung Woon in the letters. These disclosures came to light at Victoria, and they then considered they had good evidence to prosecute the interpreter in Vancouver.

Judge Murphy.—On what advice? Legal advice?

Witness.—Mr. Farris and Mr. Grant, both.

By Mr. Grant.—Did that advice follow the luncheon at the Carleton? Yes.

And was it the only legal advice given to you?

Yes.

Judge Murphy.—You say that you came from Victoria with the idea of prosecuting Yip On. Did you see your solicitors then?

Witness thought that he did so.

Why were these men allowed to go out of the country?

The men were retained, said witness, only until he had seen his solicitors.

Judge Murphy stated that whoever was responsible for it, it was a most unfortunate thing that the men were allowed to go back to China.

After further inquiry witness admitted he had taken counsel's opinion on October 12, the day after he got back from Victoria. Further telegrams of the 12th and 16th of October, he stated that counsel advised against the prosecution.

In connection with the next letter, dated October 12, which stated that 'if there was a Royal Commission with judge McInnis presiding he was sure that a prosecution would follow.' Mr. Foster explained that he made the suggestion on his own initiative and it was not made to him by anyone else.

Now we have some light on the nature of the appointments recommended by the patronage committee at Vancouver, the same patronage committee administering this government's patronage at Vancouver to this day, the same gentlemen who are the consorts of the ministers of this government on every visit there and through whom alone these ministers can be successfully approached. Now I quote from the 'News Advertiser' of January 14, page 8:

John McPherson, the Canadian Pacific railway watchman on the wharf, was the first witness called at the morning session.

A watchman on the Canadian Pacific Railway wharf is no ordinary watchman. It is left to him to regulate whether or not any smuggling takes place from a steamer, in this case smuggling at the rate of $500 a head for every Chinaman who could walk unobserved from the ship ashore; and of every package of opium or silk or other commodity that could be smuggled under the cloak of any person leaving the ship. These watchmen have the most responsible positions in the customs service of Canada. Recollecting that the humble title of watchman is not the only thing to be considered, but that we must consider the duties to be performed by these men, I would like the attention of hon. members to the evi-

dence of the nature of the appointments made to these positions:

John McPherson, the Canadian Pacific railway watchman on the wharf, was the first witness called at the morning session. He had been previously examined two weeks ago.

All the way through his examination Mr. McPherson presented an appearance of injured innocence, and protested it strongly during the whole of the time.

He depended greatly, he said, on his eyesight for his suspicions, and depended on his suspicions for the investigations he made.

The witness was warned by Judge Murphy as to his evidence, and the judge offered him protection regarding any statements he might make before the commission. Witness stated that he was recommended for the position he had occupied by the Liberal executive.

Mr. McCrossan said that McPherson had been again subpoenaed, and was present. He was at once called. He is a one-armed man.

This witness was previously examined two weeks ago. He lives at 632 Hamilton Street, and was yesterday represented by Mr. W. H. D. Ladner.

In reply to Mr. McCrossan, witness said he might have occasionally taken a glass of whisky, but he was not drunk.

'But Fagan says he twice ordered you home?'

'I have never been sent home because I was drunk that I know of.'

He was not drunk, nor had Mr. Quinn ever seen him drunk on duty, or seen him stay, for an hour, or for half an hour, on the 'Empress.'

The house will notice Mr. Speaker the strength of this contradiction. This witness says that he never was sent home drunk 'that he knows of.'

If any one said he was breaking up his furniture at home through drink it was not true. He was not a drinking man.

Told that 'Con' gave him a flask of whisky—which he could not remember— the judge pressed witness to tell 'Con's' name, informing witness that he meant to know who he was, and that he must give his name.

Had never seen 'Con.'

McPherson said he had never seen 'Con' until the time at the wharf. 'Con' was a member of the crew of the 'Empress,' the Empress of China, he thought. He denied he let 'Con' go on board. He was willing and anxious to tell the truth.

Witness said he had been here twenty-three years, and had never heard the slightest slur on his name. He did not know who 'Con' was.

He had seen the latter on the wharf two or three times, but not half a dozen times, and—to his knowledge—never twice on the same night. He considered he did his faithful duty as a watchman.

He could not remember that he ever told Mr. Quinn to 'turn his back and take what he could.'

Told that Mr. Quinn had shown the day and the hour when witness told him so, he said perhaps Mr. Quinn had some reason to say so.

He had never improperly received five cents for anything. He did not warn No. 1 pantryman to stay back and not go on board. He had no orders to stop any one going on board.

'Then you had no orders to stop any one coming off?'

'Only the Chinese.' He did not let any strange Chinese go on board.

As to 'Con,' again, that individual was either quartermaster or quarterdeck man. He knew nothing about him in any shape or form. He never saw a parcel thrown from the ship, as stated by Mr. Quinn. He did not see that parcel.

He explained that he put in most of his time on the dock, and if he was sometimes on the gangway he considered that was quite as prominent a place. He had never been on the 'Empress' more than fifteen or twenty minutes.

Counsel reminded him he had just said he had never been there except for a few minutes.

Witness often took a walk round the ship, he said, not to get a drink, or to fraternize with the petty officers. The latter would all be in bed.

There is other evidence which states that these men were not only taken on board the Empresses but retained there for long periods while goodness knows what went on the wharfs.

An hon. MEMBER. Carried.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I was going to ask whether it was one of the ministers who said 'carried'. Probably he is one of the few who has not been mentioned and no doubt that is why he feels so happy.

Mr. McCrossan here asked that Mr. Quinn should put in the notebook from which he had given his evidence on the previous day, when Judge Murphy suggested that Mr. Quinn could sit beside Mr. McCrossan and that the latter could put in his questions from the book.

'As far as I am concerned,' said Judge Murphy, 'this matter is not going to be a farce. If any crime is committed, or any perjury, the man guilty will go direct from this room to the court.'

Addressing the witness the judge warned him very seriously that either he or Mr. Quinn was not telling the truth. 'Mr. Quinn must be a double-dyed villain if he purposely wrote up that book to blacken your character,' concluded Judge Murphy.

Then addressing the witness the judge asked who it was that recommended him for the appointment?

Witness replied that it was the Liberal Executive. Also he thought that Mr. Tom Neylands, Mr. Robert Kelly, and the present postmaster had said something in connection with his getting the position.

So that Mr. McPherson had very influential friends indeed and they must take some responsibility at least for the failure of Mr. McPherson to perform the duties for which he was paid and for the hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of stuff that is supposed to have come in through the failure of this appointee

of the Liberal executive to take his position seriously or as anything but a means to get his monthly salary.

'You were transferred by Col. Worsnop to the immigration business?' asked Judge Murphy.

Witness said he applied to Mr. Kelly and one or two more of them, and he was transferred from the Australian line to the Empresses.

Mr. McCrossan read the note as to witness 'going behind the shed and having a drink.'

McPherson could not remember that, nor could he remember any one coming off the 'Empress' and his having a drink with them. It might have occurred, but not to his knowledge.

It might have occurred to Mr. Quinn's knowledge. You did not know that Quinn was there watching you. You are prepared to say that what Quinn has said here is untrue?

Witness said he could not say anything about it.

Quinn was a detective put on to watch McPherson and other so called watchmen and find out how it was that these frauds were possible. The Counsel for this watchman McPherson suggested that they were wasting too much time about it; that his client was altogether too humble a person to be so minutely inquired into, but the examination proceeded.

Asked further as to the night of Oct. 14 when 'Con' visited him twice, witness said that 'Con' never visited him. He did not know 'Con's' business any more than counsel did. 'Con' had no business with him at all, or he with him.

Did he only come to give you the flask of whisky?

Witness could not remember.

But we can remember. We have it here the day and the hour.

Then it must be so, witness said.

Why did he give you the flask of whisky if he was no friend of yours? You knew he was going down on board to take things off? Witness denied this.

But you knew he did not belong to the ship on the night of Oct. 14, and yet you did not search him?

No I never saw any suspicious thing about him.

But you did not seem to have any suspicion of any one at all who went there frequently?

Yes I had.

Of whom?

I said if there was anyone I had suspicion of I would ask them if they had anything about them. I never saw anything 'crooked' in any shape or form. He could not remember saying anything about Officer Fagan 'being too darned strict,' but he could not swear against it.

Mr. W. H. D. Ladner, who appeared for witness, protested that the questions were allegations and were improper.

Judge Murphy—I think they are not. They will proceed.

Then you were engaged down there in practices not in conformity with your duty? Witness could not remember even one.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster.)

You are rather faint-hearted about it, suggested counsel.

Judge Murphy said he would be prepared to give witness protection so that any answer he gave should not be used against him in any other court. Witness, however, made no request for this.

Mr. Ladner thought that if the questions were put in the form of straight questions they would get on quicker. He contended that many people in the city testified to the good character of the witness.

Judge Murphy said he could not agree with counsel as to the probability of proceeding quicker, and if counsel had been here as long as he had he might alter his opinion. He could not, however, believe that Mr. Quinn was the double-dyed villian he was made out to be. And regarding the high opinion some people might have of Mr. McPherson, that course of action he had been pursuing on the boats was certainly not calculated to enhance his character.

Witness said he knew Mr. Chang, a Chinese merchant in the city, and he had told Mr. Quinn that he had known Chang for nineteen years. He remembered giving permission for two boys to go to dinner with Mr. Chang.

Asked why he had to explain this case to Officer Quinn when other Chinese were frequently leaving the boat, he said he might have told Mr. Quinn or the latter might have asked him.

He also remembered 'Con' going on board with the woman, the latter standing on the dock, because the quartermaster did not like her to be on the ship. He remembered that well.

Your memory is getting very much better suggested Mr. McCrossan and Judge Murphy, suggesting they were at least doing better.

Witness did not remember, however, going in the shed with that woman for a drink. (Laughter.) But the woman might have gone in and had one.

'Con,' he said, 'was a stout, well-built gentleman, 35 to 40, not very dark.'

As to the question of three men leaving the ship at 10.30 p.m. with square packages he could not remember.

Too much time taken up promenading with the lady, suggested counsel?

He, however, remembered introducing her to Mr. Quinn. He thought she was the quartermaster's wife, but found out afterwards, he said, with a smile, that she was his sweetheart.

He had no recollection of motioning to the men with packages to go round to the end of the pier.

Judge Murphy asked when did witness see 'Con' last? Not since that time, said witness, by which he meant since he left the watchman job.

As to the cook on the 'Empress,' Chang Ko, the man who used to wear the big long overcoat, witness said they most all came off wearing big long overcoats, a reply which produced general amusement.

He did not remember saying to Quinn 'Here comes Chang, but do not be too strict on him.' If the Chinese went ashore they must have done so when his back was turned.

'And that was quite frequent.' remarked Mr. McCrossan.

'You got a lot of cigars off the 'Empress?' 'Very few; never a box at a time.' He never, either, got money from Chinese.

Possibly Mr. Quinn might have been offered money, but they knew better than to offer it to witness.

The incident of the throwing of a parcel at night from the stern of the vessel to a boy on the pier, he did not remember, nor did he remember seeing the C.P.R. constable Howard and a Chinaman talking, or Howard asking for a cigar. He did not also remember 'Con' going aboard, although he may have done so, and he agreed he would not search him or his friend. He depended greatly on his eyesight.

He might have told 'Con,' he admitted, that he would see him, or run across him, after the boat sailed, but he had never seen 'Con' down town.

As to the constable Reason, he told Jake that Reason looked very suspicious to him and he said he did not want him.

'That was not because he watched too much?'

'No; he was asleep half the time.'

'You were not?'

Witness said he could watch forty-eight hours without sleep.

He had no hard meaning when he warned Quinn that Officer Foster was around. Asked why then, it was necessary to say this if it meant nothing. Witness said there was no evil meaning in it. He could not remember telling Quinn at the same time to also warn another man on the Redhill, but if he did so he did it with no evil will or evil purpose. He did not know of any motive he had for so acting. Then he was asked why he sent Mr. Quinn to see if the lights were out in Mr. Fagan's office.

He could not say, but as in the case of the warning to Quinn and the man on the Redhill, it 'was without any evil purpose.'

Now, the Minister of Inland Revenue will excuse me I hope for having thought it worth while to call attention to the conflicting testimony as to himself because, like the reading public, I would have received the impression from this headline in the 'News Advertiser' of January 15th on the 1st page.

Evidence is in direct conflict—two witnesses before Royal Commission on Immigration contradict each other as to Templeman's statements.

The newspaper here makes a little summary of the proceedings up to date which I would like to interpolate, showing the impressions made on the citizens of Vancouver. It says:

Up to the present time the things which have been brought out are the finding of the packet of letters on people who, apparently, brought them from China; the securing of the two sworn declarations; the laxity of the officials, and the smuggling which might, in consequence have gone on at the wharf; the apparent integrity, in this matter, at any rate, of David Lew; and the sincerity of the convictions, as the result of his investigation, of Mr. Foster.

Mr. Gordon Grant, a young Liberal of Vancouver, a barrister by profession, was called on this day as a witness. His evidence is on page 4 of the 'News-Advertiser' of January 15:

Mr. Gordon Grant further stated that a lot of people had been discussing the matter of Yip On. Witness and Mr. Farris felt that as they were not going to recommend a prosecution, they were not disposed to have themselves quoted or relied upon. If any one was trying to make them responsible they were making a mistake. They had recommended it simply and solely because they thought the matter ought to be gone further into. They then went to Mr. Farris' office, where witness settled a letter, he and Mr. Farris keeping a copy each for their own protection if any one said that they wanted to stop the investigation.

David Lew, then coming into court, the judge asked him had he got the letter he went for, warning him that he was still on oath. Lew stated that there was some moving going on round the place and that the files were mixed up. Judge Murphy told him that he had plenty of time before Monday and Lew replied that seeing the way affairs had now gone he was going to take up the whole matter very thoroughly.

By Mr. McCrossan—Did you ever send a telegram stating that Mr. Senkler was untrustworthy and dangerous to Foster?

Witness said he recollected sending one saying that Mr. Senkler was unsafe.

Told to be frank in his replies, witness stated he certainly would be so. He sent the telegram because he was informed that there could be nothing without the possibility of Mr. Kelly getting his finger into it, and that Mr. Senkler was a great friend of Mr. Kelly's. He considered that this was graft of considerable magnitude, and it was impossible to know where its ramifications began and where they ended in regard to Yip On. He still thought that Mr. Senkler was an unsafe man to be interested in the investigation.

That is one Liberal on another Liberal—Mr. Gordon Grant on the president of the Liberal association.

Asked by Mr. Taylor for the reason for Vancouver Liberals had in taking the view suggested, witness said that an investigation would be likely to bring to light things that would hurt them individually and also as a party.

In the 'News-Advertiser' of January 17, on page 4, the report of the evidence of Mr. Gordon Grant continues:

As Mr. Gordon Grant testified that Mr. McInnes had definite instructions from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Judge Murphy stated that this disposed of any possible 'conspiracy' on the part of Mr. McInnes, Lew and Mr. Gordon Grant, and he said he should telegraph direct to the premier for confirmation.

Mr. Gordon Grant was in the witness box most of the day, and gave detailed evidence as to an alleged demand on the part of Yip On for $300 before passing merchants to the United States.

There was only standing room in the court during the whole of the day.

This indicates the interest taken locally in this transaction, the report of which

has been so carefully suppressed from the date when this evidence was taken up to this day, when we are still awaiting its presentation to this House. Here is a new element in the inquiry. The labour organizations in Vancouver began to be very much interested in the revelations:

Mr. J. H. McVety, secretary of the Trades and Labour Council, asked witness how the conversation arose with regard to Mr. Senkler.

It was on the street. Witness asked Mr. Senkler who sent the telegram in his name. He said he did not know, and started to show some correspondence, some of which he dropped on the sidewalk. Witness saw minutes of a meeting of the patronage committee in regard to the appointment of an interpreter. He told Mr. Senkler that in anything in regard to the Chinese investigation Mr. Robert Kelly was somewhere in it. Mr. Senkler asked him what he had to say about it.

In reply he said that it seemed to him that Mr. Kelly was very attentive in regard to the Chinese interpreter losing his job, and he thought it peculiar that Mr. Templeman had gone into it at all and tried to stop the investigation.

Now, I do not forget that the minister says that he did not try to stop the investigation, but at every turn we are confronted with witnesses in Vancouver on whose minds the impression is that he did try to stop the investigation.

I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that all the way through this matter, we have nothing but Liberals. It is a family quarrel, pure and simple, not a row or a feud between the Conservatives and Liberals of Vancouver, but purely a family quarrel among the Liberals themselves over the division of the spoils. This man evidently is not a professional politician. Being secretary of the trades and labour councils, he is, I presume, a workingman, and has therefore rather simple ideas as to governing principles. This is what he said:

He was accused of being a traitor to his party and it was stated that the asiatic exclusion league would hurt the party but for patriotism you require a sacrifice even of political party. He was a British Columbian first and a politician afterward.

To show how the sentence was received in the courtroom—where there was standing room only—the witness was cheered for these expressions, and Judge Murphy warned the public that such a breach of decorum would not be permitted.

I would ask the House to pay particular attention to this because here is the crux of the whole matter—the reason for this disclosure. There was a family quarrel in Vancouver which brought these branches of fraud to light. The whole thing is explained in the sentence which follows. I would like you to remember that this is not the evidence of any irresponsible char-

acter, but is the sworn testimony of a young gentleman of high character. I would like to call the attention of the Solicitor General to this, partiularly, because it is his department, I presume, which has in hand the preparation of prosecutions in connection with these matters. This sentence contains the crux of the whole matter and gives the reason why these Liberals in Vancouver had this family quarrel:

He did not care personally how many Chinese came in illegally, but he did object to these fellows hogging it all.

An hon. MEMBER. Who is Senkler?

Mr. TAYLOR (Westminster). The president of the Liberal Association at Vancouver, and this is what Mr. Gordon Grant, a barrister of Vancouver and a Liberal, testifies as having been said by Senkler:

If it——

Meaning the rake-off of $120 per Chinaman.

If it had gone to the Liberal executive, I would not have cared.

As I said a while ago, wnen some hon. gentleman challenged me, I refer to the Liberal party, as a party, as beneficiaries of these frauds, and am not making any personal reference to anyone within the sound of my voice. Here we have the evidence that this was simply a quarrel among the Liberals themselves in Vancouver, as to whether Bob Kelly should get the money or the Liberal executive. But the Liberal executive were out for the dough. Judge Murphy asked:

If it had gone to the Liberal executive, I would not have cared.

And the witness said that Mr. Senkler objected to Kelly or some undiscovered people hogging it all. Judge Murphy asked whether he was speaking very seriously, and the witness replied that he was. I now quote from the newspaper report:

The witness was speaking very seriously; he was very agitated and he was very serious. The conversation still further impressed him with the reasonableness of his advice to McInnes who he knew would go direct to the government to advise with him not because he thought that Sinclair was dishonest. He thought the matter was important and that nothing should be hushed up or slurred over. This witness admitted that he himself was a Liberal in politics.

The witness warmly added that neither Foster, McInnes, Lew nor himself had been animated by any conspiracy against Yip On or with a view to get control of any grafting at Vancouver. Their idea was to have the graft stamped out.

Let me point out that this has been within the knowledge of the minister for a very long period. Here is some evidence to

prove that statement. Mr. Gordon Grant said:

It was between September 1907 and early in 1908 that he met T. R. E. McInnes as the personal representative of the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Hon. Frank Oliver in connection with the matter. He was told that McInnes had been specially deputed by them to get information for the information of the government and for the consideration and information of Earl Grey.

I should, I see, have read some preceding paragraphs to show what the reference covers:

Mr. Gordon Grant said the matter dated back to the year 1907, when he was secretary of the Asiatic Exclusion League, and when much rumour was in the air as to the bogus entry of merchants, merchants' sons, &c. He was deputed to investigate the matter and saw the interpreter to the United States Immigration Department to try to find out the methods adopted by the United States. In reply to Mr. McCrossan, witness said he never went with Payne of Seattle to Col. Dudley. Witness told of the information he had received from the United States interpreter by his subsequent visit to the wharf where he witnessed the examining methods carried out there by Yip On. He reported to the League that there was absolutely nothing that guaranteed Yip On's methods.

He went down again and heard another examination through an interpreter by Mr. Bowell. After it was over, Mr. Bowell asked what the witness wanted and he said he was there on behalf of the League. He considered that Mr. Bowell was not intentionally rude, but his manner was decidedly rough.

He stated his reports were sent to His Excellency Earl Grey.

Knowing the position that Mr. McInnes occupied and that he had followed around pretty generally the people who had attended an Asiatic Exclusion League meeting in Seattle, he implicitly trusted him. Mr. McInnes had said that he hoped to see more riots as it was relieving the matter of the strain between the United States and Japan.

Mr. T. R. E. McInnes, the witness said, came out to look into the question of Chinese immigration, and at the request of the hon. Frank Oliver and Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and that his final interview had been with Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Then on page 11 of the same date:

Witness had learned from the newspapers that a telegram had gone from Mr. Senkler, asking that Yip On should be reinstated but he had by that time learned the nature of the evidence against Yip On. The telegram he sent was sent because he had heard particularly that the Liberals wanted the matter hushed up.

'The names?' suggested Judge Murphy.

'Mr. Senkler's particularly, and Mr. Kelley's.'

'Who gave you the information?'

'Mr. Foster. He had discussed the matter with Mr. 'Andy' Tyson, Mr. A. M. Pound, Mr. D. Menzies and Mr. J. J. Graham and Mr. E. E. Teetzel, but he could not say that anyone but Mr. Foster told him particularly of a desire to have the matter hushed up.' When he saw Lew the latter said there were stronger people than Mr. Senkler and Mr. Kelly.

Mr. McCrossan.—Did that mean Mr. Templeman?

Witness did not know. After a question from Judge Murphy, witness said Mr. Templeman was directly under the influence of Mr. Kelly, which Judge Murphy explained was a statement which neither agreed with his own or Mr. Foster's evidence.

I call the attention of the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) to the injustice he is doing himself in leaving the matter there, because Mr. Murphy is an appointee of his own and seems to have stood up for him pretty sturdily during the investigation. It is due to the minister, if he can get flattering comments like this from the judge, and I think 'flattering' is not too strong, to state his position. I would like it to be noted that I give publication to the first certificate of character to the minister even in advance of his own action.

The witness—

Notwithstanding what the judge had said, this Liberal witness stuck to his guns.

—thought that Mr. Templeman would be unduly influenced by Mr. Kelly.

Witness further mentioned in regard to this stated conflict of circumstances that after what he had heard he considered Hon. Mr. Templeman, despite his good resolutions, might make another fall from grace. That he repeated what he had already testified to concerning Mr. Foster's statement as to what Mr. Foster had said concerning Mr. Templeman's first remark as to burking the inquiry and his subsequent remark as to moving to help it along. Then witness referred at length to the first investigation when Dr. Chang told him that he felt that the men were not genuine although they were as the doctor humourously put it coming by different steamers, they were all in the same boat.

Public opinion on the progress of this investigation is indicated by these headlines in the 'News-Advertiser' of January 18, page 1:

WATCHMEN WHO DID NOT WATCH.

Mr. Justice Murphy makes pointed comments on the state of affairs in watchmen's department on water front.

'CHARITY ORGANIZATION AND INEBRIATES' HOME.'

And the paper starts the summary of the day's proceedings thus:

'A sort of charity organization and inebriates' home.' This was the very pointed remark made by Judge Murphy at yesterday afternoon's session of the Royal Commission

on Chinese Immigration, following a recital of the list of the halt and the lame, and as is alleged, generally intoxicated, who seemed to have formed the government line of defence on Vancouver's wharf against the wily ways of the Chinese who sought illegal entry into the city and the country.

It was Mr. E. S. Busby, the inspector of customs, who told the details of the infirmities of the old staff of watchmen employed to guard the boats. He also told how these old-timers had been replaced by new men—one of whom, by the way, fell into the water and was nearly drowned because he was unused to a boat.

Inspector Busby came armed with the official files from his department, and as they were confidential documents the witness read and dissected them as he went along, passing those which were material over to counsel for examination and discussion. From the information which, in consequence came out, it appeared that witness, as far back as 1907,recommended the dismissal, in the interests of the department, of some of the officials. The reports show that the inspector was aware of many peculiar things that were happening, and that he had at once reported them to his chief at Toronto and at Ottawa. One of the matters was in fact that the chief land waiter, Bowser, was in the habit of paying in official money to his private account and that the inspector warned him that if he continued to do so he would at once be suspended. . . . . .

Mr. W. F. McLeod was the first witness at the afternoon session. He was now a detective but was formerly connected with the Canadian Pacific railway as chief inspector of the western division police. Asked as to matters on the water front he said he had often found the customs officer was on board the ship at night and it had been continually reported to him that that officer was in the habit of going aboard after eleven and coming off between eleven and five in the morning. He might just as well have been uptown, he thought, and he believed there was just as much stuff going off irregularly as in the proper channels.

I would call the attention particularly of the prosecuting officer of the government, the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau)——

Mr. BUREAU. Go on.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I really would like the attention of the Solicitor General——

Mr. BUREAU. I have read the paper before.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If the Solicitor General has any duties they are particularly in connection with the prosecution of persons guilty of offences against the government. That, I think, is the business of the Justice Department of this country. Mr. Speaker, am I to understand that the Solicitor General refuses to be interested in this matter?

Mr. BUREAU. He is not alone in that if he does.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster.)

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like that to be taken down. He is not alone among the ministers of the Crown if he is not interested in frauds against the government aggregating at least one million dollars. That is the position taken by a member of the government speaking for himself and five of his colleagues who are present. And I would like their names to go on record. The First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur), the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), and the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman). He is not interested in frauds to the extent of a million dollars to which I am calling his attention; he is not interested in the statements which I am reading, that because of the absence of a watchman from his post of duty , as many goods leave the Canadian Pacific railway ships at Vancouver without paying duty as leave the ship upon payment of duty. That is the statement I have just read and that is what the Solicitor General says he is not interested in. Mr. Speaker, I believe the statement of the Solicitor General, I fully believe it. I do not think there is any thing in his record in this House to cast any doubt upon his perfect good faith in making the statement or to cause me to believe that he is interested in this detail of his duty as an official of the government.

Mr. W. F. McLeod was the first witness at the afternoon session. He was now a detective, but was formerly connected with the C. P. R. as chief inspector of the Western Division Police.

Asked as to matters on the water front, he said he had often found the customs officer was on board the ships at night, and it had been continually reported to him that that officer was in the habit of going aboard after eleven and coming off between eleven and five in the morning. He might just as well have been up town, he thought, and he believed there was just as much stuff going off irregularly as in the proper channel.

That is the statement as to which the Solicitor General says he has no interest and he believes he has as much interest as have his colleagues.

Inspector Busby was recalled, and continued the production of his reports from the morning session.

The first one was a letter received from Mr. B. R. McDonald, Collector of Customs at Prince Rupert, dated Sept. 3 last, in reply to one from witness, it being stated that the party who volunteered the information desired that his identity be not divulged. Mr. McDonald also drew attention to the alleged abuse of the regulation regarding minor children of merchants.

He found that when the 'Japan' was in port McPherson was on watch, also that Officer McKee found McPherson intoxicated,

but that no action beyond a reprimand was administered to McPherson. Owing to the time allotted for meals during the night, there were three periods when the vessels were unwatched, and altogether they were neglected for six half hour periods during the whole day. Witness recommended certain changes to secure more effective service.

He referred to the watchmen. Kent, one of them, was unsatisfactory. Another was physically unfit, and Warburton another was a cripple, and was unfit through drinking habits.

Judge Murphy—A sort of Charity Organization and Inebriates' Home.

On page 4 of the 'News Advertiser,' of January 18, I find:

It was reported that the Chief Inspector at Toronto in acknowledging the report stated that it had been resolved to discharge the watchmen and to engage new men, and that they should not be allowed to take any meals on the ship. He was authorized to make the arrangements after conferring with the local committee.

Mr. Gordon Grant—What does that mean?

The Liberal executive. He was to see Mr. Pound. But. any recommendations Mr. Pound sent him were subject to witness' approval.

Mr. Gordon Grant referred to some names being mentioned 'on a list.' Did witness know of any list at all? Inspector Busby said he did not . The appointments were left to the Provincial Board of Customs. There had been, however, an urgent case when he had himself appointed a man temporarily. In the ordinary way the Minister of Customs would deal with the matter.

Mr. McCrossan—Who would he apply to?

The Collector of Customs, replied witness, who went on to speak of the greatly increased work at the port, and the fact that he was often compelled to be away for months at a time. He had personally examined the present eight watchmen, and he knew that they were all good men. The first man that he found drinking would be suspended. He had given the fullest instructions as to this.

Judge Murphy—Did you ever have any names sent to you from Ottawa?

Witness said he was instructed to apply to the Liberal committee here.

The department looked to you to see that the patronage committee did not foist any improper man into the service?

The department looked to him, said witness, to see that the man had proper qualifications.

Mr. Gordon Grant asked what percentage of appointments were made during the absence of witness against those made whilst he was here, and witness replied that he could not say.

The suggestion of Mr. Gordon Grant being that Inspector Busby being a strong man and an honest official, advantage is taken of his absence from port to introduce into the service men whom he would not pass.

Asked also did he confer with any member of the patronage committee, witness said that he called once on Mr. Senkler and once on Mr. Kelly. . . . The next report referred, on July 11, 1907, to an interview by Mr. W. A. Blair, of the customs, with a man named Chin Chan, who suggested that 'easy money' was to be got. The man explained to Mr. Blair the whole modus operandi suggested to be worked with himself, Yip On, and witness as partner. The scheme included a trip to China, the arrangements for sending over Chinese in bulk, each of whom was to pay them from $600 to $700, Chinese money. On Mr. Blair inquiring, with apparent interest, how they would get their 'rake off,' Chin Chan said it was 'heap easy,' by putting the money in the bank at Hong Kong and sending a draft to a Chinese firm in Vancouver.

It was further stated that dozens of Chinese had done this, and had paid $700 to Yip Yen at Hong Kong, 'and not a cent to the Government of Canada.'

Here is an official report in the possession of the government for a long time yet nothing is done to institute prosecutions against the men carrying on these frauds.

$100,000 was said to have been cleaned up in one year in this way by a Chinese firm in shipping Chinese to Canada.

Showing that this one firm alone represented one-half of the million I have represented as the amount of the frauds proved to have been perpetrated upon the government.

Witness showed this letter to Mr. Bowell. On reporting the matter to Toronto, he was advised to give the substance of the letter to the chief landing waiter, so that he might be on his guard.

Mr. B. R. McDonald, collector of customs at Prince Rupert, is to be subpoenaed. A letter from this official gave information as to proposed methods to be carried out for illegal free entry by Chinese in the way of substitution, the idea being that for every illegal entry $20 should be paid to the interpreter and $100 to the customs officials. He had been approached by a man who thought this plan might be carried out in Prince Rupert.

This report does not say so but I saw another report, and no doubt this is in the official document held back by the government, a statement that he added that this was the system being carried out in Vancouver, and that he simply offered for Prince Rupert what had long been in operation in Vancouver.

Next was a letter, November, 1908, from Chief Landing Waiter Aiken to the inspector, telling of the search, following suspicion, of the S.S. 'Tartar.' In this letter Mr. Aiken stated he had told the collector that he and Yip On were going to search the 'Tartar,' and that the collector then stated he would advise the captain of the vessel, which Mr. Aiken considered a peculiar thing to do. He was afterwards told in a letter from the surveyor that he was to wait until the collector came back.

When the collector came down, in response to a telephone call, and Aiken told him of the surveyor's letter, showing it to him, the collector said 'it was a damned lie,' as he never said such a thing, and tore up the letter. The collector then stated they 'would search her now,' and they did so, but he got no assistance from the collector, or from Mr. Fagan, or from the ship's officers. They found thirteen Chinese in the well, ten more in the coal bunkers, and another was found the next day.

That is 24 contraband Chinamen found, involving a loss of $12,000 to the government of Canada, in this one little incident alone.

To digress for a moment from the sworn testimony of the investigation, I would like to read the comment of a very prominent citizen in Vancouver, a very prominent Liberal, a man who did more than any other individual to put into power this present government. I refer, of course, to Mr. Joseph Martin. This is reported in the 'News-Advertiser' of January 20, noticing his return on a visit to Vancouver from London, and his statement is timely in connection with the discussion of the case because Mr. Martin's mission in Vancouver was to be a witness at this Chinese investigation. Mr. Martin says:

So long as the Liberal government continue to put up all their appointments, and fill their contracts, for sale at a certain price, so long will the present condition of political affairs in British Columbia, and in Vancouver especially, be indescribably rotten. The political position in Vancouver and in British Columbia is the rottenest in the world. I do not blame the people. So long as the Liberal government continue on the course they are travelling the people will buy. I blame the Liberal government. They are grafters, and it will never be stopped until the Liberals go out of power.

The next day, in the 'News-Advertiser' of January 21, on the front page, we find this heading:

POLITICIANS AS STUMBLING BLOCK.

Summarizing the local impression of the events happening there.

Difficulty of Reforming Conditions Governing Admission of Chinese at Vancouver is laid at Liberal's door.

This is the introductory passage:

It was said yesterday, before the Royal Commission, that 'the difficulty of reforming things here was due to the influence of the local politicians. By this remark was meant the Liberal executive.

Evidence further indicating deplorable conditions which—unaltered by the Dominion government notwithstanding their knowledge of them—existed in the Customs Department of this city for so long a time was again furnished from the examination of Mr. Greer, deputy surveyor of customs at the port.

To show that it was not a matter of great difficulty to stop these frauds or prevent them, if the government had desired to stop or prevent them, I will read this little passage referring to Victoria, where, as I said before, there is an honest administration of the customs. It will be found on page 13 of the 'News-Advertiser' of January 21:

Everybody knew, suggested counsel, that at Victoria, Collector Newberry was refusing to pass these passports. Had he heard of that? Witness had not, nor had he ever heard that Chinese could not be passed at Victoria, but could be passed at Vancouver.

Other evidence illustrated that the collector at Victoria had made an official report to the government calling their attention to the fact of the extraordinary number of these passports getting in at Vancouver, while hardly any were offered to him at Victoria, and suggesting that the number was caused by fraud. Now, we have another Liberal called in evidence —Mr. Norman McLean. This is a gentleman whom the Minister of Inland Revenue knows very well indeed.

Mr. Norman McLean was called by Mr. McCrossan. He had no recollection of a reported conversation with Judge Grant, concerning immigration frauds. He was clear, however, he never said anything as to Chinese immigration frauds. He may have said it was rumoured of course, he could not say as to that, but he really had no recollection of any conversation. He was not interested one way or the other and knew nothing about it.

By Mr. Gordon Grant—He was told that Ottawa officials had reports on matters here, but he could not go as far as to say that it reflected on Mr. Bowell's honesty. It referred to the honesty of the officers of the department, he understood.

It was told him that the difficulty in reforming things here was due to the activity of the local politicians?

'Yes.'

'Mr. Robert Kelly was mentioned?'

Yes.

Here we have Mr. Kelly, to whom I called attention before. Wherever we turn Mr. Robert Kelly is the pivot and Mr. Robert Kelly continues until to-day to be the pivot of every action of this government at Vancouver.

'Mr. Robert Kelly got Hon. Mr. Templeman to do what he wanted?'

'Yes.'

Judge Murphy—'In Vancouver or at Ottawa?'

'Everywhere.'

'And to reform things you would have to reform Mr. Kelly?'

'No, Mr. Templeman.' (Laughter.)

There was laughter in Vancouver when they were told that to reform things you

would have to reform Mr. Templeman rather than Mr. Kelly.

Judge Murphy—'And that would lead to the reform of Mr. Kelly?'

Did witness remember, asked Mr. Gordon Grant, that some years ago when Mr. Aiken was given the position of Mr. Schlater and Mr. George Macdonald made a very strenuous 'pull' to get the position for Mr. Fagan? Witness said he was not familiar with that matter, and on leaving the witness stand the judge told him that he would like to have the name of the man who said they could not reform Mr. Templeman except by first reforming Mr. Kelly.

An hon. MEMBER. Time; carried.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would say to the hon. gentleman that if he would stand up and identify himself his name might appear on the official record for his sole contribution to the business of the House this session. Mr. T. R. E. McInnis of Ottawa was called, and his evidence was reported in the 'News-Advertiser' of January 22, page 4.

Mr. Crossan resumed.

'Then you brought to the attention of the Premier certain things?' 'Yes, I did.'

'When would that be? What year?'

'Well, last July at Calgary. I think it was about the end of July, or it might have been in August.'

'That would be when he was in his tour west?'. 'Yes.'

'Following these facts were you unofficially retained by the Premier to investigate?' 'I could not say exactly as to that.'

'Voluntarily?' 'Well, no.'

'Without a retainer?' 'So far as Chinese matters were concerned, yes.'

'What were the facts you brought to the attention of the Premier at Calgary?' 'I brought to his attention that I had reported certain facts to Hon. Frank Oliver on November 10, 1909.'

'Why did you make a report to Mr. Oliver? I understand he has nothing to do with the Department of Chinese immigration'

'That's right. I was acting in an advisory capacity to the immigration department generally. I was officially retained to look into the whole matter of immigration, to draft a new Act, and to advise thereon. One of the things I advised should be done was to have Chinese immigration administered by the Immigration Department. I felt that, otherwise, a lot of bungling would happen, if not worse.'

'Then Mr. Oliver did not go out of his department to have you go into the working of another department.'

'No, not officially. Mr. Oliver felt it was an anomaly that the Chinese immigration Act should be administered by another department but at the same time he did not, I suppose, want to tread on Sir Richard's toes. If you were to take it from the Trade and Commerce Department they would have very little to do.'

Here we have an insight into some of the family quarrels of these gentlemen; Trade and Commerce and Interior scrapping as to which should have control of immigration. I would not suggest that the value of the consideration has anything to do with the desire to possess on one side, or the reluctance to give up on the other, but I would suggest that as under the administration of the Department of Trade and Commerce we are suffering such an appalling loss to our revenue, the Minister of Trade and Commerce should give up this Chinese immigration service which is about the only thing that remains in his department. Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if we get down to the estimates we will be doing a splendid public service if we strike out in toto the vote for the Trade and Commerce Department because here we have the evidence—second hand evidence it is true—of another minister of the Crown that if you cut out the Chinese business from the Trade and Commerce Department there is nothing left for the department to do. We have also the evidence that the Department of Trade and Commerce is doing nothing with Chinese immigration except to permit these wholesale frauds to go unchallenged.

'When you were in Vancouver in November, 1909, and submitted a lengthy report to Mr. Oliver you were reporting only off your own bat?

'Not quite. No. I understood that the government wished advice on the whole subject of immigration.'

'That is Mr. Oliver?' 'Yes, and involved in that I brought in the opium matter.' Witness then referred to his report on the whole of the work, and a letter was read from Mr. W. D. Scott, superintendent of the Immigration Department, in which it was mentioned that witness was to receive $10 a day, expenses and a pass.

'That would be an official retainer by the Department of the Interior to inquire into the working of the Department of Immigration?'

'It might be open to that meaning. I understood I had a free hand to look into anything I wanted to.'

An hon. MEMBER. Louder.

Mr. TAYLOR (Westminster). If the hon. gentleman who calls louder had it poured into his ears in trumpet tones that $1,000,000 was being stolen from the treasury of this country without the thieves being punished, it would make no difference to him in his support of the government. I doubt whether the information that the treasury was being robbed would make any difference to the interrupter whether he heard it in trumpet tones, or in the mildest whisper, If I thought I would impress the hon. member I would speak louder, but I feel that the effort would be wasted.

'Do you know whether that is the custom at Ottawa?' 'No. Quite the contrary.'

'This was a special occasion?' 'Yes. Mr. Oliver wished in no way to encroach on Sir

Richard's department. He did not intend to interfere in any way with Sir Richard's department.'

'Do you call that interference?' 'No. I think he was, perhaps, preparing for a possible change in the administration of the Chinese Act. That it would be better for the Chinese Act to be administered in the Immigration Department.'

Judge Murphy asked who was authority for the letter, and witness replied that it was Mr. Scott, who had full authority. He had in view the working of the Act in the new provinces and British Columbia. In consequence witness drafted the Bill now going through the House. Mr. Scott simply intended that witness should see how the new Act would work out. It was not in his department.

'And the Premier never commissioned you to look into the matter. That is clear enough from your statement?'

'Not at all.'

Asked for further information witness said it would be rather a long story.

'We will take a year to hear it, if we have to do so,' said the judge.

Mr. McInnes then went on to say that he felt it was a mistake to have a head-tax on the Chinese, and that a number should be let in free. They had to wait, however, to see how it worked out with Japan. He suggested to the Premier that the tax should be lifted. It might be in the Premier's mind to inaugurate such a policy if it should be considered in the interests of the Dominion as a whole. Witness did not think that he had ever received any verbal, written, or direct instructions from Sir Wilfrid, but——

'As a friend of the government you have given this advice?'

'Yes.'

After hearing this explanation Mr. S. S. Taylor remarked that it was not such a very long story.

Mr. McCrossan, reading from the letter of 10th November, 1909, to Mr. Oliver regarding illegal entry of Chinese into the province and to the smuggling of opium, came to a passage in which it was stated that the government according to witness' knowledge, was losing at least $30,000 annually, and asked witness what was his reason for that statement.

It was, he replied, as the result of observation, and from what he had been told by reliable Chinese.

'What are their names?'

'I do not know that I will give those names.'

Judge Murphy.—You will have to do so, Mr. McInnes.

Witness then mentioned the name of Ow Yang King, Chinese Consul, at present in Mexico, Lew Gee Wing, Lee Kee, David Lew and Shum Moon. There were others whom he could not recollect. He would say that those he had mentioned were the most important.

Mr. S. S. Taylor thought that witness should give the other names, but the latter replied that this was impossible, as he did not remember them.

'Did they say that the government was losing $30,000?'

No, but he gathered from them that it was quite a lot of money.

The next part of the letter was in reference to smuggling to the United States through the Point Roberts route. Did he know anything definite about that. No; merely what he had been told by officers at Seattle.

Here is another bouquet for my hon. friend the minister from British Columbia, handed out by an official of his own government:

On October 28 witness communicated with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, telling him that the appointment of Poon Shun Lun was made on the recommendation of Hon. Mr. Templeman, who, although he was well acquainted with matters of western Canada, was not at all in the position of being a special authority on Chinese immigration methods. He also mentioned that Mr. Templeman had, according to that officer's statement, tried to dissuade Mr. Foster from his investigations, and had also tried to dissuade the Department of Trade and Commerce from the inquiry, and had insisted that Yip On should be reinstated.

Judge Murphy here took occasion to remark that he invited any member of the public who could speak of rumors to come to the court, when they could be investigated. It had been for this reason that he wanted the attendance of Mr. McInnes.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at 8 o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have but little to add to the sordid story, the recital of which occupied the attention of the House this afternoon, but there are still a few passages which I would like to put on record to complete one or two points as to which some difference of opinion was expressed.

When the House rose at six o'clock, I had been reading from the evidence of Mr. McInnes at Vancouver, and the proposal to change the system of Chinese immigration to make it correspond with that respecting the Japanese. Continuing the reading from the 'News-Advertiser,' I find in the issue of January 24th, in the review of Mr. McInnes's evidence, the following:

Amongst the things he said yesterday was the statement that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had spoken to him of the abolition of the Chinese head tax, and he mentioned generally, that the Premier had said what a great thing it would be in the interests of trade. Another statement made by Mr. McInnes was that he thought that Canada had blundered in every way in its entire Chinese policy. Code names for about a score of prominent government and local personages were disclosed, and provoked a good deal of merriment amongst the crowd assembled. It was not explained why Mr. Robert Kelly's code name was 'Jew.'

Then in the 'News-Advertiser' of January 24th at page 5, Mr. McInnes, in reply to another query stated that Mr. O'Hara started this investigation off his own bat. Mr.

McInnes asked Mr. O'Hara whether he wished him to continue as he had other matters in hand. A letter of October 21st from witness to Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated that witness called on Mr. Paterson, who thought that, so far as opium smuggling was concerned, any sudden or drastic action such as was taken in the case of Yip On would be unwise, but a public investigation might be desirable. He had also an interview with Mr. McKenzie King, who advocated an amendment to the Opium Act, without a public inquiry.

At the bottom of the same column I find:

It was also mentioned that recent proceedings at Vancouver had prevented the revenue being defrauded out of $17,500 head tax on 35 Chinese, picked out on two ships; also that the recent proceedings had justified the temporary appointment of Lew.

The next was a letter dated October 29, to witness from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who said he had some exception to take to what witness said of the Hon. Mr. Templeman. The Premier said: 'Of course, he is my colleague, and so long as he occupies that position I cannot put his advice aside. He may be wrong in his judgment, but his intentions, I am sure, are above suspicion.'

Another letter brought out a remark from witness that he did not wish to come to this investigation. If he had not been here, he said, he would have been in Washington on a very important matter, which would have meant a deal to him.

A letter from Sir Wilfrid Laurier's private secretary acknowledged with thanks the letters and enclosures from witness in which 'there was excellent advice, but the writer might mention that Judge Murphy had been appointed commissioner.'

In reference to the statement made by the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) this afternoon charging me with suppressing his telegram, which he said was in the evidence, I told him then that, from my search in the evidence, I did not find it. I am surprised that the hon. minister should so recklessly make a statement of that nature reflecting upon a colleague in the House, when the record—which he should have known—shows that what he said to the House was not correct:

I read in the 'News-Advertiser' of January 25th, page 1:

Counsel then stated it appeared that the telegram from Hon. Mr. Templeman to Sir Richard Cartwright was reported by the telegraph company to be missing. Mr. McCrossan said he did not know whether the copy was amongst the files, as he had not been through them yet.

Now that is the telegram the hon. minister so flippantly told the House this afternoon was in this record, and should be read by me.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). The telegram I sent to Sir Richard Cartwright, and the only telegram I sent was produced in evidence. It was procured at a telegraph office at Vancouver, and published in the papers. When I gave evidence I produced a copy of the telegram which I procured from the Trade and Commerce Department myself. If the hon. gentleman will read my evidence he will find the telegram.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). If the Speaker will permit me I will read this again. It is from the report contained in the 'News-Advertiser,' and I have no doubt it is correct. The hon minister told the House that I suppressed it from the evidence I quoted. I have covered the evidence day by day from the beginning, without finding such a telegram.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am not charging the hon. gentleman with suppressing anything, but what I do say is that the hon. gentleman charged that I had sent a telegram recommending that the investigation should not proceed. I dispute that absolutely. I only sent one telegram and it was not to that effect.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have read from the sworn evidence. I have not gone beyond January 25th yet. I will read the statement from the 'News-Advertiser' again.

Counsel then stated it appeared that the telegram from the Hon. Mr. Templeman to Sir Richard Cartwright, was reported by the telegraph company to be missing. Mr. McCrossan said he did not know whether the copy was amongst the files, as he had not been through them yet.

Still quoting from the issue of the 'News-Advertiser' of January 25th, page 5, I find the following:

In connection with the telegram sent in the name of Mr. J. H. Senkler, K.C., suggesting 'the reinstatement of Yip On, and expressing the objection entertained to the drastic action of Mr. O'Hara in suspending collector Bowell,' the letter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier of October 3rd last stated that the Premier had found there was a very strong prima facie case against the Chinese interpreter, and that he had been properly suspended.

Sir Wilfrid added that 'the public are so keen about this oriental business that we should put ourselves into very serious trouble if we were to create the impression that we were not doing our full duty to have the law carried out. If you have any reason to think otherwise, please write to me and give me your full views.'

In his letter to the Premier of October 8th, Mr. Senkler stated he thought the executive of the Liberal association were wrong in sending the telegram in his name in his absence. They should, if they had felt so strongly on the matter as they apparently did, have sent it in the name of the secretary

or vice-president, or acting chairman. However, he personally thought most Chinese were proverbially dishonest, and if it were possible to get an interpreter who was not a Chinese, it would be infinitely preferable.

In the 'Advertiser' of January 26th there is a review of the evidence given by Mr. Jos. Martin, K.C., which is as follows:

Mr. Joseph Martin, K.C., M.P., was the star witness yesterday. His evidence was not exactly evidence in regard to the definite points of the inquiry, but it was a scathing indictment, of 'the graft he believed had permeated every department.'

His was a meteoric appearance, and he burst in alike on the commission the Dominion government, the local Liberal executive and Mr. Robert Kelly, its chief, in particular. His charges included the statement that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was primarily to blame, and that the Premier 'could stop it all in five minutes if he wanted to do so;' that every department in which the Liberal government spent money or had any control in British Columbia went through the local Liberal organization here, over which Mr. Robert Kelly was the head; that Mr. Robert Kelly had the control of every thing in regard to the government's business and in return supplied funds for the government campaigns. These were two of the statements made by 'fighting Joe' and listened to with absorbing attention by the crowded assembly who were present.

Judge Murphy pointed out that Foster had said twice that Mr. Templeman said to him 'Foster, I want you to stop this.' Witness said Foster did not say that to him, but that he said that Mr. Kelly and Dr. Munroe attempted to stop the matter.

Now, there are reams of evidence in addition to what I have read. The inquiry proceeded in Vancouver and Victoria for some time after January 31, to which the files from which I am reading extend, and which contains all that I propose to read to the House. I think I have read enough to show that a most appalling condition of affairs has existed in Vancouver during the last four years; that persons in a position to know how the revenue has been defrauded have been making continual and repeated complaints since that time; that they have gone the round of almost the whole cabinet with these complaints; that no relief appears from any quarter until Mr. O'Hara a deputy minister saw fit, off his own bat, to institute an investigation which inspector Foster is declared by Judge Murphy to have said the Minister of Inland Revenue himself wished to have stopped. But the matter had gone too far to be stopped. It went on, we are told, largely as the result of the fear inspired by the Drummond and Arthabaska election which showed that it was possible to conceive that a day of reckoning could come. The evidence has been in the possession of the government, some of it since December, and the last of it since April last.

And we wind up with a statement in this House a few days ago that, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce the matter is under consideration, and the ministers do not know when, if ever, that report will be laid before the House, or whether any action will be taken in connection with it. Now, the whole indictment, so far as the smuggling of Chinese into Canada is concerned, is against the Department of Trade and Commerce primarily to show its utter inefficiency, and its entire neglect of the business entrusted to it. We are told that a colleague of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is doing his level best within the cabinet to relieve the paralysis by having control of the Chinese transferred from a dead department to a live one. We are told by another employee of the government that the only reason that this is not done is that if you take this from the Trade and Commerce Department there will be nothing left for it. In the face of all that, this House is supposed to be content with the statement that the government will not act except on the initiative of the Trade and Commerce Department. I, for one, am not satisfied with that. I am quite satisfied that those of my constituents who form part of the population of the city of Vancouver are not satisfied, that they are earnestly desirous that the government should take some steps to put an end to the gross scandal prevailing there, and they would call me seriously to account if, in common with other members, I was so derelict in my duty to them as to allow the session to pass without some exposition of the state of affairs there, and a demand that some action shall be taken by the government. I leave it to the judgment of the House whether or not the facts indicate that we should put upon the record the opinion of this House as to the failure of the government to deal with these scandals, and to punish the perpetrators who, for a period of many years, have gone unwhipped of justice.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). I thought that some minister of the Crown would give an answer to the very serious indictment brought against the government or give some explanation of the masterly inactivity which appears to have characterized the government in connection with this affair from first to last. I thought the minister for British Columbia (Mr. Templeman) especially would say something. But he chooses to remain silent. It seems to me that this is an extraordinary situation, and yet it is not so different from those we have had to deal with during the last few years. The government found themselves in this situation because of trouble over which, perhaps, in the first

place, they had no control. But the action which they took in the premises was not calculated to impress the public with the belief that they were very anxious to punish the wrongdoers or stop the wrongdoing, otherwise we should have had different evidence of it from that which we have to-day. Rumours of wrongdoing, dishonesty, and fraud in connection with Chinese immigration, and government officials was brought to the notice of the government several years ago. It was brought to their notice in the most pointed and, direct way, by letters from their officials, by letters from their friends, by conversations they themselves had with those in whom they ought to have full confidence. But, notwithstanding, they appear to have paid no attention to it, and allowed these frauds to contipue. There was finally sufficient information brought to their notice to induce the government to appoint a Royal Commission to inquire into the matter.

They did appoint that commission, and the inquiry went on. It commenced about the time of the opening of this session last November. That inquiry was confined to two ports, Vancouver and Victoria, and so was not widespread, and did not require a long time to take the evidence. Now, seven months after its appointment, parliament is anxious to see that report, but we are denied that right although the report has been in the hands of the government for two months. Why are we denied that report? Because the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not here. Because the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who happens to occupy a seat in the Upper Chamber, which has adjourned until August 10, is off enjoying himself at his summer residence and may not put in an appearance until that date or afterwards.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. He will be here to-morrow.

Mr. SPROULE. Is that not strange conduct on the part of ministers and on the part of the Prime Minister himself? In the absence of the minister of any department one of his colleagues invariably administers his department, and surely it was the duty of the minister so acting to at least make an effort to procure this report for parliament. It is a strange parody on ministerial responsibility and executive duty. It is not what the country and this House demands. This House may at any time collapse from its own unfortunate conduct, and parliament be dissolved, and, in the absence of that report we will have no information to give to the country to enable the electorate of Canada to judge of the action of the government in connection with that transaction. Perhaps a year after the election that report may be presented to the House.

If the evidence given in the press is at all reliable an awful state of affairs has been disclosed. We see a minister of the Crown controlled by one of his supporters out there in the Tammany of Vancouver, Mr. Kelly, and an executive or patronage committee, a confidential committee who seem to control the whole affairs of this government in that great city. It was the duty of the Minister of the Interior to look after immigration, but he has done nothing in this matter. The attention of the Minister of Customs was drawn to these frauds in the smuggling of opium and Chinese into the country, but nothing has been done. Then we have the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) who belongs to the city, who knows all these men, and who has been acting through that committee, that Tammany ring for years, and has had brought to his attention over and over again the discreditable conduct of this committee. Yet there is no effort to do away with it or to purge the uncleanness of that stable out there. So it goes on, masterly inactivity, unconcern, indifference, dishonesty, culpability, crime, fraud, and everything, all brought home to the government in the plainest possible way if this evidence is reliable, and yet the evidence is kept from the House at the time we ought to have it. The report of the commissioner was finished early in May, but it has not been presented. This is not the only case of the kind; we had a similar condition with reference to the Marine Department, and were told that everything was all right there. The government from session to session were urged to make an inquiry, but they were able to sidetrack it in some way. Finally a commission was appointed. They attempted to prevent the carrying out of that investigation, to burke the inquiry after it was begun. The commissioners had not time to cover more than a portion of the ground, but they made a partial report of what they inquired into. That report disclosed the most disgraceful state of affairs that was ever known in the running of a department of the government here in Ottawa.

Then what happened? The ministers of the Crown commenced to abuse the commissioners and the commissioners were indicted before this House because of the report they had presented. They were the criminals, they were held up before the people because they had honestly endeavoured to do their duty. The government could not absolutely burke that inquiry although they stopped it after the inquiry was partially made. We had following that another one—the Printing Bureau.

The opposition endeavoured to have an inquiry, but they were not allowed to do so. It was voted down because it was said there was nothing wrong. Everything that had transpired that was wrong had been righted and yet there is only a fraction of what should come out that has been laid before this House to enable the House to judge of the state of affairs in the Printing Bureau. In every one of these instances the same tactics were followed by the government. The members of the House were kept in the dark as far as possible. The commissioners were prevented from going on with that inquiry as they should have gone on with it. In the case of the Department of Marine and Fisheries there was a second investigation that disclosed a great deal more wrong-doing than the first one and even that only covered part of the ground. From information in our possession we have reason to believe that there are other departments that are as bad as this, if they were inquired into. The opposition have tried over and over again to get a commission of inquiry with full powers to make an investigation into these departments, but every time it has been voted down upon the declaration of ministers that everything was all right and that there was no need for investigation. This, if it had been brought up in this House, would have been treated in the same way. But while there was a commission appointed and while it did bring out a lot of valuable information, the House is denied the right to see that information, to read, analyse and sift the evidence and present it to the people of the country, who in all human probability will be shortly called upon to express their verdict at the polls in regard to the conduct of this government during their term of office. We cannot have it. Is that treating the electors of the country right? It is an injustice to this House that should not be tolerated, it is an injustice to the electors that should not be tolerated, and I can only hope that when the day comes that the people must sit in judgment upon them they will have this case before their minds and that they will mete out even-handed justice to their representatives in this House who have made this effort to prevent this information being given to the House or the country as it should be, so that it can be dealt with in a proper way.

The hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) said that this thing was under consideration. How long will it remain under consideration before it shall fructify in results? With regard to the efforts made to recognize the veterans of the Fenian raid-fiasco, why, it has been under consideration, for 14 years and there is no indication that they have reached a conclusion yet. From time to time we have had that declaration from the Prime Minister, from the Minister of Militia and from other members of the government. It is still under consideration. As in this case the Minister of Justice declared that it was under their consideration. What does that mean to the House or the people of the country? If we are to judge what it means by what we know of other cases where the same expressions have been used and where we have had time to ascertain what the results have been we are justified in coming to the conclusion that it was under consideration for the purpose of keeping it from the people, keeping it from this House, keeping it in the dark, rather than for the purpose of bringing it to light. I think it is disgraceful, I think it is discreditable, I think it does not reflect credit upon any member of the present government. It happens that by an accident of life some of the members of this government must be in the Senate, but when the House of Commons desires information and if the Senate is not in session there is the easiest way in the world to have it presented to this House, instead of using the fact that the Senate has adjourned and that the minister is off on his summer holidays as an excuse for refusing to give the House the evidence of that important commission which it ought to have to-night and which it ought to be able to read over carefully and take action upon before the House has probably collapsed and a new election is held.

Right hon. Sir WILFRID LAURIER (Prime Minister). Mr. Speaker, I did not rise after my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) had taken his seat for the reason, which I will give him very frankly, that, in my estimation, the speech which he made was not so much for the purpose of obtaining information as for the purpose of killing time and obstructing the business of the House. My hon. friend spoke for a matter of three or four hours, certainly for three hours, and there is no reason at all, if he had been anxious to have the information, why he should not have had the answer which he wanted to have in ten minutes. My hon, friend (Mr. Sproule) has just taken his seat after having devoted fifteen minutes to the same subject and under such circumstances I owe it to him to give him the answer which he requires. An investigation has been made into the condition of things which prevailed in British Columbia with regard to the administration of the Chinese Act. This investigation was held by a Judge of the Supreme Court, Mr. Justice Murphy. His report was sent to my right hon. friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright) who handed it over to the Department of Justice for the purpose of taking action upon it. My hon. friend the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth)

asked me to look over the report to-day and I had a conference with him. I will give frankly to the House the reason why the report has not been placed upon the table of the House. Mr. Justice Murphy's report is a very voluminous one, containing at least 100 pages of foolscap typewritten matter, if not more. I had no time to read it in its entirety, but I looked into it at the conclusion. The conclusion of the report is that certain parties should be prosecuted. These parties have not been prosecuted because they are not at this moment in the country. Mr. Justice Murphy's second recommendation is that this report should not be made public until the prosecutions have been instituted. I have not had the report in my hands to read it over, but I presume that if the report and the evidence were disclosed it would, to some extent, interfere with the administration of justice and with reaching the culprits. Under such circumstances we have to make up our minds either to make the report public and therefore give this advantage to the culprits which Mr. Justice Murphy says should not be given or we will have to keep the report to ourselves and be subjected to the very charitable inference that we have something to conceal. I said a moment ago, that I have not yet had an opportunity of looking at the report. It is my intention to look over it with my hon. friend the Minister of Justice in order to discuss with him what action should be taken upon the report. Then, we shall make further communication to the House and state whether we shall make the report public or not make it public as we deem best in the public interest.

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the right hon. gentleman why the Minister of Justice answered in these words:

> The report has been received by the Department of Trade and Commerce, but in the absence of the minister, I am not able to say anything in reference to it except that it is under consideration.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce is not to be interpreted as it has been interpreted by my hon. friend that he is to be absent so long as the Senate is adjourned. The minister is to be in Ottawa to-morrow and it is my purpose to discuss this matter with him.

Mr. SPROULE. The Minister of Justice gave the idea that the report was in the Trade and Commerce Department, and that he knew nothing about it, whereas it was in the Justice Department, and he might as well have told the House so.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The First Minister has been so unfair as to say that I have brought this matter up simply for the purpose of wasting time. I give that statement a most positive contradiction.

Mr. TALBOT. You can contradict it if you like.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I do not expect to convince the hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot). I brought the matter up in pursuance of my duty to a large number of citizens of Vancouver who are my constituents, and in pursuance of my duty to my constituents generally. I asked for this report on two previous occasions without making any remarks at all. The first time I was promised it and the next time the promise had vanished and I was given no information at all.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I must give my hon. friend the credit of this disclaimer but I am sorry to say his prolixity gave a different impression.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Prime Minister ought to make an apology rather than an insinuation. This matter has been in the public press for months past; the evidence has been taken, and largely printed in the newspapers of the country; a report has been made; parliament re-assembles, and there is not one word from any member of the government with regard to that investigation or report. No explanation is given by the ministry as to why the report of that commission has not been submitted to parliament and the inquiry of my hon. friend (Mr. Taylor) is met in an evasive way. As a natural result of that, the evidence published in the press of the country has been placed in part upon 'Hansard' as it was the duty of my hon. friend from New Westminster to do in view of the apparent unwillingness of the government to give any information to the House or to the country. When the Prime Minister says that this report is not submitted to parliament because its submission might interfere with the course of justice I do not understand what he means. I am bound to say that the Prime Minister has not expressed himself in a manner that would carry conviction on that point in my mind. The inquiry was open to the public, and the evidence was published in the newspapers and it does not seem that there can be anything in the suggestion that the placing of the evidence on the table of the House would give these men information which they have not at present. I do not understand the suggestion of the Prime Minister in that respect.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend (Mr. Borden) was not in the House when I stated, that, this morning I had a conference with the Minister of Justice upon the subject. I had not time to read

the voluminous report, but I read the conclusion wherein Mr. Justice Murphy suggests that certain parties should be prosecuted. I am informed by the Department of Justice that these parties are not in the country. Mr. Justice Murphy also recommends that the report should not be made public previous to these prosecutions. That is why the report has not been tabled. I will see the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Trade and Commerce about it again to-morrow, and we will have to decide then whether we shall bring down the report and give to those who are to be prosecuted an advantage which Mr. Justice Murphy says they should not have, or whether, in order to clear ourselves, we shall act against the recommendation of the commissioner and bring the report down.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would not for a moment criticise a report made by Mr. Justice Murphy, or any other commissioner, but I am not at present able to appreciate the point he makes. I presume there can be nothing in the report which is not founded upon the evidence which was taken in public, and which every one of the men implicated knows. If the Prime Minister on the day parliament met had stated what he has stated to-night, and left it to the members of the House to press or not press for the report, it would have been better. Instead of that, we have an answer of an evasive character in regard to the report, and my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) in the face of that was in duty bound to extort from the government some explanation of their very extraordinary conduct in connection with this matter. I had not followed this subject very closely in the public press, and to-day I have been absolutely astounded at the evidence which seems to have been given before Mr. Justice Murphy in connection with Chinese immigration. Some of that evidence is of the most shocking character, and I should have thought that any government involved as this government has been, would have felt it its duty at the earliest moment to make an explanation to parliament, if any could be made, as to the extraordinary revelations made. I find it stated—not by Conservatives, but by prominent members of the Liberal party in the province of British Columbia—that there was actually a quarrel among them as to how the plunder from the public treasury should be divided. One would suppose that such evidence would bring from the government a prompt statement that effective measures would be taken immediately not only to end such an intolerable condition of affairs, but to bring to justice those who have been plundering the people of Canada for many years past.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). Mr. Speaker, the right hon. the Prime Minister has stated that the hon. member for New Westminster was taking up the time of the House, and carrying on this discussion purely for the purpose of wasting the time of this House. To me it seems that the party who is guilty of all this loss of time, if there is any, is the right hon. the Prime Minister himself, because had he earlier in the day made a statement such as he has made now, the discussion might have been curtailed, that is, provided the right hon. gentleman had gone a little farther, and stated to the House that in view of the fact that departments of his government have been so derelict in their duty as to hold this report over for three months in order to enable all those likely to be prosecuted to get out of the country, he would bring down the report at once. In fact, he did not apparently know that some one was to be prosecuted until to-day, nor did the Department of Justice know that the judge who made this report had suggested that some one should be prosecuted. For months that report has been pigeonholed in the Department of Trade and Commerce, and the men guilty of defrauding this country of about $1,000,000 have no doubt been aided by information given to them directly or indirectly to leave this country, and thus avoid any prosecution. This is not the first time that the government has been asked for this report. The hon. member for New Westminster has again and again asked that it be presented to the House. One would have thought that in a matter not only involving a great money loss to this country, but showing that a most flagrant conspiracy existed in Vancouver to defraud this country, and that officers employed by a department of the government were in that conspiracy, the government would have as quickly as possible taken action, and laid the report on the table of the House. Instead of that, they have done nothing, and the guilty men are now out of the country. Certainly there was loss of time there on the part of this government. Under the circumstances there was only one course for the party on this side of the House to pursue, and that was to place on the records of this House the evidence taken by the commission as disclosed in the newspaper reports, and show as clearly as possible the facts connected with this great Tong war carried on between two factions of the Liberal party in British Columbia in the last few months. The birds have flown, and the fact that the Prime Minister has announced in this House that certain people are to be prosecuted is warning to those peo-

ple who are out of the country that if they return they are liable to be placed under arrest. The cat is out of the bag. So far as future prosecutions are concerned, the report might as well be placed on the table of this House by the Prime Minister to-day or to-morrow as a month or six months from now, and I think he should state that he will place the report on the table to-morrow. The facts disclosed in that report are to all intents and purposes public property at this moment. In justice to this House and the country, I think the evidence should be placed on the records of this House. The hon. member for New Westminster has placed on the records the evidence up to the beginning of February. As his physical powers are not equal to his quoting the evidence for two or three hours more, I think I am justified in assisting him by proceeding to read the evidence taken at the remaining sittings of that commission in British Columbia. That is the only way in which this House can have the facts before it, and then we shall be able to deal with this question in an intelligent manner. It would be very absurd for us to bring in a motion casting any reflection on the government in this matter before we had all the evidence before us, and I am sure that hon. gentlemen opposite, who are so closely and intently listening to the evidence, will be pleased to read it in 'Hansard' to-morrow. The Minister of Customs is at the head of the department which has to do with the collection of this tax, and he is the first man who should have taken action against these frauds and rascalities; yet he as the principal watch-dog has been absent during the whole afternoon, when this sordid tale has been told in the House. Let us see how this thing occurred. We know that the law with reference to Chinese immigration was changed in 1907, permitting merchants, students and merchants' sons to come to this country. A vast conspiracy was formed, with its ramifications in China and Canada, by which men in China, on payment of $100, were made partners in firms of merchants there. Some who were cooks or laundrymen were in this way raised to the dignity of merchants, and they received consular certificates from China on which were placed their photographs, and in many cases were given new names.

As near as I can understand it they were met by a man supposed to be an agent of this government, and he handed them gold coin to the tune of $150 or $200. Drafts were given on imaginary banking houses, and after they came to Vancouver they were met by the commissioner of customs, who was deluded by the interpreter, the latter pretending to ask a great many questions from these men, but it was definitely and clearly proved that he did not ask them any questions at all, on the other hand he laughed up his sleeve at what he was supposed to say. He made a long face to the customs house officer there who had charge of this end of the business and looked very wise and these men were passed as merchants. Hundreds of them got through in that way, and before I close to-night I propose to show how many were passed. The strange thing about this is that these men were not passed at Victoria—where they might have been passed—or Prince Rupert or Comox, but at Vancouver. The most peculiar thing in connection with it all is the appearance there of a patronage committee which seems to rule over the destinies of the Liberal party on the coast. That patronage committee has since become divided against itself, a great tong war now rages, their dirty linen is being washed before the public, and the names of ministers have been dragged into the light of notoriety, as we read in the evidence given from time to time in these papers.

But members of the opposition have refrained from making any reference to these questions previously during this session. That was not due to the fact that we were not well aware of what was going on or that we did not watch closely the evidence taken before the commissioners in Victoria Vancouver and elsewhere, but because we felt that the Prime Minister of this country and those who have charge of the treasury matters should realize the importance of this question and take prompt action. I am satisfied that it was the duty of the Prime Minister the moment the commission was appointed to ask the commissioner to make a report direct to him and give him the result of the investigation, by wire if necessary. In this matter this country has suffered a loss to the extent of at least one million dollars through the dishonesty of public servants —lost apparently through the machinations of the patronage committee who stood in with these Chinamen. In the newspapers on the coast at the time, it was stated that the interpreter who worked the racket got $20 a head on those he put in, and that $100 a head went to somebody higher up in the confidence of this party—some man who had power and patronage to distribute?

That is a very sordid and sad tale. I could quite understand it in connection with any other department but a department collecting revenue. In no other British country can we find anything of the kind in connection with the Customs Department. There have been frauds in connection with contracts, and petty grafting in connection with other departments, but such a thing as this in connection with

a department collecting revenue is unknown.

The strangest feature of the whole matter is the apparent and intense interest shown by the hon. the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) to help somebody out throughout this whole transaction. The holding of nice dinners at which this was discussed, nice little dinners where, according to the witnesses, nobody got drunk, and at which all these matters were threshed out by the patronage committee—these are the facts that came out in the evidence; and I am sure this House will not be satisfied until the whole of the evidence is laid before it in 'Hansard' to-morrow. The only possible way in which we can get this story before the public and the only way that we can get the facts before the people so that they can pass judgment upon it is to have some of the evidence placed upon 'Hansard'. Therefore I would ask the House to be patient with me while I read portions of the evidence from the 1st of February until the inquiry was closed.

On the 1st of February the investigation was resumed, and two Chinese witnesses were examined. These two men were printers. Apparently they have a paper in Vancouver called the 'Sun Bow,' published by the Chinese Association or a Chinese company. They were in need of printers, and they did not seem to have trouble in getting Chinese printers.

Reading from the Vancouver 'News Advertiser' of February 1st, page 5 I find the following evidence given by these printers:

Then two Chinese witnesses who had the appearance of students, who were dressed in European style, were brought in.

This was before the judge who was taking the evidence:

Then two Chinese witnesses, who had the appearance of students and were dressed in European style, were brought in, and Mr. McCrossan suggested that David Lew or the reporter of a Chinese—not English—paper should translate, but Mr. Taylor objected to Lew. The judge suggested Lew should translate subject to check on the part of someone else, but as Mr. Taylor had no one present the judge decided he would not let the men go before they were examined, as the chances were, if he did so, they might not see the men again.

Eventually Mr. Cum Yow was telephoned for, and while they were waiting for him the paper oath was administered, Lew, first being sworn in as interpreter for the purpose of administering the oath.

Hon gentlemen will understand what a paper oath is. The name of the Chinaman is written on a piece of paper and the paper is then burnt before him. There is another form of Chinese oath known as the 'chicken oath'. They threatened several

times to use it in this case, but I do not see any evidence that it was used.

Then each witness, whose names were Yip Dit Chor and Yung Jung Sung wrote his name on a slip of paper which was lit and each witness held it until it burnt itself out, telling them beforehand, in Chinese, what the oaths meant and the full signification if perjury was committed.

AsMr. Cum Yow had not arrived at 5.20, the judge directed a message to be sent saying the court was waiting, and Mr. McCrossan unavailtingly tried witnesses in English.

Then David Lew started to interpret the questions, and soon after Mr. Cum Yow came in.

"Yip Dit Chor was a typesetter on a Chinese newspaper."

You will observe his name 'Yip' shows his clan. He was one of the Yip clan, and the interpreter against whom these charges were made was Yip On. I do not know whether this man Yip was a Liberal or an insurgent Liberal. However his name was Yip Dit Chor. He was a typesetter on a Chinese newspaper, and a fearful undertaking it is to set type on a Chinese journal. If the Minnistor of Railways (Mr. Graham) were here, he would, as he has been a type setter himself, understand what a lot of trouble it is for a man to set type when he has a font 30 feet long and has to run backwards to pick out each letter—a letter being supposed to represent a word, is it any wonder then, that under the circumstances that there was a scarcity of typesetters in Vancouver. However this man was a typesetter and the report goes to say:

Yip Dit Chor was typesetter on a Chinese newspaper here, and followed the same trade in China. He came to Canada on the Monteagle about June, 1907, and did not have the handling of a passport. He did not know whether he paid head tax or not. He came with Yung Sing Set. Mr. Cum Yow now entered and checked Lew's singing questions and interpretation.

Witness knew that he himself never paid the poll-tax. He met Yip On at the shed, and was examined by Mr. Bowell, who interrogated him as to age, etc., Yip On interpreting.

Was he asked if he was a merchant?

—He was not asked that in Chinese.

You will observe that the interpreter was supposed to ask him that question.

'Did he describe himself as Mak Sis Wah?' asked Mr. McCrossan, consulting a passport?

He signed his name as Mak Sis Wah, which was not his right name. It was his photograph which appeared on the passport. He never saw the passport before. He paid nothing for it.

Judge Murphy—And it cost you nothing to come into Canada?

Witness said it was all paid by the Sun Bow Newspaper Company.

At this point arises a very important thing in connection with the importation of

Chinese, and that is this:. Peonage is recognized in China, and men come to this country whose way is paid and who for years afterwards remain virtually the slaves of the companies or individuals who import them. Anything that will encourage that system of importing Chinese labour into this country helps in maintaining a great evil and a great wrong to these men. This evil grew to great proportions in the United States, where there were societies that enslaved large classes of Chinese who worked night and day but all of whose wages went to these companies. Here you see, was a man taken charge of by a company in China, shipped to Canada, and a passport given him. Why, he was even given a new name. And he comes into the country and pays no poll tax, I think the case is a clear one.

Did Yip On to knowledge of witness know what work witness was coming here to do?—He did not know Yip On at all at that time.

He came over on the 'Monteagle' in company with Yung Ling Sit, another Chinese newspaper typesetter, who had since died. Yung Jung Sung, who had come to the court with him, was also a typesetter here and in China. They did not come on the same vessel.

Did witness ever go before the Viceroy?—Witness did not know how the certificate was obtained. He did not go for it.

A Chinaman in China is supposed to go before the viceroy and get his certificate signed. This man never appeared before the viceroy. So you see the law there was violated.

With the view to finding out if witness remembered seeing any of the men who came on the same boat, their photographs on the passports were shown to him. He was sick much of the time, he said, but recollected seeing one out of the four men shown on the photographs.

Mr. Taylor left over his cross-examination until the morning, the judge, who said there had been difficulty in getting the man here, having it made clear that he must attend.

Yung Jung Sing, a very intelligent looking man, was put on the witness stand at five minutes to six o'clock.

He was a typesetter on the Sun Bow newspaper, Carrall Street, and had formerly worked for over three years for the 'Reform Gazette'.

He came from Hong Kong on the 'Monteagle,' but not on the same trip as last witness. He was also a typesetter there and was not then, nor ever since, a merchant.

So you see, this man admits he was not a merchant, but a typesetter. And these two typesetters say that they were allowed to enter the country without paying the poll tax.

He got his passport—which had his photograph on it—from the Yah Wick Company of Devoe Road, Hong Kong.

That is one of the big companies handling these Chinese, trying to run them into the United States and Canada.

Who got it for him?—He did not remember the man's name. He was a clerk there. Witness was engaged to come here by Long Shu Hun, representing the 'Sun Bow' newspaper Company.

Did this Long Shu Hun take him to the Yah Wick Company?

He belonged to what company?

What was their business?—Exporters of general dry goods.

Did he know Yip Yen?—Yes.

Where did he meet him?—He saw him at the Yah Wick Company last on the day he left for the steamer.

Witness said he was examined at the detention shed here by a white officer and that Yip On was there. He did not know the name of the white officer, but he was a pretty elderly man.

What did Yip On ask you?—

He did not ask witness much questions, but asked if he was a merchant, the latter replying that he had come here to go into business. Some one in Hong Kong told him to say that.

What did he pay for the passport?—He did not know.

Had he paid any thing at all?—No.

Was it understood the Sun Bow Company were to pay his poll-tax?—

All that was said was 'He give you this paper. You go over there. It will be all right.'

He never saw the Viceroy, or went to the British consul. He got the photograph from the Yah Wick Company and travelled as 'Lee Su Hung,' which was not his right name, but was the name he was told by Yip Yen at Hong Kong to use for the purpose.

He gave the picture a few days before he got the passport. When he arrived here he had some money, but he did not remember how much.

This man Yip On was the official interpreter. He was sent to these men to train them and line them up to be passed. He passed them most successfully and in such a way that this government was defrauded out of one million dollars or more.

He gave him the gold on the steamer to put in his pocket in case he might be searched, so that he could back up his story that he was a merchant, was about to go into business.

Yip On gave him some gold, which he put in his pocket, and then gave it back to Yip On after he was examined.

Did he know if others on the boat did the same thing?—He looked only after his own business.

He was a wise Chinaman.

He was given just one letter by the Yah Wick Company at Hong Kong, to be handed to Yip On. Another man collected it from him on the voyage.

He knew nothing now as to whether the Yah Wick Company were still doing business.

I do not know either. I suppose that by this time there is no such company, for they would have had notice of that report.

Mr. B. R. Macdonald, collector of customs at Prince Rupert, was the first witness at the morning session.

He had learned in Prince Rupert that Chinese were coming into Vancouver without paying the tax.

You will note that it was a well-known story all over the Coast for a long time before action was taken, that the Chinese were coming into Canada without paying poll tax and that this was virtually an open port so far as the Chinese were concerned.

Through the aid of the interpreter, afterwards getting permits and transmitting them to China for use by improper merchants, who would bring in with them boys described as sons, but who were not their sons. This state of matters had been going on for three years he was told by his informant, and the latter had come with him from Prince Rupert to give evidence.

There was a case in Toronto not many weeks ago. A bright, intelligent lad of 12 or 14 who was staying with a supposed uncle and who was brought to Toronto, no doubt as a merchant's son. The lad was found hanging dead in a room and was supposed to have committed suicide. But there is a great mystery about it. I contend that no Chinese boy should be admitted to this country except in company with his own parents. But this man knew and it was current report, that boys were admitted to Canada who pretended to be sons of men with whom they entered.

He had asked this man whether he had any proof to sustain the charges, but had been told that he knew it only by hearsay. In this it was mentioned that the price paid was $100 to the interpreter and $20 for others.

Cross-examined by Mr. S. S. Taylor witness said the name of his informant was Mar Ben Quin. Witness admitted he himself had no proof. He only mentioned what he had been told.

Mar Ben Quin, not having arrived, Yip On then got back to the witness stand, and was asked whether he had had anything to do in the way of inducing passengers to come over by the use of passports, or had he brought in mere working men as merchants?—No.

Did the Reform Association in 1907 by resolution ask him or Yip Suh Foy to bring over Chinese printers, and did not one of them come in under a passport?—No.

Asked again what he thought was the reason for his suspicion witness considered it was merely for the purpose of a government inspection. It was nothing to do with a tong war. He had heard on the street that Lew had made some trouble for him.

Mr. McCrossan switched back to the matter of passports and Dr. Chang, and the reason Dr. Chang had sent the list of names to witness instead of to Mr. Bowell, because a bone of contention between Mr. McCrossan and Mr. Taylor, the latter holding that Dr. Chang's letter, as coming from the Chinese diplomatic consul here, was absolutely free from any possibility of being impugned, and that he had kept that letter all through, as strong evidence in favour of his client.

Judge Murphy said that whether he had power to call Dr. Chang or not, he did not intend to do so.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

After this little breeze was over Yip On was taken through another cable translating effort. This was a cable to 'Conclusion,' said to be Yip On's brother's code name, Hong Kong, and unsigned. It worked out roughly as follows: 'Suh Wy's position, suspended, last boat, tell the people that know.' Mr. McCrossan assumed this to mean, on witnesses' explanation, that 'Suh Wy's position,' meant 'little brother's position,' and contended that this cable was sent by Yip Quong, Yip On's brother. David Lew made the interpretation 'Suh Wy and his brother, position, suspended, last boat, tell everybody that knows.'

Reverting to the viceroy's certificate sent to Dr. Chang there was further argument between counsel and Judge Murphy stated that he believed it was a fact that every such certificate was duplicated at Ottawa. Mr. Taylor claimed that if this were the fact the passport conspiracy fell to the ground and protested further at the time taken up in bringing out matters in reference to Yip On, while other matters, such as the opium smuggling, were left over. The commission might go on for ever.

I would ask the Prime Minister if it is a fact that when Chinese entering Vancouver or Victoria in this way receive passports in China, duplicates of the passports are sent from the British consul in China direct to Ottawa as stated in this evidence?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I could not tell my hon. friend at the moment?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Is there any minister here who could tell?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not think there is?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Could the Minister of Inland Revenue?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I do not know.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Perhaps the Minister of Customs could tell?

Mr. PATERSON. I could not state, but I suppose that if one was sent it would be sent to the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Perhaps the Minister of Militia, the latest recruit to the ranks of our diplomats, who has been practising the art lately with the intention of becoming High Commissioner, could? Would he send a duplicate passport in this way? The Minister of Militia should be an expert on passports, as no one can enter his department without a passport. It would be a proper thing to have the photograph put on the passport. No one on the government benches knows anything about the Chinese question. But to resume the evidence.

Judge Murphy interposed. There are some people, he said, amidst general laughter, who say that would be a good thing for us all. The opium matter was yet to come.

A good thing if the whole question was dropped. I wonder who the people were who the judge thought would like to see the whole thing dropped.

Mar Ben Quin not having arrived, Yip On then got back into the witness stand and was asked whether he had had anything to do in the way of inducing passengers to come over by the use of passports, or had he brought in mere workingmen as merchants? No.

Did the Reform Association in 1907 by resolution ask him or Yip Su Foy to bring over Chinese printers and did not one of them come in under a passport. No.

Asked again what he thought was the reason for his suspension, witness considered it was merely for the purpose of a government inspection. It had nothing to do with a Tong war

Yip On was then cross-examined by Mr. Gordon Grant concerning the method of examinations at the shed, and wanted to know if Mr. Bowell had refused permission to a man claiming to be a partner of Yip Sang, Yip On's partner. Witness did not notice if any of his uncle's partners had tried to come in.

Mr. Grant stated that Mr. Bowell had said that a man, so claiming, had tried to come in and had been refused. Would witness say Mr. Bowell was wrong? Witness only said: No.

He did not know how many partners his uncle had.

Why did he not know how many partners his uncle had? Because, perhaps, 200 Chinamen had each given $10 to become partners.

As regarded his brother, Yip Quong, he kept a jewellery store, starting three or four years ago, before which he was working in Wing San's. He had partners, of which witness was one, and Yip Quong and Yip Sam others, but he could not remember the names of others.

Three or four years ago he was Vice-President of the Reform Association.

I am surprised to see in the evidence that a Chinaman was vice-president of the Reform Association of Vancouver. But it is so stated here; he gives it under oath. He says three or four years ago he was vice-president of the Reform Association. Is that possible?? A Chinaman vice-president of the Reform Association, because the Reform Association consists largely of Chinamen.

Lee Quong was Secretary Treasurer. They passed no resolution that year for witness to get some men to work for them, nor did he know men employed on the paper or look into accounts. He spent no money for them to get it returned to him. He was not asked to get two printers from China for the association.

I wonder if that paper is on the patronage list. The Minister of the Interior is not here.

Did not those two men tell him, at the detention shed, where to go to get the $500 to pay their head tax? He could not remember.

Well, do you remember going and getting the $500? When?

'Did not the Chinese Reform Association pay you $1,000 to pay the head tax for two printers, or tell you where to get it?' 'No.'

'Did you ever get $1,000 from the association for any purpose?' 'No.'

'Did you not get this $1,000 and then go to Collector Bowell and pass these two men as merchants?' 'No.'

Asked why he had wished to be present at the first enquiry, witness said he wanted to be there to check up anything against him which was not true. It did not necessarily mean that he expected anything to be said against him. He knew nothing of guaranteeing to land Luey My Chee here, but he knew Won Chuck Mon and met him on the wharf in July. The latter, who had kept a store in the country, said nothing to him about an arrangement for witness to land Won Chuck Mon's cousin, and he had seen no letter sent to him stating that Pooh Kun and Wong Ching were coming in as passport men; that witness was to ask Chuck Mon for the passage money; and go and see him and have it settled.

Witness could not say why this letter should have been written, and he had never heard it said in Chinatown that he would take money to defraud the customs.

He had known Lew Duck who kept a shoe store here, five or six years. Shown the statutory declarations made by Lew Duck and Lew Dong, witness said the latter did not give him $250 and a draft at the detention shed, and nobody else had done so. On Mr. Taylor's objection to Mr. Grant's questions as being irrelevant, the judge said he would be glad if Mr. Grant would cut this sort of questions short, as much of it had no bearing unless names were given. Mr. Grant then mentioned Moy Chung, without further apparent result, and Yip On was released.

Mar Ben Quin, a smiling Chinese from Prince Rupert, who used to live in Vancouver some years ago, told that he had heard something on a visit to this city about a plan for "elegant landing in Vancouver". But pressed for details he wished to refer the matter to Mr. McDonald, as after telling things to the latter, he said he did not think much more about them.

If I know anything about this man McDonald he is apparently a partner of this man Kelly. Perhaps my hon. friends from Vancouver can check me up if I am wrong in that. Am I wrong? I understand that they are partners in various enterprises, the chief among them being a large block of land that they got from this government up the river a little way for something like $1.50 per acre, which is worth $1,000 an acre to-day, and has made these men over a million dollars. I wish I was a constituent of the Minister of Inland Revenue in Vancouver, for I could become a millionaire in a short time in that way.

Mr. McCrossan, again tried to get a distinct story in witness' own remembrance, but witness could recollect nothing, and said that

if he had known he would have to come here he would have written it all down in a book.

That finishes the evidence taken that day. The next day's sitting was occupied with the discussion of Yip On. He appears again on the scene and is examined at some length by counsel. The details are given in the 'News-Advertiser' of Thursday, February 2, page 1:

There was much curious expectancy amongst the audience at the opening session of the afternoon to see what the stenographer's official notes would disclose as to Yip Jung Sung's apparent turn-back on his overnight statement regarding Yip On being the man who took gold from him and afterwards returned it after the examination at the detention shed, but nothing transpired.

Jin Hin, with the marriage name also of Lin Chim,——

The House will understand that a Chinaman sometimes has two or three names. Amongst other names he has a marriage name. If he is a bachelor. like the Minister of Agriculture, he is not allowed to have what is known as a marriage name. I make this explanation so that the reference here in the report will be understood.

Jin Hin, with the marriage name also of Lin Chim, and of sedate, not to say clerical appearance——

Evidently due to the fact that he was a married man.

——was sworn by the paper oath, the oath being translated by David Lew. He had been here over three years, from Hong Kong. Here he first "looked after business" and was a goldsmith, working at the bench for Yip Quong.

For the first two months he was "looking for business," then worked for Li Sang, for $20 monthly and commission on profits, if any, for a period of two years, after which he paid the $400 for the partnership.

This man was four years here before he became a partner or a merchant.

While in Hong Kong for five months he lived at a drug store, and previously had been a jeweller in Australia. Asked where he lived in Australia, he gave the curious geographical answer "Singapore", and "Annam". Asked further who told him to say he was in Australia, he said he was really there.

Anybody who knows anything about geography knows that Singapore and Annam are not in Australia.

Who got him to come to Canada?

His mother, and because he was not healthy, and was also looking for business. He was aware that it cost $500 to enter Canada, but he was told by his "cousins" that "when you do business you don't have to pay." He came in by a passport, got through Jin Ding Yuan, a sort of village esquire. He went from Hong Kong to the village, staying four months there, which made his stay in Hong Kong, said Mr. McCrossan, only two months. Witness said he paid the shunshee $92 Mexican for his passport. He did not go to the British consul. The shunshee got it vised for him from the viceroy at Canton. The photograph on the passport was his. He came in on the Empress of China in a different name to that of the passport, being told he could use either of his names, as they were both the same sound. The judge wanted to know more as to the why and wherefore of this, but all witness would say was that either one would answer. He got his photo taken before the passport was issued. Choy Chee Lung told him to have this done and also told him that business men going to Canada were exempt from tax. He did not know the Yah Wick firm or the Lam How firm. When he came through the Vancouver customs he had one or two hundred in gold, which he got from his mother, but no drafts.

'But he told us before that when he landed he had not enough to go into business with,' said Mr. McCrossan. Witness explained that he had not enough. When he landed and was examined Mr. Bowser was there, although he did not know at the time that it was Mr. Bowser. People told him shortly after he was landed that Mr. Bowser was the customs man. Yes, Yip On was there, too, and several white men, asking questions. He told them he came to do business, was a business man and had money. Judge Murphy rather snubbed Mr. Taylor for badgering Lew regarding his interpretation, the judge stating that Lew seemed to be giving quite correct translations.

Shown a photograph on a passport and asked whether the photograph was not Lee Hong, a fellow worker at Yip Quong's place and that the passport was also his, witness replied the photograph certainly somewhat resembled him.

There was much curious expectancy amongst the audience at the opening session of the afternoon to see what the stenographer's official notes would disclose as to Yip Jung Sing's apparent turn-back on his over-night statement regarding Yip On being the man who took gold from him and afterwards returned it after the examination at the detention shed, but nothing transpired.

Jin Hin, with the marriage name also of Lin Chim, and of sedate, not to say clerical appearance, was sworn by the paper oath, the oath being translated by David Lew. He had been here over three years, from Hong Kong. Here he first 'looked after business' and was a goldsmith, working at the bench for Yip Quong.

For the first two months he was 'looking for business,' then worked for Li Sang, for $20 monthly and commission on profits, if any, for a period of two years, after which he paid the $400 for the partnership. While in Hong Kong for five months he lived at a drug store, and previously had been a jeweller in Australia. Asked where he lived in Australia, he gave the curious geographical answer 'Singapore,' and 'Annam.' Asked further who told him to say he was in Australia, he said he was really there.

Who got him to come to Canada?

His mother and because he was not healthy, and was also looking for business. He was aware that it cost $500 to enter Canada, but was told by his 'cousins' that 'when you do business you don't have to pay.' He came in by a passport, got through Jin Ding Yuan, a

sort of village esquire. He went from Hong Kong to the village, staying four months there, which made his stay in Hong Kong, said Mr. McCrossan, only two months. Witness said he paid the shunshee $92 Mexican for his passport. He did not go to the British consul. The shunshee got it vised for him from the viceroy at Canton. The photograph on the passport was his.

He came in on the 'Empress of China' in a different name to that of the passport, being told he could use either of his names, as they were both the same sound. The judge wanted to know more as to the why and wherefor of this, but all witness would say was that either one would answer.

He got his photo taken before the passport was issued. Choy Chee Lung told him to have this done, and also told him that business men going to Canada were exempt from tax. He did not know the Yah Wick firm or the Lam How firm. When he came through the Vancouver customs he had one or two hundred in gold, which he got from his mother, but no drafts.

But he told us before that when he landed he had not enough to go into business with,' said Mr. McCrossan. Witness explained that he had not enough. When he landed and was examined Mr. Bowser was there, although he did not know at the time that it was Mr. Bowser. People told him shortly after he was landed that Mr. Bowser was the customs man. Yes, Yip On was there, too, and several white men, asking questions. He told them he came to do business, was a business man, and had money. Judge Murphy rather snubbed Mr. Taylor for 'badgering' Lew regarding his interpretation, the judge stating that Lew seemed to be giving quite correct translations.

Shown a photograph on a passport and asked whether the photograph was not Lee Hong, a fellow-worker at Yip Quong's place, and that the passport was also his, witness replied the photograph certainly somewhat resembled him. Lee Hong did not come on the same boat. He also had $400 interest in the goldsmith's business of Yip Quong's, at which they both were now working.

Mr. McCrossman found out that the cook at this store was Lee Foon, another passport man, three or four months here from China. Mr. McCrossan had tried, unsuccessfully, to also find this man during the morning. Witness expressed his willingness to go with an officer and bring Lee Foon to the court, and Mr. Taylor held it was unnecessary, as this man had paid the poll tax and was not a passport man at all, but Mr. McCrossan thought differently, and said he had the man's photograph. Witness failed to identify the photograph on the passport as Lee Foon, but he had seen the original of the photograph around the store a few days ago on a New Year visit. He did not work there.

Another passport man, by own name Yip Lee, was then brought in. He seemed rather of a different type to last witness. He was very cheerful. He was also sworn by the paper oath to tell the truth.

Of course he had other names, one of which was 'Yip Gee Gong," his 'marriage name,' and as for nicknames he had 'more than he can remember.' This effort at forgetfulness, however, did not help him out much, the judge ordering him to write out any and all of such names as he might ever have signed as a signature. This brought out conditionally the 'firm' name of 'Lim Gee Wing,' 'Yip Sung' and 'Chick Chang,' which, he said, included the lot

He was now over 40 and was about 34 he thought when he came here, having lived previously in China and Singapore following the 'jewellery' business for himself. He firmly but politely denied counsel's suggestion that he was a peddler. He was, for instance, ten years in business at Han Kow on his own account, and for a year at Hong Kong, which city he left for Canada, hearing that things were good and prosperous here.

When he came he brought in $1,000 worth of gold leaf, and at Yip Quong's request, went into business with him, holding $500 partnership interest in his Yip Gee Gong name, and being registered, so he had been told by Yip Quong.

Why did you come in under a wrong name, said Mr. McCrossan? Witness stated he came in under his old 'trade' name, and that the 'gentry' who got the passport for him took his name.

Mr. Gordon Grant asked witness his profits for the year? They did not make much. He got only $300 in addition to his wages of $300. He also had to look after the interior.

Sort of minister of the interior, said Mr. Taylor amid laughter.

Are you prepared to take the chicken oath that this is your trading name, said Mr. Grant in his very fiercest manner. Yes, mildly replied witness.

Judge Murphy—You will have to get the chicken, Mr. Grant. Counsel said he would not object, if he could have the chicken afterwards.

Before starting on the cross-examination of Kung Jung Sing, Mr. Dilldale, clerk with the Canadian Pacific railway telegraph department, testified to receiving a cable message at New Westminster for Hong Kong, and thought he could identify the sender. On Yip On and Yip Suh Foy standing up in court witness positively identified Yip Suh Foy, whom he had seen twice, when he had sent two cables. These cables were sent on October 12th and 13th.

Mr. Taylor sought, by questions as to how Yip Suh Foy was attired, to break down this evidence. Witness was very decided, however, remembered details, and knew that it was at night, about eleven, when few people were calling in. He clearly remembered that Yip Suh Foy was wearing a cap, and when Mr. Taylor suggested it was strange he should recollect one particular Chinese after that period, witness said 'it was pretty hard to forget that face once you had seen it.'

Mr. Taylor apparently failed to shake the evidence of witness, or at all to disturb his confident self-possession, and after half an hour witness left.

The interpreter's trouble was minimized here by the appearance of Mr. Hugh Arthur, who agreed to check the evidence.

Yung Jung Sing said his English name was Johnson, his school name Yung Gar Gip, and he had no married name, for the reason that he was not married.

Arriving in Vancouver in 1907, he gave as

his name the name which was on the paper, which he had used all the way since he got the paper at Hong Kong.

Did he know that if he gave his right name he could not land? He did not know, he only knew that if he went under the assumed name he would land. He did not know he was defrauding the customs, or know anything about the law. He went, as told, just according to the paper. Witness declared quietly, on being questioned by Mr. Taylor as to his veracity, that he was prepared to tell the truth and was doing so.

As to his using the name of Lee Su Hung, and giving it to the customs here, he did not remember whether he signed or not. This could not be ascertained, as this particular passport was mislaid, but Mr. Taylor assumed that witness had signed it, and taxed him accordingly, but the latter did not remember. The reason he repeated, why he did not use his own name, was because the man at Hong Kong told him to use the other name. Before he hired to come to Canada, he lived several years in Hong Kong, as a typesetter on the newspaper 'Sut-Bo,' and was hired to come here by Lung Sun Hang of Hong Kong, whom he remembered he had not seen before or since.

How was it, then, that he had sworn that this man was connected with the Yah Wick Company?

The people of the 'Sut-Bo' in Vancouver sent a letter to Lung Sun Hang at Hong Kong, so he was told by the latter, who lived at the Yah Wick Company, at which place witness saw him before the latter left Hong Kong.

When did witness first meet Yip Yen?

On the morning of his departure. He was a very stout, heavy man, about his own height, five feet five, and about forty years old. He had since once seen Yip Yen over here, but not to speak to. When he saw Yip Yen the morning of his departure Yip Yen gave him a paper and a photograph. His ticket was handed to him that morning by Yip Yen with a letter. In all, he was handed three things, the passport, ticket, and the latter, the latter of which he did not open. A fellow passenger, whose name was Lee, asked for the letter, and he gave it to him in the detention shed here. He did not know what became of the letter, or the man, nor did he recollect to whom it was addressed. It was some funny name. The names of some dozen Chinese were mentioned, but it was none of these, and the judge wondered if Mr. Taylor would get more out of a Chinese witness than Mr. McCrossan had done.

'When you went through the customs you told Yip On you were a merchant and were going to enter business?'

Witness said that was his original idea. He was hired to work for the newspaper, but if he could get the money he would go into business. What he told Yip On was that he was going to enter into business, and now he had a $100 interest in a merchandise business here, Wung Sing's, 61 or 91 Pender street, into which he had, so far, paid $25. He did not remember how much money he had when he got here, perhaps about $30 or $40 Mexican. He thought there was a draft in the letter, the envelope being marked '$1,000' or something like that, but it was directed to Lee Su Hung, his other name, care of the firm whose name he did not remember.

He saw Yip On at the shed, but was not spoken to by him at that time, Yip On did not ask him if he had any drafts; Lee, who got on board at Hong Kong, had got the letter. He did not know why Yip On had given him the letter instead of giving it to Lee, and he did not understand why he should have handed that letter and envelope to Lee. He did so without question when the man said 'let me have it.'

'Did any one go to see him before he gave his evidence here?'

David Lew and another man, a white man, who was Detective William McLeod, called on him.

Mr. Taylor then suggested that witness, having read the evidence before the commission and set up type for the Chinese newspaper, knew that passport men were being sought for and was, therefore, in fear he might be found and punished for his illegal entry. Witness said any fine would not affect him. It was a matter for those who had hired him. He knew nothing of the head-tax at that time. He was served with a subpœna yesterday afternoon and came to court accordingly.

Yip On was told to stand up.

'Was this the man who gave you money?' 'No.'

'Who gave you the money?' 'Lee.'

'But you said last night it was Yip On.' No answer.

Judge Murphy said that was clearly the way he had interpreted it, and Mr. Gordon Grant said it was a typical instance how Chinese evidence would change from night to next day.

Witness swore he said yesterday it was Lee and not Yip On who had given him the money.

The judge stated that nobody could make him believe except what witness stated last night, which was that Yip On gave him the money.

Mr. S. S. Taylor asked how it was that yesterday witness had stated that it was Yip On, and he asked that the stenographer's notes should be put in during the luncheon interval, as it appeared clearly that Yip On was mentioned.

Addressing witness, Mr. McCrossan said he had told him yesterday that he had no money, and that some one gave him back the bag of gold, which he put in his pocket. He had stated that the interpreter gave him that money and that the interpreter took it away.

Witness here stated that he gave it back to 'Lee.'

'You told us yesterday that he gave it back, after the examination, to the interpreter.'

'I did not give it to Yip On. Lee gave it to me and I gave it back to Yip On.'

Did not Yip On and that crowd have control of the paper which witness worked for? Witness did not know.

'That paper in its editorials is strongly in favour of Yip On?' 'No, only fair.'

Then there was a dinner and it is just as well to read a little about it. The Prime Minister will be glad to know what a diner the Minister of Inland Revenue is. Mr. Glover is examined in favour of the Min-

ister of Inland Revenue, and it is only fair I should give his side of the story:

Mr. F. R. Glover, assistant general manager of the British Columbia Electrical Railway Company, Limited, was the first witness called. He had read the statements regarding Mr. Foster and Hon. Mr. Templeman incident, and, considering them unfair, he wished to explain the facts. He would have done so before, but had been up country.

In reply to Mr. McCrossan witness stated he gave a dinner party to Mr. Templeman at the Vancouver Club on the evening referred to last September. There were also present Messrs. Harry Senkler, Robert Kelly, George Macdonald, E. J. McFeeley, Lieut-Col. Duff-Stuart and Capt. Sclater. After dinner Mr. Templeman remained in the smoking room talking to friends until eleven o'clock, when witness suggested going home, Mr. Templeman agreeing. Witness sent for a cab, but before he, Mr. McFeely, Mr. Kelly, and Mr. Templeman were going to it Dr. Munro came in and started to chat with Mr. Templeman. The latter then told the driver to go to Glenwood, where Mr. Foster was staying, and, on arrival Dr. Munro went upstairs, then returned, saying, Mr. Foster was in bed and would see Mr. Templeman tomorrow.' After driving to Mr. McFeely's, where Mr. Kelly left, witness and Mr. Templeman went to the hotel where Mr. Templeman went to bed.

Was Mr. Templeman drunk that night?

No.

Were you? I think not. There was nothing of that sort.

Judge Murphy remarked he did not see what all this had to do with this inquiry at any time.

Mr. Gordon Grant asked witness some questions. The dinner was a purely social friendly one it appeared, and witness had known Mr. Templeman for several years. They met at the club at seven-thirty, and Mr. Templeman did not leave until he went away with witness. Mr. George Macdonald did not go with him in the cab.

I am going to pass over some unimportant evidence which concluded the session at Vancouver, after which the commission went to Victoria and took evidence there. This is the report of that evidence as given in the 'News-Advertiser' of February 10:

Vancouver, Feb. 9.—That Chinese can evade payment of head tax by paying $100 or less into a business firm and crossing to Canada as merchants, thereby being bona fide merchants within the meaning of the Act, and that passports would have to be accepted were they printed in English or French instead of Chinese were points brought out at the morning session of the Royal Commission to-day. That the condition of affairs at Vancouver was astounding in view of the knowledge communicated in the department at Ottawa by Collector Newbury was another point made. Judge Murphy said: 'With this knowledge at the head of the department it seems astounding that things went on at Vancouver the way they did.' Evidence was also given that an investigation had been made by the collector concerning the work of Mr. Lee Mong Kow, and it had developed that everything had been carried on in a proper manner. It was shown that stricter supervision had been maintained over immigration at Victoria, and as Collector Newbury said: 'There had not been as much business done.'

Mr. Newbury explained in detail the method adopted in handling the Chinese business at this port, showing how two officers were always engaged in handling outward men and three to land returning men. There had not been much trouble with the exempt class at this port, the officials being strict and there had never been more than two or three on any boat.

He had been surprised that there were so many landed at Vancouver as merchants. He had not known how many there were until he had seen the totals in the papers. He pointed out that the eighteen taken from the 'Empress of India' were exceptional, having been booked to Vancouver and taken off by Mr. Foster at this port. More trouble had to be taken with merchants' sons than any other class of exempts, and the procedure was to hold a preliminary examination of the son, then to get statutory declarations from son, father and partner, with two certificates from white merchants. Mr. O'Hara, when he visited Victoria had looked over the local practice, and the government form had been adopted as a result.

Judge Murphy said the passports seemed to have been an open sesame at Victoria.

Collector Newbury.—I cannot understand that. I never accepted a passport for anything but corroboration. A man was not worse off with one; but I never considered him better with one. Examination was entirely apart from the passport. I had heard much how these passports could be secured in China. Any one who knew the ropes and was willing to pay for one could get one. I wrote to Mr. O'Hara about that. I believe he took it up diplomatically with Hong Kong. He was disgusted with the answer. The consul said he considered it his business to facilitate emigration, not stand in the way of it.

Mr. McCrossan asked if an inquiry had been held concerning Lee Mong Kow. Witness replied that indefinite allegations had been made, suggestions that he was 'in on it' with regard to admission of new men as returned men. Witness told the interpreter he would take over the work himself for a month and Peter Hing was brought in as interpreter. Nothing was ascertained to show that everything was not right.

Mr. Newbury said he had seen no need to change interpreters. Mr. Mong Kow had done good work. He was also a good clerk and the department made much of his services as such. There was, perhaps, too much economy in carrying out the work. He understood that at Vancouver the interpreter did no clerical work.

The Judge—His only clerical work consisted of making copies of records in the evening.

Mr. Newbury said that while the interpreter could be of great assistance he did not think an interpreter could swing the whole thing. He failed to see how the interpreter could do anything not correct without the officials knowing, if they were alive to their business.

The Judge—I don't know that you could exclude Chinese under the Act if they had, say, $100 in a firm and came as merchants.

Witness—It is difficult to define what is a merchant.

That seems to be the whole trouble under this Act—to get a proper definition of a merchant.

Mr. Newbury, continuing, said the finger print system was not used. Mr. O'Hara was opposed to it as being undignified. He did not think it necessary if the present system was properly carried out.

The Judge—If these passports were in English or French you would have to accept them.

Witness—I never construed that this was obligatory.

The Judge— I think it is.

At the afternoon session the question of the desirability of establishing a water patrol at Victoria to prevent the smuggling of opium came up.

Collector Newbury when cross-examined on this point, said that the port had now reached such a size that money spent in this direction would not be wasted. He considered, however, that other means could be adopted, such as giving more power to the police.

The chief customs clerk, Mr. Davey, on being recalled to the stand said that he had made a mistake in saying that the customs officers at Union Bay lived four miles from the wharf. Often vessels coaling at that point were brought within a few yards of the wharf, where the official was stationed.

The Inspector of Customs, Mr. William Marchand, was on the stand when the commission adjourned for the day.

In the Sunday issue of the Vancouver 'News-Advertiser' of February 12 appear the figures found by the commission, showing that at the port of Victoria there have been fewer than ten merchants landed since 1904, whereas in Vancouver the number landed in three years totals 548.

Having examined the officials at Victoria the commission met again in Vancouver, where a number of witnesses gave evidence. Our friend Kelly was put in the box, and a report of his evidence appears at page 17 of the Vancouver 'News-Advertiser' of February 21st:

At the reassembling of the commission, morning session, Robert Kelly was the first witness called. Mr. G. E. McCrossan represented the Dominion government. Mr. S. S. Taylor appeared for Yip On.

I might state that Mr. McCrossan is Kelly's brother-in-law.

Mr. Kelly, examined by Mr. McCrossan, said he was a member of the executive of the Liberal Association in this city. Asked what he knew of the telegram signed by Mr. Senkler to Sir Richard Cartwright, he said a certain telegram was sent recommending Yip On should be reinstated. Mr. Bowell brought it in, and witness suggested he take it to Mr. Senkler, after asking what was the matter, and being informed that the Chinese were crooked. He did not sign the telegram, but he approved of it, as he knew there was a certain element at work trying to get rid of Yip On and 'boost' themselves, and Mr. T. R. E. McInnes was at the head of this movement. Neither did Hon. Mr. Templeman ever send any such telegram.

Regarding the telegram of September 20, from Hon. Mr. Templeman to Sir Richard Cartwright, witness stated this telegram was sent at the request of Mr. Senkler, Mr. George Macdonald, himself, and several others, being assured there was nothing against Yip On. This was sent at the dinner given at the club. They had a very nice little dinner and every one was perfectly sober. Hon. Mr. Templeman signed the telegram after discussion on the subject had taken place.

On the judge asking what the discussion was about witness said it referred to the element at Ottawa who were trying to get Yip On discharged. Hon. Mr. Templeman met him the next day and told him he had seen Mr. Foster, who had assured him there was nothing against Yip On. As regards the bringing in of the name of Hon. Mr. Templeman he thought it very unfair. He had known Mr. Templeman for twenty years and had never seen him the worse for liquor. As a matter of fact, he was a man who drank very little at all.

Regarding the telegram of September 24 as to 'drastic action,' witness said he probably had seen it, but he did not sign it. At any rate he approved it. The Liberal Association or Hon. Mr. Templeman had never attempted to stop this investigation in any shape or form.

Did he know of any graft in connection with Chinese being brought into the country? No.

The Liberal Association, continued witness, never got subscriptions from Chinese, nor was this ever attempted. Being told that Mr. McLean had stated that witness controlled Hon. Mr. Templeman, Mr. Kelly stated he certainly did not control Mr. Kelly, nor did he think any other man in Canada did so. So far as Mr. McLean's remarks went he thought Mr. McLean was the only man who had tried to do so.

Mr. McLean had sent his brother Hugh to Ottawa, where witness met him at the Russell House, and where he was very pleasant. He stated that he wanted to get the matter of a lawsuit for $350,000 settled. He knew witness was an honest man, and he wanted him to see the minister, and witness agreed to do so. The claim was thrown out. He presumed they did not have any claim against the government.

In the opinion of witness, Mr. McLean was not fit to clean the dust off Hon. Mr. Templeman's feet. He might say that Mr. Templeman had never done anything for witness in his life, and he had never asked him a favour.

As to the visit of Hon. Mr. Templeman to Mr. Foster nothing was done at it. Mr. Templeman asked to see Mr. Foster and Dr. Munro said he was in bed, and it was left till morning.

By Mr. Gordon Grant: He was not sure that he was regarded by the people of Vancouver as a leader of the Liberal party. As Mr. Gordon Grant was proceeding to press him on that matter the judge stopped counsel, saying he was not interested in Mr. Kelly's

position with the Liberals, but counsel could question him as much as he liked regarding the telegrams.

As to another telegram witness also assumed his share of responsibility for it. Mr. Bowell had brought in the telegram saying he was suspended and did not know the reason. On account of it the telegram had been sent.

Again as to 'the might of the party' at the club witness said he had not to his knowledge prior to that dinner, discussed the matter with Hon. Mr. Templeman. He did not remember who drafted the telegram. It was filed with the Canadian Pacific railway, and he signed it. He did not know where it was typewritten, nor could he say whether any member of the Liberal Association had anything to do with the drafting of it.

Asked to explain how Mr. Templeman's telegram was typed by the same typist who typed his own telegram he could not say anything about that. It was not a fact that the Hon. Mr. Templeman's telegram was typed at his office before he left to go to the club, nor, to his knowledge, was it taken to his office to be typed, nor, to the best of his knowledge, did any one take it from the club to witnesses' office to be typed. He did not remember if he saw the telegram after it was completed. As far as he could remember—'and my memory is not good sometimes'—said witness, he had no discussion with Mr. Templeman on the subject previous to the dinner.

Any assistance he gave Mr. Bowell or Col. Worsnop came from himself. He only did for them what he would have expected they would have done for him. They had never asked him to do anything.

Yip On had had no business with you?—No. His firm, Wing Hai On, had very little business with you?—Very little. What he did was for the Liberal party and with the idea that what was being done should be done by the Liberal party here and not from Ottawa. He thought this quite right. Witness felt Yip On and Mr. Bowell should be retained in their positions.

As to Mr. Foster, he was asked could he suggest any reason why he should not be continued in his work in the same way he admitted Yip On should have been continued in his, witness said he did not know of any reason Mr. Foster should not have been trusted, or any reason why he should have been interfered with in his work as to Yip On.

He did not, to his knowledge, ask Dr. Munro to send any telegram to Ottawa. He understood that Mr. Bowell was suspended on account of irregularities in regard to opium and bringing in of Chinese, and before sending the telegrams he heard from Col. Worsnop that all was right. He also got the same information from Dr. Munro. That was all the information he had, and he thought it justified him in sending the telegram requesting the 'reinstatement pending an investigation.' He did not know, at least he had not heard from Mr. Bowell or Col. Worsnop that all was right. He also got detention shed at that time.

As for Yip On, he sent for him to come in to see him. He had not said twenty words to Yip On in a year. He did not think he introduced Yip On to Mr. Ralph Smith, and he did not remember if the latter was in his office at the time. Had he been in town he might, of course, have been there.

He knew of no other reason for communicating with the Hon. Charles Murphy beyond that he was a minister whom he knew.

Reverting again to the subject of Hon Mr. Templeman and the club dinner, witness did not remember who had asked him where Mr. Foster lived. The time was 11 o'clock or half past eleven. He knew what they were going to Mr. Foster for, which was to ascertain if there was anything wrong with the interpreter and if not verified Hon. Mr. Templeman was going to send a telegram. The telegram was sent at 9.40 the next morning.

Concerning the telegram 'David Lew's claim should not be entertained,' he did not know what was the reason for that phraseology. He was satisfied Hon. Mr. Templeman would always back up a man if he was doing the right thing, not otherwise. He did not think Mr. Foster would give him any information if he asked him, and he did not intend to bother his head about Mr. Foster. He took the word of Mr. Bowell and Col. Worsnop.

You were, I put it, trying to influence the government?—The government in this case was Mr. O'Hara, and he ought to be here.

You took it on yourself to back up Mr. Bowell against the government?—Yes, and I would do it again.

Had you any reason to think Mr. Foster was not as sincerely honest in his department as Mr. Bowell was in his? Witness considered improper influence might have been brought in. He was concerned in this, that if Lew got control of the interpreter's position, the work would go to the Blue Funnel line, who spent no money here. He would support a line who spent money in the city, not one who bought their supplies on the other side. He thought, too, that Lew was not straight, and he also considered Mr. T. R. E. McInnes was pushing the whole bunch, and he was to fight them. 'I'll give it to you if you want it.' snapped Mr. Kelly.

I don't suppose it's much good asking the question, said Mr. Gordon Grant, but I will do so. Did you not think it fair to have gotten from Mr. Foster the facts on which he had procured the suspensions?

Witness said he was not concerned with Mr. Foster; he did not owe anything to Mr. Foster; he did not think him worth seeing, and he would not go across the street to see Mr. Foster. If Mr. Foster wanted to see him he could have come to his office to do so, he would not have charged him anything.

He knew inspector Busby as an efficient officer and never endeavoured to get him dismissed, or never saw the Minister of Customs at Ottawa to that effect.

Judge Murphy (to Mr. Grant).—Before you ask that question you must give Mr. Kelly the name of your informant. I have allowed a lot of latitude, but I am not going to allow it any further, either in Mr. Kelly's or any other cases.

Mr. Gordon Grant stated his information was that witness had seen the inspector of customs and Mr. McMichael, and had tried to get inspector Busby dismissed. Was there any truth in that?

Witness wished to have the name of the informant, and counsel agreed to furnish the

name after reply to the question. Witness then stated that he had never seen Mr. McMichael in Toronto in his life. That gentleman had called at witness' office to get a box of cigars. What counsel had been told was a falsehood, and there was no man who could substantiate it. He never, in any shape or form, tried to get inspector Busby dismissed. It was quite the reverse. From all that was said about him, concluded witness, people might think witness was a sort of horse thief.

Mr. Gordon Grant then stated that the name of his direct informant was Mr. Norman McLean. 'Sure,' responded witness.

Asked by Mr. McCrossan for the name of his indirect informant Mr. Grant said it was inspector Busby himself, and the judge stated he would recall Mr. Busby on the subject. Witness having made a few uncomplimentary allusions to Mr. McLean, the subject dropped, and Mr. S. S. Taylor commenced his cross-examination, which was short. The signature of Mr. Senkler, representing the majority vote of the executive, was, witness agreed, known to be so at Ottawa, and was purely an official signature.

As to Yip On the Liberal Association or any member of it, to his knowledge, had never made a dollar through either opium or through illegal immigration. Their position was that they should make a stand against the proceedings of Mr. McInnes at Ottawa.

Mr. S. S. Taylor said that witness should have an opportunity to say something as to Hon. Joe Martin's general charges as to graft in connection with the Liberal party.

Mr. Kelly stated that he wanted to say he had never made a five cent piece by graft in the Liberal or any party, and rising in his chair and thumping the table in front of him, witness further stated that he defied any person to prove it. He did not get his living that way; he did not have to do so. And as to offering a judgeship for sale he had never done anything of the kind, and he would make the man who said so prove it. After giving some interesting personal details of his early struggles here, commencing with $200, and having since made money, witness concluded, amidst the broad smiles of the court, the bar, and the audience.

Ka Kim Yang came from New York to give evidence in place of Ching Hing, who was ill. He also mentioned the name of Tong Chung Wing, of the 'Sun Bow' Chinese newspaper in this city. Ching Hing was a student.

Now, I think I have placed on record the most important portion of the evidence taken by this commission in British Columbia. Unfortunately, in doing so, it has been necessary for me to occupy a certain portion of the time of the House. I have endeavoured, in putting this on record, to give not only the evidence that tells against the government, but also the evidence as to the goodness and excellence of the Minister of Inland Revenue. I trust the House will not allow this matter to drop, as it has been disclosed that a serious wrong has been done. The Prime Minister says that the people prosecuted in this matter have, unfortunately, left the country. But the report discloses the evils that have existed, and, so far as I can see, there is no reason why it is not proper that that report should be placed on the table in order that we may know what the conclusions of the commissioners were. I hope the House will take action on the matter at an early day, and, if possible, place itself on record. For, if we are going to allow any such practices to obtain in connection with the customs, in a short time we shall not have an efficient customs service and the revenue of the country will be steadily depleted.

I regret having occupied the time of the House so long but there was no other course open in the matter and having now placed the evidence before the House, I will leave it for the House to taken future and further action in this respect.

Mr. G. H. COWAN (Vancouver). I wish at the outset to draw your attention to the fact that this inquiry and this discussion which is, in fact, a very brief summary in three or four hours of the evidence taken at the inquiry, which extended over a period of two or three months, have to do with a matter of peculiar scientific interest apart altogether from its political significance. The inquiry has to do with a new and secret process, devised by oriental cunning, patented and operated by Caucasian rapacity, a process for diverting the people's money from the public coffers and with the least possible friction and waste to convey that money into the private pockets of the Caucasian Liberals and the Asiatic Liberals of Vancouver. That, I say, is a matter, apart altogether from its political significance, of peculiar scientific interest. Science is the accumulation of the wisdom of the ages, but when that wisdom is made up of oriental craft and Caucasian graft it is a combination that the world has never seen before.

I would like to pursue the scientific side of this question. Science has, in the matter of transportation, annihilated distance. In the matter of manufactures science has created the waters of the world into a force many times greater than the power of man. Science has done wonders in other directions, but has never before been applied to the study to which the good gentlemen, Orientals and Caucasians, of Vancouver, have applied it, and I can understand, when the report of Commissioner Murphy came in, that the Prime Minister would desire to kill time and pigeon hole the report because it contained what was to him a suggestion that if that were done the criminals would have time to get out of the country. Accordingly the report was pigeon-holed. The premier did not find it necessary to read the whole of that report, he was content to read the conclusions. The conclusions state that in the interests of justice certain parties should be prosecuted and

in order to let the machinery of justice begin its work, in order to have the warrant served, it might be well not to make public this report. Another part of the report, however, was made public, and communicated to the newspapers. I read this portion of the report which deals with Mr. Bowell, the collector of customs at the port of Vancouver. We are glad to find that the commissioner did his duty in regard to Mr. Bowell. Everybody knew that Mr. Bowell had not been guilty of one single act of dishonesty. Everybody knew that this new device was not of Mr. Bowell's making and did not operate in his interest or to his advantage. But the fact remained that the report was made public, at least so much of it as concerned Mr. Bowell, and then it was pigeon-holed. Then, while justice, with lagging feet, was slow to execute her duty, the alert feet of the criminal carried him beyond the bounds and the reach of justice in Canada. Then the premier comes into this House and tells us forsooth the reason why this report was withheld from this House and from the people of Canada, was that a suggestion of that kind was made by Mr. Justice Murphy in his report. The suggestion of Mr. Justice Murphy was made in order that justice might be quick and sure and that the warrant should issue and be executed at once. Mr. Justice Murphy had no thought in his mind when he made that suggestion that justice should be so slow in Ottawa. When the premier made that public statement today he advertised to these fugitives from justice in Canada, the fact that it is better for them to remain, as W. T. R. Preston remained beyond the reach of justice. Who knows but some of these fugitives from justice may, like Preston, turn up one of these days as trade commissioner in Japan or some other oriental country. We know at least that this House and this country are not going to get from the government these trade secrets by which $1,000,000 have been filched from the public treasury of Canada. From the first I could see in the illumined countenance of my friend the Minister of Inland Revenue that he had no thought of attempting in the slightest degree to defend this charge. We know that at great sacrifice to himself and this country he snatched enough time from his needed rest and sleep to go to Vancouver and testify to the working of this new and secret process; but we know that when the offence was brought home to the criminals—we could see it in the light of his beaming countenance—that he had no thought of standing up in this House and defending his department or himself against the negligence which lies at their doors. I could see from the face of the Minister of Customs, after he woke up that he had some thought that this related in some degree to his department, that he had something to do with the Chinese Immigration Act—and $1,000,000 had leaked out of the profits of his department. But, I could see that he had no defence to offer. I could see that he had no thought of making a defence of any kind to the charge. It was left to the premier. We know that this new method of closer relations between the occidental and oriental population of British Columbia, and in particular of the city of Vancouver, is more or less in line with the policy which the premier has been developing in Canada during recent years. For example, we know that this scheme of plundering the public treasury and dividing the plunder between the oriental and occidental participants, and incidentally of allowing the oriental to evade the provisions of the Immigration Act, is exactly in line—and I speak with absolute accuracy—with that policy which hands over to the party heelers of British Columbia and their confederate Japs the licenses and right to fish in the waters of British Columbia. If you take, for example, the herring licenses issued in British Columbia for the years 1910-11, you will find that every single herring license was issued either to a party heeler of this government, or at the instance of a party heeler of this government, to a Jap confederate, and after being issued to the heeler it was traded off to the Jap for a consideration. The waters of British Columbia under the license of this government are fished by Japs and by Japs alone. I know myself of four reputable white fishermen, reputable citizens of Vancouver, who applied for herring licenses, but they might have known, as others have assumed, that no white man need apply. They were refused, and I say again that in harmony with this new, scientific device is the policy which hands over the fishing industry of British Columbia, not to the people of British Columbia, but to the party heelers of this government and their Jap confederates. These two things are entirely in line with the world-wide policy which we heard announced in this House, on the day before we rose, a policy conceived in the fruitful mind of the premier, brought into the daylight and given its place in the sun of beautiful things by the obstetric art of the Minister of Agriculture, which guarantees by solemn treaty to the Japanese, and which proposes to guarantee by solemn treaty to every Asiatic immigrant, that he shall enjoy a preference in Canada over British immigrants. The measure of that preference in dollars and cents is $50 per. Under the treaty with Japan, under the treaty which the Minister of Agriculture says the government proposed to make with other Asiatic nations, Japanese immigrants, of whom there is a possible

number of 63,000,000 since the addition of Corea, are guaranteed the right of free entry and residence in Canada, a right which this government is not to be allowed to control or check, which no power on earth can control or check except the government of the country from which the Asiatic immigrant comes. Under the Immigration Act of Canada, on the other hand, the British immigrant, instead of being guaranteed the right of free entry and residence in Canada, is denied the right of entry or residence in Canada unless he has in his pocket the good round sum of $50 and unless he complies strictly with the other hard conditions of the Immigration Act as applied to the British immigrant. I can understand the premier's defence and his desire to have that report pigeon-holed until the operators can be far and away beyond the reach of justice. While they are safely beyond, it is desirable to make out that it is in their interest to stay beyond, less the Department of Justice may be compelled perforce to stretch out the strong arm of justice and bring them to bay and to book. I can understand that. I can understand that this Chinese and Japanese policy with regard to fishing, and this immigration policy are exactly in line with that larger policy which hands over to foreign states the power to control immigration into Canada from these foreign states, and which gives Canada no return. We see a new light in the firmament. We see the rise of the Asiatic preference, and we are here to consummate the decline of the British preference. Under this trade pact, for example, we see the attempt to exclude to a large extent the British trader from the Canadian markets as against the American trader, and under this policy of immigration we see a distinct and successful attempt to exclude the British immigrant from the Canadian field of employment, and give it in preference to the Asiatic immigrant.

In August last the Prime Minister of Canada was waited on in Vancouver by the working men of that city who are forced to live under the hard conditions which this policy of his creates, and to fight for a living every hour of their working lives. Would you believe it that in reply to these working men the Prime Minister of Canada, with an assurance not born of human knowledge, (he, being then on his 3rd visit to Vancouver in twenty years), told these working men that he had made a study of this problem for years, that he had mastered it, and that nothing they could tell him could add to his wisdom. You can imagine with what august reverence these hard working men looked upon this man who had probably spent five hours in twenty years in a country where the conditions of contact between Oriental and Caucasian had created profound economic and racial difficulties, and who could find a solution for this problem after three short visits in twenty years. One cannot help thinking that the Prime Minister on that occasion, enamoured perhaps of his Oriental policy, which discriminates against the Britisher in favour of the Asiatic in the matter of immigration, forgot what was due to people whose objection to Asiatic immigration of every sort is deep-seated and is not the result of shallow prejudice on the part of the white people of British Columbia, as the same Prime Minister in December, 1907, in the Russell Theatre in Ottawa proclaimed it was. I cannot help thinking that he forgot what was due to them as rational men when he flung it in their face that he did not care for their sentiments. I cannot help thinking that he has not made a study of conditions in the United States, Canada, Australasia and New Zealand, where that same deep-seated objection prevails. I cannot help thinking that the adulation which his followers, and the people of Canada have generously accorded him has given a very peculiar bias to his judgment upon this, and many other questions. It is the man who studies, and who has a sympathetic feeling for his fellow-man, and he alone who can reach a right solution of difficult social and economic questions such as this. It is he, and he alone who is not only a careful student, but who has lived under the actual conditions from day to day, who can solve these problems. The Prime Minister attempted to tell us in Vancouver that he was actuated by imperial motives, in explanation of his policy on this matter, but, in that he out-Heroded Herod, because when he adhered to the Jap Treaty in 1905 the imperial statesmen suggested to him that he should do so only on condition that Canada should retain the control of immigration over Jap labourers, and Jap artisans as well, and if he were actuated by imperial reasons surely he should have followed imperial suggestions. I give the Prime Minister notice now that in a few days I shall endeavour to ascertain from the government what, if anything, they have done during the negotiations on the new treaty between Great Britain and Japan, to find a sane solution of the difficulty arising from the objection of Anglo-Saxon people to large numbers of Asiatics residing in their midst, just as there is an objection by the Asiatics to large numbers of Anglo-Saxons residing in their country. I trust the premier will be able to tell us that something practical in this matter has been attempted, and accomplished by the government of Canada.

As I have said, I can see that this report is one of the things which this government desires to remain unrevealed to the people of Canada. For my own part, I avoided

any reference to this investigation during its progress and until the report of Mr. Justice Murphy was made. I thought it was due to the commission, I thought it was my duty, not to make any comment of a public kind; and since the report was made and the evidence published, I find that so far as my own constituency is concerned, my duty is done by the press; the public have reached their conclusion, and the conclusion is one that is exceedingly damning, not only to the party locally but to the departments of the government which were concerned in the fraud. Personally I had no desire to take part in this discussion but I believe it is due to the people of Canada to know that crimes of this kind are being perpetrated under the noses of the Premier and the other members of the government. When the evidence and the report of these crimes are brought in, they are pigeon-holed only after they discover that the report recommends the prosecution of the criminals. I believe that it is due to the people to know that they have a party in power that have that conception of their public duty in the enforcement of the criminal law of Canada. I think the course the government is pursuing in this connection should be condemned in no unmeasured tone. I have a higher conception of the morals and the decency and the sense of right on the part of the public than to believe that they would condone offences of that kind once they are known. I believe that every attempt is being made to conceal this evidence and prevent the report coming before the public; but my hon. friend from New Westminster has served the public well to-day when, in three hours, he has summed up evidence which required nearly three months to take; and from that evidence he drew the right conclusion. I am well aware that the government dare not disclose that report before another general election, because it is in keeping with the disclosures in other departments of the government. The Premier displayed what seemed to me to be a lack of taste at least when he suggested that the hon. member for New Westminster was bringing this matter up to kill time. What was the object of pigeon-holing that report after the discovery that it recommended the prosecution of the criminals if it was not to kill time and to kill justice? I think it is right to fling that expression back in the face of the Premier. If there is an explanation why that report was pigeon-holed instead of being brought down to the House, if there is an explanation why the parties recommended in that report to be prosecuted were not prosecuted, I think it is due to this House and this country that that explanation should be forthcoming at once. If it is not forthcoming, then the only just and right inference is that the report was pigeon-holed to kill time and kill justice, to conceal the frauds and iniquities of the party in the constituency of Vancouver. Of course, the government is here under the fiction that they are going to pass reciprocity or something else in this House. Like boys in autumn, they are standing at the brink, fearful of the dip. If by this discussion or any other discussion we could inspire that government with any kind of courage, even Dutch courage, to go beyond the walls of this chamber, beyond the walls of Torres Vedras—to go to the country and ask the country, man fashion, to adopt the baby that President Taft has presented them with—if we could inspire them with even Dutch courage to do this, I believe the people of this country would say we had done well. If we could smoke them out of this burrow—if there is any courage left in the party to which we can appeal—if we could convince them that this chamber is not a gopher hole, that their duty lies not in this chamber, but before the people of Canada, that the people are waiting to give them exactly the reception they deserve—if we could do this, we would feel that we have served our country well. But apparently the courage, the inspiration, is gone and the appeal to their sand and their manhood is unavailing. It may be that the smoking process, too, would be unavailing; but I think, nevertheless, it is our duty to continue to exhort, to appeal, to persuade these people that when they have brought down a measure so new, so subversive of Canadian institutions and the fiscal policy of Canada, this is their duty, however fearful they may feel, however great the mistake our two dear mothers in Israel made when they journeyed to Washington. If we could convince them in any way that it is their duty or their profit or their glory or their renown to get out of the House and go to the people, their masters, and accept the verdict of their masters, I think we would be serving our country well. For my own part, 'hope springs eternal in the human breast.' I cannot say that as yet we have succeeded on this side in pointing out to them the path of duty and the path of glory which leads——

An hon. MEMBER. To the grave.

Mr. COWAN. That is too grave a suggestion to make. If we can get them in any way to amble along that path it would seem to me we have served our country well. As I said a moment ago, I am not without hope. Sometimes I think I can see the bright rainbow of hope and promise shining on the political horizon of Canada, and that the people will once more be given an opportunity of governing this country themselves. Sometimes I think we may have an opportunity of sub-

mitting some of these great questions to the people of Canada before their management and control shall have been handed over to another power. If we succeed in it, and if by chance the people of Canada should mete out to the government what the people of Canada are almost sure to mete out—their just desserts—let me say now to my good friends on the other side of this House that there is really no occasion why their countenances should be so drawn. It is the fortune and the fate of all men to have reverses. It is only delaying the hour. If you make it short, true you cannot make it sweet, but you can at least make it less bitter.

If there is any human instinct uplifting in its character still dormant in the breasts of our friends across the House, and if by any effort of ours we can make that instinct active, and thereby lead the government to the performance of its duty towards the people of Canada, then I apprehend it is but right that we should labour to awaken that instinct and awaken that sense of duty, and to aid so far as we can the government party in the performance of its duty.

I cannot think that there is the slightest doubt in the mind of any member of the government awake in this House at the present hour that it is the plain duty of the government to go to the country and go at once, and accept its Waterloo like men. If, on the contrary, I misread the signs, and if the fortunes of war are to be still with the government party, for my part I am content. It is the will of the people, and that is what I value. The will of the people is my pleasure and my duty. Could I get my friends across the House to feel and think in the same way, could I get the members of the Liberal party to realize that no divine right rests in them to carry on the business of this House after they have proposed to introduce legislation so entirely subversive of the policy and the institutions of this country, that the whole procedure is out of joint with the best constitutional practice of this and every other representative House in the English speaking world?

If I can persuade them that it is their duty under these conditions to go to the people, and go to them at once, I think that the solatium and the comforts which hasty appointments, judicial preferments and commissionerships afford, ought to be sufficient to allay the fears of the less courageous of the party. I cannot think that the low appeals of self-interest are the only appeals that can be made to that party. I cannot help thinking that there are members in the party actuated by higher motives—anxious to serve their country and to serve it well. If there are any such men in the Liberal party—and I believe there are—surely they have the

courage and the force of character to impress upon their colleagues, not only the wisdom but the duty of submitting this great question of reciprocity to the people of Canada, as soon as the country is properly represented by redistribution; otherwise we shall have to continue to hold up the mirror which, in the hands of my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) and other hon. members, reflects with peculiar accuracy the hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House, and we shall have to continue that process to the end. By the way, I sometimes think that there are gentlemen on the other side of the House who make too frequent use of the mirror. I have wondered when I heard the Prime Minister appeal to the people of Quebec and declare to them that he had gone to England to break a lance with the powers of darkness that would wrest from them their rights and their autonomy, and, after making this declaration, appeal to them to 'follow where the white plume leads.'

I have wondered whether he has not been making too frequent and too free use of the mirror. Can it be that it is reserved for our Premier to suffer the sad fate of that other gentleman who made too frequent use of the mirror? I refer to Narcissus who gazed into the limpid waters of the Castalian spring so long that he finally fell in love with his own image reflected there, and later died in adoration of himself. As a student, and somewhat interested in the old mythology may I apply these myths to the conditions of the present day—not in the way the Caucasian Liberals and the Asiatic Liberals of Vancouver have applied them. May I not counsel the Premier that it might be better instead of making too frequent visits to the mirror, instead of pursuing the course of the fate of Narcissus he should go before the people of Canada and discuss on its merits the question which to-day agitates our people. It is not a question of the white plume—as my hon. friend from New Westminster has most aptly said; if the delay is continued it will become a question of the white feather. Now, I think in all seriousness——

An hon. MEMBER. Hear hear.

Mr. COWAN. I thought that I heard some of the babbling and the murmuring of the limpid water into which the leader of the House gazes. Let me say in all seriousness that the time has come when each of us should go fearlessly, courageously, man-fashion to our masters and say: Have we done right? if we have, approve, if not, condemn. There is no use trying to dodge the issue; you will not succeed. There is no use in hybernating, or the reverse, in this Cham-

ber; no use in delaying the fateful day. If the worst comes to the worst and you are driven from power, accept your fortunes like brave men and take that which fate and destiny provide for you. Waste not the time of this House and this country—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. COWAN. I noticed a smile when I said 'waste not the time of this House and this country.' Will the gentleman who owns the teeth that that smile discovered to this House tell me one bit of business, of real business that concerns the welfare of the people of Canada, that has been done in this House since this session opened on the 17th of November last? We are not in control of this House, allow me to correct, not in numerical control of this House. The party in control of this House, I say again, has not put upon the statute-books of Canada one piece of valuable legislation since the 17th of November. The party in control of this House, in numerical control of this House, has not done one single bit of administrative work to the advantage of Canada since the 17th of November last. In order to help to meet the political exigencies of this party, and of the branch of this party across the line, two of the members of the government journeyed unto Washington, and they came back with new gods for the faithful. The worship of these new gods has been not entirely unmixed with nausea. Indeed, the development of faith and belief in these new gods has been but slow. The development of faith in these new gods in the country is yet to begin. I do not want to discourage too much the party of hon. gentlemen opposite, and it may be that there is still a chance for them. But it may be that the thought of the slimness of that chance is bringing grief—even tears it may be—to some of the members of this government. But whether that is true or not, I again appeal to men of undoubted virility men of moral courage, men like—if I may be permitted to do such a thing as single out an example—men like the Minister of Labour (Mr. King). I appeal to that young mind to instil into the older minds of the government a new born faith in the party, a new hope a new expectation. It may be that the vigour of that young man can attain a success as yet unattained. And whether it can attain that success or not I feel it is his duty as a rising star in the Liberal firmament to shed some light on the fading stars of that party, even though it may be 'a little of the light that leads astray.' Then there is my friend from British Columbia. Can I not persuade him to rise to his accustomed vigour and energy and by the mere force and weight of himself and his character compel that party to go to the country and to do its duty.

I cannot help thinking that there remains to me an appeal that will be effective, an appeal to a man who, though of riper years, has yet preserved his health and strength into a vigorous middle life, and I hope will preserve it to a healthy old age, that man of single blessedness, my appeal is to him. It may be that by a shorter, a briefer use of his power of speech with a more vigorous and energetic exercise of his well-known virile nature, he can effect the desired result and induce the government to rise to the occasion and get to the country, to the tall timbers.

But, Sir, I know there is one member of that government whose keen sense of duty, whose high appreciation of the rights of the people, upon whom the moral restraints necessary for a proper exercise of the franchise and for a proper performance of the duties of a representative are strong, a man of influence, of credit and renown in his native province, a man whose fame has gone throughout the length and breadth of Canada, the Solicitor General. I cannot help thinking that without an appeal from this or any side of the House, that gentleman will rise to the occasion and do his duty. Can it be that we are to write upon the portals of this chamber: Abandon hope all ye who enter here. I refuse to think so meanly of the government party.

I know that there are motives to which I can appeal not far from this chamber, the judiciary, in the Supreme Court. Can we not at once add to the efficiency of that court and expedite an appeal to the country? I ask the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to join me in this.

I look into the future far as human eye can see.

I can see that my appeal to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries has not been made in vain. Again there is our eloquent friend who is always eloquent, always interesting, always theatrical, I appeal to him. There may be, away in the dim and distant future, the glories of leadership waiting for him. It may be that the future will be brought nearer to the present if the delay between now and election day is shortened. I know that the Postmaster General can see that political sagacity alone dictates that his party should no longer linger in this chamber devoting its time to Micawber-like hopes and aspirations that something may yet turn up.

The hour is late and I may have much more to say to-morrow.

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it is a fitting hour, and a proper, and that it would be a useful act, and a gentlemanly act if this House should adjourn now. There

are other matters to which I would like to refer briefly. They have to do more or less with the investigation, perhaps more than less. In handling a question of this kind I attempt to be guided by this principle that I will not in my public career, I hope, charge dishonesty or fraud of any kind against a man private or public unless I have the proof. Our duty as public men, involving as it does a party system imposes it upon us to observe gentlemanly rules of conduct. One of these gentlemanly rules is that no man on the floor of this House should be charged with any wrong doing or dishonesty or fraud unless the proof is in the hands of the man who prefers the charge. It is for that reason that I have hesitated to use in a public way, either on the public platform or in this House, the material reported in the public press with reference to that investigation. I have hesitated to use it because I did not know how much of the evidence was reported correctly, how much of it was omitted, how much of it was distorted from its true meaning, and I regret, therefore, that the absolute refusal of the government to bring down to this House, and make known to the people of Canada the real evidence, and the real report based upon that evidence compels us in the interest of the public, and in the interest of justice to deal with the evidence such as we have it in the reports of newspapers. That evidence displays a condition of political degradation, induced by the policy and practice of this government for the last fifteen years, never surpassed in the annals of any Anglo-Saxon people governed by representative institutions. I can readily understand that your ear, Mr. Speaker, has never been offended with evidence going to show that two factions in one party had actually quarrelled, not because the law was being violated, not because the Immigration Act was being evaded, but because the profits and plunder arising from that violation, and invasion were 'hogged,' as it was put by themselves, and a portion not given to the executive of the party. I cannot understand human nature sinking to a lower level that that. I cannot understand how the premier of this Canada, a country forging ahead by leaps and bounds as no other country in the world to-day is forging ahead, a country that has a future that ought to have public men guided by high motives, and high principles, can listen to evidence of that kind, can allow the men who committed the offences to go unpunished, and can hide from the public eye, can conceal from this House, the evidence of that iniquity. I cannot understand by what moral principles a man can be governed who permits that. I cannot understand how he is regulating his life among his fellow men when he allows that

sort of thing to go on under his eye, when he withholds the arm of justice, delays the lagging feet of justice, does everything to prevent bringing home the crime to the criminal, and does everything to prevent the formation of a healthy public opinion upon the question, and the condemnation of practices of that kind. I cannot understand why the man who has it in his power to expose this wrong doing, and to bring to bay, and to justice the men who are guilty of it will yet withhold his hand, and not exercise that power. The premier of Canada has the greatest power of any ruler of any country of the population and importance of Canada in the world, and why is that so? It is so because the premier of Canada is not tied down in formulating the policy of the country by the splendid sanctions of a resident Crown and by any great body of social opinion the result of the fine feeling of ages. He is allowed to plough his furrow where he will, and I say that a man in that position has a responsibility resting upon him that I fear the premier does not appreciate, but which I believe the people of Canada do appreciate, and because of that appreciation will mete out to him treatment appropriate to a man who fails to appreciate his public responsibility. The party which will uphold the premier in that position, knowing these offences, flagrant beyond any language which I have at my command with which to describe them, and which have been disclosed because of the quarrels of these people over the unfair division of the spoils, and the plunder, must share with him the responsibility for their action. It is a reproach upon the public morality not only of Vancouver, but of the whole of Canada, it is a reproach that can be wiped out only by bringing down the report of the commissioners, and acting upon its recommendations or acting upon better advice if it can be had. That is our bounden duty, that is the duty imposed upon me, and every member of this House by the solemn oath that we took when we became members of this House. If that oath of office, and that sense of duty are binding upon the public men of Canada that oath, and that sense of duty impel with irresistible force every man who has built up his character upon principles of morality to expose to the finish an offence such as this which has been committed against morality, and against the public life of Canada.

When we have men sitting in this House as deaf as an antediluvian boulder to the duty that devolves upon them, it is a black-letter day for Canada, and I believe in my heart that the people of Canada only await an opportunity to sweep them from the treasury benches. It seems strange that rational men, supposed to be guided

by reason and judgment, but men so devoid of the sense of the duty they owe to the memory of those who established free government, should be able to climb to high places in the councils of the country. If the Prime Minister listens, he will hear the ground swell of indignation, coming from the people, because the mind of the people after all is pure and their motives high and altruistic. I appeal to the young members of the government that they listen to the principles inculcated in their minds in youth; I appeal to them not to listen to the siren song of the boodler, the grafter, and the camp follower. The time has come when the people will demand that the men who control the destinies of Canada shall rise above such influences. We are inducing the people of the Orient to come to our shores, we are telling them that if they will come to Canada they need not have $50 in their pockets as the beastly British immigrant has to have, and while we do this why do we not attempt to elevate their mental and moral nature. They are the product of a civilization older than ours; 2,000 years before Christ the Chinese empire had a civilization as developed as it is to-day, but it is a civilization that is not our civilization. If we induce these people to come to our shores, we should set them a good political and moral example and not teach them that when they reach Vancouver they can make a dicker with Mr. Party Heeler, living on Graft street by which they can discount their head tax of $500 by a large percentage and come in as merchant princes, instead of coolies and labourers. We should not let them see that the men who perpetrate these iniquities are not only allowed to go scot free, but are promoted to higher office, are sent as trade commissioners to Japan or China, and are placed in positions of honour and power. The callousness with which the governments looks on at wrong-doing of this kind must have a bad effect upon the public life of Canada and more especially upon the orientals, for whom the Prime Minister has so much care. Now, I want to speak of another and a very important matter. On Friday, the 14th of July, 1911, there was consummated a new treaty of alliance between Great Britain and Japan, and which is of peculiar significance to the people of Canada, inasmuch as it removes the apprehension which existed under the treaty of 1905, and the preceding treaty of 1902, that in case of trouble between Japan and the United States the mother land would be compelled by the terms of the treaty to take sides with Japan.

I am happy to say that this new treaty, entered into on Friday last, puts an end to the possibility of such a contingency ever happening. It provides in express terms that in case of war between the United States and Japan, the United Kingdom shall not be obliged to join on the side of Japan. That is a matter of rejoicing to the people of Canada, because we cannot forget that our good neighbours on the other side of the line are of the breed of our own sturdy race. For 2000 years we were of the same family; the common jurisprudence which they and we enjoy came down from Blackstone and Coke to Marshall and Story. Our common literature is enriched at times by a Tennyson, at times by a Longfellow. The two countries have much in common. To each country our German friends have added their intelligence, their industry, their thrift, and our French people have added not only these, but their brilliancy and their love of art. So that they and we have much in common. But I think the Premier, when he was induced after much reluctance to put his seal of approval upon the little document which the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs brought back from Washington, without even crossing a 't' or dotting an 'i,' after it left the hand of President Taft, forgot the fact that although we and our good neighbours to the south have all these things? in common, yet we do not keep house together. We each must clean our own doorstep and warm ourselves at our own fireside, and I think it is good and well that it should be so, and as long as that is the case, I think our good Premier, whose brilliant gifts in other respects, I will say, have been an enrichment of our public life, should discuss public questions on their merits. But he failed to see the merits of the situation when he forgot that we and our good neighbours to the south do not keep house together; he forgot that each country must solve its own domestic problems according to its own point of view, and that as long as Canada remains a part of the British empire there is imposed upon Canada the plain duty of having at least some regard for those interests which we have in common with the other parts of the empire when we seek to establish new relations with a foreign country. As to the application of this to the question in hand, I still have hope to pierce the thick veil of partisanship in some of our friends across the floor of this House, and reach the gray matter and influence the will and form the intelligence of those gentlemen. I still have hope to convince them that the cobweb robe with which they clothe themselves in regard to this Chinese inquiry, is indecent in the public eye, and exposes much that should not be exposed to the public eye of Canada. As these great events are marching down the grooves of change in the political history of the world, Canada should be up and doing as a prime and foremost nation amongst the nations of the world. Cana-

da's duty is not to hold back, but to proceed with the other parts of the empire, and to strengthen the bond and to cast away that foolish fear that there may be found some one in some part of the empire thrusting at the rise of Canada and tearing away our autonomy. That figment of the imagination, fed to the minds of the people of Canada, will tend to mislead them, and it behoves the public men who can rise to the height of informing the electorate of Canada as to their real duty, instead of appealing to their fears, to assume the duty of protecting the destinies of Canada in the future.

If so, Canada will follow the course dictated by self-respect, nationhood and manhood, and that course will be that Canada will stand as a nation, and as the foremost in the great family of nations composing the British Empire.

As the hour is passed the usual time for adjourning, and the gentlemen in the back benches have returned refreshed and rested, but have not had an opportunity of giving any intellectual expression to that refreshment, it may be that under the circumstances, Mr. Speaker, I should defer the remarks which I would otherwise make, to another occasion.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. THOBURN (resuming). Owing to the fact that I spoke last night till after midnight, I would move that the committee rise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. THOBURN. I question if there is such a case on record in the annals of this House that an hon. member is compelled, after speaking till after midnight last night, to speak again at such a late hour as this. Now, I appeal to the right hon. the Prime Minister if I cannot have the privilege I ask.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Go on.

Mr. FIELDING. I move that the resolution be adopted.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. THOBURN. Then I suppose I must proceed. When the committee rose last night, I was discussing the reciprocity Bill now before the House. I had referred to several items in connection with the Bill, and was about to deal with the preferential clause when the committee rose.

You will have noticed that reference has been made several times during the debate to this clause by hon. gentlemen opposite. Looking at it from a purely business standpoint, I have been unable to find a single instance in which the preferential clause is of benefit to the farmers of Canada. Can any hon. gentleman in this House name one single article of Canadian product that gets a preference in the British market either in Canadian manufactures or in Canadian farm products? Canadian manufactures and Canadian farm products of all kinds sell in the British market on their merits, and that is the reason why the Americans are so anxious that the Reciprocity Bill should pass. They want to import Canadian farm products into the United States, and export them into Great Britain as American products. But, Mr. Speaker, while the American government is anxious to have reciprocity in farm products, they take very good care not to allow these products to enter their country after being partly manufactured. We know that while they will admit a million bushels of Canadian wheat into their country free of duty, the very moment you turn that million bushels into flour they charge you a duty upon it. Why is it? Because the government of that country has always looked after the interests of the American workingman, and any labour that has to be done on that million bushels of wheat they want done in the United States. Take the case of lumber, it is said that they will admit lumber into the United States free in its rough state. That is true, but the moment you plane a board on one side, and export it to the United States there is a duty imposed upon it. Why? Because they are preserving that labour for the American workman, instead of having it done in Canada for the benefit of the Canadian workman.

I cannot think for one moment that our farmers are going to stand for any such fraudulent bargain as this. They have the British market now, and they are going to do their best to keep it. It is a well known fact that the preferential clause means a larger importation of goods into this country, but what does that mean to the manufacturers of the country? What does it mean to the working class of the country? The greater part of every million dollars worth of manufactured goods that comes into this country might be manufactured here and supply labour and wages to the workmen of Canada.

Then, Mr. Speaker, you cannot but have noticed that there has been a free trade element in the speeches of some of the hon. gentlemen opposite in reference to the clause now under consideration. I am very glad that the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) is in his seat to-night, because I wish to deal with some of the utterances of that hon. gentleman in the year 1909, as compared with his utterances in the year 1911. In the year

1909 the hon. gentleman moved the following resolution:

That in the opinion of this House such steps should be taken as may be deemed most effective in conserving the home market to the Canadian coal operators.

After giving a very exhaustive statement he went on to say:

I have reason to hope that the government will be equal to the occasion, and that this House will support the government in inquiring into the cause which is bringing about such a great influx of American coal into Canada, to the exclusion of the use of our own Canadian coal, and that whatever steps are necessary to conserve to us our own market and to exclude American coal shall be taken.

I regret that I have been obliged to speak at such length, but the question is a very important one. I am not presenting alone the case of the capitalists for whom I can assure you I have no retainer, but I feel that it is my duty as representing a large number of working men as near to the foot of the throne as I can, and as far as I am able to submit to the government and the people generally that some measures should be taken to enable these working men to have employment every day and to earn sufficient money to support themselves and their families in comfort. I regret that this winter they have not been kept in continuous employment because of this displacement of Canadian coal in the home market by American coal. It is not at all necessary for one to call himself a labour candidate or to sit in this House as a labour member in order that he should put those issues before this House. Representing as I do a large number of working people, although I do not pose as a labour candidate, I believe that it is my duty to the best of my ability to present to the country and to the House the interests of these people and to appeal for a remedy to the only institution in the land which had power to provide a remedy which will relieve us from any further imposition of this kind, and which will hold the markets of Canada for Canadian coal which we are capable of producing just as well as they can produce coal in a foreign country.

And a little further on he said:

I have presented my views and these statistics to the House in the hope that the government will take into serious consideration the circumstances of those who are dependent on this trade for a means of livelihood as well as those who have had the courage and the enterprise to invest millions of dollars in our coal areas in Nova Scotia and elsewhere in Canada.

What did the Minister of Finance say on that occasion?

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). I do not imagine that my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) desires to divide the House on this question to-night, especially as there is a very slim attendance of members present. I take it for granted that the purpose of a motion was to have an opportunity of presenting these very interesting statistics to us and to urge if it is necessary to urge the importance of the great mining industry. There will be no difference of opinion in that respect. We all recognize that the coal industry of the country not merely in Nova Scotia but in other parts of the Dominion, is a very great industry and that whatever may reasonably be done to advance the interests of our Canadian miners should be done. It is, however, a very vexed question. It is a question on which there will not be by any means unanimity of opinion. I do not imagine that my hon. friend desires to-night to challenge an opinion, and I would suggest therefore that the debate be adjourned so that at a later date when there is a better attendance of members any hon. member who desires may continue the discussion.

Now, that discussion was never continued to my knowledge by the hon. member for North Cape Breton until this present session. It is utterly impossible to understand what the hon. gentleman meant on that occasion when you compare the utterance that he made then and his utterance during the present session of parliament. I refer to page 5120 of Hansard:

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to pay a little further attention to some observations that were made about the prosperous condition of this country, and before I reach that I wish to say something about the province of Nova Scotia, and the coal question. I suppose the coal industry is the largest of any one industry in Canada. The coal industry of Nova Scotia has a capital invested in it of something in the vicinity of $1,000,000,000, it has 10,000 or 12,000, possibly more, men directly dependent upon it, and for us in Nova Scotia the coal question is a very important one indeed. At the same time, we realize that we are part and parcel of the country, that it takes all kinds of people to make a world, and that all manner of agreements, give and take must be made in order that we shall get along peaceably and harmoniously the one with the other. That being the case, and knowing that, there must be duties raised in this country and that the consumer must also be taken into consideration of this question. Speaking as one representing the coal industry of Nova Scotia, while we would like to have seen the duty remain as it was, and while we think it would have been perfectly justifiable to let it remain, we are content to take our share of the burden of taxation upon the people, and if eight cents a ton has been taken off that coal we must put up with it, and do the best we can.

For utter political inconsistency, I do not know where you can find a parallel to this case. Was the hon. gentleman sincere when he made his statement in 1909? Or was he sincere when he made his statement in 1911. Speaking further on on the free trade question I wish to quote the remarks of the hon. member for South Huron (Mr. M. Y. McLean).

Now, Mr. Chairman, I wish to make a little departure and in doing so I shall say in what I say, I speak entirely on my own responsibility. To use a sporting phrase I wish to cast a ball off my own bat. I know from expressions used by my hon. friend the Finance Minister, that he and the members of the cabinet are not prepared to follow as far as I would like to lead, and also that many of my hon. friends on this side would not agree with the sentiments and ideas I am about to express. I believe those ideas to be in the best interests of the country, and therefore that it is my duty to give them utterance.

I believe that the best fiscal policy for this country is absolute free trade, the public revenue to be collected by the simplest, and most inexpensive method of direct taxation that can possibly be devised.

Further on he says:

It has been stated by several members on this side of the House that they would feel better pleased if the government would increase the British preference to 40 or 50 per cent. Now, Sir, I am prepared to go a long step further than that. I say that Great Britain admits our products into her market free, and that we should admit her products into our market free.

We have been lead to believe that the preferential clause was enacted to show an increased loyalty to Great Britain, but we are told now it was nothing of the kind. In this connection I would quote from a speech delivered by the hon. member for Carleton, New Brunswick (Mr. Carvell) who said:

Our hon. friends opposite may say that we introduced it in order to cater to the feeling prevailing at that time that we should do something to help out the British people and to prove our loyalty. I do not believe that was the object at all.

Further on he says:

I can assure the government that there is no way in which they can more ingratiate themselves with the people of Canada or do more good to the people of Canada than to bring down before this parliament adjourns a measure increasing the British preference to at least 40 per cent.

Those are the utterances of hon. members in this House in reference to free trade. We have also the utterance in the memorial presented by the United Farmers of Alberta, which stated that the association welcomed the reciprocity agreement as a first step towards free trade.

In addition to that we have the Americans clamouring for free trade with Canada in manufactured goods as well as in natural products. I quote the following extracts from a speech recently delivered by Senator Beveridge.

There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbour. That policy already has driven American manufacturers across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, employing Canadian workingmen to supply trade. That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply Canadian demand. We should admit Canadian wood pulp and Canadian paper free in return for Canada's admitting our agricultural implements, our engines, pumps and other machinery free. We should freely admit Canadian lumber to American planing mills in return for Canada's freely admitting other American manufactured products to Canadian markets."

In addition to that we have the utterance of Senator Townsy supporting reciprocity:

Not only would he lend his support to the Bill now under consideration, the senator declared, but he would have favoured 'a treaty which would have included all of the products of Canadian and United States industries on the free list.'

Careful and unbiased study had convinced him that the agreement would benefit both countries.

'But I am convinced,' he added, 'that reciprocity with Canada can never be the greatest success until manufactured as well as natural products meet no customs walls in passing between the two countries.'

Senator Townsend argued that it was the duty of the United States and for its best good 'to enter into the freest trade relations possible with those nations where the conditions of living and industry are similar to those of our own country.'

Canada, he contended, came in this class. Personally, he said, he would have 'striven long and hard,' for absolutely free trade between the two countries.

I wish also to refer to some remarks made by President Taft in reference to the tariff between the two countries.

Washington, May 8.—President Taft indulged in some plain talk to-day in explaining to 25 members of the National Grange that he does not intend to play politics with the Canadian reciprocity agreement even if the enactment of that measure by congress costs him the farmers' vote. The president told his visitors bluntly that he was sorry to hear that Republican farmers would desert the party if the agreement goes through, but fear of such desertion would not change his conviction as to the wisdom of such legislation. He said that he believed reciprocity to be the best thing for the whole country and that he did not intend to argue it.

But my conviction with respect to the advantage of this treaty is very deep. So far as is the effect of this on my personal political fortunes, it ought not to influence me, and does not influence me in the slightest. I believe this treaty to be the best thing for the whole country, including farmers, merchants, labouring men and all, because I believe it is contrary to nature, it is flying in the face of Providence, to put an artificial wall like that between this country and Canada and not get the benefit that will inure to peoples of the same traditions, the same language, especially with the same character of labour. If we take down that wall we will benefit by it,——

I wish the House to pay particular attention to this utterance. They are not entirely enacting this measure for the benefit of Canada.

—for we shall sell more agricultural products to Canada than she will sell to us. We do now, and we shall sell her even more after the treaty goes into effect. That is my judgment. I am not arguing—I am merely stating my conviction. If I did not believe this, I should not have taken the responsibility of doing what I have done to put this reciprocity treaty through. I am willing to abide the judgment of history—the judgment that will come after the event. When you gentlemen come to see the result, I believe that you, as fairminded men, will admit that you have been wrong in your fears and that I have been right.

Senator Kenyon, of Iowa made the following statement:

Although President Taft has made several speeches of late, trying to convince the farmers in America that it will be the Canadian farmers who will suffer.

Just think of a statement coming from a senator that it is the opinion of the President of the United States that is the Canadian farmer who has to suffer if this reciprocity goes into effect. Can it be possible that the Prime Minister, or any cabinet minister, or any hon. member on either side of this House, would support such a Bill when the statement comes from the President of the United States that it is to be to the injury of the Canadian farmer? I cannot think so and I will never believe so until such a thing should come to pass Now, I do not wish to occupy the time of this House any longer. I want to put in as concise a form as possible my reasons for opposing reciprocity, and they are as follows:

1. Because I firmly believe that it will be injurious to the Canadian farmer.
2. The farmer has as much right to protection as the manufacturer has.
3. It is taking a link out of the chain of our moderate tariff that has done so much to bring this country to its present state of prosperity.
4. It is striking a fatal blow at the very foundation of our national resources.

Mr. BEST. Seeing that the hour is late I will move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Mr. FIELDING. I regret I cannot accept the motion. I think I may say frankly now that the desire of the government is that this reciprocity debate shall be continued in a reasonable manner from day to day so that we may make progress. If intervening proceedings, I will not say obstructive proceedings—that might be objected to—but if intervening proceedings occur to prevent the consideration of reciprocity in what we think a reasonable manner, then we think we should sit later and advance what we regard as the paramount business of the House at this moment.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The hon. gentleman in that regard is making himself the sole judge of what is in the public interest.

Mr. FIELDING. I am expressing my own opinion. I do not object to my hon. friend having his opinion of what is in the public interest, but I think I am doing no wrong in expressing what I believe to be in the public interest. My hon. friend and I differ, that is our mutual misfortune.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It may be my hon. friend's misfortune; I do not regard it as mine. I was about to say that if matters of public importance are brought forward by hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, such, for example, as the loss to the people of this country of a million dollars by a system of boodling, I ask if it be reasonable that we should be obliged to sit to an unreasonable hour simply because that particular matter has been brought to the attention of the House today. However, the hon. gentleman is entitled to his own opinion on the subject. I am certainly entitled to mine and the proposition, as I understand the hon. gentleman, is that no man on this side of the House shall be at liberty to bring to the attention of parliament, or the country any matter of any public interest whatever except at the risk of being obliged to sit to a very late hour in order to make up that time by a continuation of the reciprocity debate.

That is the proposition as I understand it. No matter what the subject may be—it may relate to the danger to the west of suffering from a coal famine, it may relate to irregularities and abuses in the public service—no one on this side of the House is to be at liberty to open his mouth in regard to any one of these subjects except under the penalty suggested by the hon. Minister of Finance. That may be regarded as a reasonable proposition; certainly, I desire to enter my protest against it at the earliest moment.

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid I cannot agree with the statement of my hon. friend as to what is in my mind on this subject, nor can I admit that his statement that there has been a loss of a million dollars in connection with boodling is to be accepted for a single moment. I do not say that there should not be, in the ordinary procedure of the House, inquiry into matters that are new, matters of urgency, matters which have not previously engaged the attention, and could not conveniently have

engaged the attention, of the House at an earlier date. It is reasonable that there should be such an inquiry, but I do not agree that the reading hour after hour of columns of newspapers many, many weeks and months old is a legitimate contribution to the debates of the House. However, if the hon. gentleman differs from me again I say it is our misfortune.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The columns and columns of newspapers to which my hon. friend refers are no later than the evidence submitted of the boodling to which I have alluded. While I have heard the Prime Minister to-day state that there is an opinion expressed in the report that the report itself should not be laid on the table of the House, I have not heard a statement from any hon. gentleman on the treasury benches that there is any such reason to prevent the evidence itself being laid on the table of the House. It was urged by the right hon. Prime Minister that the commissioner had stated that his report should be kept private for some purpose that I have been as yet unable to understand, but even the right hon. gentleman himself did not state, and I do not think he will state, that the commissioner said that the evidence should not be laid on the table of the House. If that evidence had been laid on the table of the House as it ought to have been in common decency on the very first day we met here the reading of that same evidence in the form in which it had appeared in the public press would not have been necessary. It was necessary to go to the public press because of the neglect of this government to lay on the table of the House the evidence that in common ordinary decency should have been presented to the House the very first day that we were here. I do not know, speaking of my own knowledge, in regard to this boodling, anything of it except from the statements read from the public press, not contradicted up to the present time, that seem to establish that there was within the Liberal organization in British Columbia a scramble as to who would be entitled to the moneys plundered from the public treasury. I am not responsible for that statement. The witnesses who gave their oaths to those assertions are responsible for it, and up to the present we have been unable to appreciate the character of that evidence or to know really how correct, or how incorrect the statements in the public press may be simply for the reason that the government have not had the courage up to the present to lay that evidence on the table as it should have been laid on the table on the 18th of this month.

Mr. LENNOX. Of course, the Minister of Finance must judge for himself in reference to the position he should take in this debate.

The Minister of Finance has more experience than I, but my opinion is entitled to consideration just as his is. I would be glad to see this debate proceed from day to day and a full elucidation of this important subject, but at the same time we are not going, at the beck of the ministry or at the call of the United States, to surrender our rights in this parliament as representatives of the people. I conscientiously attend every sitting of the House and I intend to stay here as much as I can while the reciprocity debate is in progress; but the Minister of Finance is not reasonable in asking that we should stay here until after one o'clock in the morning, because some hon. gentlemen in the discharge of their duty have discussed an important matter as to which the government has offered no defence. This side of the House have no apology to make for entering on the discussion this afternoon. The Minister of Finance may do what he likes, but there are members of this House who intend to express their opinions on reciprocity at an hour when there will be an opportunity for these opinions to go to the public. I tell the Finance Minister with great respect that I shall use my privilege on the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means to bring before the House any matter which I deem of importance, and I will not ask the permission of the 'Globe' to do so. I am enumerated in the 'Globe' to-day amongst what they call the obstructionists and that because in the briefest manner possible I called the attention of the Minister of Agriculture to the fact that I was not enumerated in the census. If the Minister of Finance is not afraid of discussion then he should not deter this side from giving the public an opportunity to judge whether they want reciprocity or not. Until the people have an opportunity of saying whether they do or do not want to ally themselves with the people of the United States in this matter, I for one shall continue to protest against the action of the government.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am informed that while I was out of the chamber, the Minister of Finance thought fit to reflect upon my course, in, this afternoon, bringing to the attention of this House certain rascalities which, if the government has not actually encouraged, it has done nothing to prevent. I might, if I cared to, have prolonged the discussion this afternoon for at least an hour by reading the evidence under my hand reflecting personally upon the minister from British Columbia, but I was good-natured enough to cut that out and it comes with ill grace from these gentlemen opposite to taunt me with

wasting the time of the House when they very well know I had this damaging evidence here and could have read it had I desired. I have had this evidence in my possession since last December; week after week as it accumulated in the records of the committee it came under my observance and was ready for me to present to the House, but I thought it more decent to wait until the evidence and finding of the commissioner were presented before I discussed it. Over two months ago I inquired of the Minister of the Interior in a few words whether it would not be better to defer a Bill then before the House until this report was brought down, and speaking for the government the Minister of the Interior told us that this request was most reasonable. Two months later, knowing that this report was long in the possession of the government I inquired if a formal motion would be necessary to have it produced. I then learned for the first time that the word of a minister of the Crown given to me across the floor of this House was not of value, that it was not the intention to implement his word and bring down the report, that the report was in the custody of the minister shown to be delinquent, and I knew that if we waited for him to decide to bring it down we would never have it. Then I considered that I would be derelict in my duty if I did not take the earliest opportunity to lay before the people of Canada through this parliament the most scandalous condition of affairs that has ever arisen in any city of Canada.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I will ask the hon. gentleman not to enter into the merits of the question at this moment, though I will allow him to defend his action in speaking

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I understood that I was attacked in my absence, and that is the reason I speak. For more reasons than one I do not want to enter into the merits of the question, for in my opinion it has no merits. I wish to resent the imputation cast on me by the Minister of Finance in endorsing the slur first cast by the First Minister, and afterwards withdrawn by him, that I was wasting the time of the House instead of serving the interests of the people of Canada.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe). I wish to say a word in reference to the aspersions cast on me, as one of the speakers, by the Finance Minister. If there is one man who on political matters has only one view, who as it were lives all his life in a barrel and only knows what he sees through the bunghole, it is the Minister of Finance. He seeks to coerce this House to discuss nothing but reciprocity and to force us to discuss that question until it is disposed of. Coercion is the weapon of tyranny, and the day has gone when people will put up with it. We have had a few tyrants on this continent. We have done away with Castro, Don Pedro and others, and recently another tyrant on this continent was disposed of, and the time is not long before Laurier and his crew will be dispensed with. The First Minister and the Minister of Finance cannot coerce a free parliament into passing something which is contrary to the constitution, and which should be submitted to the people. That is the question before this House: are we going to be coerced into adopting the views of the First Minister, who is in essence a coercionist? The very terms coercion and tyranny are distasteful to a British people, and they will not submit to it. The day is not far distant when this effort to coerce us to adopt a policy contrary to the genius of British people will meet with the same fate that befel another tyrant in another country not long ago. Six months ago there was no greater man on this continent than President Diaz in Mexico; he was the great immaculate; but to-day there is no one so mean or poor to do him any reverence. The Minister of Finance seeks to coerce this parliament into all-night sessions that it may pass a measure contrary to justice and to all the rules of public policy known to history. There has been nothing of the kind in any parliament since the days of the Long Parliament and ship money; and because we choose to discuss a public question of the most burning kind on the Pacific coast, he says we are wasting the time of the House. How long has he wasted the time of the House? If he has wasted the time of the House, he has been very well paid for it. He can afford to come back to this House and spend a few days here; he has a few dollars in his pocket to pay his board. Whom did he get the money from? If he got the money from honest and fair men, he should give the names of those who subscribed to his nice little purse. He of all men to talk of wasting the time of the House. He cannot understand for one minute how he stands in the eyes of the public of this country. The man who got $120,000—what for?—he to stand up and challenge honourable members with wasting the time of the House because they choose to discuss a question of this kind and put it on record. Mr. Chairman, I trust that all motion of that kind, especially from the Minister of Finance, will end to-night.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says that I pressed for an all-night sitting. I pressed for nothing of the kind. The House frequently sits longer than this. I thought that the hour was late and that we might make some reasonable progress.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe). I am very glad the Minister of Finance has apologized to the House.

Mr. FIELDING. If I had occasion to apologize, I would be ready to apologize, and I would not expect the hon. gentleman to do so.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe). When it comes to a question of ethics, either personal or political, I do not take my ethics from the same book as the hon Minister of Finance.

Mr. BEST. If it is the wish of the House that I should proceed, I will do so.

Mr. FIELDING. I shall be very glad if my hon. friend will proceed, and if he purposes to occupy any considerable time, after he makes reasonable progress, I will offer no objection to an adjournment.

Mr. BEST. Seeing that in some of the remarks I want to make I wish to refer to the Minister of Customs, I would like him to be in his seat.

Mr. FIELDING. I will guarantee that the Minister of Customs will read what the hon. gentleman says.

Mr. BEST. He is paid to stay here and listen.

Mr. FIELDING. No, he is not paid to stay here and listen.

Mr. BEST. From the time the House met in November, for three or four months, there seemed to be an abundance of time. Members on the government side spoke for three or four hours, and there seemed to be very little objection. But things have taken a very sudden change to-night. The Minister of Finance suggests that the time is precious and that we should not take up the time of the House. It seems to me it is a policy of sit tight.

I have been looking for the time to come when we would hear from the ministers on the government side of the House what they were going to do for the people of Canada. We have heard them tell us that reciprocity was going to be a great thing for Canada—that it was going to enrich the farmer—going to do a lot for this country; but I have yet to find that they have ever made one tittle of proof that either nationally or financially we would be any further ahead than we are to-day. It puts me in mind of what happened last winter between two neighbours of mine—call them Jones and Smith. Jones had a very nice chesnut mare, and had been trying to get a mate for it. Smith was a professional horse trader, and he came along one evening about dark and said to Jones: 'I hear you have a nice chestnut mare. Now, I have a good mate for her. I will give you a trade for this horse.' Jones took him to be sincere, and asked him if the horse was all right, he said it was,' adding 'If you take this horse it will go very well with yours, and you can do a lot of work with them, or if you want to sell the team you can make a pile of money out of them.' The trade was made, the next morning when Jones went to look at his matched team he found to his surprise that the new horse was broken winded, was heavy, had ringbones and was bogspavined. In fact everything that was bad. When he hitched them up and tried to drive off the new horse baulked and would not go at all. Now, I am of the opinion that many of the arguments put up here in connection with reciprocity are similar to this horse trade.

From the time the House adjourned on the 19th of May last up to the present time, I have had the pleasure of meeting the great majority of the electors of the county which I have the honour to represent, and, knowing what I am talking about, I should say that at least 90 or 95 per cent of the people of that county are absolutely opposed to reciprocity. When you consider that about 85 per cent of these people are farmers, why should we not say that they are thinking justly and rightly. Just think for one moment of the position of the farmers in the Dominion of Canada. They claim they have not got justice, and I claim they have not got justice. For instance, this present government will spend in one year between $140,000,000 and $150,000,000, and the farmers of Canada—who are the source of wealth, constituting 63 per cent of the population of this country will get less than $1,000,000, for there is less than $1,000,000 spent on agriculture. I say the farmers of this country have not been rightly used, and I say further that this government would be doing very much more for the farmers of Canada if they would help them financially in their agricultural pursuits.

If this reciprocity treaty goes into force the farmer of Canada will be in competition with the world without any protection whatever. After growing his wheat he takes it a mile down the road to the miller, and the moment it is turned into flour there is a duty on it. If he takes a load of hogs to the market, he has to sell the hogs in competition with the world, but if he wants to take a pound of bacon home with him he has to pay duty. If he takes a steer or sheep to the market he has to sell it in competition with the world, but if he wants to take a pound of fresh meat with him he has to pay duty on it. I would ask the hon. members of this House if that is fair play for the farmer?

It is simply a matter of experiment with the farmer, who has been experimented with long enough, and I believe the day is not far distant when he will be experimented with no longer.

The farmers say to us: 'How is it that in 1900, 1904 and 1908, we never heard of reciprocity, yet it is thrown into the political arena now and we are told, here, take all or none.

The hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) made a statement here to the effect that he wanted the question discussed fairly and clearly, but on the very same column of 'Hansard' you will find that he gagged every member of the government and said that it must go through. He told them that the honour of the government and the honour of the House was pledged to this treaty. I would ask the hon. Finance Minister if the government was so particular about doing as the farmers of the Northwest asked, why is it that nothing was done for them? The hon, Finance Minister and the hon. Minister of Customs went to Washington and made a treaty with Mr. Taft and his legislators, which treaty they did not want to have broken. Seemingly they have no regard for the pledges made to the people of Canada, but they have respect for a pledge made with the American people or with the President of the United States—that is something which must not be broken.

We are asked who suggested this when it was brought before the people. I find that the hon. gentlemen on the government side tell us that previous to 1896 the Conservatives asked for reciprocity. Well, I make the statement, and I believe I am correct, that it is not on record in 'Hansard' that any Conservatives ever asked to make a treaty with the United States whereby the farmers would be divested of every vestige of protection and would, at the same time, have to pay duty for every article they use. Why did the present government not do as the Conservative government did in 1893? In 1893, the Conservative government sent some of the cabinet ministers to many counties throughout this Dominion to find out the needs of the farmers. Amongst others they came to the county which I have the honour to represent, and there were 20 farmers sent from different parts of that county to interview the cabinet ministers. These farmers were not Tories nor Grits, but Tories and Grits combined. It was a representative deputation of farmers, and with the exception of one man, who asked for free corn, we stood solid, asking the government not to take the duty off farm produce, but rather to raise the duty on it. Now, if the farmers of the Dominion, and especially of Ontario, wanted the duty raised on farm produce in 1893, why should they want it taken off to-day? To-day we have transportation facilities which we did not have then. We have spent almost $500,000,000 in building railways and canals, and to-day we have the British market nearer to us than the American market was at that time. No one will gainsay the fact that the British market to-day is far superior to the American market which we had at that time.

We have heard it said that the farmers made a great deal of money previous to the McKinley Bill coming into force. This may be true. But as a farmer, I know—as well as any other man—that if we got high prices sometimes for our products, for years we did not get so much.

But what was that leading up to the deterioration of our farms. I can say as a farmer that, no matter where you went, especially in the province of Ontario, the soil was depleted of its fertility. The farms were not growing, in most cases, within five or ten bushels of grain per acre as much as they do to-day. Our coarse grain was sent to the United States, and with it our steers were sent out to be fattened on the American side. The McKinley Bill came into force and many farmers thought they were hurt. I was one of of those who were of that opinion. We had to look about us and see what we were going to do with our coarse grains, and especially with our barley. We went to work to raise stock, of which, previous to this, very little was raised in Ontario. We started to raise hogs and cattle. And as soon as we began on this course we had the fertility coming back on the land, and that is the reason we have the land in a superior state of fertility to what it was at that time. And I can honestly say as a farmer that there is not a man in Ontario who is feeding his coarse grain to stock, as he should do, who sells his barley for less than 75 cents a bushel, and some of it is as high as $1.25. And this has been the case for the last ten years. Then, we have been compelled to build up the reputation of our farm produce and live stock in England. It took years to do that. I can remember when in the agricultural societies and farmers' institutes the idea constantly expressed was that we should try to build up a fine type of bacon hog. That took fifteen years to accomplish. But to-day we have that type of hog and our bacon stands second to none in the English market. Shall we allow the American hog to come in so that the American bacon shall be mixed with ours? Shall we allow Canadian bacon to be sent to the United States to be mixed with lower grade American bacon and sent to the English market there to lower the standard of our product? We are told that if the American market is not satisfactory we can still send to the English market. But we know that the Minister of Agriculture himself has

been telling us to send our best quality of cured meat and grain to the English market. This we have done, and it is because of that that we have such a reputation in that market. I quite admit that, for a small percentage of our farm produce, those of No. 1 standard we should probably get a higher price in the United States. But, while we get a little more for twenty per cent of our farm produce we shall get far less for eighty per cent. If we sell this high quality cured meats and grain to the United States, we have only the lower grades to send to the English market. The result will be to lower our standard and our reputation and the reputation of our farm produce in England, so that it will take another fifteen or twenty years to regain what we have lost.

Now, we have been told that from 1854 to 1856 good times reigned in Canada because we had reciprocity. But times are different to-day from what they were then. Simply because the times were good then with reciprocity between Canada and the United States, is that any reason why we should expect prosperity now under reciprocity? We cannot judge of the future by the past. Our fathers lived in log houses, but we do not want to go back to houses of that kind. We have been progressing in the last fifteen or twenty years, and we want to still go on. But some people insist upon judging the future by the past. They would hark back to the days of 1854-1866 and say that because reciprocity was good for Canada then it must be good for Canada now. It is not necessarily so. I believe that it was a good thing then, but to assume that it will be a good thing now is to assume that the conditions now are the same as the conditions were then. But they are not, decidedly not. When a farmer is told of the high prices received for his products during the latter part of the time that that treaty was in force he should remember that peculiar circumstances existed then that do not exist now. The great civil war was wholly within this period. The prices of that time were enormous, and need not be expected to-day. Think of our condition as a country then. There was not even a confederation of the provinces. Now, the scattered fragments of those days have been brought together and made one great Dominion. Then there had been no combined systematic attempt to find a market for our goods. Apparently the United States was our only market. We had not learned of the possibilities about us. Now, the federated provinces have expended $427,000,000 on railways and canals to develop means of transportation; the provincial governments have spent $36,000,000, and the municipalities $18,000,000 in the same direction. Furthermore, the provincial and federal governments have guaranteed bonds for railway construction in Canada to the amount of $127,000,000 more. We are proposing a further expenditure of $75,000,000 to $100,000,000 for the Transcontinental railway. All this expenditure is to develop internal trade between the east and west, and make us independent of the markets of the United States. At the time of the last reciprocity agreement we were in large measure dependent on the United States for our markets. But we are not dependent on them now. The mother country has replaced the United States in this respect. Improved transportation and cold storage have brought the British market nearer to us to-day than the market of the United States was in 1854. In 1910, Great Britain took of our animals and their products $42,000,000 out of a total of $54,000,000 which was exported, equal to 77 per cent. Of our agricultural products they took $71,000,000 worth out of a total of $91,000,000, equal to nearly 80 per cent. In the same year the United States took of the first 20 per cent, and of the second 9 per cent. The United States took last year of our agricultural products only 7 per cent more than she took forty-two years ago. These figures show conclusively the ability of the mother country to take all our products, and at good figures. They prove our independence of the United States market. Let us disabuse our minds of the idea that because reciprocity was a good thing for the Canadians in 1854 we need it now, that because it was profitable under conditions existing then it would be profitable under the changed conditions of to-day. Circumstances alter cases. Before we consider the effect of the proposed arrangement we must consider three things concerning this reciprocity treaty. Mr. Speaker, I would ask for an adjournment.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT—BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. FIELDING moved the adjournment of the House.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN. Shall we continue the same discussion to-morrow?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, continue this discussion.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 1.30 a. m. Friday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

FRIDAY, July 21, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

CHINESE INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. With reference to the question which came up yesterday, and which was brought up by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in regard to the inquiry made by Mr. Justice Murphy as commissioner to investigate frauds in the administration of the Chinese Act at Vancouver, I stated yesterday that I had a conference with the Minister of Justice on the matter, but that I had had no time to read the report, and had only looked at the conclusions. The first conclusion is that Mr. Justice Murphy advises certain prosecutions be taken. The other recommendation was that the report should not be made public until the prosecutions had been taken, the reason being—I could not give the reason yesterday, but I can now—that if the report were made public before the prosecutions were undertaken, witnesses for the prosecution might disappear. I understand, on further conference that the parties indicated for prosecution are in China and therefore that no prosecution we could undertake would reach them. I have looked at the report and see no reason why it should not be given to the public even in the face of the recommendations made by Mr. Justice Murphy. Therefore, I lay it on the table. As hon. members will see, it is a rather voluminous document. What I have here is the report and the evidence. There is also about a trunkful of exhibits which I said might be sent to the office of the clerk.

MR. COURTRICE.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I wish to refer to a question asked by the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. J. D. Reid). The question was based on an item which appeared in the newspapers and referred to Mr. Courtrice, an employee of the Department of the Interior. I have made inquiries, and find that Mr. Courtrice applied for leave of absence without pay beginning on the 1st of July. He was granted the leave, but, on the reassembling of parliament he was told he must report for duty. He has been at work in the department at his ordinary duties since and including Wednesday afternoon.

THE CENSUS—OMISSIONS IN ENUMERATION.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) whether or not he has any further information about the alleged irregularities in connection with the census. I would like to inform him at the same time, that I have a letter from a gentleman residing in an apartment house in Toronto stating that people in that House to the number of twenty-two were not included in the enumeration. And when he asked the enumerator the reason for this, some very unsatisfactory reply was given, and the enumerator also stated that if any person were omitted they had enough in other respects to make up for any such losses. I have forgotten the exact expression, but it is something like that. I intended to bring the letter in, but omitted to do so. I do not know whether the minister has ascertained yet whether I have the honour to be enumerated or not. I would like very much to know.

Mr. FISHER. I should have preferred not to make a statement until I had had an opportunity for fuller investigation. I hope the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) will send in the names of the people said to have been omitted, so that I may investigate the matter.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I will.

Mr. FISHER. So far as the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) himself is concerned I can only make a partial statement, not yet having had an opportunity to investigate the matter fully. The statement given me is that the enumerator called at the hon. gentleman's house when he and Mrs. Borden were out. The servant told him so and said that if he would come back, no doubt they would be in. The statement I have is that he went back five or six times, and was not able to find any body in the house. I am making more careful inquiry to find out whether that means that he was not able to find Mr. or Mrs. Borden, or that he was not able to find anybody at all. The statement made to me, was that he was not able to find any body at all. He did what his duty required in such circumstances and sent an absentee card to the office, which is in the office, and was there when my hon. friend made his statement the other day. That card will ensure that the case will be worked out and fully enumerated.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I made full inquiry, and my information is that the enumerator did state that he would call again, but from that time up to the present, so far as my information goes, he never has called again. Of course, I have no personal knowledge of the matter, but that is the information that comes to me after careful inquiry.

Mr. FISHER. Was the house open all the time?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The house has been open all the time.

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—REDUCTIONS ON OVER-CLASSIFICATION, &c.

Mr. LENNOX. I desire to ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) if the computations have been made which would enable him to inform the House as to what reductions have been made in expenditure on the Transcontinental in reference to over-classification, overbreak and matters of that kind. The minister will recollect that I asked him, some time ago, in reference to this, and if my recollection is correct that hon. gentleman told me he could not put it in figures at that time because the matter would involve a good deal of investigation before the result could be known. The investigation had been made by the arbitrators and data obtained on which a computation could be made, but at that time it had not been worked out. Perhaps he can inform the House whether that has been done, and if so what is the result, if not, what is the probability of the information being available within a short time.

Mr. GRAHAM. My recollection is that I gave a portion of the figures. But the report of the arbitrator was made in technical terms, and I was not at that time able to have it reduced to dollars and cents. I will make inquiry at once and see if the matter is in the form the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lennox) desires and will give him the information.

ST. PETER'S RESERVE.

Mr. BRADBURY. I desire to ask the Superintendent General of Indian Affairs (Mr. Oliver) with regard to the official documents in the case of the St. Peter's Reserve. I understand that the Royal Commission of Manitoba has made an official request to the minister for the documents and that the understanding was that if the commission made the request the minister would grant it. The commission sits on the 24th instant and it will be difficult to proceed without these documents.

Mr. OLIVER. The requests spoken of have been received, and measures are being taken to furnish the documents as requested, so far as we are able to do so.

CHARGES AGAINST HON. MR. OLIVER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the orders of the day are called I would like to ask the Prime Minister what is the reason of the delay in calling the committee which the right hon. gentleman moved for. a short time before the adjournment, to inquire into certain matters which, in his opinion, affected the status of the Minister of the Interior. A committee was moved for, was constituted, and I believe had one or two sessions, and was to resume work on the 18th instant. Up to the present time, so far as my information goes, there has been no attempt to call that committee together. If the matter was worthy of public attention, and necessitated the appointment of a committee, I would think it was especially worthy of expedition. I am at a loss to understand why the committee has not been called before this.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Like my hon. friend, I am at a loss to know why it has not been called. I do not know any other reason except that the attendance of the House has been very small; I do not know whether the members of the committee are in the House. When the chairman is here, I shall ask him.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex). The chairman is waiting for the arrival of the members of the committee. One was here the second day of the session, one only arrived yesterday, and another has not arrived yet. As soon as all the members are here. it is the intention to call the committee together.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I may observe to my hon. friend that if delay in the arrival of the fifth member makes it impossible to go on, the committee might not go on at all this session. I would think the proper course would be to call the committee and to see who is present.

Mr. CLARKE (Essex.) I understand the other members will be here within a day or two.

WAYS AND MEANS—VOTERS' LISTS IN UNORGANIZED DISTRICTS.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Before you leave the chair, I desire to refer briefly to the condition of matters in the northern district of Ontario as regards the preparation of the voters' lists for the unorganized portions. As the Prime Minister is aware, there was a good deal of discussion in the session of 1908 as to the methods which were prescribed by the then Election Act for the making up of the voters' lists, and a good deal of criticism was directed to the somewhat cumbrous procedure prescribed by the amendment to that Act. The amendment requires the services of a board of registration, comprising three judges chosen from the adjoining counties, the chairman of which was to be the senior judge of the electoral district for which the lists were to be made up. Now, I have received, as the sitting member, a semi-official noti-

fication that no voter' lists are to be made up under that Act, and that no board of registration is being constituted for that purpose. I am not aware, and my right hon. friend will be able to inform me, whether any special proclamation has been issued requiring the voters' lists in those unorganized territories under this Act to be made up at an earlier date than the period prescribed by the statute. If there has been no such proclamation, or if no such proclamation is to be made, then section 9a of the Act will govern, and the lists must be made up between two specified dates, namely, the 1st day of August and the 15th day of October in each year. Now since the discussion ensued upon the making up of these voters' lists a practical test of the workability of the Act has been made, it was made in the year 1908. I know that my right hon. friend will credit my words when I say that, with all the speed that could possibly be put upon the cumbrous machinery that was at the disposal of the district judges, by shortening the available time in a manner which was, according to my view, beyond the jurisdiction of the board of registration within those periods, from the first week in August up to the 26th day of October 1908, the judges were only able, with the kindly assistance of the Department of the Secretary of State, which opened the printing bureau on a Sunday and printed the lists, and then, by the kindly assistance of this government in sending a special train with the lists to the scene of the election, they were able, three hours after the election had commenced, three hours after the polls were opened, to get lists there, which were imperfect and irregular. During the course of revision by the board of registration there was a judgment written out by the board, of which I presume a copy is lodged in the office of the Secretary of State. It is not in my hand at the moment, but I can produce it shortly. The judgment was to the effect exactly as I contend, that under the provisions of this Act it was impossible, within the periods, and with the machinery at the control of the board, to revise and complete the lists within that time.

Now those are the conditions which prevailed in the northern districts in 1908. But the difficulties there are tremendously increased at the present time. There are polls, of which I have received a semi-official notification from the enumerator, which will be opened in the district of West Algoma, to get to which, and to get back again to my home, will require a journey of not less than 2,000 miles. Now what I am told is that the board of registration will have to be a law unto themselves that in making this Act workable and applying it to the preparation of these lists, they are going to cut down all the periods mentioned in the Ontario Voters' Act which governs the period for making up the list under this Act. Consequently the lists cannot be properly prepared. If the enumeration is to take place fifteen days after the notice, or ten days after the notice, as the case may be, there will hardly be time to enable anybody to get there in order to make the enumerator. I am told that in some instances a canoe trip is required, and a great deal of walking and railway travel is necessary in order to reach these polls. Therefore I draw this matter to the attention of the government in order that, before the work of the board of registration is organized and the enumeration of the voters' in these polls is commenced, careful regard should be had to the condition of things which arose in 1908, and that care should be taken to give the necessary time in order that proper lists may be obtained, and that everybody may have an opportunity of seeing that fair lists are made and that a fair revision is had. The lists of 1908 were very unsatisfactory. Names were put upon these lists by the hundred, wthout any attempt to obtain information as regards the qualification of the voters.

That was shown to be the case before the Board of Registration, and in one place many hundreds of names were dropped off. The revision was not so satisfactory in other ridings where that contention was not expressly insisted upon. I should like the government to give some intimation as to whether, under that condition of the law, the Board of Registration is authorized by this Act to shorten the periods which are fixed for the making up of these lists. It is of the most vital importance if we are to have a fair list up there. It is all very well for an enumerator, after having given notice which, by the Act governing the time, is said to be thirty days, and which the Board of Registration reduced to ten days, to be there and get the names of a whole lot of men on a pay roll or from a mine superintendent or a road boss and put them on the list without giving an opportunity for any one to investigate. The Ontario Voters' List Act, amended, of the Dominion Elections Act, is made to govern matters of this kind, provides that a longer time shall be prescribed for the making up of these lists. The section to which I refer reads as follows:

> In the preparation of such lists the provisions of the law of the province regulating the preparation and manner of revising and bringing into force the provincial voters' lists in the like cases shall, as far as possible, be observed and followed, but the revision of the said lists shall be had before the board of registration, who shall hear all appeals from the said enumerators, and no person whose name

is not included in the voters' lists so prepared and revised shall be entitled to vote.

Under the Ontario Consolidated Voters' Lists Act of 1907, section 60, not less than thirty days is the time prescribed for posting notices.

Not less than thirty days after the posting of the notices the enumerators shall visit every part of the territory where by the statute or by proclamation of the lieutenant governor there is required to be a polling place, and shall ascertain the names of all persons who are entitled to have their names entered on such lists, including any who may deliver to him an affidavit according to form 22a or 22b.

It is all very well for the enumerator to go to satisfy himself by reference, perhaps, to incorrect information as to the qualifications of voters, but there is a period prescribed by the Ontario Voters' Lists Act for the preparation and making up of these lists just the same as there is under the Assessment Act or in connection with any other procedure in an organized district. Especially is it necessary that sufficient time should be allowed in these remote districts, as we have to face them for the purpose of the preparation and revision of the voters' lists. The polls are absolutely new and are in very recently opened up country and very remote and difficult of access. If the Board of Registration is arbitrarily to be permitted to shorten the period from thirty days to ten days or even less, or to usurp authority not accorded to it by statute in order to make that change, there will be no accurate list of voters in the northern country, and there will be no opportunity afforded to any persons desirous of obtaining an accurate list by means of a fair revision of the list. The Act as originally framed provided that the time for appeal should be thirty days. That appeal has been cut down by the amendment of the Act to ten days. I am most anxious in the interest of a fair voters' list to be prepared under the most difficult conditions, to bring to the notice of the government the fact that if the Board of Registration is to arbitrarily change the law, arrogate to itself the functions of this government, revise and amend the statute and prescribe other days or sets of days and other times than those limited by this statute for the preparation of these lists, there will be greater confusion in that north country in connection with the preparation of these voters' lists than there was in 1908, more inconvenience and very great dissatisfaction with the methods which are employed in the making up of these lists.

Mr. LANCASTER. And disfranchisement.

Mr. BOYCE. Disfranchisement to a very large extent, as my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) says. But that is not the worst danger that we have to fear in the preparation of these lists. The danger is accentuated by the shortening of the time, the lessening of the power to get information. The tendency is to put on the list holus bolus as it were, if I may use the expression, unqualified men who are not entitled to be on the list at all with an utter lack of any opportunity of enforcing the provisions of the Act or of ascertaining the qualifications of these men and of getting such particulars as it is fair and reasonable that every one should have in order to secure a fair list. I know of my own knowledge that in the preparation of the lists in 1908 men were put upon those lists who came upon the same train as the enumerator had come upon to prepare the lists, from an adjoining province not possessing the qualification of residence or other qualifications required by the Ontario Voters' Lists Act. These men were put on actually while they were in a condition of transit as being residents of a polling subdivision in which they had never set foot at the time the enumerator put their names on the lists. How was that done? That was done in the simplest possible manner and in such a way as to give the enumerators as little trouble as possible. He simply went to a camp foreman, an irresponsible person, a gentleman possibly concerned in promoting the interest of one side or the other, in this case interested in promoting the candidature of the gentleman who was seeking the suffrages of the people in behalf of this government, and got a list from him as of the persons in the polling subdivision who were qualified to be put upon the lists. That list, given to the enumerator by an absolutely irresponsible person, in so far as any oath of office or other qualification was concerned, was taken by this enumerator, sworn to discharge his duty and make up a list according to the requirements of the Ontario Voters' List Act. It contained hundreds of names while the qualified voters numbered somewhat under 100. The lists were made up, they were sworn to by the enumerator and they were published and went out to the world as the authorized lists of voters in that polling subdivision. That is not a fair administration of the Act. I think the right hon. Prime Minister will see that it was not that kind of an administration of the Act that in 1908 he proposed to have. I think he will agree with me that it was an outrage upon the provisions of this Act, and my purpose in addressing myself now to the House is to ask the right hon. gentleman and those directly concerned with the administration of this department to see to it that there shall not be a recurrence in 1911 of the wrongs and outrages which took place in 1908.

When this Act was framed in 1908 my right hon. friend, with some hesitation, said that he hoped it would be workable. Strong objections were made by myself and others as to the workability of it, we having some personal knowledge of the local conditions, but I hope that my right hon. friend will realize that it is undesirable that the conditions to which I have referred shall again obtain in that part of the country.

It was stated by my right hon. friend that the act was intended to procure a fair voters' list, but I would refer him and his Minister of Justice to the proceedings and records of the Board of Registration to ascertain whether the provisions of the Act do provide for a fair voters' list. There is a ruling in writing by the Board, in which all members of the Board concur, that the proceedings necessary to procure proper lists under this Act could not be performed within the time and in the manner prescribed by the Act, and the Board went so far in the first instance as to say that the election then pending would have to be postponed in order that proper lists might be obtained. The Board, finding it had no power to interfere with the currency of the writ then issued, reconsidered their finding and decided to make a law unto themselves and to have a special train for the Board to carry its court from poll to poll to revise these lists. We know what confusion ensued; where the lists had to be sent down, the Secretary of State fetched from his constituency in a motor car, the printing bureau working on Sunday in violation of the Lord's Day Act and a special train sent out with the lists to Sault Ste. Marie, and along the line of the Canadian Pacific Railway. I desire that the government should give me this information: Has there been a proclamation under the Act of 1908 prescribing an earlier day for the making up of these voters' lists; if so, when will the work of enumeration be started and how long is it expected, from the most recent advice the government has, that it will take; and, will the government see to it that the Board of Registration is prevented in this instance from arrogating to itself the functions of government by abridging the time which by this Act is directed to be followed as far as possible. The words, 'as far as possible' are introduced into section 5 of the Act. But who can say that in a territory so vast that one has to travel 2,000 miles to go to and from these polls that the time limited by the Ontario Act is unfair. Who will say that when in order to get to a place to make up these lists one has to travel into an almost unknown region, that the thirty days prescribed by the Ontario Act for the preparation of the appeal and the holding of the Court, should, under the difficult conditions existing, be curtailed, or any other period prescribed by the Board of Registration, to the prejudice of those who are anxious to have a fair list. This is a vital subject, and I would urge the government to consider the difficult conditions existing in that country, especially in West Algoma, where it is exceedingly difficult to get to these far distant polls where up to a year or two ago no white man's foot had ever stepped. In this territory, I have been told, that two or three thousand names are to be put on the lists. I can scarcely credit that. In the face of the imminence of a repetition of the various irregularities of procedure of 1908, I urge upon the government the very great necessity, in the interests of a fair election, of seeing that the procedure prescribed by the law is strictly followed.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. The administration of the statute which the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) has referred to is not in any way in the hands of the Department of Justice nor is it, I think, in the hands of any department of the government. The idea with which this statute was framed, and the intention of parliament in passing it, was that the preparation of the voters' lists in the unorganized portions of Ontario should be in the hands of the judges of the various courts of the districts constituting this unorganized territory, who were thought to be the best people for the practical administration of the provisions of the statute. The statute having been framed and passed with that intention it seems to me it is now in position to be worked out without reference to any kind of governmental supervision or control. The conditions which existed three years ago when this statute was for the first time coming into practical operation were of somewhat unusual character. Before, under the statute, it was possible to complete the lists the House was dissolved and a general election was called. That general election being fixed for the latter part of October and the lists being in preparation during the immediately preceding months it may very probably be that there was need for limiting, to the very briefest period which the statute would permit, the times during which the various steps towards the preparation of a voters' list should be taken. The Secretary of State of that day did, I believe, concern himself to a very considerable extent, in an effort to be of assistance to the judges in working out the provisions of the Act. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) says that the practical operation of the statute at that time was in its result not satisfactory. That is probably a matter of opinion. At all events I have never heard any complaint with reference to the result of the operation of the statute in

question, upon that, the only occasion upon which it has been operated, except the complaint which has come from the hon. gentleman himself. I am encouraged to think that there has not been any need felt of amendment to the provisions of this statute, from the circumstance that not only has no suggestion of amendment at any time come from any of the numerous judges who were concerned three years ago in working under this statute, nor has there been so far as I am able now to remember any suggestion of amendment made by even the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) himself.

No amendment has been proposed to this House during the sessions that we have had, and I have been gratified to think from that circumstance that this statute, which, as I have no doubt everybody who hears me is aware, I myself framed, has been found to answer well the purposes for which it was passed. In regard to the present situation, fortunately we are not in the same position that existed three years ago. No one, I presume, has any expectation that the general elections which follow upon a dissolution of this House, are any where in sight, or are at all liable to take place until there has been at least one session or perhaps two sessions more. In these circumstances there seems no danger to be apprehended that it may be found necessary on the part of the learned judges who are at present engaged in the preparation of these lists to curtail at all the time which the statute provides for taking the various steps.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH (East Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I can speak as one who suffered somewhat from the iniquitous lists that were gotten up by this government in 1908, perhaps more so than any other member of this House; in fact, so much so, that it was necessary for the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice or the Secretary of State to send up eight or nine of the helmeted gentlemen who stand around the corridors of this House, and other parts of this city, to protect life, and property during the voting period in the backwoods of Algoma. The manner in which the lists were gotten up there ought to bring a blush of shame to the right hon. the premier, who now sits looking me in the face, when I tell him that there were 630 names placed on the voters' lists 50 miles from civilization, and placed under the control of followers of this government who controlled the camps where the men worked. One of the enumerators whom I questioned as to how he came to get so many names on the list, and as to whether he was satisfied that these men were still in the woods or were in the woods at all, said to me: 'I got some of them from the foreman of the camp, some from a certain gentleman in Blind River, a lawyer who was very friendly to this government, and some from men in the woods who were coming out.' These men who were placed on the lists were hired in the city of Hull, in the city of Ottawa, and in different parts of the province of Quebec, and their names were placed on the lists the moment they set their foot in Blind River or between that and the place for the polling. They were so unacquainted with that part of Ontario that the gentleman who took their names from them was not able to understand one-half of them; so he took a jump at them, and those who were placed wrongfully on the lists had substitutes on polling day when they came to vote. 630 appeared at the polling booth, and 230 voted. The balance of the 630 refused to take the oath, because they were conscientious men after all; but that was no credit to the government, who placed their names on the lists. To show you that the lists were gotten up in a partisan spirit, under the hands of those friendly to the government, at the dictation I have no doubt of some of the members of the government, those men were practically placed in the position of criminals, and your humble servant was placed in a very peculiar position. When I or my agent objected to those names being placed on the list, I sent a subpoena to every man on the lists who I knew had no right to be there, and because I did not accompany it with conduct money, these men did not appear at the revision, and the judges allowed every name to remain on the list. The result of the election in these bush polls was of course exactly what we expected. I had the magnificent number of 18 votes to my credit as against 200 or more to the credit of the gentleman who intended to have their votes, and got them. As my hon. friend from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) has said, there should be no curtailment of time in getting up the lists in the northern parts of Ontario at any rate. The distances are great. Although I live within a hundred miles of some of the points in my constituency, I have to travel 570 miles to get to those points. Moreover, a great many people do not see the proclamation at all, because they are scattered in batches through the woods, while the proclamations are posted only where there are school houses or at other public places; so that in many parts of Algoma the men entitled to vote do not know that a proclamation has been issued, and that their names are on the lists until it is too late. Now we have a new condition of affairs in that district. There is now the district of Porcupine, with a great number of people there who were not there at the time of the last election. I am told that there are some 10,000 people there. Then, we have the Grand

Trunk Pacific crossing the northern part of the district of Algoma, and that is hard to get at. So that it is necessary for this government to see that plenty of time is given, and that a careful list is made up in the northern parts of this province. I hope the government will not repeat what they did in 1908. I think it was a very unfair handicap. I am never afraid to go up against any reasonable proposition in an election, so much so that I have the honour, which perhaps no other member of this House has, of having won four general elections in six years. So that I am not any ways afraid where there is not such a handicap placed upon me as was the case in the last campaign. I was glad, however, that the good people who were entitled to vote knew what they were voting for, and placed me in this House. I hope the next time we shall not have the same handicap.

Mr. BOYCE. I yould ask for an answer to the question which I put.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sorry I cannot give any answer to my hon. friend. The administration, so far as this Act is concerned is in the hands of the Secretary of State (Mr. Muprhy) who is not in his seat to-day. He will, however, I have no doubt, read the remarks of my hon. friend and give an answer on Monday.

EXPRESS RATES, PARCEL POST SYSTEM.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). For a few moments I wish to refer to a matter which I brought before the House the other day, in connection with the principle of state ownership in competition with private ownership, in order to secure better treatment for the public.

I pointed out that in the province of Ontario, where there is state ownership now in regard to hydro-electric power, there is a great improvement, and I urged that by the same instrument a great improvement could be made in the telegraph and cable charges in this country, if we adopted state ownership. I also elicited from the Postmaster General the statement that state ownership was likely to obtain in the matter of telegraphs and especially in connection with cables, and that an understanding had been reached by the Postmaster General of England in association with the Postmaster General of this country to have state ownership, and, therefore, a reduction in the tolls. While I am referring to that I wish to say that I hope no agreement will be made by which, for a small reduction in the telegraph and cable tolls, the right of the state to intervene and to establish its own cables will be interfered with. No parliament should part with a sovereign right of the state. That was done some years ago to the great disadvantage of the province of Ontario, when the Ross government gave a monopoly to three companies to develop power at the Niagara frontier, and bound the state that as long as that franchise existed the state would not interfere. This was a wrong. The state cannot part with a sovereign right in that manner, and if it does any other parliament can rescind the Act. The same thing could happen in connection with the telegraphs and cables, if the state agreed, for a small reduction to postpone the experiment of state ownership.

Having said that, I wish to come to another practical point where state ownership will render great benefit to the people of this country. This is in connection with the post office and the parcel post. The people of this country are to-day paying exorbitant express charges. It is true the Railway Commission had undertaken to reduce them, but the process has been very slow, and the people of Canada are dissatisfied with the express rates obtaining in this country. While the express companies which are owned by the railway companies, are making an enormous profit out of their charges.

Just to show you what can be done in this matter, I may say that only the other day the Railway Commission of the United States intimated to the express companies that they proposed overhauling their rates. The result was that a great reduction has already taken place in express charges. It was not only the threat of the railway commission which reduced the rates in the United States, but rather also the well known fact that there is a widespread agitation in that country to-day for the adoption of the parcel post system of England. We have in Canada a better parcel post system than they have in the United States, but our system is not as good as the English system. The effect of the English parcel post system—and in fact of the European parcel post system—because they have a better one in Germany—is to give the people an express service which does not cost one-third of the rate prevalent in Canada, and there is no such thing in England or Germany as the tyranny of the express companies so well known in America to-day.

Some centuries ago, the greatest departure in scientific subjects was when Sir Francis Bacon came forward with his great work in regard to scientific investigation. He said he had found a new instrument or new method in regard to scientific investigation, which he called the principle of induction. This brought about a revolution in scientific discoveries and in philosophy. Well, the great political principle to-day in regard to economics is state competition, as

against these great public service corporations.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not good for reciprocity.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I do not see the point of my hon. friend's remark. However, if we cannot have absolute public ownership in this country, we can at least have the state in competition with these companies. I have tried to show the other day that if the Intercolonial system were extended we would have a reduction in freight rates. This seems to me to be a self evident fact. To-day we have an organized parcel post system in this country which ought to be extended. The government is pledged not to extend it because the railway companies have told them they must not do so, using this pretense that if the parcel post rates are reduced the country storekeeper will be injured. There may be something in that, but it is a peculiar thing that every time I heard that argument, I was able to trace it back to the express companies. My contention is that all the people of Canada would be greatly benefited if the parcel post system of this country were extended and put on the same basis as the parcel post system of Great Britain, and still more if it were put on the basis of the parcel post system of Germany. Every citizen of this country feels the burden of these express charges, and while the Railway Commission has not yet been able to catch up with them and effect a reduction, I think we ought to go ahead and increase the weight of the parcels we allow to go through the parcel post. We ought to reduce the rates, and make them what they are in Great Britain or in Germany. If we do that a great benefit will be conferred on our people.

Just to show you that the railways dictate the policy in regard to these matters, I need only tell you what is admitted to be the case in the United States. It has been found that the railways control the express companies. The shareholders of the express companies are pretty well spread out, and have brought a great deal of influence to bear in arguing that the parcel post system cannot be adopted, much less extended. John Wanamaker, the late Postmaster General of the United States was asked while he was in office why the people of the United States could not have a parcel post system. He said there were four reasons, and the four reasons he gave were the names of the four great express companies operating in that country, every one of which is controlled by the railways. The railway lobby in the Senate of the United States has been all powerful for 20 years, and it is, apparently, all powerful yet. But the day of relief is at hand, and the widespread movement in the United States for the adoption of a parcel post system, in connection with the threat of the Interstate Railway Commission to reduce the rates, has brought about a great reduction in the express charges in force.

Every time the attempt has been made it has been stopped by some great influence, and that influence comes from the railways. We are told that we were to have an international court in regard to railway matters. The chairman of our commission, and the chairman of the United States commission in consultation devised a scheme, and I believe it was authorized by law. But somebody has interfered, and it is a dead letter. My information is that the railways have been sufficiently powerful with the government to have the proposal tied up, and made innocuous so far as they are concerned. If these corporations can exert such an influence, if for twenty years they have been able to prevent the expansion of our parcels post, the people of this country ought to know it, especially in view of the fact that an election is near at hand. The people ought to have an opportunity to say whether we are to have the benefit of the parcel post system. It is all very well to have a skeleton of the system, but that is not enough; you must have life in it. The life is this principle of state competition with these corporations. Extend your parcel post system, and the express rates in Canada will be cut in two to-morrow. I would remind the House, of the experience I had in the Railway Committee some years ago. I took some action with a view to bringing the express companies within the purview of the Railway Act. We had a special committee on the subject of which Sir William Mulock was chairman. At our first meeting the express companies appeared by their lawyers, and presented the argument that they could not be brought under the Railway Act, because they carried parcels partly by water, and only partly by rail. That was argued for two days. When the lawyers were through, I said: If that is your argument it would be better for us to seek relief in an expansion of the parcel post system. The lawyer came back next day, and withdrew his whole argument, admitting that the express companies could be brought within the operation of the Act. The railway companies which own the express companies feared the competition of a state-owned, state-operated parcel post system. Nothing would do so much to improve conditions in the west as to bring into operation the principle of which I have spoken. I challenge representatives of the west to say what they think of the efficacy of the parcel post system in reducing express charges. The competition of state-owned utilities with telegraphs, cables

and express would be a great relief to the people of the west. The proposition is self evident, and only needs to be applied. And the only reason I can find why the people of the west, and of Canada generally to-day are paying exorbitant express charges is that the expansion of our parcel post system has been checked. The fruit men of Ontario, time and time again, have brought forward their grievances in connection with the transportation of their products. I may be told: The parcel post system could not handle fruit. Why, in Germany the post office handles all kinds of farm products. And it not only takes the farmers' products to town, but it markets the goods, and brings back the money, and the empty package to the farmer at night. And the farmers and florists, and other producers in England use the parcel post system in the same way. This system has been the great instrument in the reduction of express charges. And if that is done in Europe, there is no reason why it should not be done here. The system would be of great advantage to the farmers also in making purchases in the city, which purchases have to be carried over long distances. In the application of this principle that I advocate there is far more for the people than in this vaunted reciprocity. Give our people cheap transportation rates, and they will get better prices for their products. The return to the farmer is measured by the freight charge for the rule of the railway men is to charge all the traffic will bear. On the other hand, the state in competition with the railway that seeks to give the service at as low a rate as possible for the benefit of all. But here in Canada, and in America generally, which pretends to be the progressive part of the world is the most completely tied up to corporations. You cannot get for the people benefits that have been enjoyed by the people of Europe for fifty years past. It has been a surprise to me that not a single man from western Canada, so far as I know, has stood up in the House, and presented the high railway charges put upon the people of the west. I made a speech not long ago dealing with this question in connection with Canadian Pacific railway rates. There are members of the grain growers' organizations in the west who have defended their own rights. They have been in conference with the Prime Minister, and he has proposed to meet their grievances by giving reciprocity. I have had letters from some of these grain growers' associations, and one thing mentioned in these letters was the fact that when I ventilated the proposition not a single member from the west protested against the exorbitant and unfair charges of the railways. I contend that the relief to the people of the Canadian west is not to be found in reciprocity, but in reduced railway charges. Do not you suppose that the Canadian Pacific railway could reduce its passenger rates, with the enormous travel they have on all their trains? They could easily give the people a two cent rate. But they will never do it until they are forced to do it. And a railway commission will never force them to do it, but state competition will bring it about in a single day. If my voice can reach the people of this country—and it may be difficult for me to make myself heard beyond this House—it will make known to the people this new political economic principle, and its effect in helping the development of the country, and affording relief to the people from unfair treatment by great and powerful corporations. That principle is the competition of the state with these corporations. The state must either tie these corporations down or go into competition with them. We already have that principle applied in part. We have telegraph lines of our own, and we have a parcel post system. But these must be energized and made effective, and their tolls reduced. And somebody must be put in charge of the department who will realize that, as this is a great public department, public service is expected of it.

I give the Post Office Department credit for doing considerable service for the people of Canada. There have been improvements, but the greatest improvements that can be made is to follow the lines of the post office department in European countries, and give us an efficacious parcel post system, a system that will meet the wants of the people. It won't hurt the railway companies. The right hon. gentleman and his friends say they believe in the doctrine of competition. Let us have competition, but don't let us have combination. There is combination now. The railways combine to keep up the rates, and they terrorize the government so that the government will not provide competition. Now, let us give the competition, and let it be a state competition if necessary. But let us have that competition, and a great benefit will accrue to the people of this country, a benefit that will not depend upon the whims of another nation, but upon the action of our own government. It is for the state to see that the people get fair and just treatment, and an excellent and cheap service. My object will be served if, in some way, the attention of this country can be drawn to this great new principle, that of state competition against corporations, which are exorbitant in their charges, which are arrogant in their treatment of the public, and will only do their duty when they are compelled to. Now, I trust the Postmaster General will have even more to say than he said the other day when he admitted that he was doing some-

thing to reduce the cable tolls, and that, perhaps, something would be done to reduce telegraph tolls. But it is not promises we want, it is performances., The old Greek adage was that to play upon the heart you must play upon the heart, and the only way to bring the express companies to time is by establishing a parcel post system. If you do that we will then have, within one day, an improvement, we can cut the express charges in this country in two. There is something that the government can do for the people of this nation.

Hon. R. LEMIEUX (Postmaster General). I am almost inclined to believe in telepathy, for I have been for several days working on a plan to establish a parcel post system. I have been much interested of late in reading a very able series of articles published in 'McClure's Magazine' of New York, and in one or two other magazines, on this very important question. In fact, my hon. friend probably knows that there is an editor in New York, a Mrs. Low, who for the past few years has made a special study of the application of a parcel post system to the United States. In my hon. friend's statement there are many things with which I agree. The parcel post system in Europe, especially in England, France and Germany, has been a boon to the people of those countries. It is surprising what distance a parcel can be carried at a cheap rate. When one compares the cost of carrying a parcel between Canada and Great Britain with the cost of carrying a parcel between Toronto and Halifax, one cannot but be surprised at the discrepancy between the charges. It costs more money to send a parcel from one Canadian town to another, or from one province to another, than it costs to send the same parcel across the Atlantic. You may ask why that is so. Wel, it is one of those things that can hardly be explained. You may ask why a letter sent from Dover to Calais, from the shores of England to the shores of France, costs five cents, and a letter sent from Halifax to the Yukon, or to Melbourne, Australia, only costs two cents. That is one of the secrets connected with the mail systems of the world. As I said, I have taken a great deal of interest in this question since I took office. My hon. friend will remember that about 1906 or 1907, I made an announcement that the department was preparing a parcel post system for Canada. My hon. friend states that the old enemy is the railway corporations. I cannot say that it is the railway corporations. I supose my hon. friend from Hamilton (Mr. Barker) would be better informed than myself on that subject. But this singular fact occurred at the time I speak of. The moment the announcement was made that a policy could be shaped within twenty-four hours—because the Postmaster General has all the powers to start a parcel post system within a very short time with the legislation already upon the statute book in the Post Office Act—as I was saying, the moment it was announced that we could readily establish a parcel post system in Canada, at once, for weeks and for months, the department was simply flooded with petitions against such a system. These petitions did not come from cities, but they were signed by farmers and by country storekeepers, and the argument which they used against the establishment of that system was that the departmental stores would get all the benefits of the system. One peculiarity which struck me at the time was that all these petitions from every province were couched in the same terms. they were all either printed or typewritten, and the language was the same. There is apparently an organization against the establishment of a parcel post. In my judgment a parcel post should benefit the farmers and benefit the outlying districts, and I was surprised to find these objections coming from farming districts and from the storekeepers. On many occasions I have tried to take up this question. I think that a good preliminary to the establishment of a parcel post system has been the rural mail delivery. This, I may say, is on a fair way to success. I am pleased to inform the House that this year, in the city of Toronto, we are manufacturing 100,000 boxes for the rural mail system. I am pleased to state that in many of the most populous counties of Ontario, in some of the western provinces, and in some of the eastern provinces, the system is expanding daily, the department is spending freely, and I believe intelligently in that direction.

Mr. LALOR. Has the minister, in connection with a parcel post system. considered what size or weight of package he would send through the mail?

Mr. LEMIEUX. This would require a detailed statement, which I am not able to give. I have some figures, and from the investigations which I have ordered, and which are now being made under the direction of Mr. Ross, of Toronto, if the parcel post is established we would have to provide for parcels of the same weight and dimension as those carried in Great Britain. I forget what are the weights mentioned, but I can give that right away.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I would like to ask the Postmaster General if, in view of the fact that he is considering the possibility of instituting a parcel post, he has found it advisable to consider the question of increasing the size of the rural post boxes. They would not hold a pound of butter or of sugar. I think they cost about $2 apiece.

Mr. LEMIEUX. My hon. friend refers to what we call the King Edward or rural mail delivery box?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Yes.

Mr. LEMIEUX. It is a fair sized box. At all events it is only a matter of detail. I would say, speaking in favour of the parcel post, that the Post Office Department has the whole machinery in its hands and can within a short time start a parcel post system better than the railway or express companies can, because the express companies only reach certain points, whereas the Post Office Department reaches the 15,000 post offices that are spread from one end of this country to the other.

Mr. LALOR. That would depend on the size of the package.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly. If we were to establish that system the railway companies would immediately apply for higher rates. They are at present applying for higher rates.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). What railway?

Mr. LEMIEUX. All the railways.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Has the Canadian Pacific railway applied for higher rates?

Mr. LEMIEUX. All railways—even the Intercolonial railway. We are paying mail subsidies to the Intercolonial railway —the government railway. The state-owned railways are also looking after their own interests. We have more difficulties with my hon. friend the Minister of Railways in the way of rates than with the private corporations. But, the first question to be dealt with would be to fix the standard of rates, because, of course, the mail cars would not only be filled with the ordinary mail matter, but the parcel post would take up a considerable portion of the space. Therefore, you would at once have to face the issue whether the railway mail rates should have to be raised. That is one part of it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Would the Postmaster General tell me whether the arrangement with the railway companies at present is by weight or lump sum?

Mr. LEMIEUX. On the basis of mileage. It is 4 and 8 cents a mile. We have some old contracts with the earlier railway companies under which we pay less than 4 cents when it is a baggage car service, but the standard rates to-day are 4 cents if we use baggage cars and 8 cents if we use the railway mail cars. In the United States it is on a weight basis, but they are going to change it. They have experienced very many difficulties in coming to a settlement. There was a commission in session in New York for several months composed of officials of the United States government conducting an investigation and they found that the Post Office Department of the United States had been mulcted by the railways since the establishment of the mail service.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does the minister know what the arrangement is in Great Britain in respect of parcel post between the post office and the railways?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I could not give my hon. friend that information. I did not expect that this question would come up this afternoon, but, in Great Britain they have the telegraph, telephone and cables, and a most perfect system of parcel post. What special arrangements they have with the railway companies I could not say, but of course they pay subsidies as we do.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). But they give a fine service.

Mr. LEMIEUX. A splendid service—the best in the world.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Let us try it.

Mr. LEMIEUX. But my hon. friend must not forget, and this must be credited to the post office system not only in Canada, but in the United States, that the conditions are very different. You can travel from London to Paris in less than a day, while here it would take more than a week to travel from one end of the country to the other. Therefore, that has always to be considered in the establishing of any such service. Several months ago, after the publication of those very able articles in the United States by people who have made a special study of this case, I gave Mr. Ross of Toronto, who is personally in favour of the parcel post system, authority to look around and consult with people, especially in Ontario, where I met, a few years ago, the strongest opposition, I am sorry to say, when this question was mooted for the first time. I have instructed him to investigate and prepare a report. I expect this report very shortly and then I will be able to say something more definite upon the question. I am glad that my hon. friend has brought this question before the House this afternoon, in order to invite the attention of the country and the House to the consideration of this very important system.

Mr. LALOR. I desire to say a word in reference to the matter of excessive rates brought forward this afternoon by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). I do not know of anything to-day in Canada that is a greater handicap to the business of the country than the rates that are

charged by express companies. That applies more particularly to the north-western provinces than to any other part of Canada. I speak from experience because the concern of which I am president in my own town fills an express car every day with express parcels. Most of these parcels are small and they go to all parts of the country. During the fall of the year, the busy season, we probably ship to a greater extent than a car load a day. I find that the rates are most excessive. In the western Canadian provinces they are handicapped to such an extent that it is almost impossible for them to give you repeat orders for goods to be shipped to them when they have to go by express. They have to give you large orders, buy once a year, and get their goods shipped by freight for the reason that if they repeat and have a parcel sent to them by express they are unable to pay the excessive freight charges. I know that in one case where I shipped a parcel, and not a very large one either, to British Columbia, the express charges on it were $90—over one-third of the entire value of the whole parcel. The result of it is, as I have already stated, that business is handicapped in the west and it is handicapped in the east too, because wholesale merchants and manufacturers in the east are unable to get these repeat orders that they should have on account of these exorbitant and extravagant express charges. A further handicap when you ship by express is that if you happen to ship from your own station by a Canadian express company to a point at which they have no office and the parcel is handed over to the American express company, they charge you double rates. Altogether the people are actually robbed by the express rates in this country. I do not know of anything to-day in Canada that needs investigation and looking into to such an extent as do the express rates. Two or three years ago there was an investigation into some of these express companies and the profits they were making were so exorbitant that one could hardly believe the figures when he read them. We have, as the hon. member for South York has stated, transferred to the Railway Commission power to regulate freight rates. I do not want to find any fault with the Railway Commission.

That Board has been doing good work and I think the people of Canada appreciate it, but, I cannot understand what is the trouble with them in connection with these express rates. It is two years since this matter went before them and there has not been a word from them in connection with it. Are they making any effort to relieve the people of this country from these exorbitant rates and charges; if they are, we know nothing about it. I am also interested in a line of business in the United States and the rates there are far different from what they are in Canada because you can ship quite a parcel in the United States for ten cents, whereas in Canada there is no rate under 25 or 35 cents. The question of express rates in this country is of the greatest importance, and I hope the Railway Commission will move more expeditiously in the matter than they have done.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Is there in Haldimand county the same prejudice on the part of country store keepers against departmental stores as there is in other parts of Canada?

Mr. LALOR. There is no doubt that the country merchants are very generally opposed to the parcel post system especially if large parcels are to be taken through the mails. The large departmental stores are a very great handicap to the country merchant, and it is very doubtful indeed whether they give the people much greater value than they get from the country stores. There is a strong inclination on the part of the people of the country to take a catalogue issued by one of these departmental stores and order something that is now sent to them by express, and if there was a parcel post system, it is very questionable whether this practice would not be carried on to an enormous extent to the detriment of the country merchants. The parcel post system is a debatable question, and it is possible that in the interests of the public generally, it might be carried too far.

Mr. SPROULE. Of late years it has become so easy for great corporations to coalesce under the same management or arrive at an understanding with regard to rates that the public are often unfairly treated in the matter of charges for the use of these public facilities. This applies to railway companies, express companies, telephone companies, telegraph companies and others. It is universally admitted that it is very difficult for parliament to interfere with these wealthy corporations for the protection of the people. So powerful are they and so far-reaching the influences they can bring to bear on governments that it is almost impossible to get any government with sufficient moral courage to grapple with them in the public interest. I was a member of a committee to inquire into certain rates charged by public utilities, of which Sir William Mulock was chairman. From every part of the country there were people coming to these corridors, lobbying the members, telling them what would happen to their political friends, what great injustice would be done these corporations, how the public would suffer, and bringing every influence to bear on the representatives of the people and of the

government to stop interference. It has been said over and over again that but for the influence brought to bear on the government at that time to frustrate the plans of Sir Wm. Mulock, that gentleman would not be on the bench to-day but would still be a minister of the Crown. They made it so disagreeable for him that he chose to leave public life rather than to submit to the indignities heaped upon him. I was a member of that committee and I know what difficulties confronted him. In my judgment the solution is either independent competition which will afford reasonable charges, or otherwise absolute control of these utilities by parliament. Parliament must deal with that problem one way or the other. I believe the time has come when no government can remain in power that is not possessed of sufficient moral stamina to grapple with these problems. We have tried competition by subsidizing other lines of railway and granting other charters, but our experience is that when competition appears these interests get their heads together and come to an understanding for their own benefit and remove the competition we expected to get. We have in a measure tried control under the Railway Commission which, although it does not come up to our full expectations, is certainly doing something. Perhaps it is not doing all we expected of it, because we have not given it greater powers.

Now, what has competition accomplished? Have we examples from sources that are not controlled by corporations to show whether it does good or not? I cited an example to this House many years ago which will bear repeating—the carriage of grain by a private-owned railway as compared with its carriage by the government-owned railway at a figure which the government declared paid, but which the private corporations have not been satisfied with as sufficient to enable them to pay their enormous dividends. The Canada Atlantic railway, a private corporation, carried wheat, for instance, 346 miles for 2.27½ cents, a little over 2¼ cents a bushel, while the government railway carried it 828 miles, nearly three times the distance, for the same charge. That was healthy competition. When that fact was brought out, the Minister of Railways was asked if it paid to carry the grain at that figure. The answer was that having regard to the return cargo it did pay. That is one concrete illustration among several that I could give which will serve to show the advantage of healthy competition. If the Intercolonial railway had been extended to Parry Harbour so that it could have taken the grain from there instead of receiving it at Montreal from the Grand Trunk railway, it could have hauled it from Parry Harbour to Halifax for very much less than it cost to haul it jointly by the private-owned railway and the government-owned railway; and had the government railway been extended to the Georgian Bay, there is no doubt that the private-owned railway would have been obliged by the competition to reduce its rates. Let me give another example that came within my own experience a few years ago. I required to get a piece of machinery of only 400 or 500 weight from a firm between 30 and 40 miles east of Toronto. The charge for delivering that in Toronto was $5; yet a farmer offered to haul it with his team at the same price, although we did not give him any subsidy to help him to carry it, while we subsidized the railway very heavily. Then, I take the express charges. Farmers often have to get a small piece of machinery. I have had to do it more than once—a piece of machinery that cost me 25 cents, and I have paid 40 or 50 cents express to have it carried less than 50 miles. This is exorbitant and unfair, and there should be some authority in the land to see that justice is done to those who are compelled to use these public utilities. The same is the case with regard to the telephone and the telegraph system. I remember ordering a small article a part of a farming implement, through the telephone at a distance of less than a hundred miles. The article cost me 40 cents; and the express and telephone cost me $1.20. And that is called reasonable. I say it is little better than thievery, and so long as there is not some authority in the land to control these public utilities, so long will these exorbitant charges continue. On one occasion in this House, when the government was being criticised for not controlling the railways in the interest of the farmers, the Hon. Edward Blake made this remark: 'I have often thought of it and have searched my brain to find some means of controlling them, but I have long since come to the conclusion that it cannot be done, for two reasons, that these corporations, when they do wrong, have no body to be whipped, and they have no soul to be damned.' Therefore they go on with evidently no fear of the future. If these corporations were not earning big dividends, it might be pleaded on their behalf that they were not making exorbitant charges; but when you see the stock of the Canadian Pacific Railway selling up to between 200 and 300 per cent, you can take this as evidence that their earning powers and their returns from the subsidies which parliament gave them, are yielding them more than they are entitled to. So it is with the express companies. The glimpse which the railway commission has recently given the public of what these companies have been doing has shown that what they have been making out of the public has

been away out of proportion to what was required to pay a large dividend on every dollar they invested in the service. I join with the hon. member for South York every time in demanding that these public utilities should be brought under such control, if there is no possibility of having a healthy and permanent competition, as to secure for the people the service of these utilities at a moderate and reasonable cost.

The sooner parliament deals with it the better. Some may say it is a heavy task, but parliament is here for that purpose, and we should never shrink from any task that confronts us as parliamentarians or as a parliament. These problems are not impossible of solution if we apply ourselves to them, and until that is done I will be an advocate of government ownership of these utilities, or absolute control over them by some commission, power or authority which will force these corporations to do what they ought to do in the interests of the great users of these public utilities.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I was not present when this discussion started, but I have heard enough from those who have spoken to understand that this is one of the most important matters which could possibly come before this parliament. Originally, I understand the question had to deal with parcel posts, but it seems to have extended a little beyond that, and taken in the express rates and freight rates.

If there is any part of this country of ours where this question is all important, it is the west. I do not intend to say very much about freight rates now, because, if I understand it, it is not the intention of the hon. gentleman who first brought up the question to have the matter dealt with now, but when the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) introduces legislation into this House to give a guarantee of $35,000,000 to the Canadian Northern railway for a railway from Port Arthur east, and only gives $2,000,000 to build the Hudson bay railway, to use an expression far more forcible than elegant, I think that is simply rotten legislation, and had it not been that we were about to have an election we would never have heard of such rotten legislation being introduced.

We have no parcel post in this country, so I do not know that there is very much use spending time discussing it, we have, however, express rates and freight rates which are very unsatisfactory. I would like to have an answer from some member of the government. I would ask the government if the present Railway Commission has full jurisdiction over the express rates of this country.

Mr. GRAHAM. Personally I have no doubt that the legislation now on the statute-boks gives the Railway Commission full authority over the express rates in the Dominion of Canada, but it does not cover international express rates.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I was referring to the Canadian express rates only.

Mr. GRAHAM. To make it explicit, if my hon. friend will put his question on the Order Paper, it will be answered.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. I will do so. There is no question about the freight rates and express rates being too high, and I agree with any hon. gentleman who says in this House that it is the duty of this government to take the matter up. It is one of the most serious grievances of the west, and if the government had been as anxious to settle the grievances over which they have control as they have been in running to Washington, in an endeavour to do something which a great many people think is of no use, they would have been doing something for the benefit of the country. Through rates are not so bad. If you go west of Winnipeg and ship goods to Port Arthur or further east, you get practically the same rates as they have in the United States for similar distances. That being so, why should the western local express and freight rates be so high?

Mr. CAMPBELL. I want to endorse very fully all that has been said by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean), my hon friend from Souris (Mr. Schaffner), and my hon. friend from Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) in regard to the overcharges in express and freight rates. Without desiring to take up the time of the House with a reiteration of the arguments which have been so far laid before us, I would like to place on record one instance of the way in which the public of western Canada—and probably the whole of Canada—are being robbed by the railway companies in freight rates. The railway companies of the west advertise that pedigreed live stock is carried at half rates. On the face of it this looks pretty well. It looks as though it were in the interest of the farmers and of agriculture. But when any one happens to send a pure-bred animal from one point to another, he finds that instead of paying half rates he is paying full rate, because of the method followed by the railway company, which is to double the weight of the animal, and then cut the transportation rate in two.

I see that my hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. Graham) smiles, but I happen to have in my pocket the proof of what I am saying. I have here a bill which I received myself last week, for freight on a thoroughbred stallion. If my hon. friend knows anything about thoroughbred driving horses even, he will know that there never was a driving horse

which weighed 4,000 pounds. Yet, that is the weight charged against me by the Canadian Northern railway. After figuring it out at 4,000 pounds, the transportation is cut in two. I think the government is blameworthy for this condition of affairs, because no man or company should have the right to charge more than the actual value of the transportation furnished. I think this is a matter that ought to be attended to at once by the hon. minister under whose control it comes.

Mr. BEATTIE. This debate, Mr. Speaker, started with a discussion of the question of parcel post in Canada, and led up to a criticism of the express rates prevailing throughout the country.

There can be no question that the express charges are too high; I do not defend the express companies so far as that is concerned. But it must be remembered that they carry an immense variety of parcels. One has only to notice the express wagons as they go about the city to see that they carry many parcels that the post office would not want to carry. And I should think that the small parcels, such as the post office ought to carry would be the very ones the express companies would not want. And this small class of business must be expensive for the express companies. When a parcel is to be picked up, they must send a man with a horse and wagon perhaps many blocks distant from their office, and in the city of its destination, equal trouble must be taken in delivering that parcel. There must be a great deal of expense involved in this business, expense which, I think, many people are apt not to consider. I am not defending the rates of the express companies, but they, like other people, are entitled to fair play. An attempt is made to compare our conditions in this matter with those of England. But no such comparison can be made with fairness. You can cross England in a very few hours; it takes days to cross Canada. Our population is very much more scattered than theirs. So far as the matter under discussion is concerned, the two countries cannot be compared. I am quite in favour of the government taking any reasonable course to reduce express charges. The charges on parcels should be regulated by weight, and that is not done to-day. I had proof of that only recently. I sent a parcel on which I paid 75 cents. When it arrived at my home, the expressman wanted 45 cents. I am not complaining of the attempt to charge twice; that was a mistake; but the fact that the charge was different at the shipping point and at the receiving point for exactly the same parcel shows that they have no proper scale of charges. Especially such small parcels as are referred to by the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule) should be charged for weight. Of course, there are parcels, millinery goods and articles of that kind, that take up much room yet are very light. But, as a rule the charge should be strictly by weight. It would be better, in the case of most of these parcels to leave the business to the express company rather than to try to do the business through the post office. The express company gives a receipt for a package and undertakes to deliver the goods in good order. I do not know that the government would want to carry parcels on that basis. I have had some experience in this kind of business, and I believe that some people are harsh in their remarks about the work of the express companies.

CHINESE INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I wish to refer briefly to a matter that I had occasion to mention yesterday, namely, the Chinese Investigation Commission at Vancouver. At the conclusion of my remarks I left it to the judgment of the House whether or not we should put on record our opinion as to the failure of the government to present that report. In consequence of the nature of the discussion which followed I thought it my duty to procced further, so I gave notice to the government of my intention to move a resolution to-day expressing the opinion of this House that that report and the evidence should be laid on the table. I am happy to say that on this occasion the view of the government has come to coincide with my own. The fact that the first minister presented the report at the opening of the House to-day relieves me from my duty to proceed with the motion of which I have given notice. But, with the permission of the House I would like to refer very briefly to the suggestion of the first minister that I wasted time in occupying three hours in presenting what I did of the evidence, and commenting upon it. I would like to contrast that statement of the Prime Minister with the volume of evidence he has presented here to-day. I have not yet had the opportunity to look at that evidence and report, but I should think, from seeing it as it was laid on the table that it must cover in the vicinity of 10,000 pages. I think that if the government can find a person to make a readable summary of evidence so voluminous including a little comment, and do it in less than three hours, that person must be a Jim Dandy indeed. In connection with the suggestion of wasting time, I believe it would be incumbent on some person to make a review of that report after its presentation. For my part, I should like very much to have made my summary from the official evidence, and also to have had the advantage of the conclusions ar-

rived at by the judge, so that I might apply his conclusions if he had forestalled me, and present the view that I thought best to present to the House. But, as I had not the official report, I was compelled to do the best I could and use the reports of the newspapers.

I must express my disappointment at the suggestion made to-day that there will be no prosecution consequent on this investigation. From what I know of the evidence brought out I believe there are persons equally culpable with the few Chinese who have made their escape from the country since their complicity in these crimes has been brought to light. It seems to me that the detective force of the Dominion police could not be put to better use than in following up the inquiry started last summer, and so skilfully carried on, to run down the persons responsible for this conspiracy, to identify as many of them as possible, and to gather material upon which, I am quite sure, prosecutions could be sucessfully conducted. I have not had the opportunity to read the report, but I should like to have been told by some person on the government side who has had that opportunity whether or not the commissioner makes any remark upon the patronage system, and the manner in which it is administered in Vancouver, and the irregularities resulting from it. To my mind that is the crux of the whole matter. If we could have assurance from the government that the patronage of the government at Vancouver could be taken out of the hands that now control it, better still, if we could have assurance that the customs appointments at Vancouver and elsewhere—because they are very important—would be relieved altogether from political pull, and put into the hands of the Civil Service Commissioners or some other independent authority, I think we should have some valuable assurance that frauds of this nature would not be so likely to occur in future.

Now, just a few words in conclusion with reference to my good friend the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) the minister from British Columbia. A few weeks ago, that hon. gentleman took occasion to visit my riding. Because of the remarks of the speaker who preceded him, and the other remarks of the speaker who came after him, this member of the government had no time to say anything of consequence at New Westminster except that he had not time to go into his subject. Yesterday in this House, though evidence was presented to show that he is regarded in some quarters—and not without show of reason—as particeps criminis in these frauds at Vancouver, to the extent at least of being an accessory after the fact by exercising no diligence to secure punishment, again he had not time seemingly, to make any reply or defence. It seems to me the minister from British Columbia is the most untimely man in this country—he never has time for anything.

I feel like apologizing to this House for the minister from British Columbia I wish to say that he is not a fair specimen of what we have out there. I think that his prolonged and continuous residence at Ottawa must have deteriorated his quality, and that it would be a very good thing for the Minister of Inland Revenue if he could become again a permanent resident of British Columbia. I want to say to the House, what the minister from British Columbia knows very well, that the custom out there is when a man is attacked, to make some show of defence. He knows that even if Providence has not equipped us all with the same degree of manhood, that no matter what the inequalities may be between the attacker and the attacked, it is expected out there that when a man is told that he is put on his defence he should rise to the occasion and make some defence. Mr. Speaker, I think it is due to this House, and due to the government, and it is due to the minister himself, that we should have heard from him some explanation of the extraordinary course he is shown to have taken in connection with this Chinese investigation. I must express to you, Sir, and to the House my disappointment that the minister representing the province from which I come, should so utterly fail, in my estimation, to have regard for the duties, the responsibilities and the dignity of his office.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I think I can dispense my hon. colleague from taking any notice at all of the charges which have been made against his character. I think the silence of my hon. colleague, in the attack which has been made against him, is quite justified by the report which has been laid to-day on the table of the House. When the House has taken cognizance of that report it will see that the commission altogether exonerated my hon. colleague from the insinuations which were made against him in the newspapers read on the floor of this House. With regard to the action to be taken by the government on this question, I have not said that no prosecution should be taken, nothing of the kind. I said simply that after reading the report cursorily—it is a report of more than one hundred pages—I could see that the commissioner's recommendation applies to only two parties, to the Chinese interpreter, Yip On, in the Department of Customs and to another man; these are the only two who were signalized to be prosecuted. But I have not yet seen any others, not having read the report minutely. With regard to the insinuation of the appointment in the

custom house of men who are not fitted. I have only to say to the hon. gentleman, and he knows it—at all events he ought to know it—that the only party employed in the customs who has been suspected of anything wrong, is not an appointment of this government, but is an old officer who was appointed by our predecessors. No other man, so far as I know, has been charged by the commissioner or anybody else in the Customs Department, except the Chinese interpreter and the collector of customs. Of the only two parties who have been suspected of anything wrong, one is a fugitive from justice now and the other was not an appointee of this government.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Prime Minister might have gone a little further and stated that the appointee of the former government—because that seems to weigh with him a great deal—was exonerated by this same report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is the only party who is charged with anything wrong.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The Prime Minister said he had been suspected, but he omitted to say that he had been exonerated. I think it would have been only fair and just to have added that. But the Prime Minister did not touch one very important phase of the situation. The commissioner, in his report, said the collector of customs had had duties imposed on him in connection with Chinese immigration which, added to his duties as collector of customs, made impossible demands upon his time. But he went on to say something more. He pointed out the nature of the administration of this Chinese immigration law at Vancouver, and he said that in many respects the administration of that law had been absolutely farcical. He pointed out the reasons why. The Prime Minister has not alluded to these, nor has he shown in what respect the government have taken any steps to make that which was farcical really effective. We do not know up to the present time, so far as I am aware, in what respect the administration has been changed in that regard. I am not suggesting that it has not been changed, it may have been; but up to the present time we have no information before us whatever on this subject. I think information should be given, if not to-day at the earliest moment possible, as to how matters are at the present time with regard to that question. Then there is another matter upon which I would like to have some information, that is about what time did this inquiry end, at what time did the taking of evidence cease; how long after, or was it before this report was made and received by the government, and what steps, if any, have been taken since the receipt of the report in connection with any of these matters. It is said that the men who were indicated as guilty by the report have escaped from the country. When did the evidence disclose to the government that these men were in all probability guilty of some criminal act, and what is the reason they were allowed to escape after that evidence had been brought to the attention of the commissioners? These are all matters on which it is only reasonable that parliament should have some information. I do not know that the Prime Minister will be able to give it to-day, but I think he ought to give it on Monday, at the latest.

EXPRESS RATES.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Before you leave the Chair I would like to refer for a few moments to the subject that was brought up by the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean). This subject of express rates is a very burning topic amongst the community at large, amongst the mercantile classes and amongst the farmers. I am pleased that it has been brought before the House, and that the discussion has thrown some additional light upon the future policy of the government. It is quite true that there is a division of views on this subject, there is a divergence of opinion as to whether the adoption of a parcel post system would be of benefit to the country as a whole or not. The arguments advanced, as already stated, are that if a parcel post system is instituted, the large departmental stores will benefit at the expense of the country storekeepers. Now that is a very important matter, because these catalogue houses and these departmental stores are now competing very strongly with the storekeepers. I do not suppose that, in the matter of price or quality, these departmental stores are actually competing with the country stores.

But the fact that they advertise so extensively all over the country gives them an unfair advantage over the local trader with the result that the people of the country send their money to the larger centres, such as Toronto, and get inferior goods to those which they could buy at home for less money. Nothing that could be said in this House or out of it could make any headway against the immense volume of advertising that these departmental stores indulge in. The great campaigns of advertising which they conduct invariably lead to the conclusion in the minds of the public that prices are lower in these departmental stores than they are in the home stores. When the discussion was at its height, when this question was at its hottest stage and before it was turned over to the Railway Commission, the fact was apparent to

everybody that the departmental stores were obtaining much cheaper rates of express on their parcels than the average public could obtain. We will take an express parcel shipped by a departmental store a distance of 100 miles; the rate would be, say, 15 cents. Putting it in the reverse position the merchant or farmer shipping articles from an outside station back to the city would pay an express rate of 35 cents on the same weight of goods, so that there was a gross injustice done to the public in that way.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York). Do I understand my hon. friend to say that express companies discriminate in favour of departmental stores and against the public?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). They did that extensively, and I have no knowledge that the commission has put in force rules against it. So much did they discriminate and so low were the express rates that were quoted to these departmental store people that I doubt very much whether this government could afford to carry goods by parcel post at such low rates. The public at large, and more especially the public who live in the cities, are very deeply interested in cheaper rates by express companies. Most of the articles that are consumed in the city—eggs, butter and other country produce—are articles that pay express rates. These goods are shipped to the city by express for the simple reason that if they were shipped by freight the time occupied in their carriage would be so great that, being perishable, they would be destroyed. I know that one small town in my riding sends an average of one car by express every week of farmers' produce to the city of Toronto and the express rates would be very exorbitant on that. I have no doubt that one of the chief reasons why the people in cities pay such exhorbitant prices for the food they eat to-day is the terribly high express rates which the farmers and dealers have to pay on the farm produce which they ship to Toronto and various other cities. I am told that fruit can be shipped by express in cold storage from California and other distant points in the United States to the great centres in Canada at a much lower rate than would be charged upon same articles procured 25 or 30 miles out of the city. A basket of cherries or case of peaches could be brought from California at almost as low a rate of express as that at which they could be brought from Grimsby or Oakville.

This question has been discussed pro and con and there has been a great deal of agitation amongst the public with regard to it. As already stated by the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell) and others who have spoken, the question of freight on express rates is a burning one all over the country. During the past winter the Manitoba 'Free Press' devoted a great deal of time and space to quoting figures in order to show that in western Canada the rates of freight were far greater than the rates charged in the adjoining states of the Union. In that discussion the 'Free Press' took occasion to comment on some remarks that I had made in this House on a previous occasion. I wish to make a reply to the discussion of the 'Free Press' as far as freight rates in the West are concerned. This discussion of freight rates by the Manitoba 'Free Press' would have some point and would be of some value to this House and benefit to the country had the figures which they gave in their comparison with reference to the state of Minnesota not been open to question. What do I mean by that? I mean that about four years ago the state of Minnesota established a board to govern freight rates. This board was to have absolute jurisdiction over all the freight and railway rates within the state of Minnesota. The board was of a socialistic character. It held its meetings and it issued a schedule by which it cut freight rates then paid throughout the state in two. The freight rates that were paid and had been paid in that state until recently were such that they were fully 50 per cent less than the freight rates paid throughout the Canadian Northwest. To carry on the agitation in the west in regard to these freight rates emissaries were sent to Canada and copies of the schedule published by the Minnesota board were sent broadcast all over the Canadian Northwest. The railways in Minnesota brought this question before the courts with a view of determining whether this board had acted properly and whether its jurisdiction were such that it could make this enormous, arbitrary cut in the freight rates. The railways succeeded in showing the court that the rates established by this board were absolutely wrong, that they were virtually confiscatory in their nature, inasmuch as it was impossible for the railways to carry freight for the rates that this revolutionary board had established there. The courts have given a decision against the state of Minnesota and its board in that respect and, as I say, the arguments advanced by the 'Free Press' in using this comparison of freight rates between Minnesota and Canada are not trustworthy and of no value.

However, it is apparent to any person that in many cases freight rates, even in Ontario, are very unjust and wrong. My hon. friend from East Grey (Mr. Sproule) referred to some freight rates within his knowledge. I could have said to him that the principal town in my riding, Collingwood, is 35 miles from his principal town,

Markdale, and I can ship freight by wagon from Collingwood to Markdale at a cheaper rate than I can ship the same freight by rail.

The reason is that where there is interchange of traffic each railway charges its local rate thus making the through rate exorbitant. It is time for us to consider means to compel railways to interchange traffic in the interests of the people. The consuming public are deeply interested in express rates and the government of the day should be up and doing to provide a remedy for the existing evil. There are three lines of action possible; one, government control over the rates, a principle we have accepted by the appointment of the Railway Commission and another, the establishment of competition by the government. I may belong to an antiquated school, but to my mind, I consider it wrong for government to take any action which would unduly destroy private investment and enterprise. The Minister of Railways told us, speaking on the Grand Trunk Pacific Bill, that we are no longer pioneers in Canada, but that the object of the government in assisting railway building in the west was to bring about competition. Our experience, however, is that when you bonus a railway to bring about competition you are simply doubling the charge on the public without attaining your object, for the railways get together and combine on rates to their own advantage. Can any one here say that when a new railway is brought into a town, genuine competition ensues. The only advantage a new railway affords the manufacturer is to save the expense of shipping over two lines, for, if he has only the Grand Trunk he can only ship over the Grand Trunk at carload rates, whereas if the Canadian Pacific railway comes to his factory he can ship to Canadian Pacific railway points also at carload rates. If the government compels railways to exchange traffic, one railway will afford the same facilities as two will; the cost of the extra railway will be saved and in the end the public would get cheaper rates than they could by such so-called competition as I have spoken of. When we are talking of railway matters we are prone to think that the United States and Canada are the only two countries in the world, but let me point out what France has done. After the great war the government of France realized that they had to take steps to reorganize agriculture and other industries and that the best way to do so was to encourage the building of railways and canals. The government of France grappled with the question and spent enormous sums of money and the following citation from the Cambridge Modern History, Vol. XII, 'The Latest Age' p. 101, will show what France did in respect of transportation matters:

In the matter of manufactures and commerce, the resources of the state were especially, and at this period lavishly, employed in creating for the nation a material equipment, which had been left in a singularly inadequate condition by the Second Empire, occupied as it had been with other matters. Credit is due to France that, immediately after her disasters, she did not shrink from this increase of burdens, but reasoned that by this means alone she could be enabled to liquidate the claims of her onerous debt. From this period dates the creation of roads and highways with such ramifications into country districts that the strivings of the new life from that time onward touched the tiniest villages and hamlets. The extent of the new roadways has been estimated at 200,000 kilometres, and at 1,200 millions the grants given since 1876 for this network; 120 millions are required for its annual upkeep. It has completed the great national and departmental highways, temporarily sacrificed to the need of railways, and since restored to high honour.

The time has come when in Canada we should consider whether the government ought not to direct its attention to co-ordination and co-operation such as the French people have brought about and which, to my mind is the only real method by which we will ever secure lower freight rates.

We shall never have lower freight rates in the west if we go on building transcontinental railways at the price we are doing. It is well known that the Canadian Pacific railway and the Canadian Northern railway would have lowered their rates if it had not cost so much to build the transcontinental line. The great need of the west is not so much through lines as branch lines. The railway companies and other land companies have taken the bulk of the lands near the railway lines. You will find very few people living within three or four miles of the railways in the Northwest. The bulk of the farming population —the homesteaders—live eight or ten miles from the railways, some fifteen, twenty or thirty miles. These people expect and are entitled to railways, and the policy of parliament should be to build branch lines in the west, so that nobody would be obliged to haul his goods more than three or four miles to or from a railroad. Consider the case of the island of Prince Edward. That island is endowed by nature with everything necessary to make it a great and prosperous farming country, but it lacks transportation facilities. There is a government railroad running from one end of the island to the other. For many years, as long as I can remember, a tunnel has been advocated to offer the island closer connection with the mainland and the rest of Canada. I agree that that is a matter which should receive our earnest attention; but no engineer in Canada will say that that tunnel could be completed withing less than five or six years. But in the meantime the island is suffering for transporta-

tion facilities, and the government has not devised a practical plan for giving it immediate relief. How could it be done? The island railway is a narrow gauge railway. If the government would provide a landing place such as we have at Point Tupper in Cape Breton, and change the gauge of the island railway so that the people could move their produce in car-loads by car ferries direct to the mainland, the result would mean thousands of dollars saved to the people of Prince Edward Island every year. Yet neither the Minister of Railways nor anybody else in the government has offered any practical suggestion. At present everything that leaves the island or goes to it has to be handled two or three times at great cost. Some hon. members cannot understand why freight rates are greater for short distances than for long distances. It is because the railways have to do much more loading and unloading of the goods for the short distances than for long distances. To return to the question of express rates, there is a third method by which those rates can be reduced, that is, by the government buying out all the companies that control the express business of this country and nationalize the whole system. If they are allowed to go on as at present they may go on watering their stock by capitalizing their earnings until the government will have to pay a vast sum for them. The only fair and just method of dealing with them would be to nationalize these express companies at a fair and reasonable figure, and proceed to carry on the express business of the country on a just and equitable basis. Then we would have no more discriminatory rates and no more rebates to large concerns like departmental stores, but we would have fair and equal justice to everybody, and the man who would benefit most would be the farmer who produces truck and small produce for the cities. The store keeper would also benefit, because he would get his goods cheaper, having to pay smaller rates for shipping them. I am very pleased that the hon. member for South York has brought this matter before the House. I know that he would be the last man to suggest that the money spent properly for the cars, the offices and buildings, the equipment and the development of the business of the express companies should be either confiscated or subjected to unjust, unfair or arbitray competition. The most reasonable course would be for the government to establish a system whereby all the express business of the country would be done in connection with the post office service. I trust that this question will again come before this House at a time when we can discuss it at greater length, and when we can put our views on record by having a resolution of the House on the question.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe).

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILL.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE—THIRD READING.

Bill (No. 198) to incorporate the Quebec and Great North Western Railway Company.—Mr. Hodgins.

WAYS AND MEANS—PARCEL POST SYSTEM.

House resumed discussion of motion for Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. HENDERSON. The subject on which I intended to address you to-night, Mr. Speaker, had reference to postal rates, and I would have preferred not to take up the matter until the Postmaster General was in his seat. However, he can read my remarks in 'Hansard,' and probably be in a position to answer them.

I did not intend to make any reference to matters which were discussed this afternoon—more especially the question of express rates. I would rather leave that in the hands of gentlemen who are more familiar with the subject, and who have more to do with the express companies than I have. Not being in the business, I confess that I do not come in direct contact with the express companies, therefore, any grievances I might put forward would simply be of a secondhand nature.

A great deal has been said during the past year with reference to the excessive charges of the express companies. Whether the companies have undertaken to reduce these charges or not is a point upon which I am not informed. Some of the hon. members spoke this afternoon with reference to certain advantages which the departmental stores of Toronto, for example, would receive on account of changes suggested in regard to the parcel post system, and of the advantages which they might also have under the express regulations. No doubt these departmental stores have very great advantages in the country. I think they secure these advantages by their peculiar mode of advertising—for instance, they will advertise that a certain article which sold for $2 yesterday will be offered for $1 to-day, or that an article which was worth $1.50 yesterday can be had to-day for 50 cents. There are a great many people in the country foolish enough to believe these statements, hence the business done by these concerns.

I am glad the Postmaster General has come in, because this is something which will appeal to him directly.

These departmental stores send their catalogues from one end of the Dominion to the other—you find them all over the country from Cape Breton to British Columbia. I was going to complain of the advantages which these companies enjoy in postal rates over other people or companies who do not do as large a business. Now I do not consider it fair that these departmental stores should have special privileges under the post office system—that is, that they should get a cheaper rate of postage than anybody else sending out a smaller number of catalogues, for instance. I remember within the last two years applying to the hon. the Postmaster General to get a like privilege for a constituent of mine; a man who was engaged in the manufacture of a spraying compound, and who was anxious to advertise it throughout the country, if he could get the facilities for sending his catalogues out at the same rates as other concerns doing a larger business. I discovered then that the departmental stores in Toronto, which were doing a very large business, were able to send their catalogues at a lower rate of postage than a man in my county, simply for the reason that he did not send out such large quantities.

I had always thought that there was no discrimination in postal matters, but that the man who sent out ten letters a day sent them at the same rate as the man who sent out one hundred. But it would seem that the man who sends out a large number of catalogues makes a special rate with the Post Office Department, and thereby gets an advantage in the way of advertising over the man who does not do so large a business. If I am wrong in my statement, I hope the Postmaster General will put me right, for, as the matter is now understood it is a grievance in a part of my county. An industry is being carried there in a material for spraying fruit trees, known as the lime-sulphur mixture. If this industry could advertise as cheaply as others do, it would be of great benefit. I think the Postmaster General might take into consideration the smaller concerns of the country, and put them on a par with the larger concerns.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would refer my hon. friend (Mr. Henderson) to section 70 of the postal regulations, which reads:

> The articles of printed and miscellaneous matter comprised in the following list are subject to the rate of one cent for each two ounces or fraction thereof.

And included in this list are catalogues. I will read what my hon. friend has said, and will inquire if there is discrimination against the industry he has mentioned. I cannot find authority for it under the law. But I will inquire into the matter.

Mr. HENDERSON. If I may be permitted, I would remind the Postmaster General that when I applied to him to get a special rate which, it was understood, was applicable to the large department stores in Toronto, the reason he gave me why it could not be given in that case was that the business was not sufficiently large to pay for the extra service that would be required where the catalogues were posted. I have not read the regulations, and have no doubt they are exactly as the Postmaster General has read them. But it seems to me, after what I learned at that time from the Postmaster General that the regulations are not being carried out.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I will look into the matter.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. A. C. MACDONELL (South Toronto). The very extreme importance of this measure will amply justify, if any apology be needed, lengthy debates of the subject by the opposition as a whole or by individual members. The more this pact is investigated the more it seems to me, the matter calls for very grave consideration on the part of members of this House, and of the people at large. And the greater the opportunity the public has to investigate it the more the people justify the discussion by the very intelligent way in which they are now receiving the information that is being supplied them by members of this House, by the press and otherwise. The measure is not only of very great economic consequence, but it involves very grave considerations, political and national. In fact, so grave, in my opinion, are the objections to this pact from the political and national standpoint that it may be said really to affect fundamentally the very constitution under which we live, the underlying principles of confederation. None of us need be reminded of our country's early history, and the many struggles of our people for constitutional government, and for economic, and political consolidation. These things are a part of Canada's recorded history. The changes I have referred to culminated, as we know, in the compact of the provinces which now forms our constitution, the Act known as the British North America Act. It does seem to me that that Act was framed not only for the consolidation, and advancement of Canada, but also to assist in the consolidation and advancement of the Britsh Empire. If proof of this were needed, we find it in the very words of the preamble of the Confederation Act itself. It says:

And whereas such a union would conduce to the welfare of the provinces and promote the interests of the British Empire.

That being one of the objects, we in our day and generation should see to it that nothing is done that shall alter our position or undermine British institutions or our imperial relation. For it seems clear that anything that undermines our British institutions or our British connection strikes a blow at Canadian nationality. I think a reference of this kind is not inappropriate having regard to the importance of this pact. The very terms of confederation seem to have been based upon the idea that the provinces then separated desided to trade together, and to combine into a federal union for the purposes of common defence, progress and advancement as well as for the promotion of their various provincial enterprises. Section 121 of the Brish North America Act shows that the framers of the Act had this in view:

All articles of growth, produce, or manufacture of any one of the provinces, shall, from and after the union be admitted free into each of the other provinces.

Every hon. member is familiar with that section and I would ask them that it be viewed in that aspect. The provinces said: We are to trade together, there are to be no tariff walls between us, we stand back to back, and face the rest of the world.

As between us there is to be no tariff wall, everything is to be free that comes and goes between us; but we are to hold ourselves at liberty to shut out the rest of the world if so desired. Now that seems to have been a fundamental principle of confederation, and I do think that the extreme haste with which this government proposes to railroad this pact through the House without consulting the people is inexpedient and almost indecent, in face of the fact that there was ample time in which to have consulted the people. The provinces were not consulted as provinces; the people who are citizens of the various provinces were not consulted. Therefore I say that what has been called obstruction by the opposition is justified. and the opposition have done nothing more than their bare duty in that respect. This proposed change. in the opinion of many, is of such importance as to justifiy more than the hasty consideration which it received when it was brought into this House, and was entitled to very full consideration on the part of the public at large. As I said a moment ago, the more this pact is considered the more apparent becomes the fact that the people regard it as a fundamental change. . Their existence in many respects is proposed to be altered by it, and we are face to face with a new condition which may in time bring about a new nationality. Now it would seem to me that the very fullest consideration should be given to this question. The Minister of Finance, when he brought this measure down, brought it down hastily, as he himself, I think, admitted in a speech which he delivered in Windsor Hall, Montreal; he admitted that there was not adequate information before the people of this country on which to form their opinion. I will read the quotation later from his speech on that occasion. What information the people have received they have otbained, in great measure, from the members of the opposition in this House, aided by their friends and allies throughout Canada. Because in this great fight the opposition have made allies. History appears to be repeating itself, events are similar to those that occured in 1878. Men are breaking from their old party affiliations, and many of them are allying themselves with the party that is opposing this pact. They are men who formerly opposed this party, and so we find various organizations growing up from day to day in this country, all in opposition to this pact.

Now we are told that there is an invisible border line extending some three thousand miles across this continent. Well, one does not like to be reminiscent in certain matters, but that line is not an invisible line. It was not an invisible line when many of the founders and forefathers of this country came across that line long years ago, and left behind them all their earthly possessions in the then republic. That line is still there, it is a line of national demarcation. Tariff walls would not alter it if they were removed. The line is just as indelible now as it was then. I am not referring to that line with any hard feelings, nor do I desire to arouse any such feelings. But I say that the people who left that country long ago and came here to live under British institutions, which were guaranteed to them by the British government, have a right still to appeal to that guarantee. On the part of the people of this country there is a strong desire to continue those British instiututions and political affiliations with Great Britain. Now of course we are living in a utilitarian age. We are not dealing now with flag waving incidents, because it is to be hoped that the hundred years of peace which has prevailed between ourselves and our neighbours to the south will soon be celebrated and will be repeated in the ages to come.

We oppose this pact both upon political and economic grounds. It does seem to me that, both from a political and an economic standpoint, it deserves more careful consideration than has been given it. It seems to me that the opposition to this treaty has made many friends and allies during the time it has been up for discussion. Many people have been

touched in their sentiments of nationality by its provisions. It was not thought perhaps by those who introduced it that it would have any sentimental aspect, or that it would be viewed from a sentimental point of view by the people of this country. But I can assure the hon. gentleman who introduced it that there are a great many people in this country who are opposed to it in their most sacred and patriotic sensibilities. They are opposing it because they believe it is calculated to endanger the political conditions under which they now live, is calculated to lead to profound changes in our commercial and political relations, and ultimately to political union with our neighbours to the south. There is that element who are opposed to it. Then we have the people whose interests are affected, people who view it from an economic standpoint, the great commercial interests of this country. It does seem to me that the great commercial and business interests of this country from end to end are opposed to this pact, men who have never taken any strong part in party politics in this country, or no part at all. One of the outcomes of this feeling is the Canadian National League, which has been recently formed with headquarters in the city of Toronto. It has been organized by a number of patriotic citizens who have inscribed upon the front of their literature their views and their reasons. These are men who, in private life and in business life, have not heretofore taken a prominent part in politics, and who have no notion of participating in public affairs, men who are not concerned which party is in power. These men have leagued themselves together to form this alliance. Permit me to read some of the objects of the Canadian National League:

> The Canadian National League was formed following the protest against 'Reciprocity with the United States of America,' which was signed by eighteen supporters in Toronto of the Liberal party in Canada and published in the press on February 20, 1911.
>
> The objects of the League are:
>
> To oppose the adoption of the proposed reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States of America, and to support such measures as will uphold Canadian nationality and British connection, will preserve our fiscal independence and will continue to develop our present national policy of interprovinical and external trade, under which the Dominion has achieved its present prosperity.
>
> The basis upon which the League has been formed is Canadian nationality, British connection and fiscal independence.

Now surely no intelligent Canadian can quarrel with the objects of this League—Canadian nationality, British connection and fiscal independence. These gentlemen have given numerous and weighty reasons in support of each and every one of these objects. Hon. gentlemen in this House are well aware of the formation of this League, and of the high character of the men composing it, and of their aims and aspirations. These men have no purposes to serve but the public good. They honestly belive in the necessity of such an organization, because they believe that Canadian nationality, British connection and fiscal independence are more or less menaced by this pact. Now we have heard a good deal about the city of Toronto in connection with this question. We know that the Toronto Board of Trade went on record against this pact by a vote of something like 280 to 13. I desire shortly to read an extract from the address which Mr. Gage, president of the Toronto Board of Trade, delievered on the 19th of January of the present year.

> Canada has never known a time of such universal prosperity. Our farmers are prosperous, our merchants and manufacturers are prosperous, our labouring classes have abundant employment with good wages. Is it not a good time to leave well enough alone?
>
> If our American friends wish to share in our unequalled prosperity, let their manufacturers continue to do as they have been doing in the past few years—locate branch factories in Canada—they will be welcome. If our American farmer wishes to 'get rich quick,' let him follow the well-beaten trail made by nearly a quarter of a million farmers from the United States, who have already found homes in the Canadian west.

Surely no one can quarrel with that. It is believed by the board of trade, as indicated by the president's language which I have read, and by the members' vote which I have mentioned, that if this pact passes there will be a discontinuance of the Americans coming to Canada with their money and establishing manufactores or branches of their large American industries. These are not idle words, they are not words said in jest, or said simply for the purpose of making conversation; they are words uttered because it is believed that they are true. These are the business men of the community. They do not confine their remarks simply to the manufacturing element, but they refer to the farming community and point out how, if the American farmer wishes to come here, he can do so. Let me give the counterpart of that reference which I have read. I desire to quote Senator Beveridge from the American point of view upon the same aspect of the question. We all know of Senator Beveridge. On the discussion of this reciprocity measure, he spoke as follows:

> There must be reciprocity with Canada. Our tariff with the rest of the world does not apply to our northern neighbours. That policy already has driven American manufacturers across the Canadian borders, built vast plants with American capital on Canadian soil, em-

ploying Canadian workingmen to supply trade. That capital should be kept at home to employ American workingmen to supply Canadian demand.

A perfectly natural thing for Senator Beveridge to say. It is perfectly natural that he should desire to manufacture in the States, sell in Canada and give their men employment. But the view of the Toronto Board of Trade is the reverse; it is that these men should manufacture in Canada, that they should come here if they desire to do so, make their bona fide residence here, put their business here, employ labour here, spend their capital here and manufacture here. Senator Beveridge made a further allusion to the same matter, but I think the quotation which I have read is sufficient.

The hon. Mr. McCall who brought the reciprocity measure before the House of Representatives in the last Congress, in speaking on this subject, even before negotiations were opened, used this language.

> Add to the tremendous influences that are pulling the two countries together, the entangling web that is woven by reciprocal trade, and the inevitable day will be more quickly reached when the two countries shall be politically one.

Mr. McCall is a public man of very great prominence and not given to making idle statements. He speaks of the 'entangling web' and he refers to the period of time when we shall be politically one. That is a very significant statement and one that a public man in this country cannot pass over. We are living in an age when communication is rapid, when men cannot disguise the words they use or the meaning of their words. We are living in a manly, frank and straightforward time. When Mr. McCall uttered those words he knew that they would be read and considered in Canada, he knew that proper weight would be attached to them and he openly said, in broad daylight to this country that the United States has woven an entangling web about this people by this pact, and he looks forward to the day when we shall be politically one as a consequence of it. Surely we cannot say that we are not aware of the public feeling of our friends to the south. We cannot say we are not aware of one of the objects which is impelling them to enter into this pact. I am not one of those who hesitates a moment to look the question of annexation squarely in the face and speak about it. We are in the habit of hearing people say 'hush, hush' when the word 'annexation' is spoken. I think that public men should be frank on public questions and if there is any public question that we ought to be more frank upon than another it is upon that affecting the national, vital existence of the country. Why should we hesitate to speak about annexation? American public men do not hesitate to speak about it. Annexation looks at us squarely in the face in connection with this matter. Why should we not look it squarely in the face back again? The time may come when those who will come after us will complain, and justly so, that in some quarters this annexation aspect of the case was never dealt with fearlessly and fully. Whether annexation is going to come or not, when it is openly discussed and when it is an important part of the American programme, Canadian public men ought to deal with the question fairly, according to their convictions, and as public men let them appeal to the people and be endorsed or condemned as the people may desire upon the stand they take upon this question.

Therefore, because of that statement, I hope I will be pardoned if I allude for a moment to what I may say has been the consistent, continuous, persevering, course pursued by the United States as to the annexation of this country. The question was first mooted in the very year of the American revolution. Away back in the year 1775, a proclamation was issued from Philadelphia by the then provisional government, to the people of this country and a very direct and straightforward, from the American point of view, appeal was made to the people of this country to join them in the then revolution. We know the effect of it and the reception it met with. That is history now, it has gone by and I mention it simply to show that there has been a consistent and continuous course of conduct from that time down to the present hour on the part of our neighbours to the south. The revolution was only three years old, in 1778, when a second appeal was made for annexation to the people of this country and in various forms and various phases from that day to this our American friends have been appealing to us to join in their national life. I cannot condemn them for it; I am not saying one word against them for it. They have a perfect right to do so. There was an occasion one hundred years ago next year when another method was adopted. I have no desire to refer to it. Happily that method failed. It is buried in the pages of history and of the past. But they have been making constitutional appeals to us since continuously. I think the last direct appeal and certainly the one that was perhaps the most serious because it was made in recent times and in very plain language was made at the very time that the Act of Confederation was passing through the British House of Commons. It is not perhaps generally known by the public at large that in the early part of the year 1867 when the British North America Act was being considered, our American friends passed a joint resolu-

tion of the Senate and Congress protesting against the formation of our country and in effect offering us this annexation which they had been holding out and which they are still holding out.

This important resolution is to be found in the 'Congressional Globe' (now the 'Congressional Record') of 27th March, 1867, page 392.

BRITISH AMERICAN CONFEDERATION.

Mr. Banks from the Committee on Foreign Affairs reported a joint resolution respecting the proposed confederation of provinces on the northern frontier of the United States, which was read a first and second time (it was afterwards read a third time).

The joint resolution, which was read at length, declares that the people of the United States cannot regard the proposed confederation of the provinces on the northern frontier of this country without extreme solicitude; that a confederation of states on this continent extending from ocean to ocean, established without consulting the people of the provinces, to be united and founded upon monarchial principles, cannot be considered otherwise than in contravention of the traditions and constantly declared principles of this government, endangering its most important interests and tending to increase and perpetuate embarrassments already existing between the two governments immediately interested.

Of course the reference in the resolution as to not consulting the people is incorrect. There was some dispute at the time as to whether the people of Nova Scotia had been consulted, but as we all know they had been.

Mr. FIELDING. Had been?

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Yes.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is entirely wrong. The people of Nova Scotia were not consulted. It is not material, but as a matter of history my hon. friend is wrong.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). I think I am correct because the issue of confederation was before the people at the election.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend is mistaken historically.

Mr. MACCDONELL (Toronto). I think not, but at all events this resolution of Congress was passed at a moment when reciprocity was in the air and it was passed in consequence of the repeal of the reciprocity treaty at that time. Although, Canada met with certain temporary losses by the cancellation of this treaty, the American people were apparently unaware of the fact that we were able to take care of ourselves, and indeed, the very next year, we began to show signs of our ability to be able to do without reciprocity in the future. We know what our friend, Mr. Champ. Clark has said that we would joyfully become part of the republic and this and other similar expressions are used by American statesmen when referring to this pact, which at least shows what is in their minds when entering into the arrangement. In a recent speech in New-York, President Taft used this language:

I have said that this was a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity. It is critical because unless it is now decided favourably to reciprocity, it is exceedingly probable that no such opportunity will ever again come to the United States. The forces which are at work in England and in Canada to separate her by a Chinese wall from the United States, and to make her part of an imperial commercial band reaching from England around the world to England again by a system of preferential tariffs, will derive an impetus from the rejection of this treaty, and if we would have reciprocity, with all the advantages that I have described, and that I earnestly and sincerely believe will follow its adoption, we must take it now, or give it up for ever.

Such views are being constantly expressed by statesmen of the United States and circulated through their press. We know that Sir George Ross has declared it to be his belief that annexation lurks at the bottom of this pact in the mind of our American friends. As confirmation of his opinion I cite this language of the Hon. G. S. Boutwell, President Grant's Secretary of the Treasury, and a member of Congress at the time of the repeal of the reciprocity treaty:

ANNEXATIONIST HOPES.

The fact of the annexation of Canada to the United States whether the event shall occur in a time near or remote, depends probably upon our action on reciprocity. Canada needs our markets and our facilities for ocean transportation, and as long as these advantages are denied to her, she can never attain to a high degree of prosperity. The body of farmers, labourers, and trading people will favour annexation ultimately should the policy of non-intercourse be adhered to on our part, and they will outnumber the office holding class, and thus the union of the two countries will be secured.

We were told then that the repeal of the treaty was to drive us into annexation, and that such was the policy of the Americans, but it failed in its aim. The Minister of Finance in introducing this measure referred at length to the connection of Conservative leaders in times past with reciprocity, but he touched very gingerly the period from 1838 to 1891, because he knows the state of public opinion in Canada on reciprocity during that period. He knows that the defeat of the Liberal party in 1891, was largely due to its advocacy of that policy. We know that prior to 1891 Mr. Erastus Wyman was busy with his friends

in New York, Mr. Carnegie and others, and he was helped by his friends in this country, Mr. Tarte and Mr. Mercier, the political allies of the Liberal party. We know the course taken at that time by the Hon. Edward Blake, and that he and Goldwin Smith declined to follow in the footsteps of these men who wanted to lead us into commercial union. The Minister of Finance said very little about that period.

The hon. Minister of Finance is on record on many occasions in regard to the Imperial preference, and we are now fed with preference pap, so to speak. When complaint is made of this reciprocity pact, the public is told: 'See what we have done for England; see the British preference.' Well, the British preference is going to become non-existent if this pact passes; there will be very little of it left. On the items enumerated in the schedule to this pact the preference will be zero, because the duty the American people will have to pay on them when they come to this country will be nil. At the time the Minister of Finance introduced the preference, there was no intention on his part or on the part of the government to give a preference to Britain alone. We are told now with great acclaim that the Liberal party gave the British preference. No one knows better than the Finance Minister that at that time it was a preference not to England alone, but to any nation that could qualify by giving us as favourable treatment as we gave it. When the Finance Minister introduced the preference in 1897, at page 1111 of 'Hansard,' he said this:

I stated that the tariff that I am about to read to you is the general tariff, but that before I conclude I shall be prepared to make a statement in relation to a special tariff that will apply to Great Britain and any other country which is prepared to accept the conditions which that tariff imposes.

Later on he spoke as follows, page 1131:

We do not by our resolutions offer anything to Great Britain alone. We recognize the fact that Great Britain by her liberal policy is in a position to avail herself of this offer immediately, but we make our offer not to Great Britain only, but to every nation which is prepared to accept it. We make it to every country which is willing to establish fair and reasonable trade relations with Canada.

On the same page, speaking of the favoured nation treaties, he spoke as follows:

I say that it does not seem fair and reasonable that we should be obliged, while we are offering certain terms, not to Great Britain only but to all countries which will place themselves in the same position—it does not seem to be fair and reasonable that we should be obliged to extend the privileges of this schedule, which we call a reciprocal tariff, to nations which are not willing to do anything in return.

Now, I have just two comments to make on that statement. One is that the offer was not made to Great Britain alone; it was made to any country that chose to accept it. Secondly, at that time at least the Minister of Finance was apprehensive of these favoured nation treaties, and was unwilling to grant anything in the nature of a treaty or tariff arrangement which would entitle the favoured nations to favoured nation treatment in our market. Things have very greatly changed since then. At that time the favoured nations were not to participate; rather than that he would change the Bill, and the Bill was changed in the following year. But now, when this reciprocity of another kind is going through, the favoured nations are let in. I do not see how the minister or the government can reconcile the two positions. When dealing with England they would not allow the favoured nations in; but in dealing with the United States in the present pact, so anxious apparently are they to get it through that they are willing to open the door so wide that thirteen other nations are allowed to participate without giving anything in return. That is one of the great objections to this agreement. With the United States it is very different. By their constitution their favoured nations do not participate with Canada in their market. When we are told that this looks like a fair arrangement to both countries, both giving up something and both getting something, that feature is entirely overlooked, and it has a very important effect.

Now, we are told that reciprocity when it existed in the old days brought prosperity. Well, certain interests in Canada were very prosperous. I have no desire to disparage reciprocity at that time or deal unfairly with it; but every man in this country knows that at that time, unfortunately for the powers engaged in it, but fortunately for us who had grain to sell, there was a very disastrous war in Europe, the Crimean war. For the first years of the reciprocity treaty wheat brought $2.50 a bushel in England. We participated in that prosperity. Whether we had reciprocity with the United States or not, our wheat was worth as much money as any other, or more, because of its superior quality, and we got no more for it by sending it to the States. Then during the latter part of that period, when the American war was raging, when tens of thousands of the farmers of the United States had to abandon their husbandry operations and take the field, and when the price of foodstuffs and breadstuffs soared high, we again participated in that prosperity. But it was not all prosperity in Canada at that time. Let me just refer to the shipping trade that languished during those years. Following the treaty, business in and out of the port of Montreal declined. The carrying trade of

the St. Lawrence in 1854 was valued at $33,633,128. In the next year it dropped to $15,208,000. The ships' tonnage going to the sea from Montreal and Quebec decreased from 1,487,097 tons to 870,794, and the value of the exports from $42,000,000 to $28,000,000. On Canadian canals in the first fiscal year of the treaty the tolls fell off by 32 per cent. That in itself tells a very dismal tale of the effect of reciprocity, even at that early period, on the shipping and the foreign trade of the country.

We see that the shipping declined in tonnage and in value. The canals did not do the same work, and there was not anything like the same volume of business going through them. With the exception of the traffic going north and south there was very little business being transacted in the country compared with what there had been a year or two previous. But, our American friends were then after what they are now after. They were not so diligently in pursuit of it, it is true—still they were after it. I refer to the natural resources of this country. At that time the grass had not, so to speak, shortened for them. They still had a vast storehouse of natural resources, but as time has gone by this has been pretty well drawn on. One of the main reasons, and one of the avowed reasons, is that the American people shall have access to our natural resources, and not only have access to them, but take them away to a foreign country and manufacture them with foreign labour.

Let me just point out what President Taft said about that:

> Ought we not then to arrange a commercial agreement with Canada, if we can, by which we shall have direct access to her great supply of natural products? Should we not now, therefore, before their policy has become too crystallized and fixed for change meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two countries, and thus greatly increase the natural resources available to our people? By giving our people access to the Canadian forests we shall reduce the consumption of our own which, in the hands of comparatively few owners now have a value that requires enlargement of our available timber resources.

This is explicitly one of the American main objects of reciprocity, and it is equally one of the main reasons why it should be opposed.

I would refer for a moment to an article which appeared in the London 'Times,' and which I think most fittingly puts the case to the Canadian people. Hon. gentlemen will, perhaps, recollect the correspondent of the 'Times' who headed his article during the last two or three months, 'The Buttering of Parsnips,' with special reference to the right hon. gentleman who leads this House (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Allow me to read an extract from one of these letters:

> The short sighted man says, 'let us sell our wheat and our timber.' The long sighted man replies, 'no, let us sell our flour and biscuits and furniture and paper. Let us not sell our raw materials, but the manufactured article. That is the only way in which we can reap the full profits on our products and establish ourselves in the community of interests that makes a nation.'

Surely no one could epitomize the protection of our natural resources in more clear language than this. 'But,' hon. gentlemen on the opposite side say, 'we are not going to interfere with your manufactured articles.' Well, the same writer in the same article deals with that under the caption 'The Spider and the Fly.' He says:

> You say it is restricted reciprocity, and we will go no further. But you remember the fable: the spider invited the fly to step into his parlour. The fly replied, 'I will only put in one foot, the rest of me will remain outside.' The spider was satisfied. Why? Because he knew the foot would stick.

What does that show? It shows that when the farmer finds his goods give him very little if any advance in price, and that all he produces is open to competition, and that he has no protection in anything he raises, but has to pay duty on everything he buys, he will not be satisfied. If the farmer realizes that he has to suffer competition from American farm products, I think there will be a very great hue and cry throughout the country.

The timber question was mentioned by President Taft, as it has been mentioned by many others. Two authorities on the subject who ought to be acceptable to the Liberal people of this country, are Senator Ross and the Hon. Mr. Sifton.. These are two gentlemen who have gone on record as being directly opposed to this treaty, especially so far as timber is concerned.

I do not desire to take up the time of the House with the reading of Senator Ross's remarks, suffice it to say that he has gone flatfooted on record as being in opposition to the treaty with special regard to lumber, and in that respect he quotes, with approval, what was said by the Hon. Clifford Sifton, as chairman of the Commission on Natural Resources—or as we call it now, the Conservation Commission. It is well to read and heed the warning of Mr. Sifton, who says:

> At the end of 20 years the United States would have no timber for sale, in the ordinary way. In Canada the supply was large, but if the supply in the United States ran out, the supply in Canada would last the United States for only seven years. The time must come, however, when the people of Canada would demand legislation prohibiting the export of marketable timber.

That is the natural view, and the only view which will do justice to Canadian interests.

Now, not only is this government, by its treaty, not protecting and conserving our resources, and especially our timber resources—not only is it not heeding the warning of the chairman of its own commission—a commission constituted for the purpose of collecting information, but it is exposing these very resources to the free exploitation of the American trust man and combine man, because by taking down the duty on timber or by making it free, you will no doubt give the lumberman of this country a very large and immediate profit on his timber, but we must bear in mind that much of this timber which is growing on this Canadian soil of ours is owned by Americans. We have no desire to interfere with any man's property rights in this country, but there is no reason why the exploiter should be facilitated in denuding and depleting our country of its natural resources, and of its timber in particular.

Both liberals and conservatives talk with pride and with pleasure about our great country. We are in the habit of hearing Canada praised, and it pleases us. Our British brethren, as well as foreigners all join in one accord in complimenting this country upon its almost inexhaustible store of natural resources. How, I ask in the name of common sense, are we to preserve these resources if they are not protected from exploitation? If any one and every one can come in and take out timber, our minerals, &c., at a nominal figure, as they have in the past, what benefit is it to Canada? Many of these resources might just as well be in Egypt or in Russia if they are simply for the exploiter, to be removed in the rough or natural state.

What benefit is it to the country? Take an American lumberman who came here years ago, and bought blocks of virgin forest for a trifle—what benefit is it to this country if he is allowed to take out that timber in the rough. Of what benefit are any of our natural resources unless there is some guardianship, some protection, some conservation? For these resources are inter-dependent. If you remove the timber, you make less favourable the conditions of agriculture. And so in other matters. But of what avail is it for us to boast of our great natural resources if those resources are to be exploited by any one who chooses to come and acquire them? The only affect is to make the rich man richer, and the poor poorer. The lumberman who has acquired the timber will increase his revenues—to him that hath shall be given. But what will become of the mechanic or farmer who wishes to buy lumber? Why, the great consuming public will have to pay more for their lumber than in the past. And that is one of the features of this pact that is most frequently attacked. It is said, and said truly in my opinion, that it is a pact for the trusts and combines; it will leave this country exposed, as the United States has been exposed to the exploitation of these men. A moment's reflection will cause one to realize that the American trusts and combines will extend their operations to this country. They are anxious to do it; they seek to enlarge their area from which to draw the resources they need. That is why this pact is welcomed so cordially in the United States.

Now, it does seem to me that the home market for the producer of this country is the best market. It is said that the home market is not large enough, but we know that about 80 or 85 per cent of all that is produced in this country is used in this country. We know that the home market has built up our neighbours to the south, and that the farmer in that country has been the best advocate of the factory. And so he should be, because the factory assures him of customers for what he raises. Let me quote on this subject no less an authority than Mr. Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture for the United States. He fills the position occupied by the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fisher), who is now leading the House, and I think that hon. gentlemen will agree that the Minister of Agriculture should, and in some cases does, know a great deal about the agricultural conditions of his country. Mr. Wilson said:

> The American farmer brought about the building of the American factory, because he wanted a home market. That home market is the best to be found anywhere, because our people all live well and are all able to buy the best farm produce,—that is, all who are willing to work. It may be said, without much exaggeration, that the American farmer is responsible for the upbuilding of the factory. He has voted steadily for half a century to give protection to the extent of the difference in cost of production between this country and any country that desires to sell in our markets. Was that right or wrong? Was it wise for the farmers to do that? There was no market at home. They wanted a market as near the factory as they could bring it. Now millions of people who work in these factories and in occupations other than farming want food at reasonable prices. Who can condemn them for that desire?

All that is said by Mr. Wilson can be truly said by the Minister of Agriculture of this country. We are now embarking, as it were, upon the period that they have passed, we are experiencing the same conditions here that they experienced in their country a very few years ago, and we are finding that the best market for the farmers' produce, is in the towns and cities which are built up around the factories. Therefore, it

seems to me that the true policy of the government is not to alarm the commercial and manufacturing industries as they have done, but by every reasonable means consistent with the keeping of prices at fair levels, they should encourage the home market, affording protection which, as Mr. Wilson says, is enough to place the home producer, having regard to the higher labour cost of his product, on an equality with the producer abroad. If that policy were adhered to, our market would be found in our own country, we should have a large influx of the farming community, and much greater stability of our manufacturing and business interests.

Hon. gentlemen opposite, especially the Minister of Finance, have spoken of members of the Conservative party having made many journeys to Washington. Well, they were not the only ones who did that. Members of the Liberal party, on many occasions, when in opposition, and since they were returned to power, have made these same trips. One gentleman went on many occasions—the late John Charlton. He attended the National Reciprocity Convention at Washington, on November 19, and 20, 1901. He was there pleading for reciprocity, and holding out inducements for them to enter into an arrangement with us. I do not believe hon. gentlemen opposite will repudiate Mr. Charlton. Here is the picture he painted for the Americans of what reciprocity would do for them. He gave quite a lengthy address. He said in part:

What we want is reciprocal free trade in natural products, as I remarked a moment ago, we buy three times as much in the way of agricultural products as we sell to the United States. With free trade the whole vast mining region of British Columbia and the Yukon districts would draw its supplies of food from Oregon and Washington. The maritime provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island would draw nineteen-twentieths of their food supplies from the seaboard cities of the United States, and vessels bringing coal and lumber from those provinces would take back cargoes of flour, meal, &c., as return cargoes. The mining and lumbering regions of Ontario and Quebec would buy enormously of American farm products.

Now that would be very interesting reading for the farmers of British Columbia, the maritime provinces, of Ontario and Quebec. All these provinces were to be supplied with their foodstuffs by the American farmers. That is the exact condition today. Mr. Charlton was then speaking about a reciprocal tariff in natural products, just what we are asked to adopt to-day, and this is the inducement he offered the American people. We did not hear anything of that kind in this country. There, he was speaking his convictions, he was away from home, he was addressing strangers, and no doubt felt at liberty to unbutton himself and tell the people what was in his heart. And that was in his heart, that all the food supplies of these provinces should be drawn from the American people. Now the farmer here is told, as a reason why he should endorse this pact; it is going to improve everything; you are going to have the Augustan age in the rural districts of Canada, you are going to have a golden period; all you raise is going to bring very high prices; farms are going to improve in value, everything you have is going to be made more valuable; you are going to enter into a golden heritage, and practically your working days are over. Now let us see what effect this market of 90 millions of people has had upon the farming community in the States, and then we can form some opinion as to how reciprocity will affect farm values in Canada. It certainly will not improve them, if statistics are to be believed. Here is the record:

Advocates of reciprocity are making statements to the effect that the adoption of reciprocity will immediately increase the value of Canadian farm lands 25 per cent or more. Instead of making wild guesses let us get at the facts. Since the reciprocity negotiations began the United States government has had a report prepared by experts showing the comparative value per acre of improved farm lands in 1900 and 1910 in various border states and in the Canadian provinces adjoining them. This report states that between 1900 and 1910 the value of improved farm lands increased 67 per cent in Maine, 37 per cent in New Hampshire, 33 per cent in Vermont, 181 per cent in Nova Scotia, 120 per cent in New Brunswick, 70 per cent in Prince Edward Island, 80 per cent in Quebec, 43 per cent in Ontario, 39 per cent in Michigan, 77 per cent in Minnesota, 123 per cent in Manitoba, 201 per cent in Saskatchewan and 185 per cent in Alberta.

Now with this great market at the doors of the American farmers, we find nevertheless that their farms have not increased in value at anything like the same ratio as have the farms of the Canadian provinces adjoining. They have a market of ninety millions of people, where is their increased value? This big market does not seem to have brought riches to them. It may be said that the great increase in the value of our western lands is unusual because it is a new country. That may be so. But why the increase in the value of the farms of the older provinces? Look at the enormous increase in the value of farm land in the province of the Minister of Finance himself, most phenomenal, 181 per cent increase in Nova Scotia. Surely nothing better than that could be desired. It is two or three times the ratio of increase in the American States adjoining, and yet the farmers of this country are asked to make this change. Let us see what will happen

if the tariff wall is taken down and natural products are allowed to pass freely between the two countries. Of course, the tendency and effect will be to produce a uniformity in values. Land is only worth what it will produce. If all the territory is practically one great field of agriculture, you are going to have the value of the farm lands on both sides brought down to something like uniformity. You will not have this great increase in value continuing in our Canadian farms, because the value will necessarily be brought down to the level of American farms, the same as the value of the produce on those farms. Granting that the quality of the land is the same, it seems to me that is self-evident.

Now permit me to make an allusion to the opinions of some prominent public men in the United States with regard to what is likely to happen when this treaty goes into effect. Senator Albert B. Cummins, of Iowa, is a well known public man who has delivered a great many speeches on this subject, in the Senate and elsewhere in the United States. In a very able article in the 'Editorial Review' he says many things which are well worthy of reproduction. I will extract the following:

With respect to live stock. I have taken some pains to discover what relative prices are, comparing Canada and the United States, and this is the result: the average value of horses in the United States is $108.10; in Canada, $133. Dairy cows in the United States, $35.79; in Canada, $43. Other cattle, without respect to age or grade, in the United States, $19.41; in Canada, $31. Sheep in the United States, $4.08; in Canada, $6. Hogs in the United States, $9.14; in Canada, $11.

Bearing in mind what has been already said, I predict that with nearly everything, except wheat, barley, and possibly hay, our exports of agricultural products into Canada will grow more rapidly than the imports of such products into the United States from Canada.

That is a very important statement, and if it is true, as we are told, that the American people now sell to us $3 worth for every dollar's worth we sell to them, what is likely to take place after this treaty goes into effect?

If, as Senator Cummins says, we are going to import into Canada very much more than they are going to import of our products, what is the ratio going to be?—six to one probably, or it may be double. So that instead of trade getting better between ourselves and the United States in so far as we are concerned it will get worse because, with the exception of two items, and possibly a third, in that long list, Senator Cummins is of opinion that the Americans will sell much more largely to us than we will sell to them. He ought to know. He is a well informed public man, he understands their capacity to export, he knows the surplus of the country, he knows what the prices are there and here and he makes that very deliberate statement advisedly.

I would like to make one more reference to Mr. Wilson. Mr. Wilson is the American Secretary of Agriculture, and he refers incidentally to a matter which has been very much discussed in this country. He refers to the milling industry. In an article in the 'Editorial Review' of May, he says:

I am firmly convinced that it would be to the advantage of both countries for us to take the export wheat of Canada, mill it and send the flour to the markets of the world, because the dairymen of the United States would then get the by-products of the mills and as the population of the United States increases, the dairy market will be greater and greater. We will get those by-products then, instead of having the wheat go as wheat to foreign countries where the by-products would be sold and used to great advantage by dairymen in those countries.

Mr. Wilson ought to know pretty well the capabilities of his country in that respect. He says candidly what many people in this country have said and have been called alarmists for saying, namely, that the wheat of this country, especially the No. 1 hard grade of wheat, would be exported to the United States and there milled. It is quite obvious, it is self-evident what the advantages will be to the American people from the milling of the wheat in their country. As Mr. Wilson very candidly puts it, their dairymen will have the benefit of the by-products. He, however, facetiously says that this will be good for both countries because the wheat of Canada will go to their country for milling purposes. How the benefit will come to Canada from milling Canadian wheat in Minneapolis and other wheat milling centres is more than I can tell. But, he is not concerned with Canada. He supposes that the interests of this country are being looked after by the public men of this country. He is a public man in the American union, and he is looking after the interests of that country, and apparently doing it very well. He points out very naturally, very properly, what an advantage it will be if the milling of our wheat is carried on in that country. We all know that although a comparatively large amount of wheat is produced in this country at the present time, still we are not by any means the first, or second, or third, or fourth wheat producing country in the world. The United States produces a very vast amount of wheat, more than any other country; Russia, I think comes next; France is a very large wheat producing country, then there is the Argentine Republic and possibly one other country. I think that all of these countries, at least produce a greater quantity of wheat than

we do. But, in proportion to the quantity of wheat grown in these different countries no country exports the same percentage of the quantity grown as Canada does. Although our wheat production is praiseworthy, although it is encouraging, there is such a large home consumption of wheat in these other countries that the percentage of wheat produced in the country and exported from Canada is larger, I think than the percentage grown and exported by any other country. The export of our wheat becomes a very important matter. We are going to export an increasingly large quantity of wheat. Just in proportion to the quantity of wheat we export will rise and increase the importance of where that wheat will be milled. It is altogether unnecessary for any man to argue that it is a good thing for a country to mill its own wheat because not only does it give the millers employment, and all the incidental benefits and profits that arise from a great industry of that kind, but in addition to this, and perhaps of still greater importance is the fact that where the milling takes place the by-products remain. That is a most important thing. The by-products cannot be profitably shipped to any great distance, and it is all important that the wheat should be milled in this country, that the industry should remain in this country, and that the by-products and the benefits derived from these by-products should remain here.

I think it is only fair to say that perhaps the east and west feature of this agreement has been argued at very great length. But, if we are going to have this treaty, every man knows—it is self-evident—that to a very great extent the east and west transportation of this country is going to decrease. How much no one can tell. We know it from the history of the reciprocity treaty of 1854 that in the very next year after the treaty went into force there was an instantaneous and immense falling off in the shipment through the canals going east and west, and from the ports of Montreal and Quebec. Their shipping declined one-half practically in one year. With that example before us, and with our certain knowledge that history repeats itself when identical conditions are re-created we do know that there will be a great decline in the east and west transportation shipping of this country. How much no one can tell. We have not heard so much of the all-red route since this pact has been before the people. That seems to have dropped and very naturally and very properly so because I do not know just what it will have to do. Where will it take the traffic? What occasion will there be for it? We are getting along pretty well at the present time with our present conditions. The all red-route was proclaimed in anticipation of a largely increased shipping business to and from the ocean ports of this country. It is quite evident that that is not going to happen. There is a very significant and a very important silence upon that question.

Now, with regard to the east and west route, it is rather wonderful that the past statements of the government seem to be entirely forgotten by members of the government themselves and largely by the public. Therefore it is necessary perhaps to refer occasionally to what was said by the leaders of this government in regard to the east and west traffic of the country, especially in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. I would like to refer to some statements made by the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). When speaking on the Grand Trunk Pacific and National Transcontinental railway in the House of Commons we recollect perhaps this rather striking statement:

Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:

Heaven grant that if be not already too late; heaven grant that whilst we tarry and dispute, the trade of Canada is not deviated to other channels, and that an ever vigilant competitor does not take to himself the trade that properly belongs to those who acknowledge Canada as their native or their adopted land.

And the right hon. gentleman was followed by his Minister of Finance on the same occasion who said:

It is desirable that we should give our American brethren to understand that Canada is resolved to work out her independence in these things, and the present proposal will promote this object, and that even if still another railway should be necessary we shall be prepared to construct it. The attitude that the government has taken upon the subject . . . has already attracted much attention across the border, and there is much keener appreciation of Canada's independence than ever before.

The Minister of Finance was out heroding his chief; he was prepared to build two Transcontinental railways to move the trade of Canada east and west so that we might be for all time independent of our American friends. The very bargain itself with the Grand Trunk Pacific contains penal clauses compelling the railway to carry the trade east and west to Canadian ports. Section 43 of the contract which now forms part of the bill reads:

43. The company further agrees that it shall not, in any matter within its power, directly or indirectly advise or encourage the transportation of such freight by routes other than those above provided, but shall, in all respects, in good faith, use its utmost endeavours to fulfil the conditions upon which public aid is granted, namely,—the development of trade through Canadian channels and Canadian ocean ports.

Do I need to remind hon. gentlemen that the very same principle was embodied in the British North America Act with regard to the Intercolonial railway, declaring that it was essential to the consolidation of the union of British North America, and this same principle of east and west transportation was incorporated in the agreement with British Columbia in 1871, it being made an essential part of the union that the Canadian Pacific railway should be built. This is proof that in all sections of this country and at all times in her history there has been uppermost in the minds of the people of Canada the necessity for this east and west route until now this government agreed with the United States that her trade shall be diverted to the south. American public men are gloating over the fact that the American ocean ports are to handle our export freight, and I commend to the government the views of Governor Foss, of Massachussetts, who is strongly for the agreement, because he believes it will draw all kinds of trade away from Canadian ports; that there will be no more Montreal, or St. John, or Halifax, but that Boston is to be the great port for shipment of Canadian goods. We know only too well that that is most likely what will happen if this pact goes through. It seems most extraordinary that the right hon. gentleman and his Minister of Finance should have turned around in their own tracks, and gone back on their declared policy and are now proposing by this pact to undo much of what has been done by the legislation of past years to encourage national transcontinental east and west routes. Why, the right hon gentleman, who declared so often against reciprocity should now favour it, we do not know, but there may be a reason that will come to the surface later on. In the House of Commons at banquets and on other public occasions, and at the Colonial Conference we find him of late years pronouncing against reciprocity. In 1891 he fell fighting for reciprocity or commercial union or continental free trade or whatever you may choose to call it, and from that date to the date of this agreement he seems to have been opposed to it. In 1899 he said:

If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present, I think I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians would have given many things to obtain the American market. There was a time when the market of the great cities of the Union was the only market we had, but these days are past and over now. We are not dependent on the American market now.

At a banquet in Montreal in 1901 the right hon. gentleman declared:

I remember, and you remember also, that since the abolition of the Reciprocity Treaty in 1866, we have sent delegation after delegation to Washington to obtain reciprocity. We are not sending any more delegations. But I rather expect, and I would not be surprised, if the thing were to take place in a few years—I say—I rather expect that there will be delegations coming from Washington to Ottawa for reciprocity. Having learned from our friends in the south how to receive such a delegation, we shall receive them in the proper manner, with every possible politeness.

In 1903, in proposing the Grand Trunk Pacific legislation the Prime Minister said:

I have found, in the short experience during which it has been my privilege and my fortune to be placed at the head of affairs, by the will of the Canadian people, that the best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them.

When he found himself in England at the Imperial Conference in 1907, he was more British than ever, and this is the language he used:

If we were to follow the laws of nature and geography between Canada and the United States, the whole trade would flow from south to north, and from north to south. We have done everything possible by canals and subsidizing railways to bring the trade from west to east and east to west so as to bring trade into British channels. All this we have done, recognizing the principle of the great advantage of forcing trade within the British Empire. . . There is no boundary line except a purely conventional one over the whole territory of North America. Their habits are the same as ours, and therefore we are induced to trade and cannot help it by force of nature. But so far as legislation can influence trade we have done everything possible to push our trade towards the British people as against the American people. . .

There was a time when we wanted reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside. We have said goodbye to that trade and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

Here he was apologizing even for trading with the Americans which he excuses on the ground that they were our neighbours and that there was only an invisible line between the two countries.

But in so far as legislation is concerned, we are not encouraging trade with the States; we are encouraging and are going to encourage trade with Great Britain. Again right-about-face. One can hardly understand the reason for it, unless, perhaps, it be the old love reawakened in the heart of the premier in this late day, because we all know that his old love was for reciprocity transactions and community of interests with the people to the south.

Now, I desire to differ very distinctly from the hon. gentleman who represents South Ontario in this House (Mr. Fowke).

That hon. gentleman, in several places in the province of Ontario, the city of Toronto among others, has been preaching the gospel of continental trade as opposed to interprovincial trade. giving his reasons for that preference. He has urged that it is better to abandon interprovincial trade and encourage continental trade. I think nothing could be more disastrous to this country than to accept any such doctrine. Our own people in these provinces want to trade with each other. How can it be said that it is better to trade with the people of the south than among ourselves—that it is better to buy the products of American workmen instead of the products of our own workmen who make and finish the materials in this country? Surely it is a most desirable thing that we should trade among ourselves, that the farmers of the west should buy the manufactured goods that come from the east, and that the great toiling industrial masses of the east should buy the products of the farm and the dairy of our own people than the stuff that comes from the United States. Surely it is wise to keep our money at home. Even if the prices were somewhat higher in this country it would be preferable to deal among ourselves and keep the money in the country rather than to send the money to build up foreign factories and foreign homesteads. Our friends opposite have been in the habit of going through the rural districts telling the farmers of the great benefits of this treaty. That is not being much done now; there is a marked silence. The figures which the people have got on this subject, not from the government, but from independent sources, have enlightened them. But our Liberal friends have told the farmers that they would get more money for the produce of their farms if this pact went through, while in the cities they have told the mechanics and workers that reciprocity is going to cheapen their cost of living. How these two statements can be reconciled is more than I can understand. I leave hon. gentlemen opposite to preach their different doctrines to different audiences, but they can never make the people of this country believe that the farmer will get more for his produce and at the same time that the mechanic will get his food supplies cheaper than he gets them now.

I wish now to refer to a matter of some importance to which the Minister of Finance devoted his life, that is, the money of the country. The Minister of Finance has had to do with money; he has grown gray in the service of money. He has probably had more money passing under his hand in many ways than any Canadian who has preceded him, and, therefore, I will appeal to him, because he knows the value of money. Where do we get our money today? From our American friends? Permit me to read an extract from an article which appeared in a very excellent magazine called the 'Round Table,' for February, 1911:

For federal, provincial, municipal and other purposes Canada is borrowing at the rate of $200,000,000 per annum. It is estimated that the Dominion has absorbed $1,000,000,000 of British capital. During five years ending 1909 (per Richard Gregg, British Trade Commissioner for Canada), outside investments in Canada have totalled $962,000,000, of which Great Britain has contributed $605,000,000. In five years we have borrowed $250,000,000 for railway construction alone. During the last ten years we have received 1,500,000 immigrants and these have brought money and settlers' effects probably to the value of $500,000,000. A calculation by the Toronto 'Globe' places the government, corporation and municipal borrowings for 1910 at $215,338,500 as compared with $240,000,000 for the previous year. In the distribution of bonds the United States took 1½ per cent, Canada 17½ per cent, and Great Britain 81 per cent.

It may be possible that this will continue to a certain extent; but if we want to do business with people we have to do it fairly. We get nothing for nothing in this world; every person has to pay for everything he gets, in money or kind; and if our trade is deliberately taken from England and turned over to the American people, we cannot reasonably hope to have the same lavish expenditure of British money in this country that we have had in the past. Many people think this is a commercial combination simply. A great many very wise people think that it means more, that though it may be merely commercial at the initiation, it will become political ultimately. The desire of the British investor is to invest under British institutions, under British conditions, which he knows and in which he has confidence. Mr. Paish, an eminent London authority on finance, says that Canada has absorbed £300,000,000 of British capital. We know that capital is very sensitive; nothing is more sensitive, and it is very easy to alarm the investor. I have no desire to make statements without giving particulars, but I venture to say that there is not an hon. gentleman in this House who has not heard of at least one intending British investment of capital in this country which has been withdrawn, or which has been delayed, at least, until the question of this reciprocity issue is decided fully and definitely. I know of a great many instances of British capital which intended to come here, and in which a halt has been called very naturally. They want to know what the conditions are going to be.

Now, if we are going to borrow our money from one man, and do business with another I do not know how long that method of trade will last. What would this country

do without British capital? What would the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) do with regard to financing his loans? Perhaps the credit of Canada is now good enough to go to the European markets, but where does it naturally go? To the London money market of course. There is not a city or town in Canada whose streets are not lighted or paved or whose public utilities are not operated more or less by British capital, which was got at a time when capital could not be got at the same rate of interest from foreign countries. This capital is invested in exploiting the mines —it is invested in our agricultural lands— it is invested in every walk and sphere of our national life, and there is nothing more closely associated with business in Canada. It has always been so, and will continue so if we maintain our trade conditions as they are at the present time. How long these conditions will last if we are going to pass over our gold and silver to pay for American products, is a thing I do not know.

There is another matter kindred with the one of which I am now speaking. The right hon. gentleman has been full of hope that some day we would obtain a British preference. We on this side of the House have indulged the same hope and desire. What can be more advantageous to the great farming community of this country than some preference on the British markets for food stuffs they need and which we raise? Now, this is a hope which has some prospect of ultimately materialising. In fact some of the British public men are now committed to it—and when I say this I do not mean some of the men of to-day or yesterday, because the matter has been before them for the last ten or fifteen years, and they have been advocating the adoption of some preference for the products of the overseas portions of the empire. I have every reason to expect that when the time is ripe and proper some form of preference will be obtained by the overseas portions of the empire in the home market of Great Britain.

The agreement ignores one objection which has been urged with force and persistence in Canada. It has been contended that with free trade in natural products between Canada and the United States, reciprocal treatment of Canadian products in British markets would become impossible, inasmuch as American products would seek an outlet at Canadian ports in order to secure the benefit of British preferential duties. Certainly Canada has faced no such radical change in fiscal policy since the system of protection was established over thirty years ago.

Now, how can we hope to succeed in getting that preference if the proposed treaty passes? How can we expect a British preference if all the food stuffs and natural products of the American nation are at liberty to swarm over the border line into this country, and be reshipped to Great Britain as the products of this country? Surely that would make a British preference impossible, and it seems to me natural that it should be so, because the preference would be given to us as part of the overseas dominions of the British Empire. It would not be given to the products of the United States. Now, if reciprocity is enforced between ourselves and our American neighbours, it is, of course, quite obvious that their products would come in here, and intermingle with ours in such a way that there would be no possibility of distinguishing between the two, the result would be that Great Britain would naturally say: 'It is impossible for us to admit your products into our markets when they are accompanied by a great avalanche of American products which we cannot distinguish from your own.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) when introducing this measure, spoke delightfully about the certainty and the uncertainty of the duration of the pact. He told us in one sentence that this would only be a temporary affair—that if we did not like it we were not bound to anybody for any time—and if it were found to be inconvenient or unprofitable we could undo it, and revert to our former condition—that we did not have to abide by it, but could cancel it at any time. In the next sentence he told us that the hope was expressed by both prties to the transaction that it would be found profitable and that it would be enduring.

Let us see what the opinion of our American friends is as to the enduring of it. Mr. McCall, who introduced the measure into the House said in the debate on the reciprocity agreement:

> It is scarcely good form for us to regulate in advance, the internal fiscal policy of the British Empire. It will, however, always be within the power of Congress, if it shall appear that any undue advantage is hereafter given to Great Britain, to correct and change these rates, or repeal them all.

Before the pact goes into force, Mr. McCall says: 'If this does not suit us we are going to repeal it.' There is a condition of uncertainty created which is in itself, a very grave objection. We all know that the commercial interests of any country strive and struggle for one thing more than all others, and that is certainty and stability. Certainty of tariff and stability of trade. They cannot get on with a tariff which is changeable like a moving picture show, and which may alter at any moment—new scenes being rung up, and brought into the arena. That is not a condition which the

mercantile and manufacturing classes in this country desire. It is quite obvious that that kind of a temporary tariff would be most injurious. It would not be a stable condition of affairs, after diverting our routes of transportation north and south, after changing our trade conditions, and adopting our commercial life to the new conditions, to have all this suddenly overthrown and wiped out. What condition would trade be in then? 'Disorganization' is scarcely a fair word to express the condition in which we would find ourselves.

The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) took exception to a remark which I made regarding his statement in Montreal. I have it before me now. Speaking at the Windsor Hall, Montreal, on March 25, 1911, the hon. minister said:

> We know that a great many things have been said about this agreement which are wrong; we know that a great many men have formed their opinions in relation to this measure without adequate information, and so it is our desire that as opportunities occur, we shall endeavour to remove some of the misunderstandings which exist.

If the people have not had adequate information regarding this agreement who is to blame? Surely, the government. It may be, with the extraordinary and undue haste that has characterized the government's action, they could not prepare for our people proper information on this subject. But apparently our American friends were warned and advised in advance. They had their information all prepared, and much of what has been used in this House and throughout this country is information we have gleaned from American sources. Had full information been before the country when this pact was brought into the House, there would not have been the lengthy discussion upon it. We on this side have insisted that the people should have the information necessary to form an opinion upon this question. Every man in this country is as much entitled to information upon the nature of this pact as were the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) when they were discussing it. It is an essential and fundamental change in our economic and national conditions. Every man is affected by it, and every man is entitled to the means of forming an opinion upon the matter.

The opposition have condemned and opposed this pact in the belief that it is bad for Canada and for British interests. That, of course, is merely an opinion. But what we have tried to insist upon was that the people should have the information necessary to form an opinion in the first place, and in the second place that they should be afforded an opportunity to express that opinion. We believe that the people may be trusted. And we believe that on this subject the people are being educated. Notwithstanding the complete absence of information brought down by the government, the people are getting the information. Public men are arising everywhere to spread the knowledge of the subject and people who are not in public life at all are engaged taking part in the work of public education. We hope the people will be given an opportunity of expressing themselves, pro and con on this question. That is all that the opposition asks. We believe that the people may be trusted; but we believe also that when the people's voice is heard on this subject it will be, not unanimously, of course, but by a heavy preponderance in opposition to this pact.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH (East Algoma). Mr. Chairman, I assure you of my sympathy in having to sit up so late listening to this debate. Perhaps you are tired because of hearing only from one side. And we on this side also are not only somewhat tired, but almost ashamed that in the House of Commons, representing this great Canada, we have a majority who sit as dumb as oysters. We know that these gentlemen have ability to discuss this question if they wish to do so. We also understand that they are taking advantage of their position for the purpose, as they think, of letting this side talk itself out. I do not know that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) who is now leading the House is going to accomplish exactly what he has set out to do. But I am sure that every member on this side—I would like to include the 'colony,' but I am perfectly satisfied I speak for all the Conservatives—is willing to remain here until this time next year if our humble efforts may protect the interest of the people. Surely, we could have no other desire at heart than the interest of the people to leave our homes and businesses and come here to remain during the sweltering July nights, impairing our health, to carry on the debate on this question.

I feel it my duty to address this House, becaue my constituents have sent me here not to sit dumb, but to express to the powers that be my views on the questions before the House. It is not for me to say how hon. gentlemen on the other side shall meet their constituents and explain why they did not take part in the debate. Only a few of them have taken part. But apparently they would rather leave unsaid what they believe to be the right thing for the people, than to say what they would have to say under the dictation of the gentleman who leads the House. We on this side, thank God, are left untrammelled; no lash is applied to us. Who can think

of our leader doing as the leaders of gentlemen opposite did?—going down to Washington where no doubt, the president entertained him kindly and gave him a good time. He certainly made them feel good and they evidently thought it their duty to tie this—(in their eyes)—little Canada to the United States. We on this side take issue with them. We are not prepared to hand ourselves and our country over to the United States. I have lived on the borders of the United States for many years and have had dealings with people of the United States. I have always found them honourable and honest in any dealings I have had with them. But I have also found that they were all well worth watching whenever you are making a trade with them, for they would get the better of you if they could.

In the many dealings I have had with them, I always took the precaution—perhaps it is because I am Scotch—to have my wits about me before I attempted to trade with them. It would have been well for this country if these gentlemen, before they hied down to Washington, had taken the precaution to be well on their guard. It would have been well if they had gone down there with some mandate, either from the people at large or from this House. But, instead of that, they did not give any hint to the people of this country of what they were going to do at Washington. I do not think they knew themselves, and if they did know, they knew it a year before. If they knew, they knew it when they went the previous year to do a little dickering with these same gentlemen in Washington. It is my belief that the gentlemen who went last fall to Washington to make this pact had promised the American negotiators that next year they would give them a little more. Now we find these two gentlemen tying up the people of this country to a pact which, I am satisfied, the majority of the Canadian people do not want, and won't stand for. The Conservative party in this House are numerically not as strong as the government party, but I think we represent, perhaps, the majority of the people of Canada. We conscientiously feel it is our duty to oppose this pact in the interests, as we think, of the great majority of the people of Canada. We believe that it has been entered into without due consideration. We believe that there are no two men sitting in this House who are able to go to Washington and, off their own bat, to use a slang phrase, negotiate intelligently concerning every interest that they are going either to make or to break.

Now, Sir, I understand that the hon. the Minister of Finance is neither a lumberman, a miller, a merchant, or a manufacturere. I think he is a retired gentleman, or soon will be. We know that the other negotiator, the hon. the Minister of Customs, makes very nice candies, very nice cakes, and all that sort of thing; he makes crackers, but he has given us a cracker now that we don't want to take. He took very good care to protect his crackers. However, I was going to say that the two gentlemen who went to Washington could not be familiar with all the interests they were dealing with. I have had some experience in life myself. I have not been a baker, but I have been a blacksmith, a soldier, a sailor and a farmer, and I would hate to take upon my shoulders to say that I knew all about either farming, or soldiering, or anything else in connection with the industrial life of this country. I contend that the two gentlemen who went to Washington knew but very little about the lumber interests of this country. If they had been alive to the lumber interests they would not have allowed the Americans to draw the wool over their eyes as they have done. It is of course well known that lumber has been allowed to come into this country free for years; we have had free lumber entering Canada from the United States for several years. We had been up against a $2 per thousand duty, until a short time ago, upon our lumber going into the United States. Now, as I understand this pact, lumber is going into the United States free. That looks all very well on the face of it. But how does our lumber compare with the lumber that is coming into Canada free of duty? It is well known that lumber is not manufactured solely into boards. Lumber has to be manufactured into other articles; it has to be planed, tongued and grooved in many instances, thereby not only reducing its weight because of the dressing, but reducing its weight because of the fact that it has to be dried before it is dressed. Now, the United States very carefully shut out dressed or partly dressed lumber. They knew that if we had to ship all rough lumber into the United States from the interior of Canada, lumber in its rough state, the addition to the weight of that lumber, in comparison with what it would be if it was dried and planed, would more than offset the price of lumber in its dressed state. When we talk of lumber we do not mean simply boards. Now, the Americans very wisely objected to allowing our shingles to go free into the United States. It is a well-known fact that the lumbermen to-day, in order to make a living and a fair profit out of their industry have to utilize every bit of the timber that is standing on their limits. It is a well-known fact that to-day the lumbermen are using up material, odds and ends, for lath, &c., that they wouldn't look at fifteen or twenty years ago. But

they have to use that. They have a great surplus of that sort of material, but very little of it is going to be allowed into the United States because it cannot go in free. If I understand it right, all their rough lumber, partly planed, lumber, shavings and lath come into this country free.

Mr. FIELDING. No, we have made no change whatever in our lumber duties. The only change that has been made is that the Americans admit our lumber on more favourable terms than before.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). While you are at it you might have made a very material change to the benefit of the lumber interests if you had been alive to the necessities of the case.

Mr. FIELDING. But as we gave them nothing in the matter how could we expect to claim all those great benefits? We gave them no change in lumber; it remains the same.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). But you could have protected the lumber interests when you had the chance.

Mr. FIELDING. The protection remains the same in Canada; it is not touched one iota.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I quite understand that it is not touched one iota, but you did not take advantage of the fact of being there. When you had the opportunity you could have placed $2 a thousand feet on lumber coming into this country.

Mr. FIELDING. But we did not want to do that.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). Why? If you had been wide-awake and understood your business you would have done something for the lumber interest.

Mr. FIELDING. We think it is bad policy; we do not want it.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). Perhaps the hon. gentleman is not aware of the fact that the Americans require the better grades of our white pine lumber. They do not require our lower grades stuff such as hemlock and spruce (other than pulp wood), and low grade pine. There are lumbermen within the sound of my voice now who will tell you that every mill yard in northern Ontario at least is piled high with the lower grades of lumber that southern pine comes in competition with in this country. The profit perhaps of their whole operations is in the cull end of the lumber and how they can best market it. If they have a failure in marketing the cull end of their lumber they usually make no profits that year at least. Our Canadian lumbermen in my district—I do not refer to the American lumbermen—claim that instead of getting lumber into the United States free they would rather have had an import duty on southern pine coming into this country.

Mr. FIELDING. Is that the Conservative policy?

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I am talking from the standpoint of the lumbermen's interests. I am trying to show the hon. gentleman that he did not know his business when he went to Washington, and I think I have succeeded perhaps in convincing him, because at least I got a response from him, that it would be to the interest of the lumber industry to shut out the southern pine as against our low grade lumber. I think that the hon. gentleman will agree with me in that respect.

Mr. FIELDING. No, I do not. I say it is not in the interest of Canada to increase the lumber duties at all, and if it is the policy of hon. gentlemen opposite to increase the lumber duties let them say so.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). I am just saying that you might have taken advantage of the opportunity at the time. We have had some very wise legislation enacted in our province with regard to the preservation of our timber, such as spruce pulp-wood, and I am very glad that in the province of Ontario a very wise government—and the Liberal government were very wise at that time because they took the advice of the Conservative party—prohibited the export of spruce taken from Crown lands. I myself was at that time perhaps one of the largest exporters of spruce pulpwood. I was very glad indeed that I had the American market to send my spruce to, but I can say it was against the best interests of the province and against the best interests of the people of Canada that our beautiful material should go over to the United States to build up such cities as Alpena, Bay City and other places on the American side. We have to-day in my constituency perhaps more mills than any other member has in his constituency. It would have been a great deal better for me if we had not had some of them at the time of my last election, but notwithstanding all that we find on our shores to-day large mills erected on account of the restrictions that were placed by the Ontario government on the export of spruce, and the district all along the Georgian bay and on St. Mary river has been transformed from an idle waste into a scene of industry.

I am not perhaps as familiar with other matters as I am with the lumber and timber interests, or as I am in a small way with the farmers' interests. Dealing with the farmers for many years, buying their produce both as a lumberman and as a

merchant, having dealt in every shape, manner and form with them, trucked and traded, it may be, I know pretty nearly where the farmer is benefited and where he is not benefited by a pact such as we have before the House. The farmers in the district I have the honour to represent were the first to petition me to oppose the reciprocity treaty. True, some of the American lumbermen would rather see reciprocity, but the farmers were the first to petition me to set my face against reciprocity, and I will show you why if you will allow me to localize my remarks a little and apply them to the district I have the honour to represent. All along the Michigan border the farmers of my district have to compete with American hay, notwithstanding the fact that an import duty of $2 a ton is imposed on hay coming into Canada. The farmers for hundreds of miles have to compete with the American hay coming in large quantities into Ontario. Lumbermen with American blood in their veins, having come from the American side naturally favour their own country and they would rather pay the $2 a ton duty sometimes than allow the Canadian farmer to have his own way a little. I have seen train load after train load of hay coming in with the $2 a ton duty added. What will that mean to the farmer if they can import it without paying one cent of duty at all? Then, how would it operate in the matter of beef and pork? It is all bosh to say that the farmer can get more for his beef and pork in the United States than he can get in Canada. It is a fact well-known to every lumberman, mine owner and large employer of labour, that they can buy their food stuffs, such as pork and beef in Chicago, bring it into Canada, pay the duty and get it cheaper than they could if they bought it in Canada.

I am not sure that it is any advantage to the Canadian lumbermen or others who use coarse grains such as oats, but I do know that you can buy these grains as cheaply in the United States as you can in Canada, and as to the cost of freight, vessels carrying lumber from the Georgian bay ports are only too anxious to get return cargo at nominal rates. I have had stuff brought into this country in that way just for the expense of loading and unloading it, so that the vessels might have ballast on the return trip. Then, with regard to foodstuffs and hay and that class of products, your reciprocity injures the farmers of my district, as I believe it injures the farmers in other parts of the country. I cannot see for the life of me why the Canadian government entered into this agreement at all. Canada was prospering better than ever before in her history, a thing for which I believe the leader of the government takes credit, although, personally, I am inclined to give more credit to the Almighty than to the right hon. gentleman. I have seen it placarded throughout my constituency in election times that it was Sir Wilfrid Laurier who caused the rain to fall and who brought the good weather for the crops; I have seen it set forth that he was greater than his Creator, but for my part I would rather take chances with the Supreme Being than I would with the present Prime Minister of Canada. We are told it was the farmers who asked for reciprocity, and all the blame is laid on the wicked farmers, particularly those in the west. I had the distinguished honour of being present in this House when the farmers came here in December. I chummed around with some of them and had a good time, but I never heard reciprocity mentioned all the time I was with them. The farmers came here not to ask for reciprocity, but among other things to ask for government ownership and operation of terminal elevators, and they were right in that contention, and we on this side of the House supported them in that, and I hope the day is not distant when the Conservatives will be in power and in a position to give them exactly what they asked for in that regard. At all events, one thing they will get from the Conservative government is fair and square treatment and no humbug. Then, they asked for government ownership and operation of the Hudson bay railway, but the reply of the Prime Minister was that he thought it would be a good thing to build it at the people's expense and then hand it over to somebody—he did not say to whom—who would help them to carry elections. We have been under the impression for a long time that the Liberal election funds come from those who build railways and some gentlemen who were poor a few years ago, but who got Grand Trunk Pacific contracts and are now candidates for parliament and are proclaiming that they will spend hundreds of thousands of dollars to get elected. Then, the western farmers asked for free agricultural implements, and the Prime Minister thought he would give them a little sop by reducing the duty 2½ per cent, which I believe is going to lose him a few supporters. The western farmers asked for assistance towards the chilled meat trade and cold storage, but the Prime Minister gave them no encouragement along that line. Then they asked for certain amendments to the Railway Act, which the Conservatives in this House moved for, but which the party in power refused to concede. But they did get something—they got it in the neck, and they went away dissatisfied. They were wrathy at the manner in which they had been treated by the government, but the astute Prime Minister thought there was a way out of it, and he kept three or four of the leading chaps over for a few days in order

to fix something up. I don't think that many of those he held over were Tories; they were good Liberals, and then it was I believe this reciprocity business was hatched. They were told: If we do not give you free implements or government control and operation of the elevators, we will give you something else so that you won't have to say you are going away empty-handed. Then, these leading fellows that stayed over took a quick right-about-face, they sold the farmers of the west body and soul and boots and everything else, and the day that these gentlemen entered the precincts of the Prime Minister's chamber was the day the scheme was laid to sell the farmers, and these so-called representatives of theirs were to be the backbone of the Grit machine that is now operating under the guise of the Grain Growers' Association of the west. That was when the scheme was hatched to carry the west at the expense of the farmers themselves.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They are Grit organizers now.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). Every man of them is a Grit organizer under the guise of a grain grower. But after the campaign of education that was carried on a few weeks ago by a very able member of this House, there are not so many of them sticking so closely to the so-called leaders of the grain growers. I had the honour and pleasure of being in the west myself for a few weeks, and I met a great many of the grain growers. I met a good many of the gentlemen who came down here demanding that the government should assist them in several ways, and went back convinced that the government were going to do something for them in connection with this reciprocity pact or something else. But when they found out that they were humbugged and sold out, that their so-called leaders were nothing but political heelers who had been trading on their credulity and their name as grain growers, they abandoned them, and to-day we do not find all the gentlemen who were here backing up those who stayed over the day after to confer with the premier staying with the machine. Now, the grain growers of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta are a very intelligent class of men, especially those I met, and they had only to be shown that they were being misled by the so-called leaders of the Grain Growers' Association to realize the position that they had placed themselves in. In travelling through the west, I found one or two of my friends who were inclined to be in favour of reciprocity, one friend especially, a very intelligent sort of chap; but he had been hob-nobbing with bad company politically; and when I asked him to tell me just how he understood this reciprocity pact, he said, in the first place, the government is going to allow implements to come free into this country.' I said, 'Who told you that?' He said, 'the leaders of the Grain Growers' Association; and they issued pamphlets in my own riding telling the farmers that they were going to have free implements. If that is the kind of campaign with which this government think they are going to carry the country next time, they are greatly mistaken, because the farmers to-day are too wideawake to be humbugged with any such nonsense as that. While some who do not read very much may be persuaded at the first blush that that is the case, by discussion with their neighbours they soon become enlightened. That is the process going on through the west, and it leads the government to question whether they should give the west redistribution and increased representation. We on this side of the House want to see the west properly represented; we shall be glad to see its representation trebled. The west deserves it, because to my mind it is the greatest part of this country agriculturally, and in many other respects. Our friends opposite were very cocky a few months ago about what they were going to do when they got increased representation from the west. They are not so anxious now; they want to put off the evil day as far as they can. Now, we do not fear going to the country on this reciprocity pact. We will welcome the election at the earliest moment, and you can throw in a few bush polls if you think they will strengthen your chances very much, because your Waterloo on this very question is not very far distant, if I read the minds of the people of Canada aright. We are accused now of having all the wealth behind us, of being imperial jingoes, and last night I was sorry to see the Minister of Finance lose his temper and accuse us of being obstructionists and of reading from newspapers. I would like to know where we are going to get our information if we do not read from newspapers, because we cannot get it from the government. I often wonder whether they are to compile it or not; they certainly have not produced it here, and I do not think they want to produce it. I will not bother the House by reading much from newspapers, but I have a few documents here that I would like to read from, and they will be very interesting. It may take two or three hours to read one of them alone; but there has been so much reference to former treaties that I think it would be well to have these matters placed on Hansard so that they will be in the hands of every member of this House and of every citizen of Canada, and I am sure that the hon. gentleman who is leading the House to-night will bear with me an hour or two while I read part of that.

Mr. FIELDING. Certainly, with great pleasure.

Mr. SMYTH (Algona). Before I take up that document, I want to take up another matter in connection with this pact. We are told that there is no danger of annexation—that the United States can get all the advantages of us they like, they can own us root and branch, but we will still be British subjects. That is a grand feeling to have, that we will be able to control ourselves in that way, even when the United States controls everything we have. I would rather remain, feeling that the mother country was going to have a firm and solid hold on Canada for all time to come, than see the United States get one dollar's worth of our products, because we can live splendidly without them. Many years ago they told us repeatedly that annexation or starvation was staring us in the face. They told us and the outside world that we were hardly civilized, that we would never be able to take care of ourselves or build railways, because we had no land to build on except a little strip along the front.

They found, Sir, they were mistaken in that. They found that we had the land, that we had the men, and that we had the money, they also found that we did not have to go to the United States to get the money, but we went to the dear old land to get it to build our railways and our canals and our public works throughout Canada.

They have realized that while Canada may be small in their eyes, still she is great in the financial world, able to stand alone, and do splendidly without their assistance, they also realized that the natural products of this country are far in excess of the resources of their country and colonies put together, and they realize that in the paper industry, and many other industries they are absolutely dependent on Canada for the material to carry on their business. They are also dependent on Canada for their nickel. It is a well known fact that near the district I represent we have the greatest nickel mines in the world. It is also a well known fact that every one of these mines is owned by Americans. No doubt these gentlemen would be very glad to see us annexed to the United States.

As I said, Canada is greater in the eyes of the United States to-day than they ever dreamt she would be. They see our natural resources, our nickel, our timber, our wheat and everything else, and they are most anxious now to trade with us. I think if the hon. gentlemen who went down there had one ounce of pluck in their breasts, when they were invited to go they would have said: Nay. We want none of you. You turned us back many a time. Now we will turn you back.' Instead of that they hobnobbed with these American gentlemen and had the wool pulled over their eyes. The result is that to-day they want to bind Canada hard and fast to the United States, which will be nothing more or less than the forerunner of annexation. In this reciprocity agreement I see the danger of the United States having control of our markets, and of our industries, and I see that their eye single is to-day on Canada. They have turned our ministers back in years gone by and when they did so the Liberal party was very jubilant in its criticism of the manner in which the gentlemen from Canada went over to the United States. Would it not be just nice, when Canada is big in the eyes of the United States, and when she is in a position to give them some of their own medicine, that they should get it just when they asked our ministers to go over there? There was some excuse for our ministers in years gone by asking to have a little trade with their big brother, the United States, but there was no excuse for this government interfering with the wheels of commerce, or interfering with every financial interest throughout the length and breadth of this country by hanging over our heads a pact which is disagreeable, offensive, and I think, unconstitutional.

We, on this side of the House, ask you, Sir, to give us an opportunity to show that the people of Canada endorse the doctrine we have been preaching along that line. There cannot be anything fairer or more reasonable than that we should go to the people who elected us on that question. I do not think we are in any less position as regards a mandate than the right hon. gentleman and the hon. gentlemen who sit on the treasury benches, leading this government. The votes of the people were not given at the last election or the election previous on a question such as this at all. It was not before them, and they did not know anything about it.

I think we must give some weight to the sayings of the gentlemen who occupy the positions of senators and representatives in the United States. What do we find? We find these gentlemen saying that one of the advantages to be derived by the United States if this pact went through, would be that it would lead to greater things, along the line of annexation. We have been told that these gentlemen were not serious. Well, we might just as well say that the hon. gentleman who introduced this pact to the House was not serious.

President Taft knew something about our forests. He took the pains to educate himself and find out all about them, and a great deal about our other industries as well. While this government does not

know anything about our forests, the Americans can give us all the information we want about them. They know more about our natural resources than we ever dreamt of knowing.

As you know President Taft is a very large man in the United States—nearly as big a man in his country as the right hon. the leader of the House is here. Surely, we must give him credit for being serious in what he said—surely President Taft is not trying to jolly somebody all the time, as he did our ministers. He said:

Should we not then arrange a commercial agreement with Canada, if we can, by which we will have direct access to her great supply of natural products?

Of course, this has been referred to a great many times, and I am reading something which has been read before, but I purpose reading it even if it is disagreeable to my hon. friends on the other side of the House.

Ought we not, then, to arrange a commercial agreement with Canada if we can, by which we shall have direct access to her great supply of natural products? They are coming. They are coming to the parting of the ways. Should we not now, therefore, before their policy has become too crystallized and fixed for change. . . greatly increase the natural resources available to our people?. . . by giving our people access to Canadian forests, we shall reduce the consumption of our own, which, in the hands of comparatively few owners, now have a value that requires the enlargement of our available timber resources.

He knew very well of our timber resources and that the time was not far distant when the United States would be compelled to pay practically whatever price we asked, and accept whatever terms we dictated for access to our natural resources. We are told by the Liberal party that the farmer will get more for his wheat under reciprocity, and that the lumberman will get more for his lumber. That may look very nice on the face of it. The lumberman will get more for his lumber this year- perhaps. I know some who have sold their year's cut, and they are going to divide $1.25 if this pact goes through. But in future years will it be our lumbermen on this side who will get the benefit? Will it be the consumer who will get the benefit? No, it will be the great lumber interests that absolutely control the market in the United States, for, when they have control, they will pay us what they please.

I have wandered from the question of annexation, but here is something of President Taft's that brings me back to it:

The reduction in the duties imposed by Canada will give us even a larger share of her market than we now enjoy, great as that is.

And here is something further. Shortly afterwards the president spoke at Columbus, Ohio, and said:

The greatest reason for adopting this agreement is the fact that it is going to unite two countries with kindred people, and lying together across a wide continent in a commercial and social union.

Next Mr. Taft went to Atlanta, and while there he developed his idea of commercial union. This is what he said:

When we entered upon the negotiations I asked the Secretary of State and his commissioners to offer free trade in everything, but this Canada could not grant us, because she has a protected system and she was afraid of the competition of our better organized industries. Canada is at the parting of the ways.

He still kept telling them that Canada was at the parting of the ways.

If we now neglect this opportunity to bring about closer business and trade relations, and insist upon the continuance of an artificial wall between the two countries, which differ no more in conditions of labour and production than do Kentucky and Tennessee or Georgia and Alabama, we shall throw away an opportunity for mutual benefit not likely to recur.

Finally, President Taft at New York at the end of April urged the editors of the United States to support the agreement and used these words as the crowning reason why they should do it.

He went on the principle to strike while the iron was hot. He had these gentlemen on the run, and wanted to keep them on the run, and here is another thing he said:

I have said that this was a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity. It is critical because, unless it is now decided favourably to reciprocity, it is exceedingly probable that no such opportunity will ever again come to the United States. The forces which are at work in England and in Canada to separate her by a Chinese wall from the United States, and to make her part of an imperial commercial band reaching from England around the world to England again, by a system of preferential tariffs, will derive an impetus from the rejection of this treaty, and if we would have reciprocity, with all the advantages that I have described and that I earnestly and sincerely believe will follow its adoption, we must take it now or give it up for ever.

He seems to think he can do more with the gentlemen in Canada who have charge of this pact than with his own people. But he is going to miss his mark if we are able to hold out, and I think we can. We are not going to let it pass without an awful struggle; make no mistake about that. And when the hon, gentleman who leads the House (Mr. Fielding) makes us sit up to all hours of the night, makes us weary

of ourselves and of them, we will stay at it. And I hope that the people of Canada will give us credit for being earnest in our endeavours to keep from them this iniquitous pact that the government is trying to foist upon us. We have a right, and I do not suppose the hon. gentleman would deny it, to express our opinions upon the subject.

Another peculiar thing is seen in this situation. I have had some parliamentary experience, but never, in any House that I have sat in, has a great measure been discussed without those who were responsible for it being in their places all the time. It is all very well for hon. gentlemen opposite to make relays of their numbers to come and go. But they must not forget that they are responsible for the issue, and responsible for the waste of time since last November, and especially since last January, all because of the determination of two gentlemen who occupy the same position, plus the salary, that other members of the House do. It is all very well for them to tell us that they will freeze us out—or smoke us out, I do not know which—because they have their monthly allowance whereas we poor fellows will be at the end of our tether soon. But we replenished our girnals before we left our homes. We have plenty to eat and drink, our families are not suffering because of the fact that we are here battling in the interests of the people of Canada. Now it is getting late, and I know that the hon. gentleman who leads the House is weary, and I would ask him to consent to an adjournment.

Mr. FIELDING. I move that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.31 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

MONDAY, July 24, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

THE QUEBEC BRIDGE.

Mr. MONK:

1. Did the invitations for tenders for the construction of the new Quebec bridge call for a carriage way as well as a railway over the new bridge, or was the carriage way left to the option of the tenderers?

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma).

2. Did the government obtain a written report from its board of engineers before giving the contract for said bridge? If so, what was the date of said report and by whom was it signed?

3. On what date was the contract adjudged, and at what price?

4. Who are the president, directors and manager of the company, which obtained the contract for said bridge?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The official design provided for a railway, street railway and roadways, but tenderers were asked in addition, to submit designs of their own and alternate designs were submitted, in addition to tenders on the official design, by the following:

The Maschinenfabrik Augsburg-Nuremberg, A. G. Werk Gustavsburg, Bruckenbauanstalt (in Gustavsburg) Germany;

The Pennsylvania Steel Company and

The St. Lawrence Bridge Company.

The British Empire Company being the only one that did not submit an alternate design.

2. A report was made signed by Messrs. H. E. Vautelet, Ralph Modjeski and Charles Macdonald, dated 26th October, 1910, stating that a satisfactory bridge could be erected on the official design, or on either of the several designs submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company. The Minister of Railways replied, requesting the Board to supplement that statement by a more positive one, as to which of the designs they named was the best, and requiring the Board to make a recommendation, as he considered that part of the duties for which they were engaged. A report was then made by Messrs. Ralph Modjeski, C.E., and Charles Macdonald, C.E., members of the Board, recommending the adoption of one design submitted by the St. Lawrence Bridge Company; the chairman Mr. H. E. Vautelet, dissenting. Under the order in council, appointing the board, it was provided that, where differences arose, two additional engineers should be called in to assist in deciding the difference. Under this order Messrs. Henry W. Hodge, C.E., member American Society Civil Engineers and M. J. Butler, C.E., formerly deputy minister and chief engineer of the department were called in. As a result of their meeting, on the 11th February, 1911, a report was made recommending the acceptance of design 'B' of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company. This design included all the accommodations for traffic provided in the official design. This report was signed by Messrs. M. J. Butler, Henry W. Hodge, Ralph Modjeski and Charles Macdonald, chairman, pro tem. In this report attention was also called to the fact that the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, had among their tenders, submitted a design omitting the roadways and stated that.

if the government desired it 'the highways can now be omitted without changing the above recommendation, or delaying the progress of the work.' After a full consideration, the government decided to build a railway bridge with footwalks, and on the 14th March, 1911, a report was signed by Messrs. Macdonald, Modjeski and Hodge, recommended that a contract with the St. Lawrence Bridge Company for the superstructure of a bridge of this character, by which a saving of $2,600,000 could be made, This design is, in every way, similar to design 'B' which was recommended by the Board, except that it provides, only, for the railway and footwalks.

3. 31st March, 1911, at 9.02 cents per pound.

4. President and manager, Phelps Johnson, vice-president, F. C. McMath, directors: Phelps Johnson, Charles Cassils, F. L. Wanklyn, G. H. Duggan, and J. F. Weber, Montreal; F. C. McMath, Willard Pope and Bernard Colbrun, of Walkerville.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What members at present form part of the Quebec Bridge Board of Construction?

2. What is the total amount paid to date for salaries and expenses of the Quebec Bridge Board of Construction?

3. Is it intended to maintain said board in activity during the construction of the new bridge?

4. Has a contract been signed for the construction of the new bridge? If so, on what date?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The members of the Quebec Bridge Board, are as follows: C. N. Montserrat, M.S.C.E., chairman; Ralph Modjeski, M.I. C.E., M.A.C.E.; C. C. Schneider, C.E., past president American Society Civil Engineers.

2. The total amount paid to date for salaries and expenses of the Quebec Bridge Board is $256,808.23.

3. Yes.

4. Yes. 4th April, 1911.

*Mr. MONK:

1. What amount did the British Empire Bridge Company deposit with the government as a guarantee in sending in its tender for the construction of the new Quebec bridge?

2. Was the said deposit made in money or was it an accepted cheque? If the latter, on what bank was it drawn?

3. How long was the said deposit or cheque kept by the government?

4. On what date was it received and when was it returned to the tenderers?

5. Did it produce interest in the meantime, and what was the amount of said interest?

6. Was the said interest allowed to the said tenderers?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. A large deposit was thought necessary and each tenderer was asked to deposit a cheque for $500,000. The following cheques were received: The Maschinenfabrik Augsburg-Nuremberg, A.G. accepted cheque for $500,000 on the Canadian Bank of Commerce payable, to the Minister of Railways and Canals and signed by the manager of the bank; The Pennsylvania Steel Company, accepted cheque for $500,000 on the Bank of Montreal, payable to the Minister of Railways and Canals, signed Pennsylvania Steel Company, per Edward M. Smith; The British Empire Company, accepted cheque for $500,000 on the Bank of Montreal payable to the Minister of Railways and Canals signed by the manager and accountant; The St. Lawrence Bridge Company, two accepted cheques of $250,000 each ($500,000) on the Bank of Montreal, payable to the Minister of Railways and Canals, one signed by the Dominion Bridge Company, Limited and the other by the Canadian Bridge Company, Limited.

2. The British Empire Company's deposit was an accepted cheque for $500,000 on the Bank of Montreal.

3. Cheques of the Maschinenfabrik Augsburg-Nuremberg A. G. the Pennsylvania Steel Company the British Empire Company were received on the 30th September, 1910, and that of the St. Lawrence Bridge Company, on the 1st October, 1910. Cheques were returned to the unsuccessful tenderers on the 6th April, 1911.

4. Received on the 30th September and returned on the 6th April.

5. No. Interest is not paid on such deposits, but interest is allowed to the successful tenderer when the contract is awarded and the cheque has been sent to the Finance Department.

6. Answered by Number 5.

LAURIER RECEPTION AT MONTREAL.

*Mr. NANTEL:

1. What amount has been spent by the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal for the Laurier reception on the return of the First Minister from his recent voyage?

2. What special sums have been expended, respectively, in ornamentation of streets, buildings and public places, in illumination and flags, in fireworks, and other general expenses in connection with the said reception?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. and 2. The government has no information.

SPECIAL NEWSPAPER TRAINS.

Mr. BEATTIE:

1. What is the cost of the operation of the special train leaving Toronto at 1.55 a.m., each week day morning for carying Toronto newspapers to London?

2. What correspondence is there leading up to this departure in the mail service?

3. What were the trains by which this mail was formerly carried and the hours at which they left Toronto?

4. What is the cost to the Post Office Department of the new train?

5. Do the newspapers pay any share of the cost of this train? If so, to what extent?

6. Why was this special newspaper train established to run west of Toronto to London and not east of Toronto?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. There is no special train for the purpose of carrying Toronto newspapers to London at any hour. What is probably referred to is the regular mail train leaving Toronto at 2.55 a.m., and which costs the department $40,650.

2. There is no correspondence except the reports of the officers of the department who deal with these matters.

Action was taken in response to repeated representations by the representatives of the western peninsula of Ontario that, owing to the hour at which trains left Toronto at night, and the fact that trains left Toronto in the morning at an hour too late to make connection with trains leaving London and other points, unnecessary delay was occasioned to important mails, not only for the western and northwestern portions of Ontario, but for important points in the Central, Western and Eastern States.

3. The train leaving Toronto at 6.20 a.m., reaching Hamilton, 7.40 a.m. and London, 10.56 a.m., too late to make any connections with outgoing trains.

4. Answered by No. 1.

5. Newspapers contribute nothing to this train whatever.

6. The mail service between Toronto and Ottawa, Montreal and other eastern points, is a direct one to these points alone, and does not involve the delaying of mails for distant points, either in Canada or the United States owing to failure to make connections with outgoing trains; and the amount of mail accumulating for Montreal, Ottawa, and other points between the time of departure at night and that of the next morning to these same points is not sufficient to warrant the expense of such a train.

PORCUPINE FIRE SUFFERERS.

Mr. WALLACE:

1. When did the request for a supply of militia tents for the relief of Porcupine fire sufferers first reach the government?

2. What time elapsed between the receipt of request and the issue of the order for shipments of tents?

3. When were the tents shipped?

4. What was the reason for the delay, if there was any?

5. Was a guarantee required by the department before the shipment was authorized?

Mr. BEATTIE.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN:

1 The evening of Wednesday, July 12th.

2 The morning of Friday, July 14th.

3 Major Hallick of the Ordnance Corps left Ottawa Friday night, arrived in Toronto Saturday morning, where he found 500 tents and 4,000 blankets and a detachment of men awaiting him; he then immediately left for the burnt district with the men and stores.

4. No delay.

5. Before obtaining proper authority from Privy Council with a view to meeting the emergency, the full value of the equipment desired was requested by an official of the Militia Department. Free issue was however authorized by the Privy Council.

SMELT FISHING IN NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. Have any requests or petitions been received from Nova Scotia smelt fishermen, or on their behalf, of recent years, for a change in the open season for the taking of smelts with bag-nets? If so, from what localities, and what alteration in the season was requested?

2. What action, if any, was taken by the department with respect to such requests?

3. Is it the intention to make any change in the dates of the open season to meet the conditions adversely affecting the smelt fishermen in the localities complained from?

4. What was the number of bag-net licenses issued to smelt fishermen in each county in Nova Scotia for the year ending 31st March, 1911?

5. What was the total number of licenses of the class mentioned issued for Nova Scotia during each of the past ten years, the quantity of smelts taken yearly by such method during the same period in that province, and the number of persons engaged in the fishery conducted under such license?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. Yes, such requests have been received from localities bordering on the Strait of Northumberland. Different alterations, looking to the closing of the season at a later date, were asked for.

2. After careful consideration the department decided that the present season for bag-nets is the most suitable one in the public interest.

3. Not as at present advised, for the reasons, given in answer No. 2.

4.

Inverness	3
Richmond	25
Halifax	7
Guysboro	6
Antigonish	5
Pictou	39
Cumberland	77
Colchester	17
Digby	7
Yarmouth	10
Shelburne	1

5.

Year.	Licenses.
1900-1901	85
1901-1902	74
1902-1903	114
1903-1904	70
1904-1905	118
1905-1906	180
1906-1907	151
1907-1908	116
1908-1909	194
1909-1910	191
1910-1911	197

Quantity of Smelts taken.

Year.	Lbs.
1900-1901	459,112
1901-1902	252,180
1902-1903	360,475
1903-1904	512,176
1904-1905	566,880
1905-1906	415,510
1907-1908 1¼ years	454,447
1908-1909	659,185
1910-1911	718,354
1910-1911	(not yet published)

These figures embrace smelts caught with gill-nets and hook and line, as the quantities caught by each contrivance has not been kept separately. The department cannot say how many in addition to the licences were engaged in this particular method of smelt fishing.

GOLD CIRCULATION IN CANADA.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. How much gold is in circulation in Canada, including amounts in banks and in the hands of the government?
2. How much of the above is United States gold, and how much British?
3. By what authority is this United States gold accepted as legal tender in Canada?
4. Is the government about to arrange with the United States for the circulation of gold coinage in both countries as legal tender? If so, is the government going to coin and issue gold of the same weight and fineness as the United States gold, and has Canada thereby decided to adopt the United States standard of weight and fineness?

Mr. FIELDING:

1. There are no available means of finding the amount of gold in circulation in Canada. It is obvious that gold coin in the possession of private individuals or corporations cannot be ascertained.

The banks do not in their returns to the government indicate the amount of gold held, silver coin being included in the 'specie' item. Inquiry will be made from the banks, and when return of their gold holdings is made the figures will be given.

2. The amount of gold held by the Mininster of Finance, June 30, 1911, was:

British Sovereigns	$5,867,913.65
United States gold coin	77,642,009.00
Bullion—mint bars	222,933.99
Total	$83,732,856.64

3 Section 10, chapter 14, of the Acts of 1910—'An Act respecting the Currency'.

The same enactment was embodied in the first currency legislation after confederation—section 9 of chapter 4, Acts of 1871. The Act in which this section appeared was entitled 'An Act to establish one uniform currency for Canada'.

The enactment first appeared in the legislation of the old province of Canada in section 11, chapter 158 of the Acts of that legislature for the year 1853, and was continued in force, in the old province of Canada, at least, until its re-enactment by the Federal Act of 1871, above referred to.

No arrangements are being made with the United States for the circulation of the gold coinage of Canada, when struck, as legal tender in the United States.

The standard weights and fineness for the gold coinage of Canada are as set out in 'The Currency Act 1910'. The standard weights and fineness of United States gold coins correspond with these provisions.

CANADIAN NAVAL SERVICE AND CORONATION.

*Mr. MACDONELL:

1. What midshipmen or naval cadets of the Canadian Naval Service attended the Coronation, and why did they not all attend, in accordance with a statement that appeared in the public press as emanating from the government to that effect?
2. What was the method of selection, and who made the selection?
3. Did the Governor General make a request that all the cadets should attend the Coronation, and if it was decided that they should all go, why was the change made?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1. P. W. Nelles and V. Brodeur. The invitation issued by the Imperial Government was extended to 3 officers and 35 men; the officers consisted of a lieutenant in charge and 2 midshipmen.
2. The officers were selected to the best advantage for control of the men forming the contingent; selection was made by the director of the Naval service.
3. An application was made to the Imperial Government for the invitation to be extended to the remaining midshipmen; this was conceded, but the reply was received too late to admit of the officers attending.

RAILWAY SECTIONMEN.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Has the attention of the Minister of Railways been called to the statement made on or about 7th June last by the representatives of the railway sectionmen, before the Board of Railway Commissioners, that section gangs as constituted, had too much work to do to handle safely, and to the statement of the Chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners to the effect that the commission has no jurisdiction over the question of lengths of sections to be worked by section gangs on railways, or the number of men to compose such section gangs?

2. If it is true that the above statements or statements to that effect, were made, is it the intention of the government to introduce legislation conferring on the Board of Railway Commissioners the necessary power to deal with such matters?

Mr. GRAHAM:

1. The attention of the Minister of Railways has not been called to such statement.

2. Answered by number one.

DON POST OFFICE.

Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Who is the party who has the contract for carrying the mails between the Don post office, or Donlands, and the city of Toronto?

2. Was such contract let by tender, for how long and at what price, and on whose recommendation was it awarded?

3. When was the Don post office moved, why, and by whose request or recommendation?

4. Who is the present postmaster at Don post office, and when was he appointed?

5. Who was the former postmaster at Don post office, and why and when were his services dispensed with?

6. Is the present post office site as central as the former site, and who recommended the removal?

7. Has the government received any petition or other request that the post office should be restored to its former site?

8. Did the government obtain a report from Mr. Henderson, post office inspector, on the new and old site, and does such report recommend the removal?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. J. C. White.

2. By tender—4 years from 1st July, 1910. The lowest tender was reduced by negotiations carried on by the Post Office Inspector from $1,000 to $600 a year.

3, 4 and 5. James H. Smith, the former postmaster of Don, having tendered his resignation, Mr. J. C. White, the present postmaster, was, on recommendation of Mr. A. J. Anderson, appointed to the office on the 18th July, 1910.

6. As far as known to the department.

7. Yes.

8. No.

Mr. BRODEUR.

GRAND TRUNK TRAINMENS' STRIKE.

*Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Has the Minister of Labour received a copy of a resolution of the Order of Railway Conductors, passed at their grand convention held at Jacksonville, Florida, on or about the 21st May last, censuring the government of Canada and Mr. Chas. M. Hays for the failure to carry out the agreement entered into between the government, the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the men, in connection with the recent Grand Trunk railway strike?

2. If so, will the minister lay the resolution on the table of the House, or otherwise acquaint the House with its contents?

Mr. KING:

1. A copy of a resolution passed by the Order of Railway Conductors at Jacksonville, Florida, on May 9 last, making certain statements regarding the strike of Grand Trunk Railway employees has been received.

2. A copy of the communication received will be laid on the table of the House.

REDISTRIBUTION BILL—MINORITY REPRESENTATION.

°Mr. MACDONELL:

1. Is it the intention of the government to introduce the principle of minority representation or representation of minorities as applicable to the cities of the Dominion or some of them in connection with the Redistribution Bill which will be made necessary by the present census?

2. If so, upon what plan or principle does the government propose that minorities shall be represented?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This will be considered in due course at the time of the redistribution.

DRY DOCK AT QUEBEC.

Mr. PRICE:

1. Is it the intention of the government to build a dry dock in the harbour of Quebec?

2. If so, is it to be built by, owned and operated by the government?

3. If not to be built as a government owned work, will it be built on the three per cent guarantee allowed for such works?

4. Is the government now negotiating with any syndicate, company or person for the construction of such work?

5. If it is the intention of the government to have this dry dock built, when will the work be commenced and when will it be ready for operation?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The only provision for the construction of a dry dock at the port of Quebec, and this remark applies to all other ports in Canada, is that contained in the Dry Dock Subsidies Act of 1910. My hon. friend speaks of a 3 per cent guarantee. That is not what the Act provides for; it provides for a bonus and in the case of a dock of the first class—and this is the

kind that has been spoken of at Quebec—a company would be entitled to a bonus of 3½ per cent for a period not exceeding 35 years upon the cost of the work, such cost not to exceed $4,000,000. That offer is open to any company which will undertake the construction of a dry dock at the port of Quebec.

With regard to negotiations, some time ago a proposition was submitted by a company, but upon examination of their proposal it was found that they had added to the estimated cost of the dock a very considerable amount which they expected would be represented by the discount upon the bonds which they might issue and my opinion was that under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act I could not undertake to pay a bonus upon that amount. The company were informed that if they would amend their proposition so as to bring it within the terms of the Act I would at once submit their proposition to council. Since that time I have had no further communication from the company. Apart from that there have been some verbal communications with different parties, but no formal proposal has been made, and I repeat that the government stand ready at any time, upon a company undertaking the construction of a dock of the first class, to give, not as a guarantee, as my hon. friend suggests, but as a bonus, an amount equal to 3½ per cent upon the cost, limited to $4,000,000, for a period of 35 years.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. minister has not stated if it is the intention to build a dry dock in Quebec, and if, in the event of no syndicate undertaking the work, it will be done as a government work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The government have no authority to build it as a government work, the only authority for the construction of a dock being that contained in the Dry Dock Subsidies Act, which provides for a bonus to the company.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Is it the intention of the government and of the Minister of Public Works to ask for authority and an estimate to go on with this work in case they are not able to go on with it under the Dry Dock Subsidies Act?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure my hon. friend is such an old parliamentarian that he will realize that any expression of the intention of the government would have to be signified by the submission of an estimate to parliament for the purpose, with the permission of His Excellency.

ATION CELEBRATION IN OTTAWA.

Mr. BEATTIE:

1. Was any gathering or celebration of any kind held in Ottawa on Coronation day?

2. What was the nature of such celebration or gathering?

3. What members of the Cabinet were present to take part in it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In connection with the celebration of coronation day, the Department of Public Works decorated the grounds of the parliament buildings very handsomely, and also gave permission to the city authorities for the occupation of the grounds by the public and more especially by the school children upon that day. It was understood, I believe, that there should be a procession of school children of Ottawa and the presentation of flags to them. I was not in Ottawa upon that day and it happened that most of the ministers were out of the city. The three ministers who were in the city, I understand, received no invitation to be present, the affair being entirely a civic celebration. I am informed that in the morning notices were posted up cancelling the celebration in consequence of a very heavy rainstorm and that the programme was considerably changed.

NEW ISSUE OF POSTAGE STAMPS.

*Mr. WHITE (Renfrew):

1. Is the government aware that the new postage stamps of King George's reign issued by the British post office are generally condemned by the people of the United Kingdom by reason of the poorness of the design?

2. Is it the intention of the Post Office Department of Canada to have the new issue of postage stamps for the Dominion prepared from dies produced by the Royal Mint? If not, where will the dies be made?

3. Is the Postmaster General prepared to lay before the House, as promised by him on March 16 last, the designs for the new Canadian postage stamps before they are finally adopted?

4. By whom are the stamps being designed, and where will they be produced?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. No, except what has appeared in the press on the subject.

2. (a) No. (b) In Ottawa.

3. If any member of the House of Commons wishes to see the designs for the new Canadian postage stamps when submitted to the department, no objection will be offered to his doing so.

4. By the American Bank Note Company, the contractors for the supply of postage stamps for the Dominion of Canada, acting in co-operation with and under the instructions of the Post Office Department of Canada.

IMMIGRATION.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What was the amount spent for Belgian immigration for the fiscal year 1910-11?

2. What was the amount expended for French immigration for the fiscal year 1910-11?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. $7,634.06.
2. $31,362.36.

It may be mentioned that emigration effort in France is discouraged by law.

Mr. PAQUET:

What was the amount expended for immigration from the United States for the fiscal year 1910-11?

Mr. OLIVER. $234,305.81.

Mr. PAQUET:

What was the amount expended for immigration from the British Isles for the fiscal year 1910-11?

Mr. OLIVER. $225,740.12.

Mr. PAQUET:

If a commission of $3 on a man, $2 on a woman, and $1 on a child, is paid to certain sub-agents in the United States for bona fide settlers induced by them to settle in western Canada, why are the other provinces excluded?

Mr. OLIVER. Because the Federal government has special responsibility for the settlement of the public lands in the prairie provinces.

Mr. PAQUET:

1. What amount was paid in premiums for the fiscal year year 1910-11 by the Canadian government for immigration?
2. What amount was paid in premiums for the same fiscal year for immigration from France and Belgium?

Mr. OLIVER:

1. $108,374.40.
2. France, £457 0 0—$2,224.06.
   Belgium, £233 10 0——$1,136.36.

It may be mentioned that emigration effort in France is by law discouraged.

AGRICULTURAL PDODUCE FROM UNITED STATES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What was the quantity and value of butter, eggs, cheese, potatoes, bacon and hams, other meats, poultry, vegetables other than potatoes, fruits, and sheep and lambs, imported into Canada from the United States for home consumption during the month of May, 1911?
2. What was the quantity and value of butter and of meats imported into Canada from Australia and New Zealand for home consumption during the month of May, 1911?
3. What was the quantity and value of cream, casein, and milk, exported from Canada to the United States during the month of May, 1911?

Mr. PAQUET.

Mr. PATERSON:

1 The quantity and value of the undermentioned articles entered for consumption in Canada, from the United States, during the month of May, 1911, was as follows:

	Quantity.	Value.
Butter..lbs.	199,061	$ 46,049
Eggs..doz.	144,252	28,884
Cheese..lbs.	15,075	2,559
Potatoes..bush.	29,173	24,494
Bacon and hams, shoulders and sides..lbs.	602,929	73,253
Beef, salted in barrels..lbs.	127,268	7,845
Mutton and lamb, fresh..lbs.	71,426	7,770
Pork barrelled in brine., lbs.	386,848	27,451
Poultry and game, n.o.p....$	.....	6,360
Dried or smoked meats, &c..lbs.	82,879	12,894
Other meats, fresh ..lbs.	96,895	10,829
Other meats, salted ..lbs.	29,200	4,066
Sheep and lambs..No.	12,226	51,063
Melons..No.	716	142
Potatoes, sweet and yams..bush.	389	887
Tomatoes, fresh..bush.	25,080	39,974
Vegetables, n.o.p..$	.....	132,917
Apples, green..brls.	2,063	13,743
Blackberries, raspberries, gooseberries, &c..lbs.	572,670	71,750
Cherries..lbs.	3,688	879
Cranberries..bush.	22	104
Grapes..lbs.	117	141
Quinces, apricots, pears, &c..lbs.	249	36

2 The quantity and value of butter and of meats entered for consumption in Canada from Australia and New Zealand during the month of May, 1911, was as follows:

	Australia.		New Zealand.	
	Lbs.	Value.	Lbs.	Value.
Butter..	24,752	$4,916	13,496	$3,352
Mutton and lamb, fresh..	193,470	12,981	.....	.....

3 The quantity and value of fresh cream, fresh milk, and casein exported from Canada to the United States during the month of May, 1911, was as follows:

	Quantity.	Value.
Cream, fresh..galls.	71,269	$63,731
Milk, fresh..galls.	110	12
Casein..lbs.	52,516	1,749

REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, 1890-1911.

Mr. EDWARDS:

What was the total revenue from all sources, and the total expenditure for all purposes of the Dominion of Canada, for each of the fiscal years, 1890 to 1911, both years included?

Mr. FIELDING:

The total revenue from all sources, and the total expenditure for all purposes of the Dominion of Canada for each of the fiscal years from 1890 to 1910, both years inclusive, will be found on pages 2 and 3, Part 1 of the Public Accounts for the year 1910, and are as follows:

	Total Receipts.	Total Disbursements.
1890..	$39,879,925 41	$ 41,770,332 73
1891..	38,579,310 88	40,793,208 19
1892..	36,921,871 60	42,272,136 32
1893..	38,208,608 85	40,853,727 91
1894..	36,374,883 21	43,008,233 89
1895..	33,978,129 47	42,872,338 44
1896..	36,618,590 72	44,096,383 92
1897..	37,829,778 40	42,972,755 89
1898..	40,556,510 06	45,334,281 06
1899..	46,743,102 95	51,542,635 29
1900..	51,031,466 71	52,717,466 84
1901..	52,516,332 76	57,982,866 46
1902..	58,052,333 34	63,970,799 86
1903..	69,348,084 10	61,746,571 81
1904..	70,679,251 49	72,255,047 63
1905..	71,186,072 50	78,804,138 77
1906..	80,141,393 83	83,277,641 72
1907..	67,972,109 65	65,778,138 57
1908..	96,055,416 72	112,578,679 87
1909..	85,549,597 76	133,441,524 29
1910..	101,616,475 58	115,395,773 70

The accounts for the year 1910-11 have not yet been published, but the statement of receipts and expenditures on account of that year appears in the 'Canada Gazette,' of June 17, 1911, page 4322, from which it will be seen that the total receipts for the year 1910-11 were $117,780,409.78, and the disbursements on account of consolidated fund $87,773,998.32, and on capital and special account—$33,696,222.17, making a total for that year of $121,470,220.49.

MINNEDOSA PUBLIC BUILDING.

Mr. ROCHE:

1. Has the site been decided on for the erection of the public building in Minnedosa, Manitoba?
2. If so, which site, what is its size, cost and from whom purchased?
3. Have the plans been prepared in whole or in part for the proposed building?

Mr. PUGSLEY:

1, 2 and 3. No.

SICK MARINERS' DUES.

Mr. JAMESON:

1. What amount of money is in the trust fund resulting from the payment of sick mariners' dues by merchant and fishing vessels?
2. In what manner is the amount to the credit of the fund invested, and where is the standing of the trust fund shown in the Public Accounts of Canada?
3. What department of the government is responsible for the investment and administration of such trust fund?
4. By what statute was such trust created?

Mr. BRODEUR:

1, 2, 3 and 4. There is no trust fund in connection with sick mariners' dues. The collections from vessels are paid into consolidated revenue, and the expenses are paid out of the appropriation 'Care of sick seamen in the maritime hospitals.'

MOTIONS AGREED TO WITHOUT DISCUSSION.

For a copy of all correspondence on the subject of the Society of Colonization and Repatriation of Lake St. John and the dates thereof, with the First Minister, the Minister of the Interior, the Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Marine.—Mr. Girard.

For a copy of all correspondence between the government, or any member thereof, and any person, persons or body corporate, having reference to the water-power on the Ottawa river at Carillon, the lease of the alienation of the same previous to the 1st January last, the lease in existence at present of said water-power to the National Hydro Electric Company, Limited; a copy of all correspondence exchanged between the government and any official of the said company; a copy of the lease at present in existence, as well as of the one which preceded the one actually in force; a copy of the order in council authorizing the present lease of said water-power, and of any deed referring to said water-power to which the government was a party since the 1st January, 1906.—Mr. Monk.

For a copy of all correspondence between the Minister of Agriculture, or any officer of his department, or any member or officer of the government, and any person or persons appointed or proposed to be appointed as commissioners, enumerators, or other officials in the taking of the census during the present year, including all correspondence and inquiries as to the qualification or status of such commissioners or enumerators or officials, and all information in the possession of the government respecting such qualification or status.—Mr. Borden (Halifax).

For a copy of all papers, letters, petitions, applications, recommendations or other documents or material in connection with the removal of the site of the Donlands post office, and in connection with the appointment of the new postmaster, or the retirement or dismissal of the old postmaster.—Mr. Macdonell (South Toronto).

SOREL SHIPYARD, OFFICIAL INQUIRY.

On the orders of the day being called.

Mr. MONK. On the 6th of April last I made certain inquiries respecting an official inquiry at Sorel reported at page 6758 'Hansard' of this year. I asked:

Has an inquiry been instituted at Sorel by the government? If so, who is conducting it, and what is the object of that inquiry?

Mr. BRODEUR. Immediately after the charges were made in the House, as it referred to the department, an inquiry was entered into by the inspector of agencies and the agent.

Mr. MONK. Who is conducting the inquiry and what is the subject of the inquiry?

Mr. BRODEUR. Statements were made in the affidavits filed before the House that affected the department, and we are investigating these allegations. Previous to that, certain

statements were brought to the attention of the department, and these also are being investigated.

Mr. MONK. When was the investigation ordered?

Mr. BRODEUR. After the charges were made.

Mr. MONK. Is that inquiry being conducted by Mr. Wiallard, the private secretary of the minister?

Mr. BRODEUR. No, but by the agent of the department in Montreal and the inspector of agencies.

Mr. MONK. That is, by Mr. Wiallard?

Mr. BRODEUR. Mr. Wiallard is one, Mr. Boyd is the other.

Mr. MONK. Is Mr. Wiallard the private secretary to the minister?

Mr. BRODEUR. He was formerly my private secretary, but not now.

Has that inquiry been carried on; has a report been made to the government, and if so will it be laid before the House.

Mr. BRODEUR. Some time before I left for England I gave instructions to have an inquiry made. Mr. Wiallard, our agent, became ill, but Mr. Boyd spent some time at Sorel making the inquiry and looking generally into the administration of the department there. I have not seen his report, but I suppose it is in the department.

Mr. MONK. Did the minister say there was a report?

Mr. BRODEUR. I suppose there must have been, but I have not seen it; I do not know.

Mr. MONK. If a report has been made will it be laid on the table of the House

Mr. BRODEUR. Certainly.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—OVER-CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. LENNOX. The Minister of Railways said that he would probably inform the House to-day as to the information I asked for on Friday.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have asked the Transcontinental Railway Commission to give me the information, but I have not received it yet.

DR. RUTHERFORD.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is it true that Dr. J. G. Rutherford has resigned from the Department of Agriculture, and if so has any explanation been given?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The Minister of Agriculture will be here this evening and perhaps he will be able to inform my hon. friend.

WAYS AND MEANS—WINNER OF THE KING'S PRIZE AT BISLEY.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. JOSEPH RUSSELL (East Toronto). Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer briefly to an event of very great national interest of which the cable has brought the news since our last meeting. I refer to the splendid achievement of a fellow-citizen of Toronto, Private W. J. Clifford, in winning the King's prize at the meeting of the National Rifle Association at Bisley. This, I need hardly mention, is the crowning honour of the great competition in marksmanship participated in annually by upwards of three thousand of the riflemen of the Empire, all the overseas dominions being well represented, while the flower of the regular and volunteer forces of the mother country enter into the keenest competition for the honours of the meeting.

Private Clifford is of the Tenth Royal Grenadiers, a regiment that since rifle shooting has been in vogue as the pastime of the volunteers of Canada has been second to none in the distinctions it has achieved as a training school for marksmen. It is especially fitting, therefore, that the honour achieved by Private Clifford shall be shared by a regiment so generally recognized as worthy to bear it. It is the young rifleman's second visit to Bisley, but for several years Private Clifford has been conspicuous at the great Canadian meeting at Rockliffe, in 1909 for instance, winning one of the three prizes so generously offered by His Excellency, the Governor-General for competition here.

Besides winning the King's Prize, Private Clifford has won also, at Bisley this year, the Prince of Wales' prize for a competition entirely distinct, an achievement never before accomplished during the fifty years of the National Rifle Association competitions. Examination of the records shows that the same has figured only twice before since the very beginning, as the winner of these two prizes donated by royalty, but in each case the honour was achieved in separate years for each prize. Thus Sergt. Lawrence of the 1st Dumbarton won the Queen's Prize in 1882, and the Prince of Wales' Prize the following year; while Major Pollock won the Queen's in 1892 and the Prince of Wales' in 1896. It has remained for Private Clifford to set a new record for the new reign, and so to identify himself for all time with the generosity of His Majesty King George and Edward, Prince of Wales.

This is the third occasion, it is fitting for me to mention, that Canadian competitors at Bisley have brought distinction to their country as well as to themselves by winning the Queen's or the King's Prize. Hayhurst, already well-known as an Old Country rifle-

man, led the way in 1895, shortly after he had come to Canada and joined the Thirteenth Regiment of Hamilton. Then Private S. J. Perry, a young Canadian of Vancouver, was the King's Prize winner in 1904; and Private Clifford is our third Gold Medallist.

Rifle shooting means much more to us as a nation than does any other sport. It is generally recognized as the mainspring of the interest in the training of many regiments, and it is the sole bond of communication between our volunteers in the several cities and provinces of Canada and between Canadians and their comrades in arms from over the seas. In addition rifle shooting is recognized as involving the best development of physical manhood and of character. No one but a good citizen, an exemplary man, can be successful as a marksman. The honour won by Private Clifford il specially worthy of recognition, and I therefore extend to him my congratulations and those of his friends in this country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN (Minister of Militia and Defence). I would ask the privilege, Mr. Speaker, as head of the Militia Department, of saying—and I am sure I am expressing the opinion of all the members of the House—how much I am obliged to the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Russell) for having brought this matter up. All Canadians must be proud of the unprecedented performance of Private Clifford in having won not only the King's Prize but the Prince of Wales' prize in the same year. The shooting has been particularly good this year at Bisley. The Canadian team won among other prizes the McKinnon Cup, and tied with the British team for the Kolapore Cup, but unfortunately for the Canadians the British team made a greater number of marks at the longest range and therefore retained possession of the prize. It must be specially gratifying to know also that this good shooting has been made with a Canadian rifle, so that we have not only the best rifle probably in the world, but we have men who know how to use it.

Mr. SAMUEL HUGHES. I am delighted to support the remarks so ably expressed by my good friend from Toronto (Mr. Russell) and by my friend the Minister of Militia. I may point out that the Grenadiers are not only splendid men on the ranges, but that on every occasion the Grenadier regiment of Toronto has had the opportunity of active service, the men have done credit to themselves and to the flag under which they fight. I may point out further, as an inducement to officers commanding regiments throughout the country, that not only are the Grenadiers to-day commanded by an officer, Col. Gooderham, who takes the greatest interest in rifle shooting, but it has had the good fortune in times past to have had commanding officers who have devoted a great deal of attention to the science.

I might also state that Clifford, the winner of the King's prize, is greatly assisted by his wife, who encourages him to go to the front, and inspires him with courage to do well for his country, and his corps. Furthermore, the Grenadiers on the ranges are coached by the wife of the colonel of the regiment, Mrs. Gooderham. In making these remarks, I desire, in the first place, to encourage officers commanding regiments to take greater interest in rifle shooting, and in the next place to point out that the wives and lady friends of the soldiers might perform a splendid service for the country by encouraging these young men in rifle shooting, as the ladies I have mentioned do. I cannot let this opportunity pass without saying a word for the officer commanding the Bisley team this year, and for the men composing that team. It was my privilege to see them at Bisley not long ago. Colonel Stimson, the commandant, was performing the work admirably, and he was fortunate in having with him his sisters, who rendered the lives of the soldiers in their quarters very pleasant by giving them every inducement to maintain the high spirit of Canadian manhood. The same characteristics are found in Major Burland, the adjutant of the team, and we were very fortunate in having an excellent coach in Mr. Richardson, who is well known to all our friends. I should not let this opportunity pass without supporting my good friend the Minister of Militia by saying a word for the weapon with which these prizes were won, namely, the Canadian Ross rifle. That rifle has established itself, not only in Canada, but in England, and in every country on the continent of Europe, and is to-day well known and appreciated. It is said that a prophet is not without honour except in his own country. The Ross rifle stands first among the serviceable rifles in the world to-day, and I would not be at all surprised, before many years roll around, to see the principles of the Ross rifle, with a different calibre and cartridge of course, adopted as the weapon of the British Empire. I might in justice to Clifford point out that one of the troubles of rifle shooting in hot weather is nickelling, and Clifford has invented a substance, which he gave to every man on the ranges, to prevent that; and his uniformly good shooting has probably been partly due to this invention of his own. I am sure that the House, and the country will join in congratulating Clifford and the Canadian team not only on their shooting, but on their splendid manly conduct.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York). Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, the Minister of Militia might go a step further and mark this event in an appropriate way, by introducing into this House a proposal to give a pension to the veterans of 1866, among whom no regiment has a better list than the Tenth Royals of Toronto. If the minister wishes to commemorate this event and encourage the volunteers of this country, he could not bring forward a more popular proposal. There came under my notice the other day the case of one of these veterans who died in the poor house. The time has come when we should recognize in a substantial way the services of these men on behalf of their country.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would like to say that recognition has been given to these men, and it is one of the things that I am most proud of in connection with my record as Minister of Militia, that I was able to induce the British government to give to those who took part in resisting the attempted raid at that time recognition in the form of a suitable medal. For some 30 years, from 1866 to 1896, the services of those men had been utterly neglected and disregarded. When the present government came in and took the matter up, within a year of the time it took office, a medal was granted by Queen Victoria in recognition of their services. I wish to say too, that at that time the veterans from one end of the country to the other expressed themselves as entirely satisfied with what had been done.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. Yes, and I can prove it. When the application was made, they stated that all they wanted was a recognition that their services were appreciated by the government of Canada —they did not want any tangible present of money or land; and they were satisfied with what they received.

THE RECIPROCITY DEBATE.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I would like to draw the attention of the House to an article which appeared in the Toronto 'Globe' of the 21st instant; though I am not complaining of this particular article, which is simply a sample of articles which have appeared in the Liberal press throughout the length and breadth of Canada since this House reassembled. There appears to be an organized campaign for the purpose of misrepresenting the attitude of the opposition. I have no doubt that before the House reassembled the government had determined to go to the country, because it found itself between the devil and the deep blue sea. The devil was the ever-increasing sentiment in Ontario, and the eastern provinces against reciprocity, and the deep blue sea was the fear that if they waited and bore the brunt of that sentiment they would have to bear the odium of refusing the west the additional representation to which they are justly entitled. But the government made their choice before we reassembled, of which I propose to give evidence later on; and so, having decided to deprive the west of the representation it is entitled to, they are trying to make the country believe that the opposition, by a reasonable discussion—as they say, by their obstruction—are preventing the government from giving the west that representation to which it is justly entitled; and they have come to this conclusion also because of the manly, straightforward and unanswerable argument presented by our leader, Mr. Borden, during his recent triumphal tour of the west, and the growing feeling against reciprocity there.

So I think I am safe in saying that it is part of the party tactics that the House should reassemble and when the opposition should express their views upon reciprocity the government should shout obstruction. I may say here that either the right hon. the Prime Minister or the Minister of Finance (I am not sure which) has already stated in this House that every member on this side would be given an opportunity to express his opinions upon this measure, and that while they were so doing they would not be considered guilty of obstruction. Now, there are 55 members on this side of the House who have not had an opportunity of expressing themselves on the question of reciprocity, and none of the members who have spoken, have spoken twice. Notwithstanding that fact we are met with the statement in the Liberal press throughout the country that the opposition are obstructing. Now, what is the evidence before us, that the government had decided to go to the country before we reassembled. In the first place it is known that the government Printing Bureau is at work in the preparation of the voters' lists for the coming election. In the second place, while the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) made up his mind not to run again, since the adjournment of the House, he suddenly reconsidered his decision, and decided to become a candidate in North York, upon the assumption that the elections were to be held this fall. In the next place the Dominion Election Act provides that with respect to the unorganized districts in the province of Ontario, every year there shall be prepared a list of the voters in the constituencies, unless a proclamation is issued by the government stating that such list need not be prepared. I find that in the years 1909 and 1910, that such proclamation was issued, but on the 17th of July

of the present year a proclamation was issued by the deputy of the Minister of Justice stating that the lists should be prepared in these unorganized districts, and that they should be accelerated, all this notwithstanding the fact the hon. Minister of Justice stated in the House the other day (21st July) that neither he nor any one else expected an election for one or two sessions yet. In addition to that, I have in my hand a document entitled 'Instructions for the guidance of returning officers,' printed in 1911, since we adjourned in May 19 last. I have seen cartloads of these documents around the building here, and I am advised that they are only printed in such large quantities in a year when an election is expected.

I think if these several facts are taken together, or even if the last fact is considered alone it is sufficient to prove that the government had made up their mind that they were going to the country before we re-assembled here, and that we are brought back for the purpose of assisting them in their party tactics of deceiving the west into the belief that the onus for non-redistribution is on us. I would point out to the right hon. the Prime Minister that on the 8th of March the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), made a proposition to the government which the government did not accept, but which if it had accepted would have enabled the west to have their representation. Upon that occasion, Mr. Borden used these words:

> Now, Sir, I regard these proposals as reversing the policy of the people of Canada for the past thirty years, given by an unmistakable mandate at every election which has taken place during that period. What should be the course of the government at this time? Take the census, give the west its increased representation, then submit this question to the people of Canada and let them decide.

The government turned the proposition down four months ago, when they might have accepted it, have taken their census and have given the west their redistribution. It is not too late to do it yet, according to my way of thinking. The government can even now, accelerate their census, bring down their Redistribution Bill, and let reciprocity wait for a few months, until the west have been given their additional representation. We have existed 46 long years without reciprocity, and I think we can wait a few months longer. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) told us this session that never in the history of this country was Canada as prosperous as she is to-day. He told us that the trade of Canada to-day is $765,000,000—a high water mark in its history, and our surplus this year $30,000,000 the highest on record. Surely it is manifest that we can wait two or three months longer without reciprocity, and in the meantime let the government bring down the Redistribution Bill, giving the west the representation to which they are entitled, and then go to the country. If that is not done, there is no other conclusion to be arrived at, but that we are here assisting the government in carrying out their farce, which will have the effect of depriving the west of their additional representation. We on this side would be only too happy to face the electors on this great question, but we can only regret the course of the government will have the effect of depriving that great and growing country of their just rights in the matter of representation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend rose for the purpose of trying to convince this House, and the country at large that His Majesty's opposition in this House is not obstructing the business of the government, and is not obstructing the reciprocity agreement, which has been before the House now since the 26th of January last. However, my hon. friend had not proceeded very far before he gave away his whole case. He protests that the opposition is not obstructing yet at the same time, he says: 'Let reciprocity wait.' If he is not obstructing, why should not reciprocity go on? That is what we on this side of the House want. We do not want reciprocity to wait. The hon. gentlemen, on the other side of the House told us what we already knew, and I thank my hon. friend for being so candid in the statement that they did not want reciprocity to go through, but wanted it to wait, and that they are trying in this House to prevent it from going on. We have had speeches of one kind and another—we have heard the same arguments repeated ad nauseam.

The other day one of the most respected members in this House prefaced his remarks by saying that there was nothing new to be said upon this question. That is perfectly true. Yet, he took three hours or more to say what had been said over and over again.

My hon. friends ask us: 'Why should we not have a redistribution?' Well, the question of redistribution, is not before the House to-day, neither is the census, but the reciprocity agreement is before the House, and we can go on with it. If the hon. gentlemen wish to prevent an election let us go on with the reciprocity agreement, and there will be no election. I have nothing to hide in this matter, but will speak to the House with perfect candor. When I saw evidences of obstruction taking place in this House day after day—

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER—when I read the reports of the speeches made here, while I was in England, and when I learned that my hon. friend (Mr. Borden), the leader of the opposition was making a triumphal tour of the country——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not need these cheers to know that hon. gentlemen opposite are satisfied with cheap triumphs. Any way, my hon. friend, the leader of the opposition was making this triumphal tour of the country, and I saw it stated that the opposition would not allow this reciprocity agreement to go through. As soon as I saw this I gave instructions to my hon. friend the Secretary of State to prepare the lists so that if the hon. gentlemen opposite should continue to want reciprocity to wait, we could appeal to the people as to whether it should or not.

We do not want reciprocity to wait. We want it to pass, either in this House, or before the country. I have nothing whatever to conceal about the matter. We are before the people, and if government is to be made a farce—if the minority abuse the privileges of a minority in order to prevent—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Then, Sir, there are judges over us to judge between the government and the opposition. Surely these hon. gentlemen do not object to an election. They say they want an election, and when I tell them that they do not object, they cheer; but when we take steps to have an election, they find fault. But we understand all this. The last thing they want is to go before the country. Well, there is one way in which it is possible not to go to the country, and that is to pass the agreement, that the farmers of Canada may have the markets of the United States opened to their products. That is our position. My hon. friend tells me that they want redistribution. Well, redistribution Bills have been passed before now, and the usual regular course has been to take the census one year, and have redistribution the following year. The census was taken in 1881, 1891, and in 1901, and upon every occasion the Redistribution Bill was passed the following year—that is in 1882, in 1892, and 1902 respectively. If we follow the usual course, we have plenty of time for redistribution. It is true, my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) told us on the 8th of March that we should have passed the redistribution first. But he did not reflect at that time that the census could not be taken before the 1st of June. The law on that point was changed some years ago. At the time of confederation, the first of April was fixed as the date for the taking of the census. But everybody knows that the first of April is not a good season for taking the census. The roads in many parts are not then favourable for travel, but the first of June, as we all know, is a most propitious season for the census work. The date was changed and nobody objected. Does my hon. friend believe that it is possible to have redistribution in Canada within three months of the taking of the census? It is impossible to have it done. It never has been done either under a Conservative government or under a Liberal government. The country is too large and the means of communication too imperfect. You must wait until the last return is in before you begin your redistribution. We will have redistribution next year. If the opposition chooses to go on with tactics of obstruction, as they have been doing, then we shall have to consider what is to be done. And if, in the last resort, the only way is to appeal to the people and ask them to pass judgment between us and the opposition, we are quite prepared and ready for it.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). The Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has alluded to certain instructions which he said were communicated by him to the Secretary of State while he was in London. I have a very strong suspicion that those instructions were given to the Secretary of State before the Prime Minister went to London. Of course, they may have been repeated from there. So far as the frankness of my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) is concerned, to which the Prime Minister has alluded, I want to call his attention to the fact that on the 8th of March, the very date referred to, I moved in this House that, in view of considerations set forth in the resolution, this reciprocity agreement

—should not be proceeded with until the electors shall have an opportunity of pronouncing upon its merits.

The Prime Minister knew what my view with regard to the matter was at that time. He is pressing for a vote in the House. Well, we are pressing for a vote in the country, a vote of the people. The right hon. gentleman, who professes himself to be a Liberal of the British school and 'a democrat to the hilt,' is unwilling to afford to the people the opportunity to give that vote except at the sacrifice of redistribution. I gave my advice on that point on the 8th of March last. It has been already quoted, but I think it was very good advice and it will do no harm to repeat it. I said:

What should be the course of the government at this time? Take the census, give the

west its increased representation, then submit this question to the people of Canada and let them decide. We held out to the United States for twenty years a standing offer of reciprocity, and they did not accept it. It will not lessen their respect for us if we permit them for a few years to put a standing offer of reciprocity upon their statute-book. We have worn some shoe leather in going to Washington; as I said before, let the Americans wear out some shoe leather in coming to Ottawa. They are submitting these proposals to a new Congress; let us in Canada submit these proposals to a new parliament.

I stand by those words. As a matter of fact, the Prime Minister magnified altogether the difficulty of enumerating the people. I am informed that in Great Britain, within two or three days the enumeration of the people is made known, and I believe that if, immediately after the 8th of March, when I asked them to follow this course, the government had taken steps to hasten the enumeration, that enumeration could have been completed before the end of June. We might then have had a Redistribution Bill before this parliament at the present moment.

For, after all, what is the position of the government in this matter? Their position is that, although the people of Canada have got on without reciprocity for forty-five years and have prospered remarkably well during that time in their great work of nation building, they cannot wait for six months in order to give a redistribution of representation and allow the people as a whole to pronounce upon this issue of reciprocity. I say that is an unreasonable proposition. I say, the course I suggested on the 8th of March would be the reasonable one. The position at that time was that the old Congress had just come to an end—it expired on the 4th of March—without having ratified this treaty. Surely, under these circumstances, it would not have been an unreasonable thing for the government of Canada to say that, as Congress had dissolved through effluxion of time without ratifying the treaty and the treaty must be ratified, if at all, by a new Congress, it might very well be ratified in Canada, if at all, by a new parliament, and after an appeal to the people.

Now, the Prime Minister is very pronounced in his strictures upon the opposition, for the course they have taken. I would like to repeat what my hon. friend from North Grey has said. It was announced by the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) himself when he introduced this proposition, if I remember his words correctly, that every member of this House should have the right to express his convictions with regard to the matter and to give his reasons to parliament and to his constituents why he either approved or disapproved of this treaty.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Mr. LANCASTER. He said the same thing on the motion referred to.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Yes, I believe he said the same thing again as the reason why hon. gentlemen opposite should vote down the proposal I made. That course has been followed up to the present time. Hon. gentlemen on this side who have spoken on this question have refrained from taking up the time of the House a second time except in the case of a few when some matter of importance or urgency arose. The speeches made have been for the purpose of doing that which every member was invited to do—express his views on the subject.

The Prime Minister knows very well what the actual situation is. He knows perfectly well that he and his colleagues on the other side of the House have made a careful estimate of this situation weeks and months ago, as to how they would stand with redistribution, and how they would stand without redistribution; and taking everything into consideration, they decided it would be a prudent thing for them to appeal to the country without redistribution. But when the right hon gentleman talks about obstruction, I would like to remind him of some occasions when he has not entertained exactly the same view with regard to obstruction as that which he seems to hold at present. He speaks of the minority abusing its rights. How does he regard the minority of which he was a member in 1885? Was that minority abusing its rights? I venture to say that it was abusing its rights very much more than this minority has abused its rights up to the present time, and during the present session. What does he think of the course which he took in 1896?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend had better ask some of his friends on his own side.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am asking the right hon. gentleman at the present time. I am bound to say that I find him very unwilling to give me an answer. It may be that the right hon. gentleman had some assistance from men who were sitting opposite to him at that time. I do not know about that. But at all events, I want to say to him that he was very willing to be a party to that alleged obstruction, and very willing to profit by it, and very willing to send the government to the country without supplies for more than a month, I think, on that occasion; and then he was very willing afterwards to take a course with regard to the Governor General's warrants which, to say the least, was of extremely doubtful validity.

Mr. EMMERSON. The point is, You are another. Is that the idea?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not my hon. friend think that sometimes that is a good retort? I think my hon. friend himself will bear witness that sometimes it is a very good retort. Now I was not putting it forward in the sense in which my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) suggested; I was putting it forward to the right hon. gentleman with a view to endeavour to bring him into a similar frame of mind to that which inspired him in 1885 and 1896. I was endeavouring to get him to look at this from the standpoint of a minority who are desirous, in the first place, that there should be a redistribution in order that all parts of the country may have their proper representation, and who, in the next place, are anxious that the people of Canada should have an opportunity to pronounce upon this agreement before the policy of this country for the past forty years is absolutely reversed; and surely that should not be done without any mandate from the people. The right hon. gentleman is apparently inclined to follow a portion of the advice which I gave him on the 8th of March last. I said this:

> Take the census, give the west its increased representation, then submit this question to the people of Canada and let them decide.

He is willing to submit this question to the people of Canada and let them decide, but he is not willing to give the west the increased representation to which they are entitled. He is following out our advice in part, he is not following it out in its entirety. I think he would have been well advised if he had taken the advice we tendered him on that occasion; that he would have been well advised to expedite the census, to have given the west its increased representation, to have given to every part of the country its proper representation, then to have gone to the people of Canada and let them decide whether or not the policy of this country for the past forty-five years shall be adhered to or shall be reversed.

Mr. FIELDING. There is a touch of humour in the present situation which serves to relieve what otherwise would seem to have been a rather tedious part of this session. For six months my hon. friends opposite have been shouting that what they wanted above everything on earth was an appeal to the people; and if there is anything they have made clear now, it is that if there is anything on earth that they do not want, it is an appeal to the people. We had a little premonition of this several months ago. In the midst of the outcry the hon. gentlemen were making as to the necessity of an election, there appeared in the chief Conservative organ an article saying that if they were not careful Sir Wilfrid Laurier would spring an election on them, and after the lapse of six months, they now say that the greatest terror of their lives is that they should be compelled to go before the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. COWAN. Take that back.

Mr. FIELDING. I would like to know what it is I have said that the hon. gentleman thinks I should take back.

Mr. COWAN. The Minister of Finance has never heard one word from this side of the House, or from any Conservative newspaper, to indicate that we were fearful of going before the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Take it back.

Mr. COWAN. Let me say that when a minister of the Crown rises in his place in this House and dares to make a statement which we, and he, and every one believes is not true——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman's language is not parliamentary.

Mr. COWAN. I do not wish to be misunderstood. I say that it does not comport with the dignity of debate for a member of this House to state that which he and we believe to be absolutely untrue.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is contrary to custom to charge a minister with saying anything which he knows to be untrue.

Mr. COWAN. That is the expression I have used. I wish to say that we believe there is absolutely no evidence, that there is absolutely no word from any member of this House, or in any of the Conservative press in Canada, to indicate that there is one word of accuracy in the statement the minister has made.

Mr. FIELDING. I am not very sensitive in these matters of points of order, and in nine cases out of ten I would rather allow a disorderly interruption to pass than to raise an issue upon it. If the House is willing to let my hon. friend violate all its proprieties, I do not know that I would complain. Now I want to say, and I want to repeat, and my hon. friend can characterize it within parliamentary limitations to suit himself—I wish to state that, according to my judgment, bearing in mind all the circumstances and facts surrounding us, in my judgment, giving it for what it is worth, there is nothing in the world that hon. gentlemen opposite are so much afraid of as an appeal to the people.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Try it.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why don't you bring it on?

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) knows that if he believed we were going to bring it on—

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The point I was making was that the government were endeavouring to make the country believe that we were afraid of the redistribution of the west.

Mr. FIELDING. And I say that the hon. gentlemen opposite are doing their utmost to prevent this government doing any business and that the business of this government is to give the country reciprocity. That is the first consideration——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING.—and in due course to give the country redistribution; and the hon. gentlemen, by the action they are taking are doing their best to prevent our giving either the one or the other

Now, let us look a little at this situation. On the 26th day of January last, almost six months ago, I had the honour to submit to this House, the terms of an agreement entered into by my hon. colleague, the Minister of Customs and myself with the government of the United States, subject to the approval of parliament, for the bringing about of a betterment of the trade relations between these two countries. If we had come before the House with an arrangement which was definite and binding for a given period of years we might well have expected that such an arrangement would have received the almost unanimous consent of the House, because, let hon. gentlemen opposite say what they like, I state that it is an historical fact that from the beginning of confederation down to this moment there has never been in existence in the Dominion of Canada, a government which did not proclaim and support reciprocity.

Mr. HUGHES. Does the Finance Minister profess to say that this is reciprocity?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. That is the first I ever heard——

Mr. FIELDING. I am exceedingly sorry that my hon. friend and I do not agree, but in our innocence we think this is reciprocity.

Mr. HUGHES. Oh no.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the sort of reciprocity Canada has been seeking for 40 years. This is substantially and with very little change the kind of reciprocity that we had from the year 1854 down to 1866. This is the reciprocity that we begged the United States for 30 years to give us. This is the reciprocity that was in view when the leading gentlemen on the opposite side of the House went down to Washington—shall I say wore out much shoe leather in the elegant phrase of the leader of the opposition—they went there to ask for the very reciprocity that is now before this House.

Mr. BLAIN. Never, never.

Mr. FIELDING. This is the reciprocity that was offered by Sir John Macdonald in the National Policy of 1879.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. COWAN. Rip Van Winkle.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. If that is the case why did the minister cut the reciprocity clause out of the tariff of 1897.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman will read the debate he will find that in the very speech with which I brought down that tariff, I declared that the government of Canada still desired reciprocity and were prepared to have it. This is the reciprocity which as an historical fact beyond question every government in Canada, from the first day of confederation down to this moment, has been endeavouring to get from the United States. This is——

Mr. HUGHES. Could the minister give us some evidence?

Mr. FIELDING. Oh yes, I could, but I am bound to tell my hon. friend——

Mr. HUGHES. I am afraid the minister cannot.

Mr. FIELDING. I gave an outline of it to this House on the day I brought the reciprocity agreement before the House. I then gave this history in general terms and if my hon. friend will be good enough to read it he will find that it is given with the utmost accuracy.

Mr. MACDONELL (South Toronto). A little illogical.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not think it was more illogical than the speech my hon. friend made the other day, but I wish to do my hon. friend the justice to say that although he made a speech which I do not think was logical and with which I did not agree it was the speech of a courteous gentleman and as such was entitled to our respect.

Mr. CROCKET. What did the Prime Minister mean in 1907, when he said that Canada was not in favour of reciprocity?

Mr. FIELDING. The Prime Minister never said that Canada was not in favour of reciprocity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. I say it now that there has never been a man of cabinet rank on either side of politics from the first day of confederation down to this moment who did not claim that reciprocity was desirable if we could obtain it, but what the Prime Minister said and what hon. members on both sides have said, was that we had made our offers to the United States to get reciprocity, and that they had not treated us generously in the matter, they had not responded as we thought they should respond, and there came a time when the self-respect of the Canadian people led us to say: 'We will no longer beg reciprocity from these people, we will stand upon our rights and work out the commercial salvation of Canada independently of the United States.' That has been the attitude of the Liberal party from that day to this.

Mr. BOYCE. Does my hon. friend say that the Prime Minister never made use of these words:

> Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself, would have given many things to obtain the American market, but, thank Heaven, those days have passed away.

Mr. FIELDING. I will repeat those words. There was a time when Canadians would have given almost anything to get reciprocity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer the question.

Mr. FIELDING. There was a time when Canadians would have given a great deal to get reciprocity. When my hon. friends were wearing out shoe leather going to Washington, they would have given a great deal for reciprocity. Thank Heaven the day has come when we will only have reciprocity on fair and reasonable terms.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). What did the First Minister have to thank Heaven for at that time?

Mr. FIELDING. I am bound to tell my hon. friend that the First Minister was thanking Heaven for something which hon. gentlemen at that time did not thank Heaven for, but for which they are thanking Heaven to-day. The Prime Minister was thanking Heaven for the better condition of life in Canada which had been brought about under the policy of a Liberal administration, and at that time hon. gentlemen opposite were preaching the cry that the policy of the Prime Minister and his colleagues was ruining the business of the country. Now, the hon. gentlemen have come to the point when they, too, thank Heaven for the commercial and financial prosperity which has come to the Dominion of Canada, and which they say is so good that they want it let alone.

Is this reciprocity? Yes it is substantially the same kind of reciprocity that was proposed in 1891 when Sir John Thompson issued his card to the electors of Antigonish, and asked to be returned because he and his colleagues were going to Washington to endeavour to bring about a reciprocity treaty, and he believed they would succeed. It was the same kind of reciprocity that the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) sought when he went to Washington. It is the same kind of reciprocity that was offered by Sir Charles Tupper in 1887 and 1888. It is the same kind of reciprocity that every public man of eminence from the first day of July, 1867, to the 26th day of January, 1911, stood for before the public with the declaration that he was willing to have reciprocity, and would be glad to have it, always provided he could get it on fair and reasonable terms. If we had come before the country with a reciprocity treaty in the ordinary sense of the word, even then we might justly have asked the support of this parliament. But we realized that after all these years while it was still important to us, we thought, that we should open up the American market, we thought it better that we should not enter into a binding engagement for any particular term. And what do we find now? Hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who, at one stage, said: Let us not make any binding treaty, let us have no entangling alliance—some of them and their friends in the press now turn around and say: 'What is the good of this reciprocity; you have no guarantee of its continuance?'

An hon. MEMBER. Who said that?

Mr. FIELDING. I have read it in the press.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

An hon. MEMBER. The Globe?

Mr. FIELDING. No, I have not read it in the Globe. That is the attitude of a number of my Conservative friends in many quarters, and there is some force in it because a reciprocity treaty binding for a given period of years would give some parties encouragement to make investment which perhaps they would not make on the faith of an arrangement of this character, and to that extent I frankly admit there is room for criticism of this reciprocity scheme. But take it all and all we thought it better we should not bind the parliament and the government of Canada for a given period of years, and we therefore arranged with the American negotiators that each party would make concessions in its tariffs. We said; We believe that these concessions will com-

mend themselves to the people of the United States and to the people of Canada; we believe that the arrangement when confirmed by the respective legislative bodies will continue, not because anybody is bound to it but because the arrangement will prove so beneficial to the people of both countries that they will desire to continue it. But if perchance that proves to be a mistake, if the arrangement is not satisfactory for one side or the other, then without breach of faith either party is free to terminate the arrangement.

Mr. HUGHES. In view of the remarks of the First Minister about the great good that is going to accrue to both countries from this measure, would the Minister of Finance have any objection to explain what construction he puts on the statement of Mr. J. J. Hill in the papers this morning, where he says the arrangement give very little but it prevents closer union between Canada and Great Britain.

Mr. FIELDING. I know of no more ridiculous argument than that; I am not referring now to the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Hughes) but to a class of argument to which this remark belongs.

Mr. HUGHES. It was Mr. J. J. Hill's remark.

Mr. FIELDING. I know.

Mr. HUGHES. The father of the Bill; the owner of the west.

Mr. FIELDING. On both sides of the line parties friendly to reciprocity make the best case they can for the agreement, and that is reasonable and proper. We point out the advantages we believe will accrue to the people of Canada from this measure, and we are not so much concerned in its advantages for the people of the United States; that is their end of the business.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. They looked after that.

Mr. FIELDING. If some member of the United States Congress takes a speech I have made in this House and says Mr. Fielding declares this is a great thing for Canada and therefore it is a bad thing for United States, there would not be much logic in that; and yet such is the kind of argument hon. gentlemen opposite are making. They find something that has been said in the United States Congress to support this measure and they say that because a member of congress has said something to help this Bill along it is therefore a bad thing for Canada. We are not concerned to explain or defend what has been said by any one in the United States concerning this measure. They are dealing with it from their point of view entirely.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. FIELDING. And I am frank enough to say that we are looking at it from the point of view of Canada, and how it will benefit the people of this Dominion. I am no more called upon to sutain or defend what any one has said in the United States than a member of Congress would be called upon to explain or defend what is said by any member of this House. I, therefore, think there is nothing in the interruption of my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes). I say that this measure is the very kind of reciprocity we have all been seeking for years, and even were it proposed as a definite treaty, we might in the light of history reasonably ask the support of this parliament for the measure. But, in its present form, we can point the country to how much stronger is the situation. It is distinctly set out in the correspondence which forms the agreement that while we hope that this arrangement will commend itself to the judgment of the people of both nations, nevertheless we do not undertake to interfere with the liberty of Congress or of the Canadian parliament to make at any time any change in the arrangement which they see fit. That being the position, would it not seem logical and reasonable that hon. gentlemen who may not view the matter with much favour, should, under these circumstances, say: We will let this measure go through, if it is a good measure we will all be delighted by and by, and no harm will be done, but if it proves to be a bad measure the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier will be condemned for presenting it, and then the government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier will pass away, and hon. gentlemen opposite will come to power, and they can repeal the measure. I believe, Sir, that that view will be taken by fair-minded men in the country. There are men—we know it with regret—who honestly oppose reciprocity, and we are sorry for it, and we respect their views as we wish them to respect ours, but these very men will surely say: What harm can be done for putting this in operation; if it is good as the Liberals say the country will benefit by it; if it is as bad as the Conservatives say, it is another nail in the coffin of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and his colleagues, and in a very short time in the natural order of events an election will come on, and a change of administration will follow, and the new government can repeal the measure if they choose. I have heard that view expressed by Conservatives in personal conversation with myself, and it is a reasonable view. The people of the country generally will I am sure say since this agreement does not profess to bind the people of Canada, since it leaves the parlia-

ment of Canada absolutely free to make such change in the fiscal policy of the country as parliament may please, it should have a chance. If it be the will of the people constitutionally expressed, to say this is a bad measure, then the in-coming government can re-impose the taxes we now propose to take off. In view of that circumstance, surely there is no fair and reasonable ground for a policy of obstruction in regard to the measure. I therefore, hold that the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite from the beginning has not been fair and reasonable. Oh, but, they say, we want redistribution, and the west particularly wants it. Some hon. gentlemen opposite shed tears for the west because they are going to have an election without redistribution. Well, redistribution affects the whole country, but I suppose as a matter of fact it chiefly affects the west, and while the west wants redistribution there is one thing it wants more than redistribution, and that is reciprocity.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No, no.

Mr. FIELDING. Your western farmer is pretty shrewd and keen.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. You bet he is.

Mr. FIELDING. He cannot very easily be humbugged; he cannot be humbugged by a Conservative member who shouts for free agricultural implements, while his leader votes against free agricultural implements. The western farmer is a pretty keen fellow; he is intelligent perhaps above the average, and he wants redistribution although I do not think he is bothered very much about it. He wants reciprocity any way, and he knows there is a great difference between the situation in respect to redistribution, and the situation with respect to reciprocity. You can have redistribution by the will of this parliament at any moment, but you cannot have reciprocity at any moment by the sole will of the parliament of Canada. For many years while the Canadian parliament was ready to have reciprocity the people across the line were not ready for it. Sometimes there was a movement favourable to reciprocity, but what did we find? Any change in the fiscal policy of the United States requires a combination of the House of Representatives, which is now Democratic, the Senate, which is now Republican, and the president, who is now a Republican. A combination of these three is necessary to effect a change in the fiscal policy of the United States. Every effort for years to secure that combination has proved a failure down to the time of the present reciprocity agreement.

Mr. FIELDING

Mr. LANCASTER. What about having equal safeguards in Canada instead of going it blind?

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend thinks that the constitution of the United States affords better safeguards than British insitutions, I do not agree with him. Our safeguards are not of precisely the same character; but we have, as history shows, excellent safeguards, and we do not propose to give them up. There is one safeguard that we perhaps need, to prevent the business of the country being obstructed, but that, as Rudyard Kipling says, is another story.

Mr. LANCASTER. What I am objecting to is not applying the fundamental principle of British institutions, which is government by the people. The people have a right to pass on this question. Let the hon. minister apply the British constitution, and we will have no quarrel with him.

Mr. FIELDING. We are living under the British constitution, and my hon. friend, who is a lawer, knows that if in any respect we violate it, he has only to appeal to the court.

Mr. LANCASTER. You do it every day.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend knew of a single point in which the constitution was violated, he would be the first man to call attention to it.

Mr. HUGHES. Might I ask the hon minister if he considers it in harmony with the principles of responsible government for two men, however capable, to go to Washington and bind the parliament and people of Canada by a resolution which has never been submitted to them?

Mr. FIELDING. In the first place, as I have just shown, we do not bind them.

Mr. HUGHES. You try to, but we do not intend that you shall.

Mr. FIELDING. When this measure passes, if it shall pass, it does not bind the people of Canada one hour longer than they are content through their constitutional authority to accept it. When hon. gentlemen opposite talk of this agreement binding the country, I can only say that they are not correct.

Mr. HUGHES. Wherein does it differ from any other law?

Mr. MACDONELL. Did not the hon. gentleman say in this House that the honour of the government and the honour of the country was pledged to it?

Mr. FIELDING. That is hardly correct. We were asked to put off the consideration of this matter, and I stated that the government of Canada was bound to bring this

matter before the House and push it to a conclusion. That is what we are doing. Parliament is not bound. My hon. friend is not bound; I could not bind him if I would. No member of this parliament is bound. The government is bound, and whatever a government does in the name of the country binds in a certain sense the whole country, but as a matter of fact every member of this parliament remains unbound and absolutely free.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the minister kindly point out any statute on the books of Canada that cannot be repealed by the parliament of Canada? Wherein does this differ from any other law?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes. If the parliament of Canada were to pass an Act confirming a treaty for a given period of years, I say, in a sense, this parliament could not repeal that treaty.

Mr. HUGHES. It could at the end of the time.

Mr. FIELDING. My hon. friend said at any time.

Mr. HUGHES. No, I did not.

Mr. FIELDING. I want to point out, first, that we do not bind the country; but I want to go and say that if we did bind the country, what right would these hon. gentlemen have to complain? They talk of two gentlemen going down to Washington, sitting in secret and binding the country. One hon. member made merry about this secret meeting at which the telephone was shut off and no one was allowed to come in. Has the hon. gentleman any idea that treaties or commercial arrangements of any sort are negotiated on the public streets? If two farmers want to make a deal about a mowing machine, they will probably sit down together in the kitchen of one of them and make an agreement. Do we not know that every business transaction between individuals in private life is negotiated privately? How was the treaty negotiated in bygone years under Conservative auspices? Was it negotiated on public streets? When Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington with Mr. Chamberlain in 1888 and 1889, and negotiated a treaty, which unfortunately the United States Senate never ratified, did he go on the public highway and invite the newspapers to come and listen to the negotiations? What childishness to put before the people of Canada. Every arrangement of this character, every important private negotiation, still more every important public negotiation, still more every international negotiation, is necessarily negotiated privately and in secret. But, Sir, in the previous treaties Canada has been in a measure bound—bound for a definite period of years. We have not bound Canada to any definite period of years; but if we had done so, hon. gentlemen opposite would have no reason to complain. But there is this important difference: the Americans have reached a certain stage in this reciprocity matter which is of vital importance to us. Hon. gentlemen opposite at one time advanced the view—it was perhaps the most rational point in their argument—that we were not certain how the American Congress would deal with this matter. We knew that in times past, after certain progress had been made in the negotiations, the American Senate failed to approve. Why don't you wait, it was said, until the Americans decide for themselves? Well, we were not so much impressed with that argument as some of our hon. friends opposite were; but if there was anything in that argument, it is swept away to-day. Every step has been taken by the government of the United States. Loyally has the president kept his faith with the government of Canada. He has put his great personality and his power behind that measure; he had quarrelled with members of his own party; he has called on patriotic Democrats and has said to them, 'I am sorry my own party is divided, come in and help this thing for the good of the country;' and he has won a response. Step by step he has done his part. The House of Representatives has passed the measure; the Senate of the United States has passed the measure; the president has recommended it, and the newspapers say that on Wednesday next, he will sign the Bill; and then, after having been for 40 years on the wrong side of the question, Uncle Sam will have put himself right. Are we to be right or wrong? We have been right in the past. We have always said to the Americans that we would deal with them on fair and reasonable grounds, but they would not consent. Now the current has changed. They have recognized the injustice—shall I say that?—at all events, the error of their way for the last 40 years in their trade relations with Canada. They have practically said, We think we have been wrong; we desire to come and make a fair and reasonable arrangement. They have made a fair and reasonable arrangement. The only surprising thing in the minds of many Canadians is that we succeeded in making so good an arrangement.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. FIELDING. It is a good arrangement for the great west, and the great west is anxious for it this very year, with the prospect of a crop of 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. The west wants to know which is the best market. Shall we sell it to England? Very well, if England wants it; but if there is a better market across the bor-

der, who will say the western farmer shall not have the right to send his wheat across the border?

A few years ago the government of Newfoundland entered into an arrangement with the government of the United States under which the fish of Newfoundland was to be admitted into the United States free of duty while the fish of Canada would not be so admitted. The Canadian government made a strong protest and for some years they succeeded in preventing the government of Newfoundland from making that agreement. Why? Because they said 'Canada wants free fish, and because we want to arrange matters so that Canada, as well as Newfoundland, shall get the benefit of the arrangement.

To-day we offer the fishermen of Canada that which the Conservatives wanted for them in that quarrel, and we know that the best farmers, the best representatives of the farmers, throughout the country all approve of it. It is a good thing for the grain grower. It is a good thing for the manufacturer, because we have achieved that which they said could not be done. We have achieved a reciprocity in natural products, without having to make any important concessions in the matter of manufactures.

This reciprocity is a good thing for the manufacturer, and I venture respectfully to repeat a word of advice which I offered them not long ago. I say unhesitatingly that from the point of view of the manufacturers of Canada this reciprocity agreement is a good arrangement, and if it goes through, we may reasonably say to the western farmer: 'Well, you cannot have all you want in this wicked world, but this goes a long way towards meeting your demands, and we can fairly ask you to give and take, and let the eastern manufacturer have a fair show,' and we believe they will do it. But, if perchance the manufacturers in their great power should unite in opposing, and possibly condemning, or even defeating this measure, then there will rise up in that western country a storm cloud bigger than a man's hand, and the end will be a change in the fiscal policy of the country, which the manufacturers will find much greater than anything they conceived of.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. Neither the hon. gentleman nor his party would think of hurting the manufacturers. The right hon. the Prime Minister says he will not hurt the manufacturers.

Mr. FIELDING. We say we have not hurt the manufacturers. We know, nevertheless, that many of the manufacturers have been needlessly alarmed, and we know that to-day they are opposing us in this matter. However, I am free to say that I think they have made a mistake, because it will be in their interests as well as in the interests of the country to have the agreement go through.

Redistribution and reciprocity—the west wants both—but they do not want them both at the same moment, and they do not expect them both at the same moment. In the year 1891, the census was taken on the 1st day of April, yet on the very eve of that census—in the month of March, I think, Sir John A. Macdonald appealed to the people, and we had a general election. The census came along a few weeks afterwards. The west had to wait for its redistribution for three or four years, and it had nothing in particular to wait for. To-day I do not know whether the west will have to wait for redistribution or not, but if it has to wait, it will be because there is a more important measure than redistribution before it. As I stated, reciprocity in days gone by has been desired by all, but never before has it been within our grasp. At the present time it is offered to us, and the question is, 'Shall we take it?' We, on behalf of the Liberals of Canada, say, we believe the people want it and will take it. We challenge you to let it pass in this House, and a year hence we will meet my hon. friends in any manner they wish. If they believe this is a dangerous measure, it can only be dangerous for a few short months. The elections will come on, in the ordinary course of events, before many months have passed. Redistribution will come on, and then they will have an opportunity not only of sweeping out this government—which they desire so much—but they will have an opportunity of repealing this measure and putting on the taxes which we wish to take off.

After nearly half a century we have now found the psychological moment when reciprocity is within our grasp. Shall we take it? 'Yes,' will be the voice of the people.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Mr. Speaker, this is not reciprocity. It is revolution.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken on the motion.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). You can rule me out of order if you wish to do so, Mr. Speaker; however, I only spoke on an incident which arose.

Mr. FIELDING. We do not object. Let the hon. gentleman go on.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). This is not reciprocity. It is revolution. It is commercial union, or at least partial commercial union which must end in complete commercial union. The hon. gentleman who has just preceded me (Mr. Fielding) says that the agreement meets with the

approval of the Republican party, the Democratic party, the Senate and President of the United States. This may be perfectly true. But why is it so? Because, for the first time, Canada has admitted the President of the United States into her councils in making the tariff of this country. It is the most humiliating thing that has ever occurred in this country. It is the first time a president of the United States by using the big stick—as he used it on the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in Albany, in connection with the Payne-Aldrich treaty—forced him to make a change in the tariff law of this country. 'Then,' he said, 'you must come back to Washington and make an arrangement in regard to the duty,' and the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) went to Washington and allowed the President of the United States, in secret negotiation, to participate in the making of the tariff of this country.

Where did we get our independence in regard to the tariff? We achieved it from the mother country, in days gone by. It was a hard thing to achieve, and once we had it we used it in bringing about a national policy, and making this country great. Now that national policy has been a success and our commercial and tariff independence has been vindicated, yet, we propose to give it over to the United States. No wonder all the parties of the United States are united in desiring to have this thing passed, because by so doing we are admitting them into participation in the making of the tariff of Canada. Surely that is not what we achieved our commercial independence for. We are putting the mother country out, to let the American people in.

An hon. MEMBER. No, we are not, and you know better.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Yes, we are, and I will give you my proof. I want to show how radical this change is, and how it departs from all the traditions of the past. In years gone by we have had tariff proposals submitted to this House, and argued from all points of view, and interest; but inasmuch as this tariff has the approval of the United States, and cannot be changed without their consent and without negotiations, a revolution has been proposed in the country. And the proof of it is that the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), the hon. member for Welland (Mr. German), and the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) has to leave their party because they could not go to the government to have the tariff changed but had to go to the President of the United States.

Mr. BLACK. That is rot.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). That is all very well for the hon. member from Nova Scotia (Mr. Black) he does not like it. But the reason he does not like it is that it is true. The Prime Minister, when in England recently, was not the friend of the Empire; and to-day, before the Empire and the world, he appears as the friend and colleague of the President of the United States. He has allowed the President of the United States to have a say in making the tariff of Canada. The Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) has said we can rescind this tariff when we like. The President called a special session of Congress in order to deal with this matter, and they have passed this agreement. If Canada passes the agreement under those conditions, it is to be said that we can so disregard the President and Congress as to repeal that agreement within a year? The United States would have every reason for a hostile attitude towards Canada if we went into an agreement of this kind sanctified, as we may say, by legislation and then repealed it within a short time. We could not repeal it without entering into negotiations with the President of the United States, if we want to keep our good faith.

I have just said that this is a great organic change in regard to our tariff the like of which was never proposed in this House before. Hitherto, we have made the tariff of this country in this House. This time, it has been made out of the House, and that is a change that every Canadian should view with alarm. Heretofore, Parliament has been able to modify any tariff propositions brought down. I remember when Sir John Thompson and Mr. Foster proposed tariff changes, it was, as they said to lop away the mouldering branches. But their proposals did not meet with the views of the majority of this House, and the result was that the Government of the day had to modify their proposals. In this case there can be no modification and, this is to be said of a tariff which, as has already been pointed out, was made by two men who did not know all the trade conditions of this country. I could name a county in New Brunswick that will be injured by this agreement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What county?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Carleton.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We will see what the electors of Carleton say about that.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have information that this will injure the Canadian farmers along the border. But here we have two men who do not know everything about tariff conditions in this country, and they assume to make this treaty, and, instead of our being able in the House of Com-

mons to make changes, I say that power has been seized by the cabinet—by a section of the cabinet for not all were consulted—and that junta in the cabinet undertake to make the tariff of Canada in collusion with the President of the United States, and that tariff cannot be changed unless.

Mr. TURRIFF. That is not true.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Turriff) to withdraw that word.

Mr. TURRIFF. If my statement is contrary to the rules of the House, I withdraw it, and I say that the statement of the hon. member for York (Mr. Maclean) is not in accordance with the agreement that is made.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). What is the hon. gentleman's (Mr. Turriff) opinion. I come back to mine that for the first time in the history of Canada our tariff has been made outside this House. And the proof is the rush the Americans make to grab it when the offer is made, and we are letting the President of the United States have a hand in making our tariff.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Maclean) allow me a question? I wish to understand his argument. Does he mean to say that we have made the tariff with the United States as evidenced by the Bill passed by the Senate of that country on Saturday last?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). There was no change made there. The gag was put on, and the same unconstitutional course pursued as is pursued here. And, for political reasons, they joined in it in order to have a say in this country. This is not only an organic change in our constitution, but it is the introduction of commercial union. In fact, it is partial commercial union. The right hon. the Prime Minister is still a commercial unionist, and it is the old commercial unionist who was discredited by the people in 1891 who will be discredited this year if he goes to the country. And when the right hon. gentleman said that he and his party were the champions of redistribution, and, though his organs demand it, yet, the responsibility for the failure to pass redistribution, should it not be passed, must be upon him and his friends. I wish to give a proof that commercial union is back of this. Commercial union was the thing that united Germany. These were scattered and divided states, but commercial union drew them together so that they became one country. And the design of the United States is to absorb Canada by a partial and then a complete system of commercial union, if they can get the people of Canada to go into it. Once the ball is started rolling, this will be the effect, unless the people of Canada unite. That is the real question in all this. Hon. gentlemen opposite have presented it to the people as a question of markets, of profits, of dollars. I hope that this question will be considered in its effect upon our national institutions. If the Americans can succeed in controlling our tariff, they will wipe out our British institutions. As President Taft said: This will wipe out trade between the mother country and other states of the empire. What are dollars compared with our institutions? We have British institutions which give the people of Canada better government than the people of the United States enjoy. Reciprocity is supported in the United States because the leaders, and the trusts there wish to divert the attention of the people from the problems with which they are faced. And another thing is to make their country greater and give it the right to intervene in the affairs of Canada. I say this is the most deplorable piece of legislation ever proposed in this country. And I believe that when the people come to vote on this agreement they will vote against it, because it means the sacrifice of our institutions. And, as I have said before in this House, I know of nothing so dangerous to the ideals of the people of Quebec—'Our laws, our language, our institutions'—as to give the United States a say in the affairs of Canada. They will drive British institutions out of this country if they can be driven out. But my contention is that no effort in this direction on the part of the United States or of hon. gentlemen opposite can be successful. The heart of Canada is sound, and it is British. It is for imperial trade all around the world, and we are going to have that band of English speaking people all around the world trading one with the other, in spite of Mr. Taft, in spite of the right hon. gentleman and his government. Our destiny is not with the United States, it is away from the United States. Hon. gentlemen are trying to drive us that way, as they tried to drive this country twenty odd years ago; and Sir John A. Macdonald said then, as every Canadian says now, 'A British subject I was born, and a British subject I will die. We will keep British institutions in Canada.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But he was for reciprocity all the same.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). He did not propose that two members of his cabinet should go into a secret treaty, or anything of this kind.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend allow me to ask him a question? Has his attention ever been called to the dispatch

which was sent by the Canadian government on the 13th of December, 1890, to the Secretary of State for the Colonies, reading as follows:

My Lord,—I have the honour to send to your Lordship to-day a telegraphic message in cipher, of which the following is the substance:

With reference to my telegram of the 10th inst., this government is desirous of proposing a joint commission such as that of 1871, with authority to deal without limitation——

Mark the word:

—without limitation, and to prepare a treaty respecting the following subjects:

1. Renewal of the reciprocity treaty of 1854, with the modifications required by the altered circumstances of both countries and with the extensions deemed by the commisison to be in the interests of Canada and of the United States.

And is my hon. friend also aware that the definition which Sir Charles Tupper gave in parliament to these words 'without limitation'; was that the Canadian government were making an unrestricted offer of reciprocity to the United States?

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The hon. gentleman can read the dispatch, and he and the man who wrote the dispatch are responsible for it. I am responsible here for my position in this House, and to the trust that has been reposed in me by the people of South York, and they are against this proposition, they are against the raid that is made on the nationality of Canada, and they intend to vote against it. Now this proposal, as I have said, is revolutionary, and it is to be followed by the threat that the Minister of Finance made here today, and the farmers of this country will be justified, if they have no protection, in coming here next year and asking for the removal of what was once described in one of my election contests as the last vestige of the National Policy from the statute-book of Canada. That is what is ahead of the people of Canada today. We are to have no more protection of our industries, we are to allow the president and Congress of the United States to have a say in our tariff, and Canada is to become suzerain of the United States, or we will become states of the union and send senators to Congress. We will have Canada reduced to the position of being a number of states in the American republic. Now we do not want that, and the issue is before us. The Minister of Finance today made it a mere issue of profit, or dollar, what the western farmer was going to get out of it. Now I venture to say that the western farmer has had his eyes opened; I venture the prediction that the people of the west will return a majority against this proposition. A great change of opinion is going on throughout Canada over this pact.

Mr. BLACK. You don't know what you are talking about.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The hon. gentleman, on election night, will find out that he did not know what he was talking about.

An hon. MEMBER. The hon. gentleman is out for a senatorship.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. There will be a good many looking out for senatorships on that occasion.

Mr. TALBOT. It will be a long time before you get a senatorship.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). After the statements that have been made here today we demand that the west be given a voice in regard to this question. But the west is to be denied its full voice on this question by hon. gentlemen opposite, because they cannot wait, in turning over the destinies of Canada, and making the tariff of Canada in conjunction with the president and Congress of the United States.

Mr. BOYCE. The remarks of my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) seem to have raised a storm of dissent from the government. The government find itself in an extraordinary and pitiable condition. I confess that I never heard a more pitiable exhibition in the shape of oratory than that which has fallen from the lips of the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance on this occasion. Why, Sir, of all the childish positions I never heard the like before. Schoolboy tactics, childish tactics, the most pusillanimous kind of tactics, the most feeble kind of protest, to come from hon. gentlemen who are supposed to have a sense of the dignity and responsibility of the government of this great country. Sir, what did the Finance Minister say on the floor of this House in February last? what did the Minister of Customs say in February last, and what have they said on the hustings? What did the Finance Minister say in the city of Montreal? Ever since they introduced this pact they have been saying that it will not be many months very much earlier than you expect, before this whole thing will be submitted to the people of Canada. And did the opposition dissent from that? Not at all, the opposition never have dissented. The government have been crying that only for us they were willing to submit this matter to the people at once. They are working off their bluff upon the opposition and the people of Canada, when the very last thing that the government desires is an appeal to the people. How did the Minister of Finance vote upon

the motion of the leader of the opposition on the 8th of March? That was a concrete motion, a proposal by my hon. friend that this proposition should be submitted to the people before it passed this House. How did the Finance Minister vote on that question? He voted nay, that it should not be submitted to the people, but that it should be forced through this House by the force of the government majority, and their party had to be whipped into line by the lash of party discipline in order to obtain a majority. And yet, under these circumstances, the Minister of Finance can find it possible to say that his great concern was for the opposition, that the opposition forsooth, was the people. Why, Sir, the opposition is trying to have it submitted to the people. The Minister of Finance laughs, he doesn't believe it. Has the hon. gentleman ever manifested such concern for the feelings of the opposition before, that, though he knows they are afraid of a certain thing, he will not give them that thing at once? If he is sincere, and believes that the opposition is afraid of appealing to the people, all I can say is that he is not possessed of that ability that I think he is, of that far-sightedness that I think he has, if he does not give us an election within the shortest possible time the statute allows. Why doesn't he give us an election and test the feeling of the people? Why, it is not long ago that the hon. gentleman, as a responsible minister, announced that the opposition had no rights whatever in this House. His deep concern for us is very sudden; I fancy, Sir, that if the order were reversed and the party on this side of the House had control of the electoral machinery the people of this country would not have long to wait before they had an election upon this question.

The hon. gentleman says that the opposition is afraid of this question, and he speaks with all the confidence of having made an agreement which is hailed with united acclaim by a grateful and thankful people. The hon. gentleman seems for the moment to forget the lamentable difficulties of the gentlemen who sit behind him. He forgets that a gentleman in whom he professed to have some confidence, not long ago, the former Minister of the Interior, Mr. Sifton, and a loyal supporter heretofore of the Liberal government, condemned this compact from beginning to end. The hon. gentleman from Welland (Mr. German) condemned it. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Harris) condemned it, and there are other gentlemen not possessing the courage that these gentlemen exhibited who, in their hearts and minds condemn it and, I venture to say, have expressed their discontent to the right hon. gentleman and the Minister of Finance but who are hushed or lashed into silence by the members of the government. I would have been glad for instance to have heard from the hon. member for West Peterboro (Mr. Stratton). It is well known that he found himself in a very difficult position. He was opposed to this agreement and his constituency was opposed to it, and I would like to have heard his clear and candid opinion upon the subject, but he, like others, was not allowed to do so.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He made a very admirable speech in favour of it not long ago.

Mr. BOYCE. And the result is he has declined to accept the nomination for West Peterboro. He has received his reward, the promise of higher things, a seat in the Red Chamber where the wicked cease not from trouble, but from troubling. Perhaps if I were to get personal I might mention other instances. What about the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald). We should like very much to have heard from him. We heard mutterings and murmurings from that hon. gentleman. He was very much dissatisfied, and while the debate on this question was going on that gentleman sat silent in this House although the mutterings and murmurings got into the papers of his own province. Strange things happen with regard to the hon. member for Pictou. I would ask the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) whether he made an admirable speech in favour of reciprocity?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure he could do so.

Mr. BOYCE. Strange things have happened. That hon. gentleman was confronted with a party pistol put to his head in one hand and a soporific in the other. He had to take either the pistol or the soporific. He took the soporific, and he has been asleep ever since. Rumour has it the hon. gentleman is to be promoted for his sleepiness and his drowsiness on this subject to a very honourable position in the Cabinet. These are the rewards given to government members who keep their mouths shut although they are not satisfied with the government policy. And yet the Finance Minister says in a childish speech that the opposition are afraid of an election, an appeal to the people on this subject when the government is so lamentably weak, so feeble and in such a pitiable plight that it is absolutely unable to carry through a compact and will not submit that compact to the high court of the people who alone should decide a matter of such vital interest to them, because it fears to do so. That is the position of the Canadian government and it is no wonder that the member for North Grey (Mr. Middlebro) before you

left the chair to go into the Committee of Ways and Means should draw attention to the pitiable spectacle presented by this government. The position of the government is like that of two school boys each afraid to take the ice cold plunge and each saying: You are afraid yourself. That is a sort of logic that might pass with a boy of ten years old, but coming from an experienced parliamentarian like the Minister of Finance it does not do credit to him, to his position or to his government.

The Minister of Finance made a statement on his responsibility which I did not like, and which I am sure he will correct. He said that the Prime Minister had never said that he was not in favour of reciprocity. I quoted to him the words of the Prime Minister and asked him if he would deny them, and, Sir, he evaded that question and never answered it. I would now ask him directly if he will answer that question and say whether the Prime Minister ever uttered the words I read.

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know whether or not they were the words of the Prime Minister. I have known the Prime Minister intimately for a great many years. I have known his mind on the question of reciprocity as on others, and I never knew a time when he was not in favour of reciprocity. His fear was that he could not get it, and so he ceased to seek it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BOYCE. I would ask my hon. friend why he went on record against it? I will quote the words again:

Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself, would have given many things to obtain the American market, but, thank Heaven, those days are passed and over.

Does the Finance Minister now say that the First Minister did not make use of these words?

Mr. FIELDING. I do not know whether he did or not.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend did not know whether he did or not, but at the same time he asserts that the Prime Minister never made the statement.

Mr. FIELDING. I state again that I do not know as to the particular speech of the Prime Minister, I said that I know the Prime Minister's mind on this question. I am not prepared to say whether or not he used these words.

Mr. BOYCE. My hon. friend will allow me to state that he is shuffling. He stated that the Prime Minister never said he was not in favour of reciprocity; I quote to him a speech in which the Prime Minister declares absolutely against reciprocity and thanks Heaven—

Mr. FIELDING. No he did not.

Mr. BOYCE. And the hon. gentleman says he did not. I will give him something more to shuffle about. Has he read the proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1907? Does he recognize this?

There was a time when we were wanting reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

Does my hon. friend recognize those words? Will the Minister of Finance say that the Prime Minister never used these words.

Mr. FIELDING. I take it for granted the hon. gentleman is reading from the official report.

Mr. BOYCE. I am reading an extract from Hansard.

Mr. FIELDING. If that is from the official record, I have no doubt that the official report is correct.

Mr. BOYCE. Then how can the Minister of Finance justify his assertion that the right hon. gentleman never said that the Canadian people were against reciprocity.

Mr. FIELDING. He never said that.

Mr. BOYCE. Now, I address myself to the right hon. the Prime Minister himself and I ask him if he did not use these words:

Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself, would have given many things to obtain the American market, but, thank Heaven, these days are past and over.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. And they have come back now.

Mr. BOYCE. Ah, that is the answer of the Prime Minister. If the right hon. gentleman thanks Heaven that the days when the Canadian people were agitating in favor of reciprocity are past and over, what power is he to thank that these days have come back again. If he is to thank Heaven that such days are past and over, must he not thank the powers of Darkness that they have come back again. At the Imperial Conference, May 7th, 1907, the right hon. gentleman said:

If we are to follow the lines of nature and geography between Canada and the United States, the whole trade would flow from south to north, and from north to south. We have done everything possible by canals and subsidizing railways to bring the trade from west to east and east to west so as to bring

trade into British channels. All this we have done recognizing the principle of the great advantage of forcing trade within the British Empire. . . There is no boundary line except a purely conventional one over the whole territory of North America. Their habits are the same as ours, and therefore we are induced to trade and cannot help it by force of nature. But so far as legislation can influence trade, we have done everything possible to push our trade towards the British people as against the American people. . .

There was a time when we wanted reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside. We have said good-bye to that trade and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

I specially commend this to the Minister of Finance. The right hon. gentleman must confess to having used this language and yet he sits silent while his Minister of Finance thrice stated he had never declared himself as being opposed to reciprocity with the United States. I fail to understand such a thing occurring in a free parliament. The Minister of Finance was certainly in a desperate plight, and he made reckless statements. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, you now accept his apology for his missstatements and the manner in which he attempted to deceive the House. the position is this: this government is attempting now to force upon the Canadian people a policy which the government is aware is opposed to the wishes of that people, but by means of a servile majority behind the Prime Minister they are attempting to pass it into law. Then, they will go to the people and howl: 'Election.' They will send out their ballot-boxes and they will take to the hustings and say: Here is a treaty of reciprocity that we have been desirous of getting for many years; here is an agreement that was passed by parliament although actively opposed by the Conservative party; that agreement is now law and if by your votes you condemn it you will involve Canada in trade complications with the Uinted States and commercial ruin will befall this prosperous country. That is the kind of argument the government will use if this measure is allowed to pass and that is the kind of argument they have used before. They forced the Grand Trunk Pacific agreement through this parliament without consulting the people. They signed sealed and delivered it and then they went to the people and told them that it would invite disaster to the country to break that agreement. That Grand Trunk Pacific agreement was never submitted to the people. True, it is said by the Minister of Finance that this reciprocity treaty may at any time be set at naught, but he also told us that the honour of the parliament of Canada was pledged to make it law, and he knows very well that the very terms of the letter he signed with reference to this agreement pledged the support of the parliament of Canada to it. That the Minister of Finance cannot deny. I am entirely in accord with the sentiments upon this question which have been expressed by my hon. friend from North Grey (Mr. Middlebro). It is high time that the hypocrisy and childishness about this question shall cease. It is high time the people of Canada should know the feebleness of a government which can pretend to represent the wishes of the Canadian people and which at the same time admit that they are unable to carry on the business of this country and to further great public measures which according to their policy are of great moment to the commercial interests of Canada. It is childish for them to sit there and say that because in the House of Commons the opposition is opposing it, they cannot get such a measure through, and at the same time, fearing to go to the country with that policy. Such a course is an advertisement of the fact that the government is afraid to meet the will of the people upon this question. I say, speaking for myself, and as a public man: let my right hon. friend bring on this election and the sooner he brings it on the better. As a man of long parliamentary experience, who for years has had the destinies of the countrv in his hands, he should realize that this agreement which we, on this side of the House and many on that side of the House so strenuously oppose, should be referred immediately to the will of the people of Canada, the last, our highest tribunal.

Speaking for myself, I welcome the day when my right hon. friend will submit this question to the people. I am not speaking boastfully; I am not saying that the people of my constituency are unanimously in favour of this; but I say that it is in the interest of this country that an agreement which involves so much, which involves a change of history, perhaps a change in the map of North America ultimately, should be submitted to the people, so that the people's message should be sent to this House either by a majority of members behind the right hon. gentleman authorizing him to go ahead with this reciprocity, and all that it involves, or by a government which will maintain for Canada that proud position which it occupies at the present time as the chief star in the Crown of the British Empire—a government that will encourage her trade going east and west, that my right hon. friend gloried in—in London, not in Washington—and that all those instruments and institutions which are the means of building up that trade shall be strengthened, so that Canada shall be united more and more closely to the empire. My hon. friend the Minister of Finance has made a great plea for reciprocity. He knows

perfectly well what it will involve; he knows that it will involve the sectionalizing of trade, the destruction to a great extent of the east and west lines, and to a great extent bring back the condition of things that existed before confederation. I cannot help thinking of my hon. friend's position and principles in 1886, when in the legislature of Nova Scotia, he aimed the invectives of his eloquence at the very prop of the policy of confederation, and endeavoured to dissolve the ties that bound the east to the west in this great country of ours. I am sorry for the position of the Finance Minister, when, after fifteen years in that position, in which he has told us annually in his budget speeches of the great prosperity of this country due to the administration of the Liberal party, while now, at the end of that time, he demonstrates that deep down in his heart there is still lurking a seething canker of disruption. To what else can you attribute the sentiments that have been expressed by the hon. gentleman here to-day? I say it is time this hypocrisy should cease, and that the country should know that the party to your left, Mr. Speaker, desires nothing more strongly than that the true position of this government should be made known to the people, that this agreement should be submitted to the people, and that the people should have an opportunity of passing their judgment upon it.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, although I am now and have been for a lifetime a strong advocate of a policy of freer trade relations with the United States, a policy of reciprocity, if you will, I would not attempt at this moment to make any extended remarks upon that question. I have, however, because of the interest I take in the question, sat here this afternoon and listened with some degree of wonderment, and with some degree of amusement, at some of the utterances that have fallen from the lips of hon. gentlemen opposite. I have learned something as well. But I have wondered what would have happened had the government of Canada, in December of last year, refused to accept the invitation of the President of the United States to sit together with him and his representatives, to see if some policy of freer trade, mutually beneficial to both countries, could not be arranged; and I wonder what would have been the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite if the government of Canada, instead of taking the attitude which it did take, had said to the President of the United States: We want none of you; let well enough alone; we do not propose to do anything; although we are prosperous, although we are progressive, and are developing our country, we have a slogan cry, we will not further advance, but will let well enough alone. I have been wondering what position hon. gentlemen opposite would have taken had there been that refusal, and I can imagine that we would have heard an entirely different song on their part when the matter came before this House. I have always had a great reverence and esteem for the public men of Canada. I have taken a pride in our institutions, in our government, and in the ability of the men, I care not on which side of the House they have sat, who have had to do, in years past and during recent years, with the administration of the affairs of Canada. But after listening to the doctrine preached by my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), that pride and esteem and respect has been greatly enhanced. My hon. friend has preached the doctrine that this whole movement has been a revolution in our constitution; and he or others on the other side of the House have stated time and again that Canada had listened to the wooing of the United States, and had sent two feeble and decrepit old men down to Washington, under the shadow of the Capitol, within reach of the claws of the American eagle, and my hon. friend preaches the doctrine that these two feeble old men went there and revolutionized——

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I did not make any reference to my hon. friends as being old and feeble men, and I did not use any such language.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not state, nor do I wish to be understood as stating or intending that my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) made any such remark, but what I want to make clear is this: my hon. friends preached the doctrine that negotiations such as this affect the constitutions of the respective countries, and that the people of the United States created, or were creating, a tariff for Canada. In reply to a question which I put to my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) he said that Canada with her 8,000,000 people, was represented by two men who have been characterized by my hon. friends opposite and by their press as two feeble old men, not knowing and not understanding the business—going down to Washington and revolutionizing the tariff and the constitution of the United States, as a matter of fact. They created sad havoc with that American constitution, and I have been wondering what the Daughters of the Revolution would say when they met in convention down in the New England states, and I have wondered what would happen when it was learned by the descendants of the signers of the declaration of independence what havoc had been wrought with the con-

stitution which was based on the declaration of independence. But, this perhaps, only serves to show how utterly absurd were the arguments brought forward by my hon. friends. If our connection with the empire is to be in any way sapped or undermined, or is in any measure to be severed or loosened—it is a strange thing that the giants of the Conservative party in years gone by saw no such danger.

Sir Charles Tupper in addressing the electors at Charlottetown in 1878, in advocacy of the National Policy, said: 'Pass this. It is merely a readjustment. It is a National Policy designed to do, , , .' What? Designed to bring about a reciprocity in natural products between Canada and the United States—designed to accomplish that which we had failed to acomplish since the abrogation of the treaty in 1866.

An hon. MEMBER. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question. Does it not also bring in the products from all other countries as well as from the United States?

Mr. EMMERSON. It is the same treaty. He was referring to the treaty of 1854, which was abrogated in 1866. In July 1878, when Sir Charles Tupper went into the province of Prince Edward Island, and was urging the people of that province—who were known to be strongly in favor of a free interchange of natural products between Canada and the United States—in order to enlist their sympathies and secure their support in favour of the Conservative party, he held out the bait, 'If you will place the Conservatives in power—in this policy there will be incorporated the idea of protection, and it will force the United States to her knees, and will force her to come to Canada and give us what we have sought.' In this advocacy Sir Charles Tupper did not point out that in bringing that about there would be any danger with respect to our British connections—perhaps he did not see it—perhaps he did not have the perspicacity of these modern lights of the party. If he had seen this danger surely he would never have urged it upon the electorate of Canada.

In 1884 Sir John A. Macdonald said from his seat in this House that he was in favour of the fullest possible interchange of natural products between Canada and the United States. He added to that statement that the more trade we could have with the nited States the better it would be for Canada. Surely Sir John A. Macdonald—giant that he was in the Conservative party—giant among the public men in Canada—surely he would have foreseen what hon. members opposite pretend to see to-day—what my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) has openly stated he sees, and what the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) sees so clearly—that by the execution of this agreement there was to be a readjustment of geography, that there was to be a reestablishment of constitutions—a reorganization. Sir John Macdonald saw no such menace. In 1888, when Sir Charles Tupper went with Mr. Chamberlain and negotiated the treaty with the representatives of the United States, and when he secured a treaty practically on all fours with the one which was secured recently, and which would have gone into effect had the Senate of the United States ratified it—Sir Charles Tupper saw no such menace, nor has there been any such menace seen during all the years down to the present time. When the clause relating to reciprocal arrangements was inserted in the tariff Bill of 1879, evidently there was no such danger seen from either side of the House. Nobody saw any recarving of the map of British North America. Therefore, if during all these years we have heard naught of this what are we to think?

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, is not this obstruction to the hon. minister's motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means?

Mr. EMMERSON. My learned friend (Mr. Lancaster) is the very last man in this House, or in any committee, to talk about obstruction. We have had experience, and we have witnessed my hon. friend's attitude before committees, and before this House.

Mr. LANCASTER. I appeal to you Mr. Speaker, as to whether there is anything in the argument of my hon. friend. I ask if the hon. Finance Minister should not seriously call the hon. gentleman to account for obstructing the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means?

Mr. EMMERSON. Sir John Thompson, in his address to the electors of Antigonish in 1891 said:

To the electors of the county of Antigonish:

Gentlemen,—At the election which will take place on the fifth day of March, I will be a candidate for re-election as a member of the House of Commons for the county of Antigonish.

The government of which I am a member is appealing to the country with a policy which we believe will be heartily endorsed by a great majority of the electors. We have made to the government of the United States, through the government of Great Britain, proposals for reciprocity in trade, which we have good reason to believe will result in an arrangement by which the markets of the United States will be re-opened to the products which our people desire most to send there.

A fair measure of reciprocity is what we desire, and we have no doubt that that can be obtained without undue sacrifices.

I respectfully ask your support and votes, and I pledge myself to serve the best interests of the country, if I should be honoured by a renewal of the confidence which was reposed in me at the last elections, and for which I shall be for ever grateful.

I remain, gentlemen,

Your obedient servant,

JOHN S. D. THOMPSON.

Antigonish, Feb. 24, 1891.

Sir John Thompson was a leader of the Conservative party. He was an advocate of reciprocity. I assume that he would be an opponent of revolutions whether as to trade, constitution, geography or anything else. And I can assume that he had an intellect and foresight not often equalled either in Canada or out of it. I pay that tribute to that deceased statesman, a tribute which I am sure, will be concurred in by the people of Canada, regardless of their political faith and affiliations.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. EMMERSON. Resuming where I left off before recess, I would ask what my hon. friend from North Toronto (Mr. Foster) had in his mind with respect to a possible severance of the ties of the empire, when, in 1891, he spoke upon the question of reciprocity. He was speaking in this parliament before the general elections of 1891, and before the conference was held at Washington at which he took part. He said:

With this National Policy, with this development of our natural resources, with this development of interprovincial trade, there is also a desire to widen the boundary of commerce on the other side. With the United States? Yes, and on the principles laid down in the order in council, taking the basis of the treaty of 1854, and adding to it, whatever may be agreed upon by the commissioners appointed on both sides. That is the principle as plainly as can be laid down. No one should be asked to say more than that in going into a trade negotiation with another country, and however the hon. gentlemen opposite may refuse to attribute to us an honest desire to carry out this policy, as they will in their great charity and distinguished probity, the government knows that the party behind it will trust it because it reflects the opinion of the men who support it.

Then, in the very same parliament, Mr. Foster read an extract, and the extract simply bore out what? (To use Mr. Foster's language):

It bore out this—that I said I saw no particular trend toward reciprocity in my reading of the sentiment of the United States, that from 1866 up to the present time, we had been counselled to watch and wait; to go upon the assumption of waiting and watching, to see whether or not the United States would not meet us with a reciprocity treaty, and I said that I thought the time had come and fully come when we should leave that position, and with the greatest courtesy and good will possible to the United States we should do our own fiscal legislating in our own interest, as we see it from the standpoint of Canadians. That is all I said, that is exactly what I stated, and I think I am perfectly consistent in that respect. Since that time, however, a change has taken place and on the invitation of the United States government itself we are to send delegates on the 12th day of October to Washington, to confer with Mr. Blaine and the President of the United States and see whether or not we can have framed or formed a reciprocity treaty on the basis which we have set forth in our order in council, and which is as plain as can be made.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). What year was that?

Mr. EMMERSON. That was just previous to the elections of 1891. My hon. friend will find it recorded in 'Hansard,' and that is the best record possible for the utterances of any hon. member.

Mr. STANFIELD. The hon. gentleman is reading from a paper—what paper?

Mr. EMMERSON. I was reading an extract; it is a matter of no importance what paper it is in. I can give the pages of 'Hansard,' but I do not think my hon. friend is curious with respect to that. Now, Sir, I did not intend to make any extended remarks on this question, but I feel that I shall have to add a few remarks at the risk of being termed, as my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) termed me, an obstructionist. I suppose my hon. friend from Lincoln will hail me gleefully, I become particeps criminis with him in obstructing the business of the House.

Mr. HENDERSON. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. I echo that hear, hear. Perhaps my hon. friend from Lincoln, and even my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), fail to see that every utterance they make in this debate is an obstruction, and viewing it from that light, I preume that is their purpose. Now the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce), whom I now see in his seat, I regret to say, was somewhat personal. I would rather that this matter had been dealt with from an impersonal standpoint. He was ready to make merry with respect to the utterances of the Prime Minister in connection with the question of reciprocity. In 1878 Sir Charles Tupper argued that the support of the National Policy was but a means to an end, he said that to the people of Prince Edward Island; and, in effect, he said that the end justified the means, and if you don't like a National Policy, if you are not

quite prepared to support this policy of the readjustment of the tariff for one purpose, then support it upon the principle that the end justifies the means, because you will thereby have reciprocity with the United States in natural products, which is so much in your interest, and which will add so much to your prosperity and development. I can only understand the utterances of the right hon. the leader of this government with respect to reciprocity in the light of everything he has said, I can only read in them that he was saying to the people of the United States, in effect. Well, we are not so particular, we are not dependent on reciprocity. And I say now we are not dependent upon reciprocity. I say we have never been dependent upon it. As strong an advocate as I have been of such a policy, I have never felt that the people of Canada needed to go down on their knees before the people of the United States and beg for reciprocity. But apparently the very indifference of the right hon. the Prime Minister with respect to the whole question as interpreted in his utterance, has served in a measure to bring about the psychological moment when the government of the United States are willing to give what we have asked them for, asked over and over again during the last 40 years. Now, they have offered it to us, and it devolves upon us seriously to consider the responsibility that is placed upon us. Now, I am sincerely in favour of reciprocity. I believe it will expand the trade of all Canada, I believe that it is particularly in the interest of eastern Canada. More than that, I believe that while our trade with the United States has expanded during the past fifteen years immensely, I believe it will expend in a greater ratio still when this policy is inaugurated between the two countries. But more than that, I believe it will develop and expand our trade with Great Britain in a way that it has never been expanded in the past.

My hon. friend will have an opportunity of reviewing that; I am giving it as my judgment, and I will give you the reason. I believe that the people of eastern Canada will become prosperous, that they will have a choice of markets, that the conditions wrought by means of such a reciprocity tariff in natural products will adjust the markets, protect the producers, stimulate production in the direction of agricultural, forest and fishery products; in fact stimulate the development of the natural resources of eastern Canada. As that is stimulated and extended it only increases the purchasing power of the people of that section of the country. Increase the purchasing power of a people and you find them indulging in luxuries. We must all concede that to a very large extent the luxuries that we as a Canadian people indulge in are very largely imported from, or through Great Britain, and if we thus indulge in luxuries our importations from Great Britain will largely increase, to the mutual advantage of the two countries, particularly of Great Britain. We cannot, nor could we complain with respect to any increase in importations from Great Britain. She has a wide open door to our natural products, for all she can possibly take of them. We have not on our side had any door open to her products; we have not given them any great advantage, but, with an extended trade, with the development of our resources, and the increase in our revenue which must necessarily follow, we could fairly well say: 'We can and will increase this preference from a 33⅓ per cent to a 50 per cent preference in favour of Great Britain.

Many hon. gentlemen in dealing with this question ask what the electorate are going to do. I do not pretend to have any prophetic sense, but I do say this, and I will make it as a prophecy that when the people of Canada are called upon, whether it be sooner or later, to deal with the question of reciprocity, or of the expansion of the trade relations between these countries, they will deal with it from one standpoint alone. It will not be with them as it is too often here, as a case of merely playing, they will not be indulging in the game of politics; the people of Canada, and particularly the people of eastern Canada, for whom I can more readily speak, will deal with it from a business standpoint, from the standpoint of their bread and butter; and I think I can fairly say, speaking from that eastern standpoint, that it is to the advantage of their bread and butter that they shall have an additional market, that they shall have at least the choice of an additional market, and that they shall not be confined to one purchaser, or even to two, but that they shall have as many purchasers as it is possible to have. It is all very well to say that this constituency, or that section of the country will do this or do that. I believe the people will largely deal with the question in the way I have indicated, and if the electorate of Canada do that, certainly I will be content and I think every hon. member in this House should be content.

My hon. friend has said that because this member or that member has not spoken there is some doubt as to his convictions. I would be very sorry to be judged from that standpoint. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) did not speak, it is true, in this House on the question of reciprocity. I did not speak, but I would not wish my views to be judged from that fact. I do know that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) dur-

ing the month of June spent practically all his time campaigning, not only in Pictou, but in every county of the province of Nova Scotia. Doing what? Advocating reciprocity.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He never did.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend may be in a better position to know the facts than I am. I only know that what I am stating can be demonstrated beyond question.

Mr. STANFIELD. The hon. member for Pictou did not campaign in every county.

Mr. EMMERSON. I want to be accurate I would not wish to say every county, I would say almost every county. I think that can be very well taken in a Pickwickian sense, but there is this to be conceded that he was actively campaigning and he was advocating reciprocity. Whether he bearded the lion in his den in the county of Colchester I do not know but perhaps he thought discretion was the better part of valour in that case.

But the people of Canada are not concerned as to who made speeches and who did not, it does not matter much whether this man goes down and somebody else come up in his place. We should have at least the earnestness and the courage of our convictions and not hide ourselves behind our electorate or our constituency.

Mr. BOYCE. Hear, hear.

Mr. EMMERSON. The hon. member for West Algoma says hear, hear. Then let us have a vote on this question. Then we will have at least a decision before the people of this country as to what the mind of the representatives of the people is as indicated by their votes and that must be the best indication. While challenges have been thrown out, if I were in a position to throw challenges to anybody I would throw a challenge not merely to hon. members opposite but to those on this side as well, let us have a vote, let us each one record his views. There need then be no occasion for aspersions on the attitude of this or that member, there need be no reflections upon the course that this or that hon. member has taken. The hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) had better refer to some very apt words once uttered by Abe Lincoln, if he will not consider me disloyal in making the quotation. Lincoln said: There is so much bad in the best of us and so much good in the worst of us that it hardly behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us. I think that is a very good motto to apply all around. However, it would not be a matter of reflection upon any hon. member in this House if he could stand in his place and give voice to his conviction by his vote as recorded on the journals of this House. I think it would be well to have such a record and to have it at the earliest possible moment. There certainly would be no obstruction, I am sure, as to that. Of course I would not for a moment insinuate that there is any desire to obstruct.

People can draw their own inferences, but I do think hon. gentlemen opposite are very anxious to change places, and they have the hope; or at least they express the hope, that they have a good chance of doing so. But, possibly, in striving to weave the purple robe of power, they have indulged in what some people may call, aye, what some people do call, obstruction. Are they going to pursue that course in the face of the attitude of the United States, when that great nation tenders us a contract signed and executed for the extension of our mutual trade. Under existing conditions, the responsibility resting upon us is, I believe, greater than has ever been placed before upon the legislators or the people of Canada. I venture to think that is the view the people will take of it. I believe they are wondering why a great political party should fling itself in the face of the wheels of progress, to prevent the consummation of that which it is believed will stimulate the development of our trade and commerce.

Mr. BEATTIE. If the hon. member admires the United States so much, would he please tell us why they took the great privilege of reciprocity from us in 1866.

Mr. EMMERSON. Somebody spoke about Rip Van Winkle to-day, but I would not be so discourteous to my hon. friend as to apply the reference to him; I do say, however, that the time for post-mortem inquests is past.

Mr. BEATTIE. I remember, Mr. Speaker, that at a large convention held at the city of Detroit to advocate the abrogation of the reciprocity treaty Senator Chandler declared: 'We will starve the Canadians until they beg of us to take them into the union.' Well, we are not in the union yet, and I fervently pray we never will be.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think the hon. member's question should be barred by the Statute of Limitations. At all events it lies in the mouth of no party to raise it because, since 1866, Sir John Macdonald, Sir Charles Tupper, Sir John Thompson, the Hon. George E. Foster, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Alex. Mackenzie, Edward Blake, George Brown, and all the great statesmen of Canada, since the declaration made by the United States Senator at Detroit in 1866, have advocated reciprocity with the United States.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). Is the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) not dealing wholesale in post-mortems just now?

Mr. EMMERSON. I am merely trying to lay the ghosts that hon. gentlemen opposite are seeking to raise. To-day, my hon. friend from York (Mr. Maclean) raised the ghost of the disruption of the empire, and the hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Boyce) raised the ghost of the termination of our national existence and presented a map of British North America carved into smithereens. I have, Mr. Speaker, strong views in favour of reciprocity, and I think it will be admitted that I have the courage to express my views. Had Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his government taken the responsibility of declining to negotiate with the United States when they made the request to us I wonder what would have been the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite. I know what my attitude would have been. I have been a Liberal all my life, but strong as I am in adherence to Liberal principles, if this government had taken upon itself the responsibility of declining to enter into these negotiations, much as I respect Sir Wilfrid Laurier I would consider that he should forfeit my support and confidence and I do not think that I would hesitate to tell him so. I have expressed views in this House contrary to the views of the government, but I am happy to know that in this instance the policy they have adopted meets with my whole-hearted approval and shall receive my most cordial support.

Mr. GOODEVE. The argument addressed to the House by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) simmered down was in effect, an appeal to this side of the House to let a vote be taken upon this question. In answering that, it might be well to remind hon. members that the position of the Conservative party on this measure has been clearly set forth from the very beginning of this debate, and had the government seen fit to adopt the position taken by the opposition with regard to it there would have been no question of obstruction and this debate would have ended long ago. On the 26th of January last, the Minister of Finance brought down his resolution to amend the tariff of 1907, and after listening to his full presentation of the case and taking time to consider it in all its bearings, the leader of the opposition moved an amendment on the 8th of March which set forth clearly and fully the position which we have maintained up to the present time and which answers the question of the hon. member (Mr. Emmerson): why not take a vote upon it? Let me remind him of the exact position by reading that resolution, and I think he will be surprised, after his remarks of the last few minutes, to find that he is placed on record as having voted against the very position he now asks the House to take.

Mr. MACDONELL.

That all the words after the word that' in the proposed motion be omitted and the following substituted therefor:

The reciprocal agreement embodied in the resolutions submitted to this House by the Minister of Finance on the 26th day of January last, was also submitted on the same day by special message of the President to the Congress of the United States of America which was then in session.

That the said session has now expired and Congress has failed to approve and carry out the said agreement.

That a considerable length of time must necessarily elapse before the said agreement can be dealt with by Congress at a special session.

The next clause answers one other point made by the hon. member for Westmorland, when he referred to the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean), who said that this involved great constitutional changes. This paragraph covers his entire argument and fully vindicates the position taken by the hon. member for South York:

That the fiscal changes by the said agreement are of a far reaching character and constitute a substantial reversal of the policy which has been approved by the people of Canada.

The final summing up was as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, the said resolutions should not be proceeded with until the electors shall have had an opportunity of pronouncing upon their merits.

All that we asked, and all that we have continued to ask, is that the electors shall have an opportunity of pronouncing upon these merits; and yet at this late hour, after nearly six months of wasted time, we find the hon. member for Westmorland, in his place in the House, saying, why not vote upon it? actually accusing men on this side of the House of being afraid of their principles, of trying to hedge themselves about and taking two positions in regard to this question.

Mr. EMMERSON. I made no insinuation.

Mr. GOODEVE. The basis of his argument, if there was any argument, was that we were afraid to go to the people. He said he himself advocated going to the people. There is the resolution clearly and distinctly asking only one thing.

Mr. EMMERSON. Will my hon. friend pardon me? I think he must have misunderstood me. What I was advocating was that we have a straight vote on this question in this House. I was not talking about a vote in the country. Before we have that, let us have a straight vote here.

Mr. GOODEVE. Exactly, and it was a straight vote we had in this House on this amendment. We placed our position fair-

ly and squarely before the country, that this agreement was so far reaching in its consequences that we should submit it to the people of Canada and ask their verdict upon it; and if there has been waste of time and obstruction, that is due to the government and the government alone.

I would like to say a word or two with regard to the very remarkable admission made by the right hon. leader of this government, an admission that I know was wrung from him much against his will by the strong argument advanced by the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce), when he had placed before him his own words in which he had declared over and over again that we were through with reciprocity, that never again would this question be brought up; and I wish to point out to my hon. friend from Westmorland that these utterances were made since the date to which he has referred. I have the official documents to show that in 1899, in 1901, in 1907 and in 1909, at the Imperial Conferences in those years, the right hon. the Prime Minister said that Canada was through with reciprocity; and in the elections of 1904 and 1908 that question was not an issue. It seems difficult to impress upon hon. gentlemen opposite what these quotations from the speeches of the right hon. leader of the government mean. Indeed, I may say that as a young member of this House, during the three sessions that I have sat here listening to the various debates, I have been amazed at some of the things that I have learned with regard to the policy of the right hon. leader of the government. Over and over again I have witnessed the spectacle of various Hansards being brought in from the library and quotations read from them of absolutely contrary opinions advanced by the hon. leader of the government on every great public question before this country; and gradually the conviction has been forced upon me that he has no fixed principle, and that he is ever ready, by pleasant phrases, eloquent in themselves, to obtain the plaudits of the people regardless of what the practical results may be. One is forced to that conclusion, however much against his will. At the Imperial Conference, of 1907 the right hon. leader of the government said:

> But so far as legislation can influence trade we have done everything possible to push our trade towards the British people as against the American people.

Mr. ASQUITH. May I say I did not in the least dispute that. My objection was not, as I think I made clear, in any sense to complain of the Canadian preference; on the contrary, I recognize both its intention and its effect. My point was that natural conditions were such that it was inevitable that the Americans should get the best of it.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Not only have we done it by preference, by legislation, but we have forced our trade against the laws of nature and geography. If we were to follow the laws of nature and geography between Canada and the United States, the whole trade would flow from south to north, and from north to south. We have done everything possible by building canals and subsidizing railways to bring the trade from west to east and east to west so as to bring trade into British channels. All this we have done recognizing the principle of the great advantage of forcing trade within the British Empire.

There is the whole kernel—if there is any kernel—of the remarks made by the right hon. the leader of the government. It is contained in this one phrase 'All this we have done recognizing the advantage of forcing trade within the British Empire.' It was not merely a matter of sentiment, it was not merely that they must give the mother country an advantage, but it was because he distinctly declared that he recognized it was an advantage for the people of Canada to force the trade within the Empire.

Then, why this sudden change of sentiment? If it was an advantage in 1907, why is it not an advantage in 1911? We had the quotation cited by the hon. member for West Algoma (Mr. Boyce)—'thank heaven that time has passed.' Let me read the exact words of the right hon. leader of the government:

> Canada to-day is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians, beginning with myself would have given many things to obtain the American market, but, thank Heaven, these days are past and over.

Yet when pressed by the hon. member from West Algoma (Mr. Boyce) as to why they were now asking for a renewal of the treaty the right hon. the Prime Minister said because those days had returned again. It would be interesting to have a frank admission as to what was in the mind of the right hon. the leader of the government when he said he thanked heaven that these days were passed for ever. Surely no man would thank Providence that something had passed away unless he felt it was for his own advantage or for the advantage of the country. Still, we have the right hon. gentleman thanking heaven that these days had gone for ever. Then, we have the most astonishing statement on the floor of the House that these days were back upon us. I think we should very much like to know what are these days which are now confronting us and compelling us to seek aid from the nation to the south. In that connection it must be appropriate to read what was said by another very prominent Liberal—A leader for many years, and premier of the great province of Ontario. This was not away

back years ago, as my hon. friend from West Algoma said, but in the year 1910. Here is what Sir Geo. Ross said before the Toronto Club:

> In 1866, when the old treaty was repealed, we were poor in banking capital, in skilled labour, in agriculture and manufactures. A treaty then would have afforded some relief—to-day conditions are different—different because the repeal of the treaty removed every prop on which we had formerly leaned and the true temper of our Anglo-Saxon spirit was roused to action. I think no country in the world affords a better illustration of public spirit than Canada when the United States in 1866 flung our poverty in our faces and told us our only choice was starvation or annexation.

I wonder what was in the mind of the right hon. gentleman when he said that these days were upon us again, when it was necessary to call for the unlocking of the door which had been flung in our faces. I do not intend to weary you with following up this line of argument, but would like to call it to the attention of the House in order that the right hon. gentleman and the Liberal press may be able to explain to the people of Canada during the coming campaign what was in the minds of the present government when they said that these days of darkness, of distress, and poverty are upon us again so that we are compelled to seek succour from the great nation to the south of us.

Another argument was advanced this afternoon by the hon. the Finance Minister. It was a very specious argument and one that, I think, I am safe in saying, occupied at least three quarters of his entire address. This argument has already been taken on the platform by the Liberal speakers throughout the country and is one which is likely to play a very important part in the coming campaign. When I referred to this argument as being specious I spoke advisedly. The hon. Finance Minister said 'It is true there are those of my own persuasion, Liberals, who honestly differ from me in regard to this question. However much I may regret that, I would say I think there is an argument which seems to appeal to me and it ought to appeal to them and to every reasonable man—it is this—there is nothing fixed about this treaty. We have been blamed for going down to Washington and binding the people of Canada. However, I say to you that there is nothing to prevent a change being made at any time in regard to this treaty.' Now, I say unhesitatingly, that while technically he was stating the fact, yet in practical results he was speaking what would not and could not possibly work out. Indeed, the hon. the Finance Minister himself was so convinced of the weakness of his argument that a little later on he said he doubted whether it would not be better if the treaty had been for a fixed time. What are the facts in connection with this? Can we alter or change this treaty at any time? I would like to ask the hon. Finance Minister supposing we decided to allow this resolution to go through, and the agreement was duly signed and sealed, if within two months we wished to alter it would he, and would the people of the United States consider that we had honorably kept faith with them? Bear in mind the position he laid before this House in bringing down his pact, that we were not to change it by one iota. The agreement as made by himself and his colleagues was to be passed just as it stood. Over and over again he had stated to this House that we are in honour bound to pass it just as it was brought down. If that was the case, I would like the hon. the Finance Minister, or the Minister of Customs—who is in his place—to tell me the exact date when he would consider us as being absolutely free to alter or change this agreement. Would it be at the end of two months? Would it be at the end of six months? or would he feel that the people of Canada had done all they were in honour bound to do if they tried it for one year and then altered it because it was found to be unsatisfactory? I think not—at least I believe the United States would not so consider it.

And so I could go on to say, one, or two, or three years. And we see that on that account it certainly would not be keeping faith; so we are bound by this agreement as fully as if we had entered into a treaty, with the added disadvantage that it is not for any fixed time, and there is therefore, there is always the possibility, as the Minister of Finance has said of disturbing trade.

Now, another argument in the same line. On the 30th of March, 1910, a committee was appointed to meet with the representatives of the United States in regard to the placing of the surtax—because, forsooth, we had made an agreement with France affecting a certain number of articles, and for that reason the United States threatened us with this discrimination. And the Minister of Finance came on this floor and proposed giving them certain concessions and defended his course in so doing. He said we did not want a tariff war. Well, Sir, if, when we were not bound to them in any way, the hon. gentleman felt justified in saying to our people that we were compelled to make certain concessions to the United States in order to avoid a tariff war, how much more would that argument apply once this pact went into force.

There is a further argument on the same line. I have only been here three sessions. But again and again, as certain changes in our tariff have been asked for by some of our own people, I have heard

the Minister of Finance, even while admitting that the changes proposed might be of some benefit to those who asked for them, yet a stable tariff is better for the people of Canada than constant changing and tinkering, and for that reason he refused to make the changes. And the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) says 'Hear, hear.' I agree with him; the argument is in itself a good one. But apply it to this pact. If the minister's argument is to be accepted, what would be our condition in regard to stability of tariff? If we did not know it from week to week when our tariff would be changed, what would be the condition of our trade? Take, for instance, the fruit trade. What will be the result of the Niagara fruit men, and the British Columbia fruit men? The handlers of the product, the commission men would make their arrangements wth the fruit producers of the United States, and the industry would be changed from the present channel into the new one. That itself would mean loss. But, once these changes are made, any man or government would hesitate to alter these conditions knowing the injury that would result. Any man who has followed the political history of the nation to the south of us knows how the commerce of that country is disturbed every presidential year. And why? Because in every presidential campaign the tariff issue has been to the fore, and commerce is practically at a standstill awaiting the result, knowing that the change in fiscal conditions would mean much loss or gain to the people. Are we to place ourselves in that position? Are we to be tied to the tail of the fiscal tariff of the United States? It is easy for the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs to stand on this floor and say: We can try this, and if we do not like it we can change it. As I say, technically that is true, but practically and in fact, as I have shown, there are reasons why it is impracticable and impossible, and no man knows better than the two ministers who made the pact, and brought it down to this House. So, I say, it is no wonder that the Finance Minister pleaded with his own side, and with the press gallery—for I saw him watching the reporters when he made his argument—and even pleaded with men on this side, that we should make the trial on the ground that it could do no harm. But he knows that this is not a question to be played with; it is too great, too far-reaching, too vital to the great commercial interests of this Dominion to be played with by any set of men. We are here to deal with these questions with a view to their broad national effect. For more than forty years we have gone on and prospered. Year after year in this House we have heard the minister say—and his words have been repeated throughout the length and breadth of Canada by the Liberal press—that the progress of the country has been marvellous under the fiscal system adopted in 1878. My hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) said that Sir John Thompson and Sir John Abbott and Sir John A. Macdonald had asked for reciprocity. But that was before they had adopted the great National Policy. But when that was put into effect, and as a result the poverty and distress—this hour of darkness so graphically referred to by Sir George Ross—passed away. We have developed our great natural resources while the people of the south have wasted and largely destroyed theirs. The time has come when we have reached the position in which we can manufacture our products against any people in the world; and at this time the people of the United States are very anxious to come in and partake of our great natural resources.

I do not propose at this time to go into that subject, though I should like to deal with the question of lumber and pulp as affecting particularly my own province of British Columbia. But I confine myself simply to the remarks of the First Minister and the Finance Minister. I say again, I would like these hon. gentlemen to lay before the people how the Finance Minister proposes to try this pact, as he says, without disturbing the commercial interests of this great Dominion.

On that ground, if no other, I say that before a measure of such far reaching consequences is placed on the statute-book of Canada, we should weigh it well, and we should give the people of Canada an opportunity of expressing their will with regard to it. Every man knows in his heart that once this pact goes into effect we cannot change it at our will. It seems that we are turning back from the promised land into the bondage of the fiscal tariff of the United States, there is no question of that. Undoubtedly we should be tied up with them, we are bound more or less to consult them in whatever we do hereafter with regard to it.

I wish to refer to an extraordinary remark the Minister of Finance made this afternoon. It is true, he says, that we sent a message to the manufacturers saying that this agreement would not injure them, that it would only help the farmers and consumers. Here one naturally asks how, if it is going to aid farmers by giving them higher prices, it is also going to help the consumers by giving them lower prices. But there is another phase of this matter. The minister's statement was carefully worded. As the member for West Algoma said, the government undertook with one hand to hold a pistol to the hon. gentleman for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald), and in the

other hand they held out this soporific. And so I may say the Minister of Finance this afternoon, undertook with one hand to hold out a badge of peace to the manufacturers of this country, and with the other hand he held out a threatening pistol. There is no doubt of the meaning underlying his words. In almost these words he says: We have given the people of the west, not all they asked, but all we are prepared to give them at this time; and I would like to warn the manufacturers that if they continue in their opposition to this agreement the time may come when they will find themselves in a worse position than they are at present; but if they are prepared to lie low and to cease their opposition, they may receive no further harm. In other words, the Minister of Finance asks the manufacturers to give up their rights of citizenship in order to purchase immunity from the attacks of this government. That was the attitude of the Minister of Finance towards the manufacturers. But his government does not reckon with the people of Canada. This government will find that the people of Canada will not tamely submit to be trampled upon, nor will they allow any government to take from them their constitutional rights and privileges.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not spoken at all during the discussion of this question, therefore I may be permitted to make a few remarks in answer to some of the observations of my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Goodeve), and also to refer to the quotations which my hon. friend from Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) has made as to the attitude of the leaders of the Conservative party in the past. I understand my hon. friend from Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) to admit that it was true that the Conservative party was at one time in favour of reciprocity, but that was before the promulgation of the National Policy of 1879. Did I understand my hon. friend correctly?

Mr. GOODEVE. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then my hon. friend must have forgotten that upon the very last occasion when the Conservative party appealed successfully to the country they declared themselves unequivocally in favour of reciprocity with the United States. That was twelve years after the National Policy had been put into force. Now, my hon. friend from Westmoreland quoted from an election card which was issued by Sir John Thompson, in February, 1891, when he was appealing to the electors of the county of Antigonish, in the province of Nova Scotia. Sir John Thompson was not an ordinary member of the House, he was Minister of Justice in the government led by Sir John A. Macdonald, and he was recognized as the second in command next to the great Conservative leader. Sir John Thompson was a man in whose judgment the people of Canada had very great confidence. He had occupied a position on the bench of the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia, and was recognized as one of the ablest lawyers in Canada. After the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, he was called upon to assume the leadership of the Conservative party, which he did with credit to the party and with credit to the country. Every Canadan, whether Liberal or Conservative, deplored his sudden demise at so early an age. Sir John Thompson, in his manifesto, made reciprocity the only question upon which he appealed to the people of Nova Scotia, it is the only great subject to which he refers. He tells the people of Canada, that the government of which he is a member have entered into negotiations with the government at Washington for the purpose of bringing about a treaty of reciprocity, which he believes would be of advantage to the people of both countries. Now, surely the hon. member for Kootenay must have forgotten this fact when he said that the Conservative party was never in favour of reciprocity subsequent to the adoption of the National Policy. He has forgotten the election of 1891, when the government went to the country upon the policy of reciprocity. My hon. friend has called attention to a portion of the language of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), which will be found on page 60 and following of 'Hansard,' and in which that hon. gentleman, then a member of the Conservative government, stated that this government had done everything possible to extend interprovincial trade. He referred to the fact that the Canadian Pacific railway had been carried out by the Conservative party, and it had then been completed some six years, because it was completed from the Atlantic to the Pacific in 1885. He referred to the enormous development which had taken place in this country, and said that notwithstanding the development of internal trade, notwithstanding the wonderful strides Canada had made as a result of the construction of the Candian Pacific railway and the inauguration of the National Policy, yet the government had sought to widen and extend the bounds of commerce in every direction. Then he asked this question: With the United States? Yes he says, we are desirous, not only of extending our commerce with all the other countries of the world, but with the United States as well. He refers with pride to the fact that for many years the Conservative party had been taught to watch and to wait until a favourable opportunity should occur, and he referred gladly to the fact that at last the moment had come when the government had been invited to visit Washing-

ton and to open negotiations with Secretary Blaine and the President of the United States, to bring about what? To bring about a treaty of reciprocity, based upon what? Based upon the old reciprocity treaty of 1854, with such additions and extensions as the altered circumstances might show to be to the mutual advantage of the two countries.

Surely in the face of this evidence it cannot be said that the Conservative party had abandoned the policy of reciprocity after the introduction of the National Policy. This shows that upon the very last occasion when the Conservative party successfully appealed to the country they made reciprocity the principal plank in their platform, and it was upon that that they hoped to win, and did win, the approval of the people.

The hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) said more than has been quoted by the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson). He said at page 60:

> The government showed itself consistent, in the first place, by declaring that there was a door open for negotiations, and that a delegation would be sent to Washington after the 4th March, and, furthermore, by sending a delegation and being prepared to go again on the 12th October to do what no Canadian government has been asked to do from 1866 to the present time, that is, to talk over the trade matters and relations existing between this country and the United States, with a view to their better and final settlement. This statement which I make will be borne out by the papers, and I cannot see where we have been inconsistent or where we have prejudiced the intersts of Canada——

And will hon. gentlemen mark these words:

> —or have done aught which any government in favour of reciprocity ought not to have done.

There is the declaration of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster) in 1891, after the general elections of that year, showing that the government of which he was a prominent member was in favour of reciprocity with the United States. That course is entirely consistent with what the government had previously done because we find that prior to the election of 1891 and as early as December of 1910 the government passed an order in council in which it was provided that commissioners should go to Washington. And what were to be their instructions? They were to go to Washington with authority, without limitation, to make proposals towards the agreement for a treaty based upon the reciprocity treaty of 1854. I think it is important to bear in mind that they were not to be limited in their instructions, they were to, if possible, obtain a treaty for reciprocity not in natural products alone —it was to be based upon the old reciprocity treaty of 1854. But so anxious was the government of that day to obtain better trade relations with the United States, so much did they believe that it would be in the interests of the whole country that this arrangement should be made, that they placed no limitation upon the authority which was to be given to the commissioners, they were given authority to deal with these matters without limitation and perhaps there are some hon. gentlemen here who can remember seeing in the press of that day some remarks that were made as to what was the difference between the Liberal policy of that time of unrestricted reciprocity and the policy of the Conservative party in making an unrestricted offer of reciprocity to the United States. Sir Charles Tupper's attention was called to the fact that these commissioners were to go without limitation to negotiate a reciprocity treaty. Sir Charles Tupper said that was an unrestricted offer of reciprocity, whereas the Liberal party was in favour of unrestricted reciprocity, and Sir Charles said that he pitied the man who could not understand the difference between an unrestricted offer of reciprocity and an offer of unrestricted reciprocity. To the ordinary mind there is not much difference.

Mr. BLAIN. Was the policy of the two parties the same in 1891?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In 1891 the policy of the Liberal party was broader, it was to include manufactured articles.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Which was right?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is not necessary to say which was right, because the arrangement which has been made to-day is absolutely in accordance with the limited reciprocity treaty of which the Conservative party was in favour. If my hon. friend will read the speeches which Sir John Macdonald made in discussing this question, he will find that Sir John, while stating that the old reciprocity treaty had been a great benefit to Canada, while stating that no argument need be presented to show that and at the same time saying it was unfortunately discontinued by the United States government owing to a not unnatural irritation against England, he said that he felt it would be but little use to go to the United States then and seek a reciprocity treaty. He also intimated that he would be prepared to go even beyond reciprocity in natural products and to give considerable reciprocity in manufactured articles, for the purpose of obtaining reciprocal trade arrangements so far as natural products were concerned.

I would quote from another hon. gentleman whose loyalty I think will not be impugned in this House, because, although hon. gentlemen who are in the House to-day, members of the Conservative party, seem, so far as reciprocity is concerned, to have departed from the views of their old and their great leaders of the past, yet I hardly think they would impeach the loyalty of the hon. gentleman from whom I am now going to quote. I refer to the Honourable Sir Charles Tupper, who was for so many years a prominent member of this parliament, and who, for such a long period occupied a prominent position among the people of Canada. I find that Sir Charles Tupper, after the election of 1891, on the 4th of August, as reported at page 3346 of Hansard, said:

> The chief point now is, without any quibbling or cavilling, that this government has arranged for a conference with the United States government in October next, without any confession such as hon. gentlemen opposite insinuate, that we are in any sense more dependent upon the satisfactory arrangements than are the people of the United States themselves. We go there, relatively, in as strong a position as they meet us; we go there——

Willing to negotiate a reciprocity treaty, does he say? No, he says:

> We go there anxious to see whether an arrangement, consistent with the interest of both countries, can be brought about.

And yet to-day hon. gentlemen say that the man who is in favour of reciprocity with the United States is doing something which will imperil the position of Canada as a portion of the British Empire. They say that the man who is willing to improve the trade relations between this country and the great republic to the south is doing what in fact is an act of disloyalty to the empire because it will tend to draw this country away from the great empire to which we are proud to belong, from that great federation of nations which all of us hope and which all the people of Canada believe and hope will for ever remain united and be for ever in the van of progress and development and will last until the end of time. And yet, because this government has simply done what Sir Charles Tupper tried to do, what the hon. Mr. Foster tried to do, what all the eminent statesmen of the past upon both sides of politics tried to do, hon. gentlemen insinuate that they are willing to do something which will weaken the ties that bind Canada to the mother land.

I wish to quote something further, and this perhaps will be of more interest than the remarks which I have quoted, to the people of my own province.

There was not only the order in council providing for the appointment of commissioners, but after the general election in 1891 the speech from the Throne at the opening of parliament contained the following clause:

> My advisers, availing themselves of opportunities which were presented in the closing months of last year, caused the administration of the United States to be reminded of the willingness of the government of Canada to join in making efforts for the extension and development of the trade between the Republic and the Dominion, as well as for the friendly adjustment of those matters of an international character which remain unsettled. I am pleased to say that these representations have resulted in an assurance that, in October next, the government of the United States will be prepared to enter on a conference to consider the best means of arriving at a practical solution of these important questions. The papers relating to this subject will be laid before you.

The reply to the speech from the Throne was moved by the then member for St. John (Mr. Hazen) who is now the leader of the Conservative government in New Brunswick, and Mr. Hazen then used language which—if we did not know it was used by one of these younger Conservatives who have departed from the paths trodden by their leaders not very many years ago,—one would think was the language of a supporter of the Liberal party. His speech will be found at p. 8 and following of 'Hansard' 1891, and in it he expressed pleasure as the representative of the city and county of St. John, and as a member of the Conservative party, at the announcement made by the government that they were about to enter into negotiations for a reciprocity treaty with the United States. He went on to speak of the business and social relations existing between the people of Canada and of the neighbouring republic, he expressed the opinion that it would be an advantage to both countries if a reciprocity treaty went into effect, and he concluded by saying that he felt sure it would be gratifying to the people of Canada irrespective of party that steps were about to be taken to secure reciprocity. Nobody will charge that these Conservatives were any less loyal than the men who now lead the Conservative party; no one will venture to suggest that these Conservatives were less mindful of the best interests of Canada than those who now lead the party; no one will suggest that they would negotiate for a reciprocity treaty which they thought would have a tendency to draw Canada away from her allegiance to the mother country. But, these gentlemen opposite say to us: the times have changed, and what might be good for Canada in 1891 is not good for Canada to-day. Surely that argument does not apply to the contention that reciprocity is apt to lead to dismemberment of the empire; surely, if to increase

our trade with the United States is likely to weaken our attachment to the mother country to-day, it must have had the same effect 20 years ago. Nay, Sir, there was greater danger of that 20 years ago because while Canada had then entered upon a stage of development, Canada was not so prosperous as she is to-day, and her people were not in such a position of self-reliance then as they are now. Since then, the population of Canada has increased, her resources have been developed, her trade has extended, and to-day our people are far more powerful than they then were and far better able to stand for what they believe to be the true interests of Canada and the empire. A few words as to the benefit which I believe will accrue to the maritime provinces from this arrangement. We in the lower provinces are very greatly interested in the lumbering, the agricultural, and the fishing industries. We have a great many fertile valleys where vast quantities of hay are produced, and to many farmers it would be a great advantage to sell at least a part of their hay product where they can find a good market. They have looked in the past to the United States but they have been met with a duty of $4 per ton on their hay, and there will be found on file, letters from producers of hay in New Brunswick and Quebec urging the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs then negotiating for this arrangement to secure a reduction of at least two dollars per ton in the duty on hay. It was pointed out that many farmers in these provinces would derive great benefit from such a reduction. Well, instead of getting the duty reduced by $2 per ton, the Canadian representatives succeeded in getting the entire duty wiped out and Canadian hay admitted absolutely free of duty to the American market. In the St. John river counties there is a very considerable production of potatoes, and were the duty removed the farmers of these counties would find in the United States an excellent market for their potatoes. It is a fact I believe that during the present generation there have only been two occasions, and then because of crop failures in Canada, when the price of potatoes in the United States has not been higher than the price in New Brunswick. We have very striking evidence of that in the fact that across the border opposite the counties of Carleton and Victoria, in the county of Aroostook in Maine, farms are to-day worth on the average about twice as much as farms of equal fertility on the New Brunswick side. A short time ago I made special inquiry in the county of Victoria, and the statements in this respect made some weeks ago in this House by the hon. member for Carleton were verified by statements made to me by a number of farmers. And so it is with other farm products. Make farm products of every kind absolutely free of duty, and there will be a large and profitable market for our farmers in the large cities of the New England states, and this they say, would add very greatly to the prosperity of our farmers.

Then, there is another very important interest in which our people are deeply concerned. If hon. gentlemen will look at the papers which are on file, they will find letters from gentlemen largely engaged in the lumbering business, in which they urge that, in addition to trying to get the United States to take the duty off lumber, they should also try to induce them to reduce the duty on shingles, which is now 50 cents a thousand, down to 30 cents. And these representations are not confined to lumber manufacturers of the province of New Brunswick, they also come from lumber manufacturers of the province of Quebec and the province of British Columbia. They report that the duty, which was raised by the Paine-Aldrich tariff from 30 cents a thousand to 50 cents, is very nearly prohibitive. I call to mind a letter from a large manufacturer of the province of British Columbia, who stated that, as a result of this change, quite a number of shingle mills in that province were idle; and I think representations were made from Nova Scotia as well as from Quebec, that it would seriously cripple the industry in that section of Canada. There is no duty on shingles coming into Canada. I remember that my hon. friend from the city of Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) went down to the city of Fredericton to enlighten the people there. That city happens to be the centre of quite a large lumber manufacturing industry, and he pointed out in all seriousness that as a result of this reciprocity arrangement cedar logs would be sent from New Brunswick into the state of Maine, manufactured into shingles and brought back to New Brunswick, where they would swamp the shingle market. My hon. friend did not know that for many years shingles had been admitted into Canada free of duty, and under this agreement the only concession made, is made by the United States, which is reducing the duty from 50 cents to 30 cents a thousand. Before the duty was raised to 50 cents, the shipment of shingles to the United States was a considerable factor in the prosperity of that section of Canada; and on the file there will be found a letter from the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket), who, I believe, has been going from platform to platform warning the people of that loyal county against agreeing to this arrangement, because it will tend to sap the loyalty of the people of Canada. That letter is addressed to the hon. Mr. Fielding, and

in it the hon. member for York says that he has received a communication from a very large lumber manufacturing company which does business in his constituency, and which carries on operations in some three lumber mills, calling attention to the increase which has been made by the United States in the duty on shingles from 30 cents to 50 cents a thousand, and expressing the hope that in any negotiations for the reduction of the tariff between the two countries the Finance Minister will succeed in having the duty reduced.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Expressing whose hope?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hope of the hon. member for York.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Read the letter.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If I had the file here, I would be glad to do it.

Mr. BLAIN. I understood that the hon. member for York, in this House, denied that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What did the hon. member for York say?

Mr. MEIGHEN. He denied that he was giving expression to his own opinion. He was simply communicating to the Finance Minister a letter from one of his constituents.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have read the letter, and any one reading it would take it as an assurance from the hon. member for York that in forwarding it he was entirely in accord with the sentiments expressed therein. If the hon. member for York thought that the entering into such an arrangement with the United States would tend to sap the loyalty of the people of Canada, it is a wonder that he did not say to the Minister of Finance: 'While I forward this plea on behalf of one of my constituents, yet I warn you, Mr. Fielding, that if you get the duty on shingles removed, so that these lumbermen will be able to send their shingles freely into the United States, it may tend to make them disloyal citizens; it is a very dangerous thing, and you ought to consider it most carefully before you get the United States government to reduce the duty on shingles from 50 cents to 30 cents a thousand.' The hon. member for York did not do anything of the kind.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the hon. minister be good enough to point out where any one on this side of the House has ever objected to the United States reducing the duty on wheat or shingles, or on any other commodity going into that country, or where we have ever raised any objection to their managing their own affairs in their own way?

Mr. PUGSLEY.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It has been stated in this House over and over again that it would be a dangerous thing for us to encourage the United States government to take off the duty on natural products, because it would enable the United States manufacturers to draw from Canada its natural resources and take them into the United States and there manufacture the goods which ought to be manufactured in Canada; forgetting, of course, that the United States could do that to-morrow without any arrangement if it wanted to. All that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs have done by this arrangement has been to sit down quietly with representatives of the United States government and say: Let us talk over what would be to the mutual interest of Canada and the United States to do in the way of reductions of duty. They have made no agreement which binds the people of this country for a single day after this arrangement goes into effect. They declare that this country shall be absolutely free to make any change in its tariff on the items affected by this arrangement at any time; and while they express the hope that it will be found so advantageous to the people of both countries that it will be continued for a considerable time, they both take pains to make it absolutely clear that they do not undertake to bind either the Congress of the United States on the one hand or the parliament of Canada on the other. Now, take the matter of lumber. Shall I say my eloquent friend—my interesting friend? Because when the hon. gentleman gets towards the rear part of the chamber, where there are many empty seats at times, and where he can move back and forth and give full vent to his eloquence, he certainly does become exceedingly eloquent. My hon. friend told the people at Fredericton; lumbermen who knew very well the nonsense he was talking—if he will pardon the word—he told these people that under this reciprocity arrangement our lumber would be taken into the United States, manufactured there, and sent back into Canada to compete here with the lumber manufacturers of New Brunswick. My hon. friend forgot that for many years sawn lumber has been admitted into Canada free of duty.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Before leaving that point I would like to say I was present and heard the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cowan) when dealing with the question of shingles say that their tariff is only reduced back to the old figures whereas shingles coming into Canada are free.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Shingles are not made free under this arrangement. Shingles have been free for years, and we are making no reduction.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. That is what we object to. They hold them at 30 cents. Whereas shingles coming into this country are free.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is because we prefer it that way. It has been so for several years, and it has been admitted in the interest of Canada that shingles should be free. I presume it is because the shingle interests in this country do not require any protection as against the United States. At all events I have never heard any suggestion that there should be a duty placed upon shingles, so far as Canada is concerned.

For reasons which have appealed to the government lumber has been free. There have been suggestions made at different times in regard to putting a duty upon it, but these suggestions have been very seriously opposed by consumers in Canada, and more particularly by those who live on the prairies, to whom cheap lumber is a most desirable thing. Lumber is made free under this arrangement, but the whole concession is on the part of the United States, and when you bear in mind the fact that the lumbering industry is a very important interest in the maritime provinces, you will agree with me that this is a very important concession, not only for the maritime provinces, but for all sections of Canada. It is of great importance to the province of Ontario—it is of great importance to the Ottawa valley, and it certainly is of great importance to British Columbia, because manufacturers of lumber in these provinces find a large market in the United States for their products. If hon. gentlemen will look at the blue-book they will find the exports of lumber and its products from Canada to the United States for the year ending March 31, 1910, amounted to $22,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. What were the imports?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know what the imports were. At the moment I am only dealing with the exports because this arrangement will not affect the imports for the simple reason that lumber comes into Canada free to-day.

An hon. MEMBER. What kind of lumber?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Sawn lumber. And sawn lumber forms a very important part of the lumber exports.

An hon. MEMBER. This treaty makes absolutely no difference in lumber coming into Canada?

Mr. FIELDING. None at all, but it makes a great difference on Canadian lumber going into the United States.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Might I ask the hon. Minister of Public Works if he would allow me to read this letter of Mr. Crocket's:

House of Commons,
Ottawa, March 11, 1910.

Honourable W. S. Fielding,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

Dear Mr. Fielding,—I have a communication from the Scott Lumber Company, Ltd., who operate two or three mills in my constituency, requesting me to lay before you, in connection with the recent negotiations between the Canadian and the United States governments upon the tariff matter, the representation that the recent increase in American duty upon shingles has seriously affected the business of Canadian mills, particularly in the maritime provinces. They claim that the rate of 50 cents per thousand is unreasonable and almost prohibitive, and that in the interest of this trade, our government should at least endeavour to have it reduced to the old basis of 30 cents a thousand.

I trust that if the question of revision of the two tariffs is taken up, you will bear this communication in mind.

Yours truly,
OSWALD S. CROCKET.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does that mean? What the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) does is this—the hon. Minister of Finance is about to enter into negotiations at Washington. The hon. member for York receives this communication from one of his constituents, calling his attention to the fact that the increase of duty has made importation into the United States prohibitive, and Mr. Crocket expresses the hope that the hon. the Finance Minister will bear this communication in mind during the course of the negotiations. This the hon. Finance Minister did. I have no doubt in the world that the hon. member for York was absolutely sincere when he said that it would be in the interest of the manufacturers of this country that the duty should be reduced, and, as a matter of fact the duty was reduced from 50 cents to 30 cents.

Mr. REID (Grenville). You misrepresented him before.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I will not contradict my hon. friend further than to say that his memory does not serve him correctly as to what was said.

Mr. GORDON (Nipissing). Might I ask a question? I would like to ask the hon. minister if in his opinion the following would be true reciprocity? Supposing I, as a manufacturer of shingles at the Canadian Soo send a carload of shingles over to the American Soo, and I am met at the border with a duty of 30 cents per 1000 according to the new arrangement, or a duty of 50 cents per 1000 according to the old arrangement; my competitors from the Ameri-

can Soo wish to send a carload of shingles over to the Canadian Soo and pays no duty —is that true reciprocity?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is nothing in the arrangement which would prevent Canada from making the duty just the same as in the United States.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Why don't you do it?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Because it was never thought to be in the interest of the people of Canada to have a duty on shingles. So far as I know, we have not had a duty on shingles for years and years, if we ever had. So it is with regard to sawn lumber —we have no duty on that article. The United States had a duty of $1,25 a thousand, and they have thrown off that duty entirely; the concession is wholly on the part of the United States, for Canada in that respect makes no concession.

Mr. GOODEVE. I desire to ask the hon. gentleman a question. The United States took off the duty of $1.25 on lumber and made it free, because they have a surplus. But we can supply them with shingles and they put on a duty of 30 cents. Why do they not make shingles free.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All that the shingle manufacturers of British Columbia asked was that the duty be reduced to 30 cents, it having been raised from 30 cents to 50 cents.

Mr. COWAN. I desire to correct the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley); I happen to know that that is not correct. What the shingle mill men want is an exact equality of tariff.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I can only say that I have read the files showing the petitions from the shingle manufacturers' association in British Columbia, and all they asked for is that the duty shall be reduced from 50 cents under the Payne-Aldrich tariff to 30 cents as it was previously, and that concession was obtained by the commissioners on behalf of Canada. The matter of removing the duty on lumber is of great importance to the people of New Brunswick, especially to the people of St. John. We have had in force in the United States for sixty years past what is known as the Pike law. Under that law timber could be cut in the forests of northern Maine by American citizens, floated down the river St. John to the city of St. John, manufactured there in American mills by American citizens and shipped into the United States free of duty. I think I can safely say that that has been of enormous bentfit to the port of St. John. These mills have given employment to many hundreds of men. They have given employment also to many coasting vessels in taking the lumber from the port of St.John to the ports of the United States. Under the Payne-Aldrich tariff that law was repealed and on the fifth of next month that repeal comes into effect.

Therefore, this privilege will be denied to the American citizens who are living in the city of St. John and are manufacturing their lumber there. The result will be that they will have to pay on lumber going into the United States $1.25 a thousand. I am told that, in view of the very large stumpage they have to pay to the land owner in Northern Maine and the large expense in floating the logs down to the port of St. John, this duty of $1,25 will be prohibitive and in all human probability these mills will have to close. If, however, the proposed arrangement comes into effect, lumber manufactured in Canada will go into the United States free of duty and these industries will be continued. So far as that branch of the lumber business is concerned, it is of very great importance to the people of the city of St.John. I think the same remark applies to a lesser extent to the St. Croix river which is also affected by the Pike law.

Now, with regard to this question of loyalty: I cannot understand how the loyalty of our people can in any way be affected by this arrangement except in the effect it will have upon people who will be benefited by the reciprocal arrangement. The lumber manufacturers are going to be benefited. Are they going to become less loyal to the Empire by reason of this? The hon. member for Nipissing (Mr. Gorden). I believe, ships lumber to the United States. Possibly he will not deny that he ships almost his entire output to that country.

Mr GORDON. I do not.

Mr. PUGSLEY. At any rate that is the destination of a considerable part of his output. Under this reciprocal arrangement he will be able to ship a larger quantity than at present. That is not going to affect his loyalty. I venture to say that if his lumber output were increased tenfold he would be as loyal a citizen of Canada as ever and would fight for the old flag and teach his children to love the empire just as much as he does today. It is not going to affect the loyalty of the people simply because they ship more lumber to the United States.

Mr. BRADBURY. Will that make it cheaper in Canada?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is that the argument that influences my hon. friend (Mr. Bradbury)? Does he want to prevent the manufacturer from getting the best market possible in order that he himself may buy what he wants at a cheaper rate?

You will also find on file a letter from the Riordan Paper Co. of which, I believe the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) is vice-president. The general manager of that company urged very strongly that there should be a reciprocal arrangement so far as pulp and paper are concerned. If hon. gentlemen opposite would allow this question to come to a vote instead of, by taking a possibly legitimate course—though I do not think the country will so regard it—preventing a vote being taken, no doubt the hon. member for Argenteuil would vote against the reciprocal arrangement. But if that arrangement comes into effect, I am told it will mean $90,000 a year of a profit to the company of which he is vice-president. That speaks well for his patriotism you will say. Perhaps it does; perhaps the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) may feel that the arrangement will go into effect just the same and his company will get the benefit of a reduction of duty, while he will be able still to say that he was patriotic enough to sink personal considerations at the dictates of his conscience and that he voted against the arrangement.

Mr. EDWARDS. That is pretty small.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not think so. Here is a great Canadian manufacturing industry the product of which goes largely to the American market. If the result of this arrangement is going to be to add to the profits of that company this very large sum of money, that is an important argument as applying to other like industries.

Mr. EDWARDS. But the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) gives the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) credit for being unselfish, but before he finishes his sentence he abuses him for it. That is pretty small tactics.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The criticism itself is exceedingly small but that is not to be wondered at considering the source from which it comes. Now, Sir, havng reference to these large industries, having reference to the pulp and paper industries, having reference to the lumber manufacturing industries, while the result of this arrangement would add largely to the profits of those various businesses, I do not anticipate that these profits will all go into the pockets of the manufacturers. I anticipate that as the profits of the business increase, the thousands of men who are engaged in the forests cutting the lumber, who are engaged in the streams bringing the logs down to the mills, who are engaged in the mills working and toiling to convert the raw material into the manufactured product, I presume they will share a portion of the profits which will be derived as a result of this arrangement. I assume that the workingmen as well as the employer of labour will receive benefit from the increased profits which will come to the business, and therefore to that extent thousands of the workingmen of this country will benefit as a result of this arrangement.

Mr. RHODES. When this arrangement comes into effect, how will it affect the consumers of lumber in this country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. So far as the province of New Brunswick is concerned, and I believe the same remark applies to other sections of Canada, there is plenty of lumber for the consumers of Canada, and plenty of lumber to send abroad; and if the lumber is properly taken care of, that will be the case for generations to come.

Mr. RHODES. I was not concerned about the quantity of lumber, I was concerned about the price the consumer will have to pay.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I would not object at all if the price of the natural product should be increased. I would not object if the farmer got more for his product, I would not object if the lumber manufacturer got more for his product, provided he shared it with the labouring man who helps to make his profit. For myself, I would not care if I had to pay more for it. I think it will be to the benefit of this country if the wages of the labouring men are increased, and if the labour of the farmer, the fisherman, the miner and the lumberman shall be better recompensed than it is to-day. I do not think that in this country, labour receives, or has received, its fair proportion of benefits from the wonderful development and progress which has taken place in Canada during the last 15 years. As a result of this development we have seen many people grow in wealth from being comfortable to becoming millionaires. And while the wages of the labouring men have increased, I do not think they have increased to the proportion I would like to see them increase. I trust that as a result of this arrangement, and as a result of the increased profits which will come to the farmer, the lumberman and the fisherman, the labouring men who are employed in helping to make those profits will receive their fair share of the increased benefit, as I think they ought to do.

Now, a few words more, and I will not detain the House further. My hon. friend the leader of the opposition, when he was in the west, said I want it understood that I am unalterably opposed to this arrangement, and I am opposed to it, I think he said, principally because it will tend to draw Canada away from her allegiance to the British Crown, and draw her gradually into commercial, if not political union

with the United States. I think that was about what he said, judging from what I saw in the newspapers. Now, my hon. friend the Prime Minister said, That is all nonsense. I think there should be an adjective put before the word 'nonsense.' It does seem to me difficult to understand how men can put forward such an absurd proposition as that—to say that because the people of this country can be given a wider market, because they can be given greater facilities for trade with the United States, their loyalty will be weakened, that they will be drawn away from the British Empire. I say that does seem to me a proposition too absurd to consider seriously. Why, Sir, if that were so, would Canada not be less loyal to-day than she was 15 years ago? Fifteen years ago what was the trade between Canada and the United States? It certainly was not over $150,000,000 or $200,000,000, at the outside. What is it to-day? According to the trade and navigation returns for the year which closed on the 31st of March last, our trade with the United States amounted to the enormous sum of $404,000,000.

An hon. MEMBER. Mostly imports.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What does that show? It shows that our people are trading with the United States to a vastly larger extent than they were fifteen years ago; I do not care whether the trade is in imports or exports. Our commercial relations with them are becoming more intimate, because a larger number of people are trading with the people of the United States than there were fifteen years ago. Now are we less loyal to-day than we were then? I think not. I think there never was a time in the history of Canada when the people were more loyal to the empire than they are to-day, when the young men of Canada were so ready to sacrifice their blood in defence of the old flag as they are to-day. But an hon. gentleman opposite says that our trade with the United States is mostly imports. Well, it is true. The imports were $285,000,000, and the exports were $119,000,000. Now, Sir, hon. gentlemen speak of trade going north and south. Do they bear in mind that this trade which we have to-day with the United States is more than one-half of the whole trade which Canada carries on with the entire world, that more than one-half of our total trade to-day is with the United States? Surely that must be trade going north and south. The hon. gentleman says it is mostly imports. Of course it is. Our imports are double what the exports are. What does that mean? It means that we are bringing north into Canada $285,000,000 worth of goods, and we are sending south into the United States $119,000,000 worth. Is it desirable that that state of affairs should continue? What does it mean? It means that we are paying to the United States the gold which we draw from other countries of the world for exports that we sell to them. Would it not be to the advantage of the Canadian people that we should sell to the United States, at all events, as much as we import from them? I think it would. If we find it in our own interest to import $285,000,000 worth of goods from the United States, goods coming by train and by steamer, surely if we can send goods back in return we accomplish a two-fold object, we make it more profitable for the transportation companies who will have return freights, and, therefore, the rates ought to be reduced so that we shall get our imports to the people at a cheaper rate than at present, and it would accomplish the other purpose, that we would pay by the products of Canada for the goods which we buy from the United States, instead of being obliged to send our gold there which we draw from the other countries of the world.

No one can deny that it would be to the interests of Canada that we should at least send to the United States as much as we import from them, but, as I have said, the larger trade which has grown up during these years has not in any way affected the loyalty of the people of Canada and I am one of those who firmly believe that it will be to the interests of the people of the whole of Canada that we should get larger markets for the products of our farms, our forests, our mines and our fisheries. I know that down in the province of New Brunswick we have fisheries of very great importance, of enormous value; they are handicapped by the duty which the United States have imposed upon them. If that duty were removed it would greatly add to the profits of the fishermen. Hon. gentlemen may say that that will not be to the interest of those who consume fish in Canada. I say it will make but little difference in the price of fish; but even if it does we should be willing when we can get it so easily, to confer this small benefit upon the hardy fishermen of our country, we should remove this handicap from them, and enable them to carry on their business at a greater profit than to-day. They endure great hardships, what little they earn they earn in the hardest possible way and in the face of the great possible dangers, and any thing we can do to encourage the hardy fishermen along our coasts, to make their industry more successful and to produce greater profit to them, we ought to do most cheerfully.

Mr. GOODEVE. Does the hon. minister agree with the Minister of Marine and Fisheries that the regulations of the Inter-

national Fisheries Commission will still continue in effect and that therefore the advantage that the fishermen would derive from this agreement will be destroyed by the regulations?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That has not a thing in the world to do with the matter, so far at least as the maritime provinces are concerned. The International Fisheries Regulations apply only to a very small body of water in the county of Charlotte at the mouth of the River St. Croix. It has no application to the fisheries along the eastern part of Charlotte, or the coast of St. John county or the northern coast of New Brunswick or the long sea coast of Quebec, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island. They have no application whatever because they do not affect these waters.

Mr. GOODEVE. The regulations apply there in regard to the bait and they affect British Columbia in the same way.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend I think is wrong. They apply only to fisheries in what are called boundary waters or international waters which are defined in the treaty and the regulations have no application to the larger portion of the seacoast of Canada.

One other remark with regard to the lumbering and fishing interests of the province of British Columbia. The member for Kootenay (Mr. Goodeve) says there is no market for lumber in the United States. A member of one of the largest lumber manufacturing concerns in the province of British Columbia, whose output amounts to about 875,000 superficial feet of lumber per week, enough to load a large vessel——

An hon. MEMBER. Name him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The firm of Davidson & McRae, of New Westminster. I have been at their mill, which is one of the largest on the continent of America, and I believe they operate several mills giving employment at the woods and at their various mills to a good many thousand people. I have the authority of a member of that firm for the statement that in all probability, if this arrangement goes into effect, they will find a very profitable market in San Francisco and other cities upon the western coast of the United States for their lumber and that it will mean in all human probability an added profit of about $1 per thousand upon the output of their mills.

I was also informed that the removal of the American duty on fish oil will result in a profit to one of the big fishing companies being established upon the Canadian Pacific coast of somewhere in the vicinity of $200,000 a year. These are only samples of industries which are going to be affected by this arrangement. I use the name of these large manufacturers of lumber with their authority. They did not give me the information in confidence but gave me authority to use their name in respect to this arrangement and the advantage that would accrue to the lumbering interests.

Therefore, believing as I do that this arrangement will be greatly to the interest of the producers of Canada, to the great toiling masses of the people who are represented by the farmers, the fishermen, the lumbermen and the miners, I do not see how any one who really has the best interests of this country at heart can oppose this arrangement.

Honourable gentlemen opposite have intimated this afternoon very plainly that they intend to exercise their prerogative as members of this House to prevent this question coming to a vote. They intimated that as plainly as words can intimate any thing. In the British parliament it was found necessary to take a course which was approved of by both the political parties to prevent useless discussion and to prevent a minority from taking such a course as would prevent the transaction of the ordinary business of parliament. That course was taken and had to be taken in the British parliament; that course was taken and had to be taken in the American House of representatives. It has been assumed by those who have had control of this parliament in the past that gentlemen who come here would recognize that it was their duty to have a full and a thorough discussion upon all questions which are brought before parliament. It was believed that would be the case, but it was also believed that when the time necessary for that full and free discussion had passed, gentlemen would allow a vote to be taken and allow the will of the majority to prevail until at all events the people had an opportunity of passing upon their conduct and upon the conduct of the majority. The threats which hon. gentlemen have made this afternoon tend towards almost if not quite revolutionizing the theory which has hitherto prevailed. That theory has been that gentlemen would recognize not only their rights but their duty and that is that the will of the majority shall prevail. That is recognized throughout this country as governing all assemblies, all meetings in which people are concerned, and at any meeting attended by the people of this country, whenever there has been fair and reasonable opportunity for the discussion of any question, the minority have always recognized that the view of the majority shall prevail so far at all events as that body is concerned; and so in this parliament I ask hon. gentlemen opposite whether, after hon. gentlemen have had a full

opportunity, as they have had during the time that this question has been under discussion, of expressing their views, it is not tending to destroy free parliamentary institutions for hon. gentlemen to rise as they have risen to-day and threaten that this question shall not be allowed to come to a vote until the people have passed upon it.

An hon. MEMBER. What about 1896?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I don't care what took place in 1896; I was not here in 1896. I say it is not in harmony with the principles which ought to govern parliamentary institutions that gentlemen should rise in their places and threaten, simply because their views are not the views of the majority, that there shall be no opportunity to vote upon this question, and no opportunity, in a constitutional way, of giving expressions to the views of the majority of the members of this House. That is revolutionary; it is not in harmony with the principles of constitutional government. And if as a result of the obstruction of these gentlemen; if, as a result of their threats, there shall be no opportunity of having the votes of the members of this House recorded; if it shall be necessary to consult the people before the time they ordinarily would be consulted, I venture to say that the people of this Dominion will express their opinion favourable to the government, not only with reference to this great question, which is before parliament and the people of the country, but also with reference to the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite, who although in a minority are seeking by abuse of the constitutional rules of this House to prevent the view of the majority from prevailing.

Mr. COWAN. I trust that the well-known sensitiveness of the Minister of Public Works will not be shocked if I first pay my respects to a man of less ability but of more pretentions, the Minister of Finance. This afternoon the Minister of Finance gave us an honourable instance of his veracity. Never since 1886-1887 when he declared that the welfare of Nova Scotia demanded that she should secede from confederation have we had such an honourable instance of his veracity. The Minister of Finance ventured to stand in his place on the floor of the House to-day and to declare that from the lips of opposition members of this House and from the Conservative press of Canada he had found evidence that they were afraid to go to the people. I want to tell any man in this House who has the like hardihood to distort the facts, that he cannot take the liberty that the Minister of Finance took this afternoon of spawning the brood of his diseased imagination on the floor of this House without castigation and without exposure. My conception of my duty when I became a member of this House was, that I should have a mathematical reverence for facts, and that if I was unable to draw the right inference from these facts then it was the privilege of the party opposing me to point out the defects. But I have yet to learn that it is embodied in any code of public or private morals that any man can dare to stand in the eye of the public and distort the things which are, attempt to misstate that which is a fact, and by that misstatement draw inferences which would bolster up his case. I trust that the Minister of Finance, at any rate not in my hearing again, will never again venture to do such a thing.

Mr. SPEAKER. If the hon. member is attributing to any member of this House an attempt to distort facts when addressing the House, he is not in order. I have understood the hon. member (Mr. Cowan) to convey that impression.

Mr. COWAN. Mr. Speaker, I have not charged the Minister of Finance with any such attempt. I say that he has given this afternoon another honourable instance of his veracity. Again, when he told the House to-day that he proposed to throttle and gag the will of the people and to go to the country without redistribution, he declared an intention to perpetrate the blackest injustice on western Canada that any public man ever attempted. For my own part I represent a constituency whose population is two per cent. of the whole of Canada. If my constituency were taken as the basis of representation of the House instead of 221 indifferent looking members here there would be less than fifty. I represent as many people as five ordinary members like the Minister of Public Works. Will the Minister of Finance dare to tell the people of my constituency that they should have only one voice in the councils of the country instead of the four or five they are entitled to, and on a question that reverses the policy which Canada has followed with success for the last forty-five years? Will the Minister of Finance dare to come into my constituency and tell the people that he will deprive them of their franchise and of their full voice on a question which concerns not only their future prosperity, but the destiny of Canada per se and of Canada as a part of the British Empire? If that Minister of Finance dares to come into my constituency I undertake that I will compel his candidate to lose his deposit. I am in one respect delighted to find that my appeal to the House two evenings ago has been effective.

It may be that the gentleman to whom I appealed for assistance added their efforts to mine and convinced this govern-

ment that in these dog days this is no proper place for them, that their proper place is before the people of this country giving an account of their stewardship, giving some reason for the faith that is in them that this reciprocity thing is going to advantage any part of the people of Canada. It may be, I say, thay my appeal to the younger members of the government has been effective. It may be that, without an appeal to the Minister of Public Works, he has added his influence to that of the other younger members of the cabinet to induce the government to do its duty. I did not appeal the other evening to the Minister of Public Works. I recognized that the appeal to him would need to be of a different kind from the appeal which I made to the other ministers. The other evening, when I made that appeal, we were discussing the patented device by which the Liberals of Vancouver diverted from the coffers of the Dominion treasury into their own pockets no less than a million dollars. I was not sure at that time that that diversion would awaken in the breast of the Minister of Public Works that horror which I felt it might awaken in the breasts of the other members of the government. That sum is so far beyond $135,000 that I was not sure but that instead of horror at a moral outrage, it might be chagrin and envy that I would awaken in his breast.

But before I refer more particularly to the speech of the Minister of Public Works, I wish to refer to that interesting effort on the part of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) to uncover the moss-grown tombs of 1854. With Rip Van Winkle wisdom he went back to 1854 as if the conditions of to-day were the conditions of that time, and he is going still. He has evidently forgotten that this is 1911 instead of 1854. To do more than make that short reference would be, I think, a mistake. Apart altogether from the waste of ammunition, there is but little sport in shooting at a dead goose.

I come now to the benign, the complacent Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works, feeling the sting that resulted from my short trip through New Brunswick, has come into the House and attempted to distort my statements made on the public platforms of that province.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think the expression 'attempted to distort' is not parlimentary.

Mr. COWAN. I agree, Mr. Speaker, that it does not correctly describe the minister's attempt. In New Brunswick I was endeavouring to point out the effect of this reciprocity pact. You know that they call it a pact. They say it is not a treaty, it is not a convention; the most they will allow us to call it is a pact, and I sometimes think that is an appropriate name. It is packed full of all sorts of misfortunes and evil for Canada. In New Brunswick I was pointing out to the people of New Brunswick that men like the Minister of Public Works and men like the artist in truth who spoke this afternoon, are declaring to the people of Canada that in the main essentials this is a renewal of the old treaty of 1854, with the accent on the old; and, Mr. Speaker, there is a great deal of truth in their statement. That old treaty, like this new treaty, does this. They both place natural products on the free list; but while they do that, they leave the tariff on goods not covered by the treaty twice as high, or almost twice as high, when entering the United States as when entering Canada. For example, under the old treaty of 1854 the average American tariff was 24 per cent, while the average Canadian tariff was 10¼.

Again at the present time the average American tariff is 46 per cent, while the average Canadian tariff is 24 per cent. I would point out to the good people of New Brunswick, as I venture to point out to this House, that as long as that inequality obtains between the tariff of the United States, and the tariff of Canada, so long will the effect of that treaty be to transfer the manufacturing business and the carrying trade of Canada from Canada to the United States. I pointed out in New Brunswick, and I wish to point out here, that our experience under the old treaty was that while the natural products of Canada flooded into the United States, the manufactured products of Canada were walled out of the United States by a high prohibitive tariff, but at the same time the American manufactured goods were flooding into Canada over the Canadian tariff walls like a gushing torrent from the mountainside.

I think I can almost repeat the idea I expressed there. I pointed out that it was no time for Canada to enter into a treaty of this kind with the United States, and that the time would not come for Canada to enter into such a treaty until the United States brought their tariff to a level with the tariff of Canada on all products. I mentioned the case of shingles; and let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I am not oblivious to the fact that shingles have been admitted free into Canada since the session of 1898. At the tail end of that session, when many of the members had gone home, and when interest in legislation had dwindled, a provision was sneaked through this House that American shingles should enter Canada free. Ever since that I know very well that American shingles have been coming

into Canada free, while Canadian shingles have been going into the United States by jumping a tariff wall, of 30 cents a 1000 at first and later of 50 cents per 1000.

If I might be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to disturb the peaceful slumbers of the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue, I would point out to him that if he could spare a few wakeful moments to the consideration of this question, he would find that the article in the 'Daily Times' of Victoria, under date July 12, is a little off colour in regard to the facts. In that article he says: 'It is our duty to point out that it is not a part of the proposal under the reciprocity agreement to allow American made shingles to enter Canada free.' The profundity of that article, and the wisdom displayed in it is well nigh beyond comprehension, especially in view of the fact that at page 20 of the official document setting forth the terms of this agreement between Canada and the United States, item number 502, it appears that shingles are to enter Canada free. The Minister of Inland Revenue is out in his statement merely by the omission of the word 'not' in this editorial or leader in the paper owned and edited by him. So that the hon. minister is a little wrong when he says that American shingles are not to be admitted into Canada free. Because, as a matter of fact, American shingles are to be admitted into Canada free. When he examines item 502 of the official document, I imagine that, like the good honest man he poses to be, he will see he has made a mistake, and that this is a discrimination against British Columbia, and that he will come over to our side and oppose this agreement. I knew that shingles have been free since the fall of 1898. I know at the same time that the effect of this agreement on the shingle manufacturers in British Columbia would be to compel them to locate upon the south instead of the north side of the boundary line. Because the reason with which I am endowed told me that the shingle manufacturer would not, for the privilege of paying 30 cents a thousand on his output, locate on the north side of the line when by locating on the south side of the line he could avoid payment of that 30 cents on going into the American market, and still have access to the Canadian market without paying a cent.

Mr. PUGSLEY May I ask the hon. gentleman a question?

Mr. COWAN. I should be delighted.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What hinders them from doing that now?—the Canadian market is free.

Mr. COWAN. They do it now, and have been doing it ever since this government came into power.

Mr. COWAN.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not in New Brunswick.

Mr. COWAN. Now, Mr. Speaker. I will get this convert. This Minister of Public Works has been converted before, and he shall be converted again. I believe I can give shape and form, and even beauty, to his intelligence. I want to tell that Minister of Public Works that, until 1898, the shingle mills of the west which are the shingle mills of the continent of America, were located on the Canadian side of the line. But in 1896—a black letter day for Canada—this government came into power. And because, forsooth it wanted to cater to a certain vote in Canada, it denied us in British Columbia that consideration which led us to come into the confederation, the right to reasonable protection for our staple product and free entry into the other provinces as against the country to the south. They placed shingles on the free list, and ever since that time the American shingles have been flooding the market of the prairie provinces, the legitimate market of the province of British Columbia.

Now, perhaps, the Minister of Public Works would like to ask me somthing else. I cannot help thinking—it is amongst the possibilities that the minister is actually seeking for information and that he is willing to be convinced. If so, I pause in order to give him an opportunity of asking another question. It may be that the answer I shall be able to give to his question will let into his mind a light which shall ultimately illumine the whole government and persuade them to do what is best in the interests of Canada, namely, drop this thing which is intended on the American side of the line as a scheme to encourage the transfer of the Canadian manufacturing and transportation business to the United States. Will the minister come again? I tell him the shingle mills that ought to belong to Canada have been induced by the policy of this government to locate on the American side of the line. And I tell him that this policy of reciprocity will have this effect on the one item that he has chosen as that which demonstrates that it will be in the interests of Canada to adopt this treaty. On this one item alone, I can demonstrate with mathematical accuracy that the tendency can only be what I said—to deny the workingmen of Canada any chance in the timber wealth of Canada except the rough poorly-paid work of felling the trees on the mountain side and booming them into the water or hauling them to the freight sheds for transportation to the United States to evade the payment of 30 cents a thousand on these logs for manufacturing into shingles. Have I reached the inside operations of the minister's intellectual battery. Will he go back to New Brunswick and tell the people there that my reasoning before them

is unanswerable? If he will not, let him dare to tell me now what he will say. Let him dare to tell me I am wrong. He knows that I am right. He ventured, with less regard for my reasoning powers than I think he ought to display, to tell this House that the removal of $1.25 per thousand on lumber was a boon and blessing to the lumbermen of the west. If the minister can point out to me where a British Columbia lumbermen can sell one car of rough lumber in the United States at a price above the cost of production, I will crown him with a laurel of success. Does the minister know anything about conditions in the west? Does he know that the timber possibilities of the Canadian west are 3,000,000,000, while the timber possibilities of the United States Pacific west are 14,000,000,000 feet? Does he know that the Americans have an abundance, a surfeit, of rough lumber with which they have been glutting the Canadian market at slaughter prices for years, and with which they will continue to glut our market if the conditions are not changed.

If the minister will give me the name of one lumberman in the province of British Columbia who will say that he is prepared to sacrifice the interests of Canada for the possibility of profits to the lumber industry by this pact, then I will undertake to say that the minister's ambition to climb up higher in the councils of his party will be gratified. He has chosen one man well known to me, well known to every man from British Columbia, a man whose motives I could analyse this moment if it were in the interests of Canada that I should take up the time of this House in doing so. He cannot select another man from British Columbia to back him up. He ventured to tell us that the petition of the lumbermen showed that they were in favour of this reciprocity treaty. I have in my hand the petition of the lumbermen of British Columbia, presented to the government of Canada, the only petition that the Minister of Public Works has had the opportunity of perusing, and unless he was seeing double, unless his vision was distorted, he perused that document, as I am about to peruse it now.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What I stated was that the petition of the Shingle Manufacturers' Association of British Columbia urged very strongly that we should endeavour to secure a remission of the duty on shingles from 50 cents per thousand to 30 cents. That is all they asked, and that is what I stated.

Mr. COWAN. Do I understand that the Minister of Public Works abandons his contention with regard to the lumbermen of British Columbia? He was speaking about the lumbermen of British Columbia, and he dare not in face of that record made by 'Hansard,' deny my statement, he was speaking of the lumbermen of British Columbia. I propose to read the petition to him, and to the other members of the government, to show their opinion in regard to the tariff. That petition, or resolution, reads as follows:

Whereas the coast and mountain lumber manufacturers have repeatedly brought to the attention of the Dominion government, as well as the public generally, the necessity for protection on rough lumber, with the exception of hardwoods; and

Whereas the representations of the lumbermen have had the endorsation on many occasions of every board of trade in British Columbia, and of the Canadian Manufacturer's Association; and

Whereas it is a matter of common knowledge, which the government can readily verify, that American lumber manufacturers use Canada as a convenient dumping ground for their surplus low-grade products, which at the present time is being sold in Canada from Washington, Idaho and Montana mills for less than the logs cost British Columbia manufactuers;

Whereas the American market is practically closed to Canadian lumber by reason of the protective tariff maintained by the United States government; and

Whereas the American market is known to be glutted with low-grade lumber, and is likely to be more so in the future, owing to the closer logging of timber limits; and

Whereas the lumber industry is the only industry of any magnitude in Canada not afforded some measure of protection; and

Whereas the lumber industry is the chief industry of British Columbia and its profitable operation in this province is practically made impossible through lack of protection on low-grade lumber;

It is therefore resolved that, in the judgment of the associated boards of trade of eastern British Columbia, the Dominion government is not only amply justified in placing a duty of $2 per thousand feet on rough lumber, with the exception of hardwoods, but in all fairness should do so forthwith.

Mr. FIELDING. What date?

Mr. COWAN. This was at a meeting held at Creston, British Columbia, on Thursday and Friday, January 18 and 19, 1911.

Mr. FIELDING. It does not refer to reciprocity at all.

Mr. COWAN. Of course, reciprocity was introduced on the 26th day of January, 1911.

Mr. FIELDING. The document the hon. gentleman has read deals with the general question of protection on lumber, and does not deal with the reciprocity agreement. One of its complaints is that the Americans maintain a high duty on lumber. That condition has been somewhat changed by the reciprocity agreement. Therefore, his resolution, while it has a bearing on the general question of protection on lum-

ber, has no bearing whatever on the question of reciprocity.

Mr. COWAN. It may be there is some merit in the contention of the Minister of Finance. Let me put it with a little more clearness than he put it. He says that this resolution was passed while he and the other father in Israel were closeted with President Taft in a room in Washington, and before he had announced the birth of his new born babe. His contention is that I have no proof that the view of the lumbermen remains the same.

Mr. FIELDING. I did not say anything about that, I said the resolution the hon. gentleman read was passed before the reciprocity arrangement, and had no relation to it.

Mr. COWAN. He says I have not correctly stated his meaning. I regret very much if I have not, but I fear that his explanation is confusion worse confounded. If he does not mean that that resolution expresses the real feeling of the lumber men of the west in regard to reciprocity and the duties of the government in regard to the industry of lumber what does he mean?

Mr FIELDING. I say he read that resolution as having some bearing on the question of reciprocity now before the House. I say the resolution was passed, according to his own reading of it, before the reciprocity agreement was adopted and it complains in the terms of the resolution that the Americans have maintained a high duty on lumber. I say that condition has been to some extent changed by the reciprocity agreement. If the hon. member were discussing the general question of protection on lumber then outside of this question of reciprocity the resolution would be pertinent to such a discussion, but I say it is not the policy of this government to put higher duties on lumber and the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden), speaking for his party, has never said it was the policy of the opposition, and if my hon. friend wishes to convey that the policy of his friend was to meet the wishes of the British Columbia lumbermen and put a higher duty on lumber, I say we have no evidence whatever that that is the policy of the opposition, and if any hon. member of the opposition from the prairie provinces is present he will not agree with the hon. gentleman.

Mr. COWAN. I am prepared to discuss this either in the light or in the darkness of this reciprocity proposal. I want to remind you that in 1894 the Americans put upon their statute books a statutory offer to remove the American duty on rough lumber if Canada would remove the Canadian duty on rough lumber. In the following year Canada, believing in the good faith of that offer removed the Canadian duty on rough lumber. But the Americans forgot the pledge contained in their statutory offer and did not and have not to this day removed the American duty on lumber. In 1896 a new government came into power in Canada but they did not, as we, on this side of the House had a right to expect, seek to protect the interests of Canada as they should have done by reimposing that Canadian duty on lumber when the Americans made default in their statutory promises. As a result the American lumber came flooding into Canada and the Canadian lumber was barred out of the United States by a prohibitive tariff which they had promised to remove. The Minister of Finance says that under these conditions this resolution that I have read was passed. It was passed, however, under these circumstances, that the people of the West, as well of the people of the East, knew that the Minister of Finance was chasing after the powers that be at Washington and attenpting to get a reciprocity treaty. But, nevertheless, there may be some virtue in the statement that this resolution which I have read was passed prior to his announcement of the reciprocity proposal.

However, I am fortunate in having under my hand the view of the lumbermen of British Columbia since these reciprocity proposals have been made to the people of Canada. It is the view of the lumbermen of British Columbia voiced by Mr. J. E. H. Barnet, a lumberman who has made a success of his undertakings in Ottawa as in the West, made on behalf of the lumbermen of British Columbia on July 15, and I would ask the attention of the Minister of Finance to this statement in the hope that even in this eleventh hour.

Mr. FIELDING. Later, 11.25.

Mr. COWAN. Even at this hour of 11.25 he may be induced to return from his love and his desire to hand over the fiscal independence and the tariff autonomy of Canada to the people of the United States. Mr. Barnet's statement reads as follows:

'The red, white and blue, with its present number of stars, is sufficient for me, and I am not at all anxious to add another star to our neighbour's flag with my vote,' is the opinion on reciprocity forcefully expressed by Mr. J. E. H. Barnett, who arrived here yesterday from Renfrew, when seen at the Hotel Vancouver.

Though Mr. Barnet's timber interests in this and other provinces are figured in the millions, and since timber men on this side of the boundary line are commonly credited with standing to reap considerable benefit from any prospective reciprocity treaty between Canada and the United States, Mr. Barnet is too loyal to the flag of his own country to permit him-

self to be swayed by sordid selfishness when the prosperity of the entire Dominion is at stake.

To my way of looking at it, this question of reciprocity lightly or altogether in the nature of a commercial agreement, for if such were the case I would soon be found on the side of those advocating it, but a step that is likely to create a chilled feeling between Canada and the mother country. Frankly, I believe the whole scheme is just in keeping with the almost imperial commercial policy of the United States. This reciprocity treaty is simply a bait held out to us in the hope that we will be beguiled into such a trap, under the guise of keeping dangling before our eyes an entry for our products into a market estimated at 90,000,000 inhabitants. But let the too-confident Canadian beware of the wily sons of Uncle Sam, who do not care a rap for our prosperity, but for their own. They are not so philanthropically inclined as to throw their doors wide open to us. What they will take from us is just a drop in a bucket compared to what they expect to ship into our markets. It is an absolute fact that American factories have been increased to such an extent for the past five years that if they want to continue to run at full blast they must find an additional market for their surplus products, as they put out nearly one-third more than the market of their own country can handle.'

In other words, unlike the Minister of Finance, the patriotism of the British Columbian is not measured by the price of a sack of potatoes on the Boston market, or the price of a car of lumber at the Chicago market.

The lumbermen of British Columbia are too intelligent to be fooled by a device of that kind. They realize that while $1.25 per thousand is taken off the lumber duty by the United States the effect of this treaty will be to increase the cost of living for the workingmen of Canada. If you increase the cost of living you diminish the return to labour and you diminish the purchasing power of wages. There are advocates of this reciprocity who maintain that the farmer of Alberta and Saskatchewan will get more for his wheat and cattle, but I remind hon. gentlemen that 80 per cent of the animal and agricultural products of the country are consumed in Canada, and if you increase the price of the 20 per cent sent out of the country you increase the price of the 80 per cent consumed within, and you necessarily increase the cost of living in this country. You lessen the purchasing power of wages and salary and capital; you interfere with that almost perfect equilibrium we have established in Canada between the three great industrial elements, agriculture, commerce, and manufactures, by the national policy adopted in 1878 and in force ever since. That policy has brought about a condition of general prosperity in Canada in which the farmer, and the workingman, and every citizen of the country has had full and fair share. To disturb that equilibrium is to disturb the prosperity of Canada. Under the reciprocity treaty of 1854, the effect was that the railways and steamboats were busy carrying American manufactured goods into Canada, and return cargoes to the United States of Canadian natural products, not to be consumed in the United States but to be carried by American railways to American ports and thence shipped to the markets of the world. The government of the old provinces of Canada realized that that treaty was destroying the manufacturing industry of this country and handing over the carrying trade to the United States, and in 1860 they imposed a tariff on leather goods, wearing apparel, cotton and woollen goods such as we could manufacture in Canada and with the revenue from that tariff they began to develop railway and canal systems so as to retain the carrying trade which had been diverted by the treaty of 1854. So soon as the American authorities saw that Canada was adopting that policy, there arose a cry that this was an injustice to the industries and trade of the United States, just as if this treaty is adopted it will arise again if we attempt to change our tariff on any of the articles not covered by the treaty. That cry became so persistent that in 1866 the United States abrogated that reciprocity treaty. And they abrogated that treaty in the hope and belief that it would either drive Canada into the American Union or into bankruptcy. It did neither, but it did develop a crop of secessionists like the Minister of Finance, and a crop of commercial unionists like the whole party that constituted the Liberal opposition of Canada in 1891: a crop of unrestricted reciprocity advocates, a small, demoralized crop at the present day, who form the rump and remnant of the growth of 1866.

But, notwithstanding this crop, Canada had men equal to the situation; men who developed a policy of Canada for Canadians, Canadian development for Canadian labour and Canadian capital, a policy inaugurated in 1878 and in force at the present day. Now it is proposed to reverse that policy, which has developed the home market of Canada, a market able to take care of 80 per cent of the production of Canada. And how great is that production? The yearly production of Canada is greater per head of population than the yearly production of any other country of the known world, and the price which is received for Canada's annual production, in her home market at the door of the producer, is such that it makes the average Canadian a richer man than the citizen of any other nation of Canada's population in the known world. But, Sir, this policy would reverse that. This policy would revert to the old quagmire of 1854. It would

ask us to return to that which in 1854 was a necessity, but which in 1911 would be a curse. How foolish, how fatal to the future of Canada is this blind indifference to the fact that this is 1911 and not 1854. When I heard the Minister of Finance in January last expound the policy of Canada in 1854, I was reminded of my student days, when I studied with peculiar interest the works of Washington Irving, and wondered if our Minister of Finance in Canada to-day was but the reincarnation of Rip Van Winkle. Had he forgotten that fifty-seven years have expired since 1854, that conditions have changed, that Canada has forged ahead to the very forefront of the commercial nations of the world, that Canada no longer is on the verge of bankruptcy, that her exchequers are no longer crippled, that her people are no longer scattered communities spread in sparse settlements from the Atlantic to the Pacific. I wondered if the Minister of Finance had been asleep for the last 57 years. I wondered if, with the prophetic eye of a seer, Washington Irving had predicted the life and work and experience of a Minister of Finance of Canada. And, again, when I remembered that this is a scheme for transferring the tariff jurisdiction of Canada from Canada to the United States, as the hon. member for South York (Mr. Maclean) declared to-day, I bethought myself that this may be true. I remembered that the effect of this treaty was to destroy that which the Premier of Canada, with charming lip-loyalty, has declared to be a cardinal principle with him, British preference. I remembered that the mother land sent to us last year $3,500,000 worth of metals of different kinds, and that the effect of this treaty would be to wipe out and destroy for ever that British preference. I remembered that the mother land last year sent to us $2,000,000 worth of automobiles, clocks, watches and such goods, and that the effect of this treaty, if ratified, would be to reduce that British preference by at least one-half. But, Mr. Speaker, I remembered that the effect of this treaty would be to establish a new precedent in the history of the British Empire. For the first time one of the members of that empire is bargaining with a foreign country to exclude the rest of the British Empire from the preference which by that bargain this country is getting in that foreign country; in other words, by a bargain with a foreign country, we are agreeing with that country to discriminate and differentiate, not only against the mother land, but against the other parts of the British Empire.

In 1892, James G. Blaine, who was at that time a great power in the United States, made a proposal of that kind to the Canadian government. The government of that day was a Conservative government, and they rejected that proposal with scorn, on the ground that it involved a differentiation and a discrimination against the mother land. When I remembered that I was unable to understand why the Prime Minister of Canada should allow these things in favour of a foreign power and discriminate against the mother land. But, Sir, the explanation of the attitude of this government and of this premier is to be found in the declaration of the premier in London, in the month of June, when he said in effect, that we, base Canadians, were mere fair weather members of the British Empire, willing to accept the protection and the benefits that pertained to a member of the British Empire, but unwilling not only to share in the common interest and defence of the empire, but even to take counsel with the other members of the British Empire in regard to that common interest and that common defence.

Mr. LOGGIE. I have not yet said anything on this important question before the House so far, so perhaps I may express my views. I have listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, but I failed to take in any real argument made by him against this proposed trade arangement with the United States. The argument used by hon. gentlemen opposite against this arrangement is that we have opened up markets with the United Kingdom, and that to divert our trade from the United Kingdom to the United States would not be in the interests of Canada. I would like to remind hon. gentlemen that if they look at the schedules they will find that there are a great many commodities exported by Canada which have no world market value, We have no market value, for instance, for many species of our fish in the United Kingdom, and we must look to the United States as our market for these species. I might also tell hon. gentlemen that if it be true that we have no market value for certain commodities, we must force these commodities on the markets of the United States, and inasmuch as the United States are willing to rebate the duty it will inure to the benefit of the producer in this country of certain commodities. From the northern portion of New Brunswick, for example, there are about 300 carloads of frozen smelts exported to the United States during the course of a year. The duty on these 300 carloads is approximately $50,000, which is paid into the United States treasury. Under the new arrangement that $50,000 will inure to the benefit of the Canadian fishermen.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. I thought the consumer paid the duty.

Mr. LOGGIE. On general principles that doctrine is good, but it does not apply in this instance. I can give you concrete examples of cases where the consumer would get the benefit of the reduction of duty. I am now giving you an instance of where the Canadian fishermen will get the benefit of the duty remitted by the United States because the species of fishes I allude to are those which have no world market value. Therefore you force them on the market of the United States. They are sold on commission, and the returns are made less the charges. If no duty is collected so much more money comes back to the pockets of the fisherman.

Mr. MIDLEBRO. Are they not saying on the other side that if they pass reciprocity they will get their fish just so much cheaper?

Mr. LOGGIE. I am not particularly concerned with what they are saying on the other side. I think as the Minister of Finance says, they are making the best show of it.

I can demonstrate what I am saying in regard to species of fish which have no world market value. I do not mean, of course, that all the fish we export has no world market value, for I know different. Let me explain what I mean. There is no duty at the present time on lobsters either in the shell or in cans, but if there was a duty on canned lobster it would inure to the benefit of the United States consummer. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the Canadian fisherman and the Canadian lumberman will receive a large proportion of the duty remitted by the United States.

The hon. gentleman made a reference to the duty on shingles going from British Columbia into the United States, and stated that there was no duty on shingles coming from the United States into Canada. He went on to say he did not think that was reciprocity. I would like to remind the hon. gentleman that shingles are not the only item in the schedules covered in that way. Take for instance, cement, which is just the very reverse of shingles so far as the duty is concerned. While there may not be real reciprocity in shingles, the same thing applies to cement in the opposite direction. This disposes of the argument of my hon. friend. As the hon. the Finance Minister explained, there are a few commodities which neither country was prepared to put at the same rates of duty, but they are very few, as the schedules will show.

That seems to me the argument they are using in their press; and yet two hon. gentlemen opposite have stated on the floor of the House that there was no fault to find with the United States remitting their duties. If that be true, what is there in this arrangement? Is there anything more in it than Canada remitting a portion of the duties that are collected today?

Then, they tell us we have no mandate to reduce the rates of duty. But we are reducing duties by $2,500,000, and that money will go into the pockets of the people. We are lessening the cost of living to that extent. We certainly have a mandate to reduce the cost of living and to cut down duties on the necessaries of life as much as possible. It was my great pleasure to be in this city in 1893 at the convention of the Liberal party, and I can distinctly remember the plank in the platform asking for a tariff for revenue only, and also the plank in favour of reciprocal trade relations with the United States in natural products and in a certain well defind list of manufactured articles. What is this trade arrangement but a fulfilment of the promise made in 1893? We went to the country in 1896 and the country put us in power. We tried to put that policy into execution and whose fault was it that at first we did not succeed?

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma). Did you do it?

Mr. LOGGIE. I am surprised at the hon. gentleman asking me the question. He knows very well that as soon as the Liberal party came into power they framed the tariff known as the British preference and they also sent a commissioner to Washington in the endeavour to carry out their promise. And when our overtures were not received by the United States, our Premier, with the dignity that be fits his position, said that overtures in the future must come from the United States. And when, in a critical condition of the trade of this country some 12 months ago, when the United States threatened to put on a surtax on our exports going to that country did we not do our duty? I fail to understand the letter which has been referred to, written by Mr. Crocket. The duty on shingles is 50 cents a thousand, and with the surtax it would have been 75 cents a thousand. It is a thing to be dreaded. The proposed policy of the United States meant that whereas. on the fish we are sending to them they collected duties amounting to $500,000, under the surtax they would have collected another $250,000, out of the pockets of the people of this country for the effect of the surtax would have been to increase the duty 50 per cent. So, I say, it was in the interest of the country that some arrangement should be arrived at. And it was arrived at with very little sacrifice on the part of Canada. The principal article on which we made a reduction was cotton seed oil, and I do not think that reduction would hurt any manufacturer in Canada. So, I say, we have carried out the platform of the Liberal party adopted

in 1903, and on which we came into power. In 1896 when this government came into power, the government was collecting from the consuming public about $19 for every hundred dollars' worth of goods that went through the Customs House.

Last year we collected about $16 on every hundred dollars' worth, which is a reduction of about 15 per cent. And if this arrangement goes through, it will mean a further reduction of about three per cent—that is, we collect about $70,000,000 through the Customs House and under this arrangement this would be reduced by about $2,500,000, which is about three per cent. Yet these hon. gentlemen have the audacity to tell us that we have no mandate, though we are carrying out the platform on which we returned to power and which we have repeated at every election. I admit that the question of reciprocal trade relations was not a live issue during the last three elections. But it was for the very reason I have already explained—that the Prime Minister had said that overtures in the future must come from the United States. But when those overtures were made we were called upon to act in accordance with the principles laid down by the Liberal party. Nor was this principle confined to the Liberal party, for, in 1894 a law was placed on the statute book making an open offer to the United States of reciprocal trade relations, in fish and certain other natural products. And yet, these hon. gentlemen tell us, forsooth, we have no mandate for reciprocity. It is greatly to the benefit of Canada to have many of these duties removed, because in the articles affected we find a market only in the United States. This is true of a certain species of our fish—we have no market except the home market and that in the United States. We have practically no market for shingles except in the United States, and the same is true of laths. Inasmuch as we must market these articles there, duty or no duty we say it is a benefit to our people to have free access to this market of 92,000,000 of people. It will be a boon to us when this trade arrangement is finally put into effect.

For the opposite side, I would say that it would be a great calamity to Canada at large and a great calamity to the maritime provinces. Another argument alleged by hon. gentlemen on the other side is that this trade arrangement would interfere with capital invested in our great transportation companies; it is alleged that the commodity of wheat will go north and south instead of east and west. Now, I would like hon. gentlemen to be reasonable in their criticisms. Does it not go north or south to-day? Is it not a fact that a man can buy a hundred carloads of wheat in Winnipeg to-day and take them down to Minneapolis, and have it ground, and exported to any foreign market, and have ninety-nine per cent of the duty he paid refunded? Is it not a fact that the same hundred carloads of wheat can go through in bond for export without any handicap whatever? So what difference will it make?

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. What is the good of reciprocity if it does not go south?

Mr. LOGGIE. One of the good things I see in it is that the people of Canada will be two and a half million dollars richer as far as consumers are concerned.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Why?

Mr. LOGGIE. Because the duties are reduced to that extent, and it will decrease the cost of living to that extent.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Then you mean that the wheat will go to the United States?

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. gentleman will see by the schedule that there are several hundred thousand dollars duties collected on pickled beef, pickled pork, lard and so on, they are reduced by three-quarters of a cent per pound, and it means that the consuming public will get the benefit of that. Then the producing public will get the benefit in a large share of the duty that is to be remitted by the United States. I do not mean to say that all commodities will be as cheap under this trade arrangement as they are to-day. For instance, on the native fish which I was referring to, the duty, when remitted, will inure to the benefit of the Canadian producer. If the Canadian consumers consume the native fish, they will pay more for their native fish. But there is another side to that story. There is quite a large amount of fish consumed which Canada cannot produce, and we are getting it free from the United States under this trade arrangement. For example, there are about 1,000 gallons of shell oysters coming into Canada every day of the year; the consuming public will get these oysters for the duty less. Canada is not in the same position as the United States regarding these commodities. We are a population of about eight millions and they have a population of ninety-two millions, and they have no surplus commodities such as natural products named that they force on the Canadian market. Canada produces a number of commodities that she must force on the Unitel States market, and these commodities that we force on the United States market the remitted duty will inure to the benefit of the Canadian producer, the fishermen, or the lumbermen, or whoever he may be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say one word about this loyalty cry. It does seem

to me childish to say that because I can send a carload of smelts into the United States and market them there without paying duty into the United States treasury, and that I can get that much more money and pay that much more to the fishermen, I will be less loyal than if the United States taxed me. I cannot see any reason for such a contention. It is nonsense to say that because the United States is willing to receive commodities from Canada that Canada will send there, duty or no duty, we must be less loyal to the old land from which we came. So far as I am concerned, I cannot conceive where there is any basis for the argument that we will be less loyal with reciprocal trade relations as now proposed than we were before. If there is any argument I have not heard it, except the argument that we can make by holding up the flag and expressing sentiments of loyalty. But after all, if we are logical we will give some reason why this arrangement will make us less loyal than we are to-day. So far as I am concerned, my loyalty is just as good as that of hon. gentlemen opposite. Of course, I have no objection to their talk, they have their own opinion, and that is all I have. I do not think they believe what they say. I am afraid that they do not really believe the story they are telling the people as to the possibilities of annexation, I am pretty sure they do not mean it. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat said that the tariff prevents our manufacturers placing their products on the United States market. I would like to know what that has to do with reciprocity in natural products. This trade arrangement does not interfere with manufactured goods to any great extent. Agricultural implements, it is true, are affected, some of them are reduced by Canada two and a half per cent and others five per cent; but with those exceptions, practically speaking, manufactured articles are not touched at all.

Mr. STANFIELD. What about condensed milk?

Mr. LOGGIE. I do not know whether condensed milk is touched at all.

Mr. STANFIELD. It is reduced only fifty per cent.

Mr. LOGGIE. I do not know about condensed milk. I believe cotton seed oil has been reduced and made practically free, also typesetting machines. So I think the hon. gentleman is quite in error when he speaks of any large reduction on manufactured articles. I have read the schedules over very carefully, and so far as I recollect, there is practically no reduction on manufactured articles. So the argument that the United States bars by her heavy duties Canadian manufactured articles, does not apply. We are only making reciprocal trade relations in natural products, that is, the products of the sea, the farm, forest and the products of the mine.

Mr. COWAN. The hon. member put a question to me a moment ago, and I am curious to know if he really wants to know why this arrangement will work against the interests of Canada.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend rises to a point of order it is quite right, but not otherwise.

Mr. COWAN. He has put a question, if he wants me to answer I will do so.

Mr. LOGGIE. I have heard the speech of the hon. gentleman, and those of other hon. gentlemen. I confess that I may be very dense, but I have been unable to grasp any real reason——

Mr. COWAN. I know that.

Mr. LOGGIE. The gentlemen may have it in their minds, but they surely have not expressed it.

Mr. EDWARDS. During the last week it was quite evident to this House that if the government have no mandate from the people in regard to the introduction of this reciprocity pact, a mandate had gone forth from the Prime Minister to his followers that they were to keep quiet, and I am under the impression that if the right hon. gentleman had been present in the last five minutes, and listened to the last speaker, he would have reintroduced that mandate, and kept them quiet still longer.

I wish to give one or two reasons why I think the position taken by hon. gentlemen opposite is not a logical one. First I shall refer to something said in reference to myself by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley). That hon. gentleman referred to the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) as one who would benefit to the extent of $90,000 a year on lumber in the event of this compact going through. Notwithstanding that large financial benefit, when this hon. member opposed this pact the minister went on to impugn his motiyes for doing so. I ventured to suggest that that was a position unworthy of the Minister of Public Works. The hon. gentleman replied that he was not surprised, that such criticism should come from me. It is true I have not won for myself a name such as has the Minister of Public Works. I have not had the privilege nor do I want the privilege of taking part in any sawdust wharf transactions or McAvity deals. I would be perfectly willing for the rest of my life to occupy the humble position I do rather than to find myself in the limelight by such means as

he has adopted. I can readily understand that to the Minister of Public Works the matter of an hon. gentleman placing his country and principle ahead of a matter of $90,000 would be something out of the question. We can all understand that would be something entirely foreign to the course he would pursue.

I have been somewhat interested to hear the hon. gentleman refer to Liberal principles. I have here a campaign document circulated very extensively by the Liberal party previous to the last general election, entitled: 'Party government in Canada, a western Liberal view.' Without passing any opinion on the contents in detail I would say it is on the whole very well written. There are one or two expressions in it which I wish to call to the attention of the hon. gentlemen opposite. The writer of this pamphlet referring to responsible government says:

> The counting of the ballots on election night decides not only who shall govern during the succeeding parliamentary term but how they shall govern. The election of representatives to parliament is, in effect, a plebiscite or popular vote, rejecting or continuing the line of policy upon which the affairs of government, have, up to that moment, been administered. A general election is a sitting of the highest court of appeal, the court of last resort on all public questions. The decision given takes effect at once and in practice is only reversed at a future election.

Therefore, we have a guiding principle of our system of government that the election of a parliament decides the policy of the party which is to govern. By the proposal introduced by this government, if this reciprocity pact is put through at the present time, it seems to me it is placing the cart before the horse, that the government would put through a policy on which the people have given no decision, on which the people have not been consulted, and after the compact had been put through then the people would be consulted as to whether they liked it or not. That would be an entire reversal of the principle of responsible government as here set forth. The writer says further:

> The real question decided by the vote at a general election is not whether certain members shall be elected or a certain government returned but what line of general policy or particular policy shall be followed, the decision being given by the individual voters at the polls according to their own views and interests.

Surely if that principle was right previous to 1908 it is the proper principle to follow now, to give the public an opportunity to express an opinion on this at a general election, the only time at which the people can have an opportunity to express an opinion. Further the writer says:

> We cannot have successful responsible government without party, especially honest parties with whom principles are the end of party existence and not merely the means to party success. The evil of the party system is not in its use but in its abuse.

I commend that to the consideration of hon. gentlemen opposite, and ask that if the policy they are pursuing now is not rather a means to an end than a following of well known and definite principles.

One other paragraph in this pamphlet. Referring to the matter of the old fight in 1891 he says:

> As Canada was entirely an exporter of natural products she clearly had the advantage, there was no hope of securing a renewal of the old treaty of 1854. The only possibility of securing free entrance of Canadian farm products into the United States was by giving free or preferred entrance to United States manufactures to Canadian markets.

That is the justification given for the course pursued in 1891 when the policy of the Liberal party was unrestricted reciprocity. Then it was set before the people that the only way in which we could get free entrance to the United States for natural products was to give a free entrance for American manufactured products to Canada. It seems to me that policy is now turned the other way round, and they are taking as the first step free trade in natural products to be followed by its logical conclusion, free trade in manufactured products.

We find the Liberal party following one course at one time and another course at another time, but each leading to the one end, namely, commercial union or free trade between Canada and the United States and the establishment of a common tariff on the North American continent against the rest of the world. It has been stated that if this compact goes into effect it will inure to the benefit of the farmers of Canada. If agricultural conditions in the United States are so much better than in Canada I ask any member of the government to tell me why it is that in the state of New York in the last ten years there have been 12,070 abandoned farms and 775,000 less acres of improved land; why is it that in Pennsylvania in the last ten years there have been 5,854 abandoned farms and 549,000 acres less of improved land in 1910 than in 1900; why it is that in the state of Ohio there have been 5,386 abandoned farms in the last ten years and 34,000 less acres of improved land in 1910 than in 1900; why is it that in the state of Vermont there were 506 abandoned farms in the last ten years and 494,000 less acres of improved land in 1910 than in 1900; why in New Hampshire there have been 2,411 abandoned farms in the last ten years and a decrease of 150,000 acres in the improved

acreage; why is it that in the state of Massachusetts in the last ten years there have been 1,203 abandoned farms and a decrease of 130,000 acres in improved acreage. Why is it that in these six states just across the line there have been in the last ten years 27,380 abandoned farms and a decrease of the improved acreage amounting to 2,132,132 acres. These are official figures from the advance sheets issued by the Census Bureau at Washington and sent to me by Mr. Durand Chief Director of the United States Census Bureau. These are pertinent questions to ask those who argue that this reciprocity pact will advantage the Canadian farmer. Why is it that in the state of Massachussetts in 1909, 38 per cent of the farms were mortgaged and that in 1910, 41 per cent were mortgaged. And yet Massachusetts is alongside the Boston market so much vaunted by hon. gentlemen opposite, and it is within a few hours run of New York, Brooklyn, Pittsburg, Philadelphia and other large centres of population. Our people are being told in Ontario that if they had an opportunity of getting to the markets on the other side of the line the conditions in Canada would be similar to the conditions in the United States, but if the result of reciprocity is that they are to have in Canada conditions like those I have mentioned in the United States we don't want anything of this kind because conditions in Canada are infinitely better than they are on the other side of the line. And, yet, hon. gentlemen who advocate this pact offer no argument to answer such facts as I have presented. Do these gentlemen think it a fair deal to the farmers of this country to submit them to competition with people who have an advantage in climatic conditions? I can understand why people in certain parts of the world are in favour of free trade, but I cannot understand how any one truly interested in the prosperity of the Canadian farmer can advocate free trade. Under this pact the farmers of the Argentine Republic will be allowed to send their stuff into our market. The population of the Argentine is largely composed of Spanish, Italians and Indian natives and the labourer is paid 64 cents a day out of which he pays his board. The people of the Argentine do not have to build expensive houses nor buy fuel nor heavy clothing to protect themselves from cold, nor stables nor barns to protect their stock which run in the open during the entire year, nor, have they to maintain the high standard of civilization Canadians have, nor do they feel the responsibility of educating their children and beautifying their homes as we do. Nothing can be more unfair than to ask the farmers of Canada to compete with the farmers of the Argentine and other countries similarly circumstanced. As to our wheat going to the American market, if it does go there the by-product of our wheat will go across the line also, and I would remind hon. gentlemen that the price of bran and shorts in Canada to-day is $6 and $7 a ton lower than in the United States, bran being quoted all through May and June in the United States at from $29 to $30 a ton and white shorts at $34 a ton. If this pact goes through the Americans will have the benefit of the shorts and the farmers of Canada will have the shortage, and instead of the people of Ontario paying $23 and $24 a ton and the American $29 or $30 a ton the conditions will be reversed and the Canadian farmer will be paying the higher price. Add to that the advantage they have over us in the matter of climate and the abundance of corn which we cannot raise as they can, and give to them these advantages in the raising of cattle, and the farmers of Canada will be put out of business entirely.

Mr. NESBITT. We will take our chances.

Mr. EDWARDS. It is all right for hon. gentlemen in this House to say they are willing to take their chances, but it is only fair to the people of Canada to give them an opportunity to say whether they are willing to take those chances or not.

An hon. MEMBER. Do not worry about the farmers.

Mr. EDWARDS. I am not worrying about the farmers at all. So far as the section where I live is concerned, the farmers who understand this matter have absolutely no use for it whatever, and I have every confidence that if hon. gentlemen opposite would submit it to the farmers of this country, they would find that they would not endorse the position they take. The fact that they are not willing to submit it to the people is a clear evidence that they have not any confidence in the policy that they are advocating at the present time.

Motion agreed to, and House went into committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. SMYTH moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Motion agreed to, and committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.40 a.m. Tuesday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

TUESDAY, July 25, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Three o'clock.

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE—MORNING SITTINGS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER moved:

That from this date to the end of the session, the House shall meet on every sitting day at eleven o'clock in the morning, and that in addition to the usual intermission at six o'clock p.m., there shall be also an intermission every day, including Wednesday, from one to three o'clock p.m.

Mr. SPROULE. There are several Bills still on the paper and it can only be known to the government whether they intend to go on with them. If these Bills are to be gone on with and if others are coming up, it would necessarily involve changing the time of the meetings of the committees. I think that the right hon. Prime Minister should give us some information as to what Bills it is intended to go on with, because the committees must, if these Bills are to be gone on with, do their work at some time and this will be taking up a portion of their time. The Railway Committee, for instance, is said to be meeting to-morrow. I think it is at half past ten, but it usually meets at eleven. If there are any of these Bills that have to go to these committees, it will necessarily involve the changing of the time of the meeting of the committees.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The intention of the government is to go on with the measure that is before the House with regard to the reciprocity agreement. Everything will depend upon the result of that. If we pass it in a short time we can take up other measures. If we were not to pass it in a short time the government would have to consider the course we would have to take.

Motion agreed to.

RESIGNATION OF DR. J. G. RUTHERFORD.

On the orders of the day being called:

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to repeat the inquiry I made yesterday as to the resignation of Dr. J. G. Rutherford.

Mr. FISHER. Dr. Rutherford has handed me his resignation, which, however, has not been acted upon.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is he still discharging the duties of his office.

Mr. FISHER. Yes.

Mr. SMYTH (Algoma)

SOREL SHIPYARD—OFFICIAL INQUIRY.

Mr. MONK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up the inquiry I made yesterday respecting the report of the commissioner who was appointed to inquire into the state of affairs at Sorel. Has my hon. friend received the report, and would he deposit it on the table of the House?

Mr. BRODEUR. I made inquiries and I found the following: Immediately after I gave instructions to hold that investigation, Mr. Boyle, inspector of agencies, went to Sorel and he has been there for more than a month. Mr. Boyle, who is now absent, will return in a few days and his report will likely be ready then.

PREPARATION OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would like to ask the government to lay upon the table of the House a statement as to the voters' lists. A representation has been made to me that the voters' lists for a number of constituencies have been printed and have been delivered to the members or to the defeated candidates. I have no complaint to make in the matter in regard to my own case because the lists were sent to me, I think, about four weeks ago, but there are some complaints in regard to others. I would like to have laid on the table of the House a statement of the ridings for which the voters' lists have been printed, completed and delivered and a further statement as to when it is expected they will be ready for those ridings which have not been served in that way up to the present time.

Mr. MURPHY. I will have much pleasure in having a statement prepared and submitted such as my hon. friend has asked for.

NEWSPAPER STATEMENT WITH REGARD TO QUEBEC MEMBERS.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of the House to a report which was published in the Montreal 'Gazette' on Monday as a special from Ottawa. It reads as follows:

Ottawa, July 23 (special).—The revolt of the supporters of the government from the province of Quebec against the calling of the extra session in midsummer for the sole purpose of carrying on a hopeless attempt to put through the reciprocity agreement, does not show any signs of dying down.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT:

Up to Friday a large number of French Canadian Liberal members had ignored the urgent call of the whips and failed to put in an appearance at Ottawa.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT:

The indemnity has practically run out, and they do not see the imperative need of sitting day after day, gagged, in the overheated Chamber while Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Fielding continued the farce of passing the reciprocity pact. It is well known that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was nettled at the result of the division on Tuesday——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT:

—when the normal majority was cut down to 16 on a straight party vote.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT. We must consider that the applause coming from the other side is an indication that this article meets with the approval of these hon. gentlemen.

There were only sixteen of the rank and file of the Liberals in the House, when the vote was taken, and seven only were paired. With the opposition determined to bring up from day to day matters of public importance on the motion either to go into Committee of Ways and Means or Supply, and follow these up with motions of censure and want of confidence, a strenuous effort is being made to whip the Quebec men into line.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT:

The situation in which the government finds itself is decidedly unpleasant.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT. I am very glad to hear this applause. We will make good use of it in time.

There is demoralization in its ranks; Laurier's control of his solid Quebec majority is vanishing;——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT:

—discipline is lacking, and those who are in attendance are chafing under the action in bringing them back when they could be much better employed, according to their way of thinking, in canvassing their constituents in view of the imminent elections.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TALBOT. The Montreal 'Gazette' is a paper for which I have had, for a great number of years, a great deal of respect and admiration. It is quite evident that of late bad company has corrupted its good manners. I must now say to you, Mr. Speaker, that my comment shall be very short because this article is contemptible, malicious and untrue in every particular. I do not know who is the author of this dispatch, but I hope that it is not the reporter of the press appointed to sit in this gallery and to occupy a place in the company of gentlemen.

It is quite true that French Canadian members of this House coming from the province of Quebec are not over burdened with wealth but there is one thing that I can say and which will appeal to the fair minded men on the other side of the House, and I hope they are many, that it is not money which brings us here in this House. We are under a strong feeling that we are discharging our duty before the country and I have to say that if the reporter of the 'Gazette', appointed in the gallery is the author of this article he deserves the censure of this House.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska). —(Translation.)—Mr. Speaker, the article of which the hon. member for Bellechasse complains is not an isolated one, but forms part of a plan of campaign. As a matter of fact, to-day's Montreal 'Gazette' contains the same unpleasant insinuations. Quebec Liberals are accustomed to the calumnies of the Tory press, and this new exhibition does not disturb us; it will, however, serve to show the electors of the province what measure of justice they may expect from such opponents.

An analysis of the vote of the 18th July, Mr. Speaker, will show that at least as many French Canadian Liberals were in their seats on the first day following recess as members from other provinces, Liberal or Conservative.

There are in this House 220 members exclusive of the Speaker. The vote taken on that day gave the following result: 61 Liberals and 45 Conservatives. Only 106 members voted therefore, less than half of the whole House. The opposition mustered 45 votes out of a total of 88 members.

Allow me to call your attention to the fact that out of the Conservative contingent from the province of Quebec two members only were present on that day, the member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), who is the party whip, and the hon. member for St. Ann's (Mr. Doherty); the ten other French Canadian representatives of His Majesty's opposition in the province of Quebec were all absent. The hon. member for Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) was not there, nor was the hon. member for Drummond and Arthabaska (Mr. Gilbert), the champion of the new doctrine in the province of Quebec.

But the narrow fanaticism of the 'Gazette's' views are more especially apparent in the vile insinuation that French Canadian Liberal members from Quebec were not here because they had no more indemnity to draw. I defy the 'Gazette' and all the Tory press of the country to point out one single French Canadian Liberal member who ever publicly or privately made such a dishonest declaration. Such calumnies will not help to maintain among the voters of the province of Quebec that reputation

for fairness and moderation which the 'Gazette' had acquired. In any case there must be no misunderstanding on this point. The Liberal members from the province of Quebec are here, and here they will remain until the end of this important parliamentary struggle, and when the fight is transferred to another field, they will be found in the forefront of battle.

THE CENSUS—OMISSIONS IN ENUMERATION.

Mr. MACDONELL. Is the Minister of Agriculture aware that in Toronto, in addition to many incidental and individual inaccuracies in the census, a whole section of Rosedale has apparently been omitted, a very large part of North Toronto. A full account of this is given in the Toronto News. I would urge that the minister take the necessary steps to have that omitted district visited by the census people so that it may be included in the census. The newspaper states that they have gone to much pains to ascertain and verify the correctness of that statement.

Mr. FISHER. I need not say that any such inaccuracy as that will be carefully investigated and if the statement is found to be correct immediate steps will be taken to remedy the omission.

IMPORTATION OF AMERICAN FARM LABOURERS.

Mr. MACDONELL. Has any order in council been passed suspending the immigration regulations between ourselves and the United States so as to permit agricultural labourers to come into this country without being handicapped or bothered with the usual immigration questions and interrogations during the harvest so as to permit American labourers to enter Canada to assist in reaping the harvest.

Mr. OLIVER. There is no order in council necessary. We admit agricultural labourers coming from the United States during harvest or at any other time. There are no restrictions in regard to money qualifications upon people coming from the United States or any other country into Canada for farm work.

Mr. MACDONELL. I understand that farm laborers are subject to certain restrictions. Have those restrictions been suspended recently for the purpose of permitting those people, as well as any other American people, to come into this country?

Mr. OLIVER. There are no restrictions as far as I am aware in regard to farm laborers coming in, except the restrictions imposed by statute, which are not removable by order in council

Mr. LAPOINTE.

Mr. MACDONELL. There has been no order in council recently?

Mr. OLIVER. No.

ELECTIONS IN NORTHERN ONTARIO.

Mr. ARTHURS. I wish to call the attention of the ministry to an article appearing in the Montreal 'Star' entitled:

To-morrow's caucuses expected to determine question of election.

The last clause of this article reads:

While till to-morrow nothing will be conclusively known, the present outlook is for a speedy termination of parliament and polling at the end of August or beginning of September. In that event it is quite probable that elections in the Ontario constituencies with unorganized districts would be deferred. The seats are now all held by Conservatives. Under the statute, the lists for these districts are to be revised annually, between August 1st and October 15, unless otherwise ordered by special proclamation. The latter appears in Saturday's 'Canada Gazette' and it fixes the time for revision between July 18 and September 18. This is significant of what is coming.

I would ask whether there is any truth in this article, whether it is the intention of the government, in the event of an election coming on immediately, to defer the elections in the northern part of Ontario. There is absolutely no need for doing so, the people of northern Ontario should have exactly the same rights as any other citizens of Canada. They have already been put to the trouble of having special lists prepared where the ordinary lists are quite sufficient. I spoke to the enumerators in my own district after the last revision, and I found that in seven polling subdivisions there were only two changes, and these two were of men moving from one polling subdivision to another. It is also true that large numbers were added in bush polls. The Ontario lists are prepared on a far better system than the enumeration made by this government. There is absolutely no reason, legal or otherwise for deferring the elections in northern Ontario. The people of northern Ontario are willing to have an election, we are prepared to go to the country on the issue now before parliament, but we desire to have an absolutely fair chance.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. There is absolutely no occasion for such a question. My hon. friend knows that the election when it takes place, in northern Ontario, and everywhere else, will take place according to law.

Mr. CURRIE (North Simcoe). The answer of the Prime Minister appears to me to be entirely non-committal, it does not convey anything. The right hon. gentleman was asked if the elections would be

held in the ridings in northern Ontario before the lists were prepared. His answer was that the elections would be held according to law. What we want to know is: Will the elections in those ridings be held before the lists are prepared, or will the elections be deferred—yes or no? If the elections are going to be deferred, the Prime Minister can take refuge in the quibble that that is according to the law; but if it is according to law it is not according to justice, and I think, in justice to the House, and the country he should state distinctly whether the elections in those ridings are going to be held at the same time as the other elections, or are they going to be deferred?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend knows that under the statutes elections can be deferred in certain constituencies and not in others. The constituencies of northern Ontario are not among those in which the elections can be deferred.

Mr. BARKER. I wish to call the Prime Minister's attention to important changes which have taken place in east and west Hamilton since the last election. I called the attention of the Secretary of State to this months ago, because it seemed to me that it was necessary that some legislation should be passed to remedy what may be an evil. Since the last election there has been taken from the county of Wentworth and added to Hamilton West a considerable district, and a considerable population. In East Hamilton there have been other changes of perhaps much greater extent. There has been taken from the county and added to the city what was perhaps equal to 50 per cent of the old riding of Hamilton East. The description of Hamilton East as it is in the Revised Statutes is made impossible to be understood. According to the statute Hamilton East consists of wards 1, 6 and 7. There is another ward added now, and wards 1, 6, 7 and 8 constitute Hamilton East; but ward 7 as it is referred to in the statute no longer exists; it has been cut in two, and one-half of the old ward 7 remains as ward 7. The other half of ward 7 and the new district from the country now constitute ward 8. According to the reading of the statute, all of ward 8 is out of Hamilton East. Then, a part of ward 7 having been put into ward 8, the people so removed into ward 8 are probably disfranchised. When I called the attention of the Secretary of State to this matter before Christmas, the answer I got from him was that there would be a redistribution before another election, and, therefore, no immediate legislation was necessary. I understand that the position is somewhat reversed to-day, and that we are likely to have an election before a redistribution, and, therefore, I think the matter should receive the attention of the government, because it may cause a serious difficulty in the three districts—the county of Wentworth and the two Hamiltons.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I would like to know exactly what my hon. friend means. The ridings of Hamilton have been settled and decided by legislation of this parliament. As I understand, the new legislation to which he refers is legislation of the province of Ontario, and I do not see what effect it can have upon our own definition of our own ridings.

Mr. BARKER. The Revised Statutes simply declare that wards 1, 6 and 7 under the laws of Ontario constitute Hamilton East.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As they then existed.

Mr. BARKER. Ward 7 is not at all the same area that it was in 1906. Then where is ward 8?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. They are exactly where they were when our statutes were passed. They cannot be changed by any legislation of Ontario.

Mr. BARKER. I doubt that very much, and there is a great difference of opinion upon it. When in 1907 changes were made in the districts of Alberta and Saskatchewan this government immediately passed an Act amending the Revised Statutes in regard to those districts. Our statute speaks of ward 7, not as having particular dimensions, but as ward 7. Read that statute to-day, a statute is read as now speaking, and it refers to ward 7 as ward 7 is. I take it, that would be the legal effect of it, and ward 7 now omits a large portion of what was ward 7 in 1906. That portion, together with an addition from the county, is now ward 8. Those people from the county are not assessed in the county of Wentworth, and cannot take the oath as being residents of that country, because they are residents of Hamilton. I submit, with all respect to the right hon. gentleman, that there is great need of making this matter perfectly clear so that there will be no dispute as to what those constituencies consist of.

Mr. SPROULE. In that particular case, who would be authorized to divide the voters in that portion of the city which was originally in the county of Wentworth? The Act provides that it shall be done by the municipal authorities. Who would be authorized to divide the voters and establish the new polling subdivisions?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. But for the authority of my hon. friend from Hamilton, who is a legal light, and for whose judgment I have great respect, I should say

that there is no question at all in this matter that the riding of Hamilton or West Hamilton to-day exists just as it existed when the statute was passed in 1906.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have had considerable experience in the matter, and I must agree with the right hon. the Prime Minister. The impression has been in the ridings I have been interested in that the riding is, what it was on the day the statute was passed and it has been left to the returning officer in conjunction with one of the government officials to divide up the voters lists.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. MONK. I regret to intrude upon the discussion of matter which appears to be not yet exhausted, but I think I am justified in presenting to the House the motion which I have in my hand respecting another matter not less important—a matter which I think deserves the immediate consideration of the House.

Hon. members will recollect that not many weeks ago we adjourned for the purpose of allowing my right hon. friend the Prime Minister to attend two very important functions in England, the Coronation of His Majesty King George and the Imperial Conference. I think the House agreed unanimously that it was absolutely necessary to suspend work here, and permit my right hon. friend and his two colleagues, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) and the Minister of Militia (Mr. Borden) to attend these functions. That conference has taken place and decisions of the utmost importance to our country have been arrived at. As the House is aware the policy of the Dominion is largely directed according to the decisions arrived at by our ministers attending these conferences. It seems to me this alone would be a sufficient reason to justify us in knowing what proceedings took place at the conference and what decisions were arrived at. I will even go so far as to say that I think it would be out of place for an assembly such as ours, not to show some solicitude under the circumstances as to exactly what conclusions were arrived at by the conference. If the presence of our ministers was absolutely necessary there, if numerous decisions were arrived at on questions which greatly affect the future policy of this country, it seems to me that these ministers should be anxious to place before the House the result of what transpired during the sittings of this conference. Delegates to a meeting of this kind act under ministerial responsibility. They are responsible to the House for the opinions they give at these gatherings, and for the votes they cast. Under the circumstances I think it behooves them, upon their return, to give the House a full, complete and sincere account of all the transactions of the meeting.

There has been an impression existing that the meetings of the conference are private. That is not by any means correct. It is sufficient to refer to the précis of the meetings of the conference, which was placed before the British House of Commons last June, to see that that is not the decision of the conference. The question of the procedure at the meeting came up for decision on March 23rd, and the proceedings of the conference on the point will be found at page 10 of the précis. It was decided that the deliberations would be private but the decisions would be published. As a matter of fact the decisions were communicated to the public press, and formed the basis of this précis, which contains many subjects of great interest to the House of Commons, and it is a matter of surprise to me that my right hon. friend and his colleagues have not found it possible to lay a similar résumé before this House. There is no valid reason, so far as I can see, why we should not have had such a résumé and a report of the proceedings of the conference. My right hon friend the Prime Minister admitted in this House the other day that we were entitled to have such a report, and told us that we would have it shortly. Hon. members will find in this précis numerous decisions concerning the declaration of London—a point of controversy most interesting to ourselves and to the entire British Empire. It also contains the decisions of the conference in reference to 35 or 40 other subjects of general interest. However, what I wish to point out to the House is that the précis in question throws no light whatever on naval or military matters. There is not a man in this House who will deny that these are matters of the most vital importance, or that they have been the subject of acute controversy throughout the country since the Imperial Conference on defence held in 1909. The matter was discussed at that conference and at the subsidiary conference held during the summer of 1909, and a new policy was agreed upon; yet there is scarcely any allusion to the important decisions arrived at upon these matters. The reason for the withholding of this information appears to be that military matters and naval matters were deliberated upon in the Conference of Imperial Defence, sitting apart from the conference, but there is proof abundant that the decisions of that committee were brought before the conference, submitted to it and approved by it.

Let me briefly refer to these allusions. At page 11, the president, the right hon.

Prime Minister (Mr. Asquith) in defining the procedure to be adopted at the conference gave indications of how the proceedings would be had in regard to these important matters:

Mr. Asquith explained that naval and military matters would be discussed in the Committee of Imperial Defence where they would have the advantage of the presence of experts. Certain other technical matters it would probably be found desirable not to bring before the conference until after preliminary discussion by the representatives of the Dominion governments interested with the departments of His Majesty's government immediately concerned.

Then there is a short reference, at page 79, to the reports of the committee on defence. It is stated that:

The conference received and approved the report of the committee on Military Imperial Defence, which had held two sittings in the War Office under the chairmanship of the chief of the general staff.

Finally, closing the proceedings, the right hon. Prime Minister, president of the conference spoke as follows:

So again our discussions, conducted also and necessarily under the same veil of confidence in regard to co-operation for naval and military purposes, have resulted, I think, in a most satisfactory agreement, which, while it recognizes our common obligations, at the same time acknowledges with equal clearness that those obligations must be performed in the different parts of the empire in accordance with the requirements of local opinion and local need and local circumstances.

Now, what I submit to this House is that there is no possible question as to the right and propriety of parliament to be informed on military and naval agreements which may have modified in some respects—in important respects—the agreements arrived at in 1909, and which have been communicated, as properly they should be, to this House. Surely, the right, the absolute necessity, of parliament being informed of these decisions and agreements cannot be called in question. We have the control of our own military matters; we furnish the money with which the whole militia of this country is maintained; what navy it is proposed we shall have is to be built with the people of Canada's money: and it seems to me there can be no possible reason for refusing to this House the full details of the agreements and arrangements made at this conference which will be the foundation of the policy of this country in respect of these two most important matters. It would not be pretended for a moment, I suppose, that these matters fall into the category of war secrets, of state affairs; that they are to be assimilated to undisclosed plans of mobilization on sea or land, plans of fortifications or any of these matters which under common agreement, under the law of every country are kept absolutely secret. These are agreements of a public nature, given over to the people of the great British dependencies, discussed in their parliaments; and surely nobody will pretend that we are to be refused communication of these decisions arrived at, for instance, on status with regard to the Imperial Admiralty authorities. But the conduct of my right hon. friend and his friends indicates that they have that intention; and I wish, for my part, to know if the House will uphold them in carrying out that intention.

The arrival of my right hon. friend and his colleagues returning from the conference was heralded throughout the ministerial press of this country, and details were given as to what had been transacted at that conference. Indeed, long before the conference was ended, the Ministerial press and other newspapers handed out to the public information respecting the decisions of the conference, which, under the circumstances, it seems to me, it is our right to have corrected. We have the right too to have before parliament the decisions arrived at on the matters laid before that important gathering. As early as the 26th of May, the 'Montreal Herald,' the official organ of the government in Montreal, said:

The difficult problems of the immediate authority of generals and imperial admirals, upon the armies and navies of the empire in time of war.

Surely, if that question has been solved at the conference, we are entitled to know in what sense it has been solved. A despatch appearing in the 'Star' of the 15th of June, stated that at Pontypool in England, the right hon. the First Lord of the Admiralty, Mr. McKenna, stated that at that conference 'most satisfactory arrangements had been concluded between the colonies and the British government, and that the dominions had united in order to furnish and maintain the necessary means of defence.

But it is in the ministerial press of this country more particularly that we have an interpretation beforehand of what was done at the conference, and in a sense, I submit to the House, at absolute variance to what is disclosed by this short précis which has reached us since the conference. Let me give some idea to the House of how public opinion, at any rate in my own province, and I think very much in the same way everywhere, has been instructed in regard to the decisions of the conference. Just as my right hon. friend arrived, a special souvenir album was published in the city of Montreal, giving to the public the transactions of the conference, and bestowing unstinted praise upon my right hon. friend because, at the

conference, and so to speak alone, he withstood all those who were inclined to imperial confederation, those who would attack the autonomy of the dependencies. This article was reproduced with approval on the 13th of July, by 'Le Canada.' in Montreal, the ministerial organ. Let me give to the House some samples of the statements that are made there, and I think when the House reads these statements which have never been controverted in any way by the right hon. gentleman, they will agree that we are entitled to have the true version of what took place at that gathering. I will now read from 'Le Canada':

Upon the occasion of the return of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a souvenir album has been issued which contains a substantial article upon the work and career of the Prime Minister. We reproduce the following:

This popular ovation is but the just return for the work accomplished by Sir Wilfrid Laurier during his entire political life, and which he has just magnificently crowned at London, of work of harmony, of peace and of progress.

Speaking of one of the proposals made at the conference, the paper says:

Another proposal which at first sight seemed most attractive but in reality was fraught with danger, well understood by Sir Wilfrid, was the suggestion that the Imperial government should consult the dominions upon its foreign policy. . . A painful and even perilous situation which Sir Wilfrid, ever solicitous of the minutest particle of our perfect autonomy, wished to preserve us against, and he succeeded as well as on the preceding occasions.

Does my right hon. friend find this report exact and correct? The precis shows us that my right hon. friend took at the conference an absolutely different position from that which is laid to his credit in these lines of his own newspaper. Does he not admit that under those circumstances we are entitled to have the true version of the proceedings at that gathering? My right hon. friend knows perfectly well, in the first place, that no attempt was made, so far at least as the precis shows, to invade our autonomy. My right hon. friend did not on any occasion stand alone, and he acquiesced absolutely in a proposal under which a consultation of the Dominions should take place. Does my right hon. friend deny that? He admits it. How then can he take unto himself, as he is given in this newspaper, and in many other in our own province, credit for having withstood the adoption of a proposal which he himself acceded to very williingly? Continuing 'Le Canada' says:

We now come to the naval questions discussed at the conference. These questions have for us a lively interest, inasmuch as they permit us to better appreciate in what spirit the Canadian navy was created.

If that is a question of a lively interest for us why should the conclusions of the conference be withheld from us? Why should they not be given to us at once, as I maintain that the government should give them to us? The paper continues:

At a preceding conference, a discussion took place as to the share which each dominion would take in general defence. Canadian representatives had objected to every proposal of direct contribution, and, in general way to any control exercised by the metropolis on the Canadian parliament which must remain, according to them, masters and free to decide in the matter.

The Canadian parliament, in 1910, approved of the creation of a naval service as the best and only means of contributing to the general defence without breaking local autonomy, that is to say, to take unto the charge of Canada gradually, the defence of its own territory. It is in this very sense that the government presented its Naval Bill, that parliament adopted it by its Liberal majority, that Liberal speakers and the Liberal press favourable to the project explained it to the people.

Shameless adversaries, desirous to gain some party advantage upon a question so near to the nation's heart have tried to falsify the meaning of the measure, some using it as a proof of disloyalty and treason, others in denouncing it as imperalism and death to our race. These dishonest and blind talkers have now exhausted their prose and comments; the people, a moment disturbed by their noise, now knows the matter in its conception and principle. They know that the government has not deceived them. Their last doubts have vanished during this conference of 1911, wherein the autonomous character of our navy has been marked in indelible manner.

In order to set at rest all question as to the freedom of action of our navy and the control which we intend exercising upon it, Sir Wilfrid has established a free maritime zone both on the Atlantic and the Pacific, which zone shall be absolutely under our care.

In this is the confirmation authentic, definite and unanswerable of our autonomy in regard to our navy.

There was also the question of the flags. What will be our naval flag? It was strictly necessary in order to accredit us in the different seas of the world, and with foreign countries that we should carry the ensign of the English navy:

Canada, whilst gradually conquering the attributes of a nation, is not yet quite, in the eyes of other countries, an independent nation. But while maintaining its character of a British possession, Canada will hoist its flag upon its navy.

The Canadian navy will use, at the same time, the white ensign which will procure for its ships the freedom of all the seas, and the flag with the Canadian arms. In the British navy, there are the White Ensign and the Union Jack; in the Canadian navy the latter will be replaced by a flag with our arms.

The drift of these decisions is obvious; they settle the field of action of our navy, and the flag which must be unfurled at our masthead.

It affirms our autonomy and the perfect control which we exercise over it. . .

Mr. DEVLIN. Will the hon. gentleman allow me a question? Is the hon. member opposed to the attitude taken by the right hon. the leader of the government before the Imperial Conference?

Mr. MONK. If my hon. friend (Mr. Devlin) will give me the decisions arrived at by that conference, I will say what I think of the attitude of the right hon. gentleman. I am sorry that my hon. friend does not quite understand the gist of my argument.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the hon. member declares he is not a dissentient, what is he objecting to in connection with the attitude of the Prime Minister?

Mr. MONK. Objecing to nothing; I am asking for something that I know the House will sanction and it is a reasonable and legitimate demand. I am not going for a single moment to discuss the merits of the question.

Mr. DEVLIN. If the attitude of the Prime Minister is such as has been declared in the press is the hon. gentleman in favour of it?

Mr. MONK. Well, that is a hypothetical question. It seems to me that we have held sufficient public meetings in Quebec, to many of which I saw my hon. friend come as a spectator, to enable him to know what our opinion is.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Answer, answer.

Mr. MONK. Without discussing the merits of the question, will anybody deny having regard to the justice of what I am claiming we should be refused for a single moment information as to the decisions arrived at by the conference upon these two very important points? We know what was the decision arrived at with regard to naval matters in 1909. The right hon. gentleman told us, when he introduced the Naval Bill, that the object he had in view was to carry out the policy of the conference of 1909. Surely, when a conference has been held since and these matters have been touched upon, when we are told that a further solution has been arrived at, we are entitled at this moment and under these circumstances, on the eve of a dissolution of this House, when it is in the power of these hon. gentlemen to give it to us, to have this report upon these questions. We have stated time and again upon every occasion in the meetings we have held in our province that we were prepared upon all these questions to accept the verdict of the people of this country. What we claimed was that the people were entitled to such a consultation. No position could be franker, could be fairer and in face of the calumnious statements which have been circulated, I think it necessary to recall the attitude to which we have constantly adhered. I believe that we have in the past received the support of those who sit around me here upon this side of the House in our insistence upon the right of the people to pronounce upon these questions. Will the right hon. gentleman state in the House that it was not possible for him to lay that report before the House upon his arrival? Were not the proceedings of the conference taken down as its sittings proceeded? Did Sir Wilfrid Laurier state to the House the other day that he had taken any step whatever to procure that report for communication to our parliament? In answer to the last question I put to the right hon. gentleman on this subject, he said in a scoffing manner that I knew as much about it as he did himself. If the right hon. gentleman today, when these proceedings have been fully transcribed, cabled to have them, we could have them here and have a copy laid before the House before the adjournment. Will the right hon. gentleman deny that? We could have them within a week and they could be laid before the House. The right hon. gentleman stated the other day that as far as he knew they were on the way out. The right hon. gentleman seems to have lost consciousness of the fact that the House unanimously adjourned in order that he should represent us at that important gathering. Nothing whatever in his conduct shows that he took any steps whatever to bring to us a report of what he did there. He returned to the House, took his seat in this House, he gave no statement whatever of what had been done at that conference, and he only learned from those members sititing on our own side that the precis had arrived. I am loth to believe that the two ministers most directly interested, the hon. Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Frederick Borden) and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) have come back without notes of what was decided with regard to their own departments. Every day the proceedings were written up and placed in the hands of the delegates. Why should we not have the decisions arrived at in regard to those zones. We are going to be called upon in a few days, to vote the beginning of vast sums of money for naval purposes. Will the right hon. gentleman pretend that these definitions of zones are private matters? The House is aware that it was an open question for over twenty years in the important dependency of Australia. First, the delimitations of the zones were fixed for the Commonwealth of Australia and a subscription of, I think £100,000 sterling was granted. That zone was continued for some years then it was altered, the amount of the sub-

scription was altered and then the zone was altered again. There never was any thought at any time that this was a secret matter; it was laid before the parliament of this dependency and was discussed, everything was published and above board. Why should not we be made aware of the decisions which were arrived at upon these subjects, when it is absolutely in the power of the government to give us this report and when we are entitled to it? I therefore move:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the main motion be erased and replaced by the following:

That in the opinion of this House a complete report of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1911 should be communicated to parliament forthwith.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Speaker, to a great many of the propositions which have been asserted by my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) I have no exception at all to take. In many statements which he has made I altogether concur. With the statement which he has made that the House is entitled to be apprised of what took place at the conference I altogether agree. With the statement which he made that myself and my colleagues, when we represented Canada at the conference, acted upon our ministerial responsibility, I also altogether agree. My action is not to-day before the House. It will be, I hope, before many days. The report of the conference will be placed not only before this House but before the Canadian people and then it will be open to the criticism of every one of His Majesty's subjects in this country. I may say to my hon. friend that I have no intention whatever of shirking the responsibility which I incurred on that occasion. The duties with which I was entrusted, I discharged to the best of my ability and judgment and so did my colleague. My action may command the approval of some; it may suggest the criticism of others. That is incidental to the duties which I had to discharge upon that occasion and to the duty which I have to discharge whenever I act in my present capacity.

And, therefore, upon this occasion my hon. friend has laid down a principle which lies at the base of parliamentary government. He only finds fault with me because the proceedings of the conference have not been laid before parliament. The objection of my hon. friend would have greater force if he could say that the Canadian Ministers who had attended the conference had been in any way derelict in the duty they owe to parliament in this respect. If the report of the conference had been placed before the Imperial House of Commons, and not before this House, my hon. friend would have legitimate cause for complaint, but, Sir, the fact is that at this moment I have no reason to believe that the report has yet been placed before the Imperial parliament so surely no one in this House can blame this government because the report has not been placed on the table of this House.

Mr. LANCASTER. I would blame the government if it had been given to the newspapers instead of to this House.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. What newspapers have got the report? Here is the report which has been obtained by the newspapers, it is the précis and nothing else.

Mr. MONK. Is our obtaining the report of the conference contingent upon its being laid before the British parliament?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend and every member will expect that the full report of the conference will be placed before all the parliaments represented at that conference. The organization of the conference was under the control of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and the officers of the Colonial Office were the secretaries of the conference; it was they who prepared the précis to which my hon. friend has alluded and who were charged with preparing the full report. At page 78 of the précis will be found the report of the sitting of June 20.

The conference discussed the question of the publication of the proceedings and decided they should be published at as early date as possible.

The publication of these proceedings was entrusted not to the representatives of Canada or any other Dominion, but to the officers of the Colonial Office.

Mr. MONK. Are we dependent for that report of the conference upon what may be done at the Colonial Office? Have we not an inherent right to these proceedings?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. My hon. friend surprises me. Somebody must do that clerical work.

Mr. LANCASTER. Where did the newspapers get the report?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am sure I cannot answer that question, they did not get it from me.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). The précis was made and published in London, it was distributed among the press.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The other day my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier (Mr. Monk) brought to the attention of the House a statement that the proceedings of the conference had been placed before the

Imperial parliament. I was surprised at this, but it turned out that it was the précis which had been placed before the British House of Commons.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Who prepared that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Mr. Just, now Sir Arthur Just.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). Was he an official at the conference?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. An official of the Colonial Office, and placed in charge of the reporting of the proceedings by the Secretary of State for the Colonies. He prepared the précis which was given to the press every day, and which has now been published in book form. My hon. friend (Mr. Monk), is anxious to have not only this partial report, but the full report of the proceedings. His motion specifically calls for the full report, and I have read the decision of the conference to have that full report published at as early a date as possible. It is not my business or the business of my colleagues who were at the conference with me to arrange for the publication of that report.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It is his business to see that equal treatment is accorded to Canada and the other portions of the empire in the distribution of that report.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. That is exactly what I say, that if there had been any dereliction on our part hon. gentlemen would have a right to complain, but nothing of that kind has taken place.

Mr. MONK. Do I understand that we must wait until the report is placed on the table of the Imperial House?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I certainly tell my hon. friend that he must wait until the report of the proceedings which was ordered by the conference on the 20th of June, at its last sitting, has been published. I do not see how he can expect to get it sooner. I am as anxious as anyone can be to have my conduct discussed in this House. The views which I maintained at the conference have not received the approval of certain parties in Canada, they have been violently discussed and subjected to criticism by some parties.

Under such circumstances it is not unnatural to suppose that it would be for me a matter of pleasure, and more than pleasure, to be in a position to vindicate my own course. But at that time I was not in a position to do so, and it is not asked by this motion, that I should. If we had the report in our hands, and did not lay it on the table of the House, then my hon. friend from Jacques Cartier would have reason to call for it; but so long as this report has not been published, it seems to me that it is simply childish to ask that it be placed on the table of the House. My hon. friend is in great haste to discuss this question. I know what the attitude of my hon. friend has been of late and also long ago. He has referred to the policy of the navy and the army. I know some of his speeches, and I shall be glad to discuss that question with him when we have the full report.

Mr. MONK. You won't give us what we want.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. This is not the time nor the occasion to discuss the question, but the time will not be long coming, I hope, and it will come sooner than my hon. friend wants. My hon. friend has not waited for the report to discuss it He has discussed it, and has condemned my course. This is not the time to discuss this question; but, Sir, I appeal to the fairness and the common sense of men on both sides of this House. Here is a motion in the form of a motion of want of confidence, asking the House to censure us—for what? Because we have not put upon the table of the House a report which we have not, a report which has not yet been placed upon the table of the House of Commons in England so far as I know. I will make inquiry this very day whether it has been or not. If it had been placed on the table of the House of Commons in England, I suppose I would know that, because there would have been a despatch coming to us informing us of the fact.

Mr. MONK. Did my hon. friend cable for it?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I did not, but I will. I shall be happy to give that pleasure to my hon. friend. I shall have the pleasure of discussing that report with my hon. friend as soon as it is laid on the table of the House, and the sooner it comes the better for myself. But, I ask, has there been any undue delay in the matter on the part of the government? Who is to blame because this report is not on the table of the House? Is the Canadian House of Commons entitled to greater privilege than the Imperial House of Commons?

Mr. MONK. We are entitled to exactly the same privilege.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Exactly—what I say also; and when the report is placed on the table of the Imperial House of Commons, if it is not placed on the table of this House, then my hon friend will have reason to complain, but not till then.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I entirely agree with the Prime Minister that the attitude

of the government at the conference ought to be discussed with full information as to what did take place. I am not at all advised as to the differences which may make themselves manifest when we have the full report as distinguished from the precis. It may be that they will be important, though I would not have supposed they would be, because otherwise the precis itself would be misleading. I think it would be advisable in the meantime that the precis itself, which has been received, should be placed on the table of the House and become a part of the records of this parliament; and, as I understand, there is no objection to that.

Now, reference has been made to newspaper comments. I do not propose to go into the merits of those comments, for the reason that I have already indicated. But I think it is a matter of some concern to this parliament as to whether or not certain reports of what was done at the conference, which have appeared in the organs of the right hon. gentleman, have any foundation in fact or not. The right hon. gentleman says he did not communicate that information to those organs. It is perfectly manifest that they must have obtained the information either from himself or from some of his colleagues, because there was no one else to give it. There has been a good deal of reference to zones established on both the Atlantic and Pacific, and I think it is legitimate comment that the information in regard to those zones appears in the party press under the control of the right hon. gentleman, though it is not laid before parliament, and that its appearance in that press is for the purpose of assisting a political campaign on his behalf. I submit that that is not a fair use for any minister of the Crown to make of his position and of the confidential information which is given to him. I say that any member of that conference who uses his confidential position for the purpose of imparting to his party press confidential information of that kind for the purposes of a political campaign is not worthy of the position he occupies.

As far as the rest of it is concerned, I do not propose to deal with the question upon its merits, for the reason the Prime Minister has stated, that there may be important differences between the report which we have now and the full report which is to come later. We once more see the Prime Minister, according to his party press, in the well-recognized, but rather threadbare garb of the saviour of the autonomy of Canada. It is impossible for the right hon. gentleman to cross the Atlantic without saving the autonomy of Canada. He has been there in 1897, in 1902, and in 1907, and on every one of those occasions he came back after having saved the autonomy of this country.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax).

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). It did not make any difference whether Balfour and Chamberlain were there, or whether Asquith and Haldane were there; it did not matter whether Selborne, Tweedmouth or McKenna were there; every one of these men was ready to destroy the autonomy of this country. That is the position that is cheered by hon. gentlemen opposite. If we are to believe these organs, Premier Asquith, Mr. Haldane, Sir Edward Grey, and all the other British statesmen at the recent conference were conspiring to destroy the autonomy of Canada, and the right hon. gentleman saved it; and the cheers which came from hon. gentlemen opposite just now indicate the character of the campaign which they propose to make. Well, Mr. Speaker, perhaps we had better have a little information later on as to what the assault was which Mr. Asquith, the great Liberal Prime Minister of Great Britain, made on the autonomy of Canada. The Prime Minister will no doubt make us acquainted with that later on.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Both parties will have seen that Mr. Asquith was saving the autonomy of Canada.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Then the right hon. gentleman should rebuke his supporters, because just now they cheered to the echo the statement that Mr. Asquith, the Liberal Prime Minister of Great Britain had been engaged in a conspiracy to destroy the autonomy of this country. Not only did the supporters of my right hon. friend cheer this statement, but a member of the government, the Solicitor General (Mr. Bureau) also wildly cheered it. I suppose Mr. Haldane, Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Winston Churchill and the other distinguished members of the British government were all concerned in this awful conspiracy from which the right hon. gentleman with his sword and his shield, and his white plume saved the autonomy of Canada.

I have got down as far as 1907, and on every one of these occasions the autonomy of Canada has been preserved by the Prime Minister. It must be pretty well preserved —so much so that I think it might be put away in cold storage for a while, so far as debate is concerned. In 1909 the right hon. gentleman did not personally save the autonomy of Canada, but he did it by deputy. He deputed my hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden), and my hon. friend the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur); and the autonomy of Canada was saved by deputy, and not by the right hon. gentleman in person. In 1911 the right hon. gentleman was again to the fore, and I would think that my hon. friends opposite would

be grateful to us on this side of the House, because, as every one in this country knows, the right hon. gentleman did not intend to go, and did not want to go, and would not have gone had it not been for the offer that was made from this side of the House. So, so far as the efforts of the right hon. gentleman on this occasion are concerned, the opposition may be regarded as the direct and proximate cause of the saving of Canada. Perhaps this particular cry has about survived the usefulness which it has served on so many occasions. At all events, when we get the information which the right hon. gentleman promised us we shall learn what was the real character of the bloodthirsty assaults upon the autonomy of Canada made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain and his colleagues.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). I have before me the London 'Times' of Saturday July 15, which deals with the Imperial Conference report. In it I find the following:

The issue yesterday afternoon of the minutes of preceedings of the Imperial Conference. 1911 (cd. 5745) come opportunely, before the conference itself has passed from memory, and when the last overseas member of it has only just left our shores, to remind us of the great issues debated in it, and the real work it accomplished towards the knitting together of the empire. The blue book contains a verbatim report of the proceedings of the conference, which have hitherto been published only in the condensed form of the official précis; but as was expected, it includes no record of the joint session of the conference and the committee of defence.

This blue-book was issued in London on July 15th, eleven days ago, and contains a verbatim report of the proceedings. Yet, Canada is not in possession of that blue-book to day; and, so far as the right hon. gentleman is concerned, he has never seen it. Now, there should have been equal treatment meted out to Canada in that respect, and if London was supplied with copies of that blue-book, why was not an arrangement made whereby a certain number of them should be sent over here?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. If the report has been placed upon the table of the House, I have no doubt it is now on its way here.

Mr. MACLEAN (York). It was placed on the table in London on the 15th July, eleven days ago. There is a two column summary of the blue-book in this article, and hon. gentlemen can derive a good deal of information as to how much progress was made in the direction of imperial unity at that conference by reading this summary. This progress may have been made with the aid of the right hon. gentleman—perhaps it was made in spite of him. Any way the reading of these proceedings is satisfactory, and notwithstanding what was done to disturb the unity of that conference and to prevent its drawing the empire together, it was a most successful conference, according to this report, and it shows in what direction the empire is moving.

The other day the hon. Postmaster General referred to what had taken place in this conference in regard to state ownership of telegraphs and cables, but I am not able to find in the summary of that report that the representatives of Canada at that conference joined with the representatives of Australia in favour of public ownership of cables and telegraphs. If they had done so perhaps we would have had it. It was probably because we had as representatives there, men who were more or less reactionary that a decision was not reached in favour of state ownership of cables.

In order that the House may have full information as to what took place there, I propose to read part of the summary of the minutes of proceedings of the Imperial Conference:

INTRA IMPERIAL COMMUNICATIONS.

On June 15 and 16 the conference devoted itself mainly to considering proposals for the improvement of communications between the various parts of the empire. In this Australia and New Zealand, as farthest from the centre, were especially concerned, and were agreed on one point—that communication by cable should be made less difficult and less expensive. Since an improvement in this direction had been made ten years ago by the laying of a state-owned cable across the Pacific (which lowered rates to Australia by nearly 40 per cent), it was natural to suggest that a similar state owned cable across the Atlantic would produce a similar effect.

A state-owned cable across the Atlantic would reduce telegraph rates by 40 per cent, yet, so far as I know the representatives of Canada did not insist on that proposal being carried out nor on the state-owned cable across the Atlantic being constructed by Canada by Great Britain or by the United States jointly. When the hon. Postmaster General gave us his account of the proceedings the other day, he did not give us all the facts because I find:

The British Postmaster General, however, brought forward another plan, depending partly on negotiations with the private companies that own existing cables—such as, he pointed out, are already securing a 50 per cent reduction in the cost of uncoded messages; partly on the establishment of effective government control over rates charged on lines which land on British territory. The Australasian representatives were still inclined to press for a state-owned cable, but were persuaded by the other members of the conference to accept a compromise whereby, if Mr. Samuel's methods did not secure consid

erable reductions, the state-owned cable could still be advocated at a subsidiary conference.

My contention is this—if the representatives of Canada had backed up the representatives of Australia we would have had state owned cables on the Atlantic, and a resulting reduction of 40 per cent in the cost of cable messages.

In order to show how much progress has been made I would like to read another paragraph relating to the results of the conference.

But these somewhat ineffective discussions were immediately followed by a striking demonstration of the empire's real unity. For three days the overseas members of the conference, sitting with the Committee of Imperial Defence, were initiated into the secrets of Britain's foreign policy——

There is Imperial progress. The representatives of the various overseas dominions, were, for the first time, made parties to the foreign policy of the Empire.

'Hitherto,' said the Australian Prime Minister, at a later date, 'we have been negotiating with the government of the United Kingdom at the portals of the household.'

You have thought it wise, Sir, to take the representatives of the dominions into the inner councils of the nation. . . I think no better step has ever been taken or can be taken by any responsible advisers of the King. I hope, as I feel, that there will be no going back on that sound principle.

And the summary goes on to say:

It is unnecessary here to dwell on the arrangement of ideas about the empire which must have preceded the taking of this step; but it must exert considerable influence both on the status of Dominion cabinets and on the scope of their discussions. No responsible Prime Minister can in future admit among his colleagues men unfit to be the depositaries of imperial secrets, and no oversea cabinet can construct its own policy without considering the effect of it upon the foreign relations of the empire as a whole.

Now, there is the first declaration of the unity of the whole empire, a joining of the empire for purposes of defence and the maintenance of the common cause; and that fact alone shows how important that Imperial Conference was, what great results have been attained and what greater results will come in the future when it is better established and there is a better understanding between the different members. Now, when there is so full a summary of these proceedings and when the full report has been published in London, I contend that we in Canada ought to be put in possession of the facts and ought to have that official report at the disposal of this House, and this country as soon as they have it in London, less the days it takes to cross the Atlantic. If the 'Times' can have that report and digest it, and if there is time for that newspaper summary to reach us, we are entitled to have the full official report here at the same time. In fact it ought to be here a little before, because it could leave before the 'Times' got it. But we know nothing about it; the Prime Minister does not even know whether it has been printed. Perhaps the gentlemen in the colonial office still regard Canada as a colony as in the old days of Downing street. It would be a good thing to wake them up and give them to understand that in handing out these documents Canada is not to be forgotten. The way to work that out was for those who represented us in the conference to have made arrangements before the conference separated that copies of the proceedings should be forwarded to this country. And I hold that it is the duty of the Prime Minister to set the cables at work so that this House may be put in possession of this document which was distributed in London eleven days ago.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). The question now before the House is one of importance. The right hon. Prime Minister was appointed to go to the Imperial Conference as the representative of Canada, and the House adjourned for the very purpose of allowing him to go. His first duty on returning here was to give a full report of the proceedings. He says it has not been printed. Well, it ought to have been printed. The précis was printed from day to day and every newspaper in London knew what was going on every day. And, at the end of the conference it was complete. I heard reports about what action the right hon. gentleman had taken in the conference, and I wanted to be fully informed upon the subject. I spoke to Mr. Foster about it and he told me he had a copy of the precis. I asked him where he got it. He said, 'I am entitled to it as a privy councillor, and I went and got it.' He was in possession of it on the 11th July. It is now the 25th of July, and we have no information before the House on this subject. That is a ridiculous position. But it is the same as in many other things, this parliament is completely ignored by the government. Surely, it is a matter that concerns Canada more than anything else—the arrangements made by the government of this Dominion in reference to imperial matters. It is no excuse for the right hon. gentleman to say that the report has not been printed in London. He ought to have seen that it was printed. But had he made inquiries he would have known that it was printed and at the disposal of every newspaper in London. The right hon. gentleman shakes his head——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The precis was printed, but the other was not.

Mr. HAGGART (Lanark). Is the right hon. gentleman certain about that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I am certain of one thing, we have not yet received it.

Mr. HAGGART. (Lanark). I was very anxious to get the information, and I have already shown that my colleague had secured possession of it. Every one in London knew about it and knew of the position taken by the right hon. gentleman who represented Canada in the matter. It was public knowledge in London, yet fourteen days after that we have no information on the subject presented to this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman will——

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I may say to my hon. friend (Mr. Borden, Halifax) that His Excellency the Governor General has been away. He is due here to-night. If the information has come, I shall know from His Exceellency and will communicate it to the House to-morrow. I do not think, however, that anything has come yet. So far as I have been able to follow the article in the 'Times' it is the précis——

Mr. MACLEAN (York). No, the full report. The price is given at which the public can obtain it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). The right hon. gentleman (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) will see that he is mistaken. I have here the 'Times' of Saturday, July 11th, which says:

> The issue yesterday afternoon of the 'Minutes of Proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1911' (Cd. 5745)——
>
> The précis is numbered 5741.
>
> —comes opportunely before the conference itself has passed from memory, and when the last oversea member of it has only just left our shores, to remind us of the great issues debated in it and the real work it accomplished towards the knitting together of the empire. The blue-book contains a verbatim report of the proceedings of the conference, which have hitherto been published only in the condensed form of the official precis; but as was to be expected it includes no record of the joint sessions of the conference and the committee of defence.

It is apparent that it is the fuller report to which the Prime Minister alluded; therefore, we have been ten days or more without it. Last Saturday was the 22nd, and this was on the 14th, eight days before. It should have been here last Saturday.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As I have said, His Excellency will be here, and if he has received it, it will be laid before the House to-morrow.

Amendment (Mr. Monk) negatived.

NORTHWEST SCRIP TO OLD SETTLERS.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Before you leave the Chair, I wish to call the attention of the House to a matter that I referred to on the 14th of last December. It has relation to certain claims that have been advanced by the pioneers of western Canada for the last 38 or 40 years. When I asked the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) on the 14th of last December as to the correctness of the report that the present government had finally denied all recognition to these claimants, I at that time gave notice that as soon as possible I would bring the matter up. Consequently he will not charge me now with being an obstructionist in carrying out my word. This is a matter, as I say, that has been more or less under dispute ever since the year 1870, consequently it has all the merits that belong to antiquity. Now the parties for whom I speak are earlier settlers of the Northwest who arrived in that country between the first days of January, 1836, and the 15th of July, 1870. Every one in the House is aware that the Northwest Territories, that is to say, the Red River country, was ceded to confederation on the 15th day of July, 1870. By that cession certain recognition was made to those who had rights of occupancy and possession in the Northwest Territories at that time. Subsequently, on the 26th of May, 1874, the recognition that was made in 1870 was altered, and a more extensive grant was made to those to whom grants had been made before, and to others by the Act 37 Vic., chap. 20. All I need to tell the House is the final result, what recognition was made, who enjoyed it, and what others were left out. In 1813 the Selkirk colony was established. Up to the time that the final settlement was adjusted on the 26th of May, 1874, settlers of many descriptions had secured rights in the Northwest Territories. They comprised five classes. There were the original Selkirk settlers themselves, there were the other British settlers, there were French Canadians, and there were the Indians and the Halfbreeds. As to the latter two classes my remarks have no bearing. There is no complaint as to the recognition by the Dominion of Canada, by what is known in law as an act of grace, of the rights of occupancy of the Halfbreeds and Indians. I will only compare the rights of the Halfbreed children that existed at that time in Manitoba with those on whose behalf I present a case this afternoon. However, as to the first three classes, a settlement was made of a very strange and arbitrary character, that is to say, as to the original Selkirk settlers, the other British settlers not of that class, and the French Canadian settlers, an arbitrary settlement was made with them. A line was drawn at the 1st of January, 1836; as to all who had arrived in the Northwest Territories prior to that time a grant of 160 acres of land was made. In the first place,

when the adjustment was first made in 1872, a grant of only 140 acres was made, and that only to the original Selkirk settlers. But by the amended Act of 1874 a final adjustment was arrived at whereby the original Selkirk settlers, the other British settlers and the French Canadians were subjected to the arbitrary settlement arrived at, those who had arrived prior to the 1st of January, 1836, obtaining a grant of 160 acres, and those who arrived subsequent to that time being utterly ignored. Not only were those who arrived between 1813 and 1836 recognized by the land grant, but their children born prior to the 15th of July, 1870, were also recognized, and they received the same grant; in fact all the lineal descendants then living were entitled under that Act to the same grant as the original settlers. Not only did the Act of the 26th of May, 1874, go that far, but what is more astonishing, it went further, it made exactly the same grant to another class who were not even born at the time the territory was ceded to confederation, namely, to the descendants of the first settlers between 1813 and 1836 who were born between the 15th of July, 1870, and the 26th of May, 1874. So the ultimate result is this, so far as it relates to the British and French Canadian settlers, that those who came in at first between 1813 and 1836 and their lineal descendants born up to the 15th of July, 1870, when the territory was ceded, and all born after the cession of the territory prior to the 26th of May, 1870, received from the bounty of confederation this grant of 160 acres. Why the line was drawn I am at a loss to know, why it was fixed there, or fixed at all, I am also at a loss to say. Why it should be that those whose rights of occupancy and possession accrued between 1836 and 1870 should be ignored in the settlement, is at this distance hard to understand. The records of the department, I think, will be searched in vain for any reason why the arbitrary line was thus drawn, or why any line was drawn.

I venture further to say that the records of such settlements in other countries will also be searched in vain to establish the principle that any line should be drawn at any period. The rights of occupancy of territory should not be differentiated as to time at all, because all rights of occupancy are the same for different classes, whether for the early settler or the late arrival. I do not intend to press that argument just at the present stage. I want to outline the state of affairs that has resulted first. The number of claimants is not large. Of the first class, that is those who received recognition, being actual settlers between 1813 and 1836, the number, according to the best compiled figures—I presume they are accurate—is 244. But of their children and descendants born prior to the 15th July, 1870, the date of the cession, there were 477, and of those who were granted the reward of occupancy, although indeed they were not born at this time, they having been born between the 15th of July, 1870, and the 26th of May, 1874, there were 128. So that, summing it all up, it will be seen that to 45 per cent of those who had established rights of occupancy and possession at the time of the cession, grants were made and to 55 per cent no recognition was given.

This matter has been brought before this and previous governments. It has been a question involving considerable irritation in the west. I wish to trace the efforts that have been made to secure recognition, not so much to bring home a case against the government, but rather to present what appears to me a good argument against what is usually brought forward as establishing the absence of any right of these present claimants. The contention of the government, when the case was last presented to them, rested on two positions. The position, first of all, was that the claim is too old, that it is of forty years standing now, and that at this stage we cannot review it. They said, secondly, that the policy of the government is thoroughly fixed and final; we shall make no more land grants except to actual settlers. I do not purpose at this point to criticise the last position. I am not asking that the demands of these men, if there is at this stage a practical objection from that point of view, should be granted in toto, as they present them. What I argue is that some recognition is bound to be made to them before confederation has done its duty to them. What form that shall take or to what extent it shall go, I do not propose to argue. But I do say that Canada has not discharged her duty towards a class of her citizens, a class which is entitled to, I feel fair in saying, more than ordinary consideration. Why is that the case? When the United States made a settlement of claims under similar circumstances I know of no instance where they did not recognize rights of occupancy as complete and deserving of reward even though those rights were established but shortly before the cession. I would refer hon. gentlemen to the Oregon claims when the United States not only recognized the Indian title, not only by way of legal recognition, but also recognized every right of occupancy however brief the period was prior to the cession of the country to the United States. A right of occupancy is a right that does not depend upon time. A right of possession to a very great degree

is the same. But, in this particular case there is more than the usual reason why time should not be recognized even in establishing rights of possession as well as rights of occupancy It has never to the best of my knowledge, been recognized in establishing rights of occupancy. In this case it should not have been allowed to interfere as to any rights which many of these old settlers had of both classes in the matter of a settlement of their claims upon their coming into confederation. Those who arrived in the country at an earlier period were not settlers in the usual sense of the word. They followed the trail, they were mostly employees of the Hudson's Bay Company, in the employ of speculators residing in the old land, and they did not at that time, as history will amply show, have the hardships to endure which subsequently were endured by those who came after them in the west. Between 1836 and 1870 the vanguard of the original Red River colony had to suffer hardships to a greater degree than those who preceded them and they suffered the hardships that are inseparable from early pioneer life. The case on this point is, at least prima facie, established. No one has yet, be it of this government or of the prior government, ventured to give a logical explanation why the settler who came in 1835 was entitled to recognition and why the settler who came in 1836 was not. No explanation on that point has been ventured, and I understand that the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) stated that he himself saw no reason for that. Consequently, on the face of it, the indebtedness is there, the right is there, and the only question is, can we in justice to our country now recognize it, and if we can, then certainly we ought to do it. I can see no reason whatever, in the defence that because the claim is old it must be ignored. It is true that in the law of every civilized nation the principle is established that as claims advance in age they become less and less deserving of recognition. Our statute of limitations is based upon that principle. The statutes of limitation of every civilized nation are based upon the same principle; that is that a private right that has been asleep, or dead, on which no claim in court has been made, cannot, after the lapse of stated periods, be advanced with success. Such statutes of limitation are doubtless based upon a sound and necessary principle, namely, that though the duty may still exist, though the duty still may be owing from one man to his fellow, from one individual to another, still the danger of enforcing the performance of that duty, the danger of compelling recognition of the obligation, is so great that it is impossible to insist upon it.

Claims of innocent third parties have come in and, therefore, the dangers of recognizing those claims that have been subject to laches, are so great as to justify their being ignored. That is the principle of the whole statute of limitations of every country. To that principle I make no dissent. But that principle has no application whatever to the present case; in fact it has always been recognized that in matters of trusteeship there is no statute of limitation that at any time does apply. This is a matter of trusteeship, and consequently on that first principle of general law of this country, and all other countries, there could be no such defence against the claim of the early pioneers of Manitoba, because certainly when this country took over the provinces of the west, when it took over the Red River colony, the Dominion became by that very act trustees for those who had rights of occupancy, and possession in that territory, prior to the cession, and no trustee can ever get rid of his responsibility to those for whom he is a trustee by pleading the passage of time or any principle of the statute of limitations. That may appear a technical argument. It is not technical, it is in the very nature of the case, it is a necessary principle that we ought at all times to recognize.

The principle on which we are justified in ignoring a claim because it is old is utterly absent in this case. There has been no laches, these men have been doing everything they are called upon to do, ever since they were denied their rights in 1874. They have exercised every diligence to secure their rights, they have been separated by large distances, they have had no common bond but these common grievances, they have had nothing to bring them together, they have had to present their case with obstacles strewn around them that made it almost impossible, particularly in the early stages of our history, to present any case to a government so far away. But no sooner were they denied their rights in 1870 than their claim was pressed, than an organization was instituted in the west known as the Prince Rupert Pioneers, and that organization, through its representatives in this House and by delegations sent to this parliament, pressed the claim I am now advancing. On what ground did they press it? First of all they based it on the proclamation issued to them by which their consent was obtained to enter confederation; they based it on the proclamation of the Governor General of that day issued with the authority of Earl Grenville the

Colonial Secretary on the 6th of December, 1879, to the early settlers. In that proclamation it was stated that all such rights would be observed, that all settlers would be treated in the spirit of British justice. That proclamation was supplemented by a further letter on the 16th of February, 1870, by which the Governor General of Canada repeated the same assurance to Bishop Taché. I do not mention this to found again any technical right. Had no letter been written, had no assurance been made at all by the government of Great Britain or by this government to the early settlers of that country they would be entitled just the same to the British justice which was assured them by that letter, they would be entitled to a recognition of their right of property. I do not deny that they were partially recognized. Those who had rights of special property, those who had made settlements and had rights defined on special limited properties, were recogniezd, but those who had been in such a line of work, who had been leading such a life that they had no defined rights of property, were not recognized, although as a matter of fact they were just as much entitled to the full extent of the letter of the Governor General, they were just as much entitled in a word to their rights of possession and occupancy being recognized as any other class. They were utterly ignored so that I would not rest their claim on any letter of the Governor General nor on any assurance from the home office, but, relying on the general principles of equal rights on which every section of this country should be able to rely, I state that these men have not been done justice to.

I set about showing that they should not be denied because their claim is old. They petitioned for it in 1871. They had at that time as representative in this House the present High Commissioner for Canada, then Sir Donald A. Smith, and in the 'Hansard' of 1871 and 1872, will be found utterances by him, representing them, thoroughly coinciding with the claim which they made then and make still demanding that they be recognized in the distribution of this land just the same as the descendants of those who were prior to them. Consequently right at the first, it is clear that they took every step they could take, because not only were they represented and their claim pressed by their representative here, but they actually went to the expense, and a great expense it was to them, of sending a delegation to this parliament also to press their claim. That delegation consisted of Judge Black, Mr. Scott, and Father Richot. Two of this delegation were not able to return, the other, Father Richot, did return and made his report and in so far as that report, which was made to the legislative body at that time in existence at Winnipeg, can be found, it shows that while they did not receive a definite promise of the recognition of their claim as presented, it at least has an indication that they were promised recognition at some future day in some form or another, because there is a reference to the fact that when the other provinces of the west were to be annexed at a later time, recognition of those settlers who were outside the Red River colony would be made. Consequently there was to that extent a recognition by the parliament of Canada of the claim of these men.

They did not stop at that. Again in the year 1886 when, of course, another government was in office, further representations were made to this House and in the meantime, not only in 1871 and 1872, but later and up as late as 1886, resolutions were passed unanimously by the provincial legislature sitting at Winnipeg recognizing the rights of these men, and spurning the idea that any difference existed between their claim at that time, and the claim of those who had already received their grants, and urging that cold justice be done the Red River settlers, and the settlers further west who had arrived between 1836 and 1870. Those resolutions were forwarded to the Governor General in Council at Ottawa, and as a result an investigation was ordered to be made in the Department of the Interior in pursuance of an address from the legislative council of Manitoba which arrived on the 8th day of February, 1872. On the 26th of April of the same year an order in council was passed deputing the department to institute an investigation into the claim and to report. The deputy minister, Mr. Burgess, made the investigation and the report.

But I venture to say, with all respect to his memory, that he seems to have misunderstood the purpose of the investigation. He seemed utterly to have misconceived the spirit of the claim which was made against the Dominion of Canada. Mr. Burgess appears to have understood that his mission was to ascertain the legal rights of those settlers, that is to say, whether or not those who had actual legal rights to defined territory at that time had those rights already conceded, or whether there were claims outstanding, and whether or not the parliament of Canada was in a position to resist the claims of the settlers who arrived between 1866 and 1886. His report bears out the interpretation that I say he put upon his mission. It refers to the care that has always been exercised in the department to see that each claim, as established, was recognized, and it contains these words:

Treaty No. 1, of the 3rd of August, 1871, St. Peter's Indian reserve, provides as follows: 'It being understood, however, that if at the

date of the execution of this treaty there are any settlers within the bounds of any land reserved by the band, Her Majesty reserves the right to deal with such settlers as she shall deem just, so as not to diminish the extent of land allotted to the Indians.'

Mr. Burgess goes on to say that 'it is difficult to understand exactly what is meant' by the claims of the white settlers after 1835, and he goes on to quote the Acts of 1873 and 1874, and concludes by saying: ,

There never was any other legal provision for making any grant of scrip or land to settlers going into the country subsequent to 1835, except the provisions contained in the Manitoba Act for quieting the title of those in possession at the time of the transfer; nor do I find any record in the department of any claim having been advanced or any other compensation than that provided for by the Manitoba Act.

Certainly he would not. No claim could be made legally on the department for any specific land unless it was specified with defined rights of occupancy. These are claims based on another principle altogether, namely, that those whose rights of occupation did not refer to particular lands at the time of the cession were just as much entitled to lands at the time of the cession as those who had particular lands. That Mr. Burgess seems to have missed. He further goes on to say that if an investigation were made as to the rights of those parties:

Such an inquiry could not fail, in my opinion, to have the effect of disturbing and disquieting the whole population of the province of Manitoba, and casting doubts upon the validity of every title hitherto granted by the Crown to claimants under the Manitoba Act.

That further establishes that nothing was done by the investigation of Mr. Burgess to ascertain the rights that these men advanced. How could the title to any lands already granted be affected by a general recognition of the right to 160 acres of land or scrip for it? It certainly could not. Those titles already recognized would of course be absolved from it, and they would be in the same position as any others entitled to make a selection just as those before them had done. I am utterly at a loss to understand the objections advanced by Mr. Burgess to the granting of this request. Well, the agitation continued to be kept up, and it was pressed with renewed vigour in 1905 and 1906. The reason of the agitation taking on renewed strength at that time was that those people relied on what they had already long considered—the original promise of the government that when the new territories were made into provinces those rights which at that time were ignored would be at last recognized. The territories were made into provinces in 1905, and from that time on a considerable body of settlers made the demand that their rights be recognized the same as those who had come earlier. Consequently the claim is utterly without foundation that the mere length of time that had elapsed since the original settlement was arrived at puts the matter past the stage of inquiry. In the first place, as I have stated, it falls because there is a trusteeship existing between the government and the people of Canada and those early settlers whose rights of possession and occupancy at least were not recogniezd by the settlement of July, 1870, and that that trusteeship exists absolutely puts it out of power to plead the lapse of time. Furthermore, it falls because the principle on which it stands does not exist in this case, namely, that they should have earlier pressed their claims to obtain recognition. Ever since the claims were advanced they have been pressed with as much persistency as we could expect under the difficult circumstances in which the settlers were placed. So that it cannot be maintained that we are entitled to ignore their claims simply because 30 or 40 years have elapsed. Further, it cannot be argued, because there is a considerable body of evidence to indicate that their rights were actually recognized in 1871, and that they were promised grants at a future stage in the development of Canada. On these grounds it does not lie in the mouth of the government to-day to say to these men: 'You have waited too long; the lapse of 40 years deprives you of any claim; the unwritten law as to limitations shuts you up, and although you may have had a claim originally, although we recognize that you should not have been denied when your fellow-settlers' claims were granted, we say that you are shut out by the mere lapse of time.' If that defense falls, what defense is left? How can we justify ourselves for saying to these men: 'It is quite true, you went in there in 1836 and 1837, and up to 1870. You bore the burden and the heat of the day in pushing the frontiers of civilization into that country. You endured the trials and suffered the hardships. You faced the dangers and the perils in order that Manitoba particularly and western Canada in general should reach the state of civilization which she has at present attained. You ceded your country under the distinct promise that you would get ample justice, and that all claims of occupancy and possession would be recognized. You came into the contract absolutely entitled to recognition, but we will not recognize you.'

I say unless it can be argued that by virtue of the lapse of time they are not entitled to recognition, there is no ground at all for refusing to recognize them. Now the government comes and says. 'It is

because in the meantime we have adopted a policy—good though it may be—because in the meantime we have changed the policy of this country, we must refuse to make any land grants and we cannot recognize your claim, however just.' I do not need to spend much time in disposing of that, because it disposes of itself. These men are not to be affected by any change of the policy of Canada, their rights accrued long prior to this change. Although it may interfere with the form of the grant, it cannot interfere with the principle, and it cannot be urged in defence of the policy of non recognition. Their rights, whatever they were, were just the same as were the rights of those who came before them—they were greater than those who were born between 1870 and 1874—they were greater and on a higher plane than many which were recognized, and we cannot say to them now that because we chose to adopt a policy in which we could not grant that recognition in just the same form as we granted it before, we will not grant any recognition at all.

Now, that is the position taken by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) as I understand it. The government of this country speaking through the right hon. the Prime Minister and the hon. Minister of the Interior denied recognition to the early settlers who came in between 1836 and 1870. There was no other ground advanced, so far as I can see, and there is no other ground that could be advanced. I argue that it is the duty of the government to ascerain by what means they can give substantial justice to these later arrivals—to these men who stood the greater share of the burden, and who shouldered the greater proportion of the difficulties. This class of men cannot always come to parliament and ask that justice be done them. In the very nature of things they are to-day well advanced in years, and will before long have disappeared from the earth. Many of them are in more or less destitute circumstances. No doubt a good many of them are prosperous, but still some of them are in such circumstances as to warrant the government in general taking steps to see that justice is done to them. It is the duty of the government to see without delay if some method cannot be devised whereby the claim of these men will be recognized.

Mr. CHISHOLM (Huron). I wish to say a word or two in connection with this matter. I did not know that the question was to come up to day, or I would have had more information to lay before the House. However, there is one case which I would like to bring to the attention of the government. I remember when I was a lad, my nearest neighbour was one of the first men who settled in the Red River district in 1812 and 1813. His name was John Cooper. This man was accused wrongfully of a crime, after he had been long on his land. He was brought to the city of Montreal and kept there in confinement for nearly a year. At the end of this time he proved his innocence and was liberated. He went to work on a building in order that he might earn sufficient money to return to his home in the west. But during the course of his work he fell from the building and when I knew him he had been an invalid for many years. John Cooper had lived for years and years on his land where the city of Winnipeg stands to day. He had raised his family there, but after he was taken to Montreal his land was taken from them, and I understand, was sold by the Dominion of Canada. When he came to this country, Lord Selkirk promised to give him a deed to certain land, if he would settle on it. He fulfilled his part of the contract, yet the land has been taken from him and his family.

If I cannot do any more for my good old neighbour, I will put on 'Hansard' the story of the injustice which he suffered. We all know that Lord Selkirk in his will left one-tenth of his lands to be given to these settlers. That land extended not only through Manitoba, but all the way up to Fort Carleton, Saskatchewan, and also into the state of Minnesota.

This is a part of Minnesota that the American government have succeeded in wheedling and defrauding us out of. That was granted to Lord Selkirk, and one-tenth of it was left to the settlers. And here is a settler who, after living for years and years on his land has it taken from him, and I suppose it is now laid out in town lots and is sold at $30, $40 or $50 a foot. I think the government might do something for the descendants of John Cooper. If not, at least the whole story of the way he has been wronged and his descendants neglected will be recorded in ' Hansard.'

Mr. MONK. I endorse very cordially the claims made by my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen). On more than one occasion since I have had the honour of a seat in parliament, I have heard the story of these settlers, and I have come to the conclusion that it is almost impossible to understand why their particular case was differentiated from those of other settlers of the same period and under the same circumstances. I have never to this day heard a reason given why a distinction was made in the case of this particular class of settlers. My hon. friend from Portage la Prairie has gone fully into their case. I have a number of documents connected with the case myself and have gone into the matter at different times. The hon.

gentleman has admirably and fully exposed the merits of their claim. What is the reason that their claim has been neglected? I take it that the reason is that their claims must have fallen for consideration into the hands of employees of the department who viewed the claims in the purely legal aspect. Of course, it could easily be established that on strictly legal grounds they had no claim upon the government. And the report being to the effect that they had no claim, the ministers in charge at the time—I do not know what their colour was—would be glad to get rid of the claim without looking at the equitable side of the matter. I think that at this moment, in view of the settlements that are made in the west, the government might very well take up these claims and put these dissatisfied people upon the same basis as those around them. We are told the government has a policy, that it cannot without violating that policy take up these claims and render justice. But the policy of this government seems to be singular in the extreme, our immigration policy has led us to make the freest concessions to newcomers. That we should extend facilities to newcomers when they desire to settle in the northwest is reasonable enough, but why should we be so hard towards the old settlers, the Fenian raiders, for instance excellent Canadians who could put forth some claim to merit acquired and who would make the very best class of settlers for the northwest? Why should we treat the Doukhobors so generously when they arrived in this country and yet adopt the policy under which we make it so difficult for good settlers from the older provinces to get any advantage in going to settle in that country. Our policy it seems to me is too generous to strangers and too hard, too rigid, too much based upon purely legal considerations when we are dealing with our own people. On the contrary, with our own people we should be most openhanded and generous with the great wealth of land we have in the west.

Hon. FRANK OLIVER (Minister of the Interior). I do not wish to traverse the very carefully prepared and very elaborate statement of my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) at any great length and would not have done so were it not for the support which he has received. But, in view of that support, and the attitude taken by those who give that support, I think it is necessary, perhaps, to say a few words on the subject. And, if I have to do so, I might as well begin at the beginning and allude to the apology which my hon. friend from Portage la Prairie offered at the beginning of his remarks, when he said he would not be accused of obstruction in bringing up this question. I would not have accused him of obstruction. But my hon. friend knows that 'to excuse is to accuse.' When he proffers an excuse he leaves an opening for an accusation; and it may not be out of place for us to consider just how far such an excuse was necessary in this case.

We have here a matter which was disposed of thirty-five years ago by the parliament of Canada,—disposed of finally by that parliament on a second attempt to dispose of it. That is to say, parliament dealt with the question in 1872 and again in 1874, and it has not dealt with it since. It seems to me that a question such as this might very well have stood for a little while longer under all the special circumstances of the case, without seriously damaging it. I notice on the Order Paper that this parliament has a great deal of business to do, pressing and important business, business which is not thirty-five years old, and has not been off the books for that length of time, but business that is on the books and awaiting action and for which the country is demanding action, or at any rate requiring it. May I just draw the attention of the House for a few moments to some of these matters which, at the instance of my hon. friend, have been compelled to give way in order that the claims of these old settlers should be brought before parliament on this particular occasion. First, we have the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means, to discuss, and to carry, if possible, a measure of tariff reduction which, I submit on the statement of our friends on the other side, has not been equalled in importance by any matter that has come before parliament since confederation. Surely, that was a matter that was entitled to precedence even over the claims of the old settlers, these claims of thirty-five years ago. But, even if we had disposed of that question, there are a number of other matters to which I think it might be well to draw attention. I notice, for instance, that there is a large body of legislation by orders in council dealing with the administration of the lands, timber and minerals of this country under the control of the Dominion of Canada which requires confirmation by parliament.

If it should happen that it does not receive that confirmation during this session of parliament, then this legislation by order in council becomes invalid under the statute. Surely this is a matter of somewhat pressing importance, and might well have had precedence after we had disposed of reciprocity. There is another matter I find here—speaking of matters that particularly concern my own department, and my duties in the House. There is the Manitoba Grain Act, which was brought down from the Senate after having occupied the attention of that body for a number of weeks; it is an Act that is ab-

solutely urgent, if the views and requirements of the people of the west are to be met. This Bill was brought before the House immediately before adjournment, it was not possible to get the Bill passed at that time, but it awaits consideration by this House now, it pressingly awaits consideration, otherwise it cannot be brought into effect so as to be of any advantage for the crop of this year. There is a Bill regarding Chinese immigration. We have had a debate on Chinese immigration in this House; it is known that the Chinese Act requires amendment. The Bill was brought in some time ago, it did not receive consideration then, it claims consideration now, but it cannot get it; it has to take second place to the claims made by our friends on behalf of the old settlers of the Red river. There is an important Bill respecting banks and banking under the name of the Minister of Finance on the importance of which I need not enlarge.

At six o'clock, House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was mentioning a number of measures of importance before the House which might have claimed attention in preference to the subject which is now under discussion without in any degree minimizing the importance of that subject. I mentioned among other things the Bank Act which is on the Order Paper for amendment. I had not reached a conclusion in regard to that. The Bank Act was so urgent that in view of the fact that it had not been possible to push it forward an interim Act had to be passed, and at the present time the country has failed to get the advantage of the Bank Act as prepared and made ready for the House. Another subject which is of some importance to some part of the Dominion which I might mention is an Act relating to waters in the railway belt and Peace river block of land, a matter upon the early adjustment of which depends the value of many thousands of dollars worth of property in British Columbia. A Bill of the same nature was introduced last session, it stood over, it was introduced again this session, and to-day these rights are being sacrificed for the lack of this or similar legislation. Another matter that I might mention is an amendment to the Railway Act which was under consideration in the last few days before adjournment, an amendment brought in by my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham) for the purpose of protecting the rights of owners of live stock which stock has been injured by the railway. It was not possible under the circumstances to secure the concurrence of the House in that provision at the time. It awaits the action of the House, and if I understand the situation the farming interests of the west certainly demand its passage at this session. I would not use the word 'obstruction' to characterize the very carefully prepared and well presented case laid before the House by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) in regard to these old settlers' rights, but I will say that with a question of such paramount importance as reciprocity before the House, unless the English language has lost its meaning, an amendment moved to the motion to take up that question must certainly be an obstruction of the discussion of the question, and therefore of the business of the House. I am sure that the ordinary elector will wonder how it is that, when there is this important question to be decided, and when there are these important matters upon the Order Paper which ought to receive the attention of the House, the House has plenty of time to spend in discussing the question of a right, which, to put it most mildly, is thirty-five years old, and which was decided upon by the House of Commons, and the government thirty-five years ago. Every thing in its place, there is a time during the session when matters of lesser importance, and which are less pressing may be fairly and reasonably discussed, but I do submit that a claim of this character brought forward at this stage of the session, with the Order Paper crowded as it is, and with a discussion such as that now before the House going on, can scarcely in fairness be called a subject of fair or proper consideration. But, however, whatever may have been the purpose of the hon. gentleman who made the motion, there is no question as to the purpose of those who support him. It was not more to secure certain so-called rights of people who are spoken of as the pioneers of Rupert's Land as to create sympathy for them in regard to the deprivation of these rights and therefore to secure disapproval of the government and its policy to a very much farther reaching extent. As to the merits of the question, I think the hon. member for Portage la Prairie stated the case very clearly and fairly when he said that the statute of limitations or the law of limitations was a right and proper law and must necessarily apply. The reason for that law is that as time goes on new conditions arise under which conditions it becomes impossible to give countenance to a certain claim because of other rights which have arisen under this new condition. In regard to the claim made by those pioneers, whatever may have been the merit of their claim in the first

place, and they pressed it at that time, and it was decided upon by the government and parliament of that day and decided against them, there is no question that the concession of their request to-day would not be in the best interests of western Canada or of the people of western Canada, speaking at large. There is also a difference between the granting of a claim at that day and the granting of the same claim to-day. At that time the scrip right to 160 acres had a very minimum value. It might have been worth $160, and it might not have been worth nearly so much. I doubt very much if it would be worth that much. To-day a similar scrip claim upon 160 acres would probably be worth from $1,200 to $1,600. There is a difference of ten times the value between a grant made in those days and a grant as it would be made to-day. That is an important change in the conditions which no government could fail to recognize.

On this question of the issue of scrip, the conclusion has been reached by the government that there should not be any further issue of land scrip in the western provinces. It is recognized that the issue of land scrip in the past has not resulted in the well-being of those provinces, it has not resulted to the good of the people of the provinces, it has not promoted their settlement or welfare.

In the first place when scrip was issued it was intended to act as an inducement to settlement. A man was given a property right and on the strength of that he was expected some day to occupy the land and in that way add to the wealth and improvement of the country. But, as a matter of fact, in practice these scrip rights have been used for speculative rather than for settlement purposes in the proportion of probably five to one, and on behalf of the actual settler of the country, the man who goes in there as a homesteader to earn his right to his land, to whom the occupation of the surrounding land is of prime and vital importance, it is not advisable that there should be further issues of land scrip. If there is to be sympathy for any one it should be for the honest settler who is honestly and fairly endeavouring to establish himself on the prairie or in the woods, and who is handicapped to a very great extent by these issues of scrip which allow land to be held without occupation as half-breed or old settlers scrip does allow it to be held, I think it would be certainly an offence against the welfare and well being of the country if the government should, under any possible circumstances except the fulfilment of obligations already entered into, further issue this sort of scrip. The contention that the government occupies the position of a trustee towards these people is not well founded. In order that there shall be a trusteeship there must be a right and the hon. gentleman admitted in the very beginning of his argument that there was no right, that whatever grant was given to the old settlers who came in from 1813 to 1835 was given as an act of grace, and not as a matter of right. Then if there is no right on their part there can be no trusteeship on ours and their claim to this grant must rest on other grounds than that; as to what grounds they can rest their claims upon I am not here to say.

It is argued that because a certain grant was made to the settlers who came in between 1813 and 1835, therefore settlers who came after 1835 are entitled to a grant. I am unable to follow the reasoning. It may be that the grant to settlers between 1813 and 1835 may have been made without due warrant for aught I know. At any rate the fact that the parliament which made that grant refused to make a grant for the time following 1835 is surely sufficient reason for this parliament to say that the case is closed, that unless a good reason can be shown, unless some tangible ground can be shown wherein these people have a tangible right, this government or this parliament should not reopen the question. So far from the fact that the government of that day did not extend the right beyond 1835 being a reason for our extending it, I submit in all fairness and all reason that the fact that they, with all the knowledge they had of all the circumstances and of their responsibility did not extend it beyond that time, is certainly not a reason why we should, unless some tangible and definite reason is produced, such as has not yet been produced.

Mr. T. S. SPROULE (East Grey). The minister treated the House to a number of reasons why nothing should be done at the present time. He says that the fact that parliament granted land to the settlers between 1813 and 1835, was no reason why the settlers coming in subsequently to that were entitled to any consideration. That might or might not be the case, but the fact that they granted land to settlers who came in between 1813 and 1835 when the conditions were much the same as the conditions after 1835, would seem to indicate that those who came in after 1835 were entitled to the same consideration. The minister has not given the House to understand that settlers who came in after 1835 came in under any more favourable circumstances than those who came in between 1813 and 1835. He says that because land is more valuable today scrip will be worth ten times as much as it was 30 years ago, and that that is a reason why we should not give a land grant. If the consideration would be too high parliament could reduce it to a reasonable and proper amount. The

minister said that because this was a case 35 years old, it should not be settled. By the same line of reasoning the claims of the provinces for increased subsidies which have been twice granted in 40 years, should not have been granted.

The minister has criticised the opposition because we have not dealt with several Bills of great importance which might have been passed if the opposition had not wasted so much time over the reciprocity resolutions. If the government were so anxious to pass these Bills they should have brought them in and attempted to pass them. The opposition have never attempted to prevent the Bills passing.

Mr. OLIVER. The opposition certainly prevented the Grain Bill and the clauses of the Railway Act relating to the killing of cattle from passing.

Mr. SPROULE. The opposition only endeavoured to secure features that would have made these fair Bills. They did not try to prevent the Bills going through. He mentioned also the Chinese Immigration Bill.

Mr. OLIVER. I, myself, presented that Bill to the House, and at the request of the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) it was allowed to stand.

Mr. SPROULE. Why? Because of the absence of information that had been brought out by a Royal Commission and which the government would not present to the House although it had been in their possession for weeks.

Only the other day we had to hold up the House to get that information which should have been presented before we separated on the 19th of May. Then there was the Act respecting copyrights. That was held up by the government, not by the opposition. We did not try to prevent it passing, but endeavoured to help the government to make it as useful a measure as possible. The Bill respecting banks and banking, a very important Bill, the opposition never prevented passing. We were willing to go on and discuss it, but it was held up by the government. They held it up for the whole of last session, and it was at the request of the Minister of Finance that the Bank Act was then extended for another year, to enable the government to get certain information which they thought desirable. Practically the same thing happened this year. So that in no sense can the opposition be held responsible for that Act not passing. Another Bill is an Act relating to the water in the railway belt and Peace River block of land. Surely the hon. minister cannot say that the opposition is responsible for that Bill not passing, for the government did not bring it on or attempt to pass it. Had they done so, the opposition would certainly have made no effort to prevent it passing at the earliest possible date. Then, there is the Bill to amend the Dominion Lands Act. Does the Minister of the Interior pretend to say that the opposition tried to hold that up? I heard nothing of it. So it is with a number of these Bills that he claims might have been passed but for the action of the opposition. In what way the action of the opposition prevented the government bringing on these measures and attempting to pass them I am at a loss to understand. I think that when the hon. minister thinks seriously over this again, he will feel that he did the opposition a great injustice when he tried to saddle upon them the responsibility of these Bills not passing, which they were ready to help the government to pass if the government had brought them on.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). The hon. the Minister of the Interior, by the statement he made in answer to the hon. member for East Grey (Mr. Sproule), has given me the text for a speech, and consequently has enabled me to contribute a little towards the obstruction of the opposition to the passing of this reciprocity matter. My speech, however, the first since the re-assembling of the House, will be a short one. The Minister of the Interior tells us that the opposition obstructed the passing of the Grain Bill. We have the pleasure occasionally of a visit in Manitoba from the hon. minister on his passage to and fro between here and the foothills of the Rocky Mountains. On those occasions he sometimes undertakes to preach a sermon. On a missionary tour through Manitoba a few weeks ago he preached the gospel of reciprocity. He did not discuss the Grain Bill in the city of Winnipeg, but he did so away in the northwestern part of the province, where no grain men live, and in Dominion city, in the southwestern part of the province, where no grain men live; and I will quote the words put into his mouth by two Winnipeg papers, the 'Tribune' and the 'Free Press,' and I will characterize this statement, taken from one of these newspapers—I do not refer to it as a part of his speech, because that would be unparliamentary—as one of the meanest representations ever made on a public platform. It contains just enough fact to make it stick, but it is an untruthful representation all the same. Here is the statement:

Turning to the terminal elevator question, Mr. Oliver stated that very powerful interests were opposed to government ownership, and the solution of a commission had been decided upon by the government as an experiment. When the Bill came to the House from the Senate, where it had been discussed at length, he had asked the House to pass it without amendment, but Alexander Haggart, of Win-

nipeg, and other western members, had refused his request, and had held up the Bill. Thus the chance of having the Bill in operation for this year's crop had been jeopardized. The west should deal with those members.

Now, let us see what was done. Important Bills of this nature are usually brought into the Commons first, and then go to the Senate; but for some unaccountable reason, the promoters of this Bill brought it into the Senate in the early part of the session, before the reciprocity resolutions were introduced into this House. There that Bill slumbered all winter, and into the early months of spring. The first opportunity we had of making any observations on that Bill was when the hon. gentleman moved the second reading; and when was that? On the last day before adjournment. It was a Bill of 242 sections. Why, it would have taken the whole of that sitting for the clerk to have read the Bill. I had the temerity to make a few observations on that Bill. Remember, it was introduced into this parliament before there was any thought of reciprocity. It makes changes in the old conditions that were asked for by the farmers, and not one section of it was objected to by the grain men. Here we have a Bill regulating the trade of one of the largest businesses in this country, in which millions of dollars are invested every year, which taxes the ability of our financial institutions to buy and store the grain and market it in foreign countries. In conversation with grain men in Winnipeg, every one of whom forgets every night more than the Minister of the Interior ever knew about the grain business, although they did not object to a clause in the Bill under existing conditions they said that it would make matters perfectly ridiculous. It would result in this, that the grain men, the merchants, and the institutions financing all that business would be sent to do business in Minneapolis, Duluth and Chicago, where they would not be subject to the discipline that is provided for in that Bill. I had the temerity to say a few words. I did not speak more than a few minutes. There were other gentlemen in this House who represented just as good a sentiment in that northwest country as the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) and who had the temerity to make some observations in reference to the Bill. That whole debate did not last more than an hour, and there was not an unnecessary word said. Then what happened? The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) rose in his place and said:

Mr. FIELDING. It is quite evident that this Bill can hardly be classed among the non-contentious measures; and as hours and even minutes are beginning to become very precious if we are to carry out our intention of adjourning, I would suggest that the debate should be adjourned and the Bill stand over.

Mr. KING moved the adjournment of the debate.

So much for this Bill, and I have no doubt that a great deal I have said is applicable to the other Bills which the hon. gentleman has cited as not having passed through this House. This claim of the old settlers is thirty-five years old. Has it lost any merits? Is it barred by the Statute of Limitations? Not at all. No Statute of Limitations runs against the King, whose representative the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver) is. It would be a poor law that would not work both ways, and it would be no credit to the government if they asked for the protection of a statute which would not be any defence to them. The fact that this Bill is 35 years old does not detract in any way from its merits. I admit that these people have no legal claim, any more than the men who fought in South Africa, or the men who received these land grants in our Northwestern country. It is a matter of grace. However, their claim is as good to-day as it was when they first acquired it—I mean as a matter of merit.

We will continue to receive in good nature the lectures which have been given to us from time to time by the hon. gentlemen, but we shall continue to perform our duty and express our approval or disapproval of what may come from the other side of the House.

VOTERS' LISTS IN ORGANIZED DISTRICTS.

Mr. BOYCE. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I desire to refer briefly to a matter which was mentioned in this House on Friday, 21st inst., in connection with the lists in the organized or unorganized portions of Ontario. I would draw the attention of the House to the statements made by the hon. Minister of Justice with reference to the position of things. By reference to 'Hansard' you will find that I drew the attention of the government to the position of the law with regard to the making of the lists in the unorganized districts of Ontario, and asked certain specific questions. I asked:

Has there been a proclamation under the Act of 1908 prescribing an earlier day for the making up of the voters' lists? if so, when will the work of enumeration be started and how long is it expected, from the most recent advice the government has, that it will take; and, will the government see to it that the Board of Registration is prevented in this instance from arrogating to itself the functions of government by abridging the time which by this Act is directed to be followed as far as possible.

To this the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) replied:

In regard to the present situation, fortunately we are not in the same position that existed three years ago No one, I presume, has any expectation that the general elections which follow upon a dissolution of this House, are any where in sight, or are at all liable to take place until there has been at least one session or perhaps two sessions more. In these circumstances there seems no danger to be apprehended that it may be found necessary an the part of the learned judges who are at present engaged in the preparation of these lists to curtail at all the time which the statute provides for taking the various steps.

I had pointed out to the Minister of Justice the very grave injustice which had been done to this country prior to the last general election by the Board of Registration being permitted to shorten the statutory periods fixed for the making up of these voters' lists, and I drew the attention of the Minister of Justice to the facts concerning the violations of the law in 1908 so that there might be no repetition of these violations at this election. I pointed out to the hon. gentleman, that the populated area in these unorganized territories of New Ontario, and for which voters' lists would be made up had been considerably enlarged since the last election, and that the means of communication were considerably more difficult than they were in 1908, therefore we were at more inconvenience than in 1908, and, if the inconvenience of shortening the time was great in 1908, it is greater still now, with the larger area and more difficult communication.

Under the machinery which governs the Dominion Elections Act, section 9a provides that the first step is a proclamation. This proclamation has to run for 30 days. After this we have the posting of the lists and then a further period of 15 days for appeal. These are all fair and reasonable periods, having regard to the immense expanse of territory to be covered and the amount of information to be obtained in order to get a fair list. In 1908, the statutory period from the 1st August to the 15th October was not sufficient to enable the preparation of the lists. As I pointed out to the House the other day, it took practically from the 1st August to midday October 26—the day of the election—to get these lists completed, and on the ground ready for the polls. As a matter of fact, by the opening of the Printing Bureau on Sunday, the running of a special train from Ottawa to Sault Ste. Marie at the expense of the government and a further train along the Algoma Central from Sault Ste. Marie to mile 68, also at the expense of the government, the lists were at the polls, completed and revised, three hours after the polls had opened. That ought to be sufficient to show that the statutory periods were short enough, and that there was little to be gained along the line of doing justice to the people by shortening the time any further.

Now the hon. Minister of Justice gave a very peculiar reply, as will be seen. He said:

In these circumstances there seems no danger to be apprehended that it may be found necessary on the part of the learned judges who are at present engaged in the preparation of these lists to curtail at all the time which the statute provides for taking the various steps.

According to the information which I hold in my hand, and which was within the knowledge of the Minister of Justice, that was an attempt to deceive this House. For, at that time, the Minister of Justice knew perfectly well that, prepared in his office and signed by his deputy was a proclamation by which the time under the statute for making up these lists had been shortened to two months. Instead of allowing from the 1st of August to the 15th of October, this proclamation directed that the lists should be prepared between the 18th of July and the 18th of September. This document which was known to the minister, is in direct contradiction of the statement he made on the 21st of July. I say that such a condition of things calls for protest and strong expression of resentment which I now desire to give. One does expect, when he asks in a reasonable manner for information from a minister of the Crown, especially on a non-political subject, or one that is supposed to be non-political, and more especially when the person of whom the question is asked is the chief judicial executive of the Dominion, that he will receive a fair statement of the facts as known to the minister. But when the minister deliberately descends to giving to the House information entirely contrary to what he knows to be correct, that calls, as I say, for a strong expression of resentment from members on both sides of the House. I ask the attention of the House to this matter, that my resentment of the minister's answer may be made known, and that the country may take knowledge of the lamentable and pitiable position to which ministers of the Crown descend to delude members on this side with inaccurate information. I hope the Minister of Justice will rise in his place now and give to the House some reasonable explanation of the extraordinary statements contained in his answer in contrast with this proclamation.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). I do not feel that I am called

upon to make any explanation of the matter. I am quite sure that every member of this House understood the remarks I made on Friday last in reference to the probability of an election within a short time in the future in exactly the sense in which I intended them to be understood. I am quite sure there was no one in this House who was deceived in any way by what I said, nor did I intend that anybody should be. And, especially with regard to the proclamation with reference to the preparations of the voters' lists in the unorganized portions of the province of Ontario, the hon. gentleman must attribute to his fellow members in this House a degree of lack of perception beyond the ordinary if he supposes that anyone could think another would be deceived on a subject of that sort by what was said on Friday last with a proclamation on the subject appearing on Saturday. At the time I was speaking, on Friday, I was, of course, perfectly aware of the fact that a proclamation was pending, that the proclamation had been prepared, and would appear in the 'Gazette' of the following day. What that has to do with what I said upon the Friday I am not able to understand. With regard to the whole question of the preparation of the voters' lists in the unorganized territory I have nothing to add to or subtract from what I said on Friday. I am not here defending the statute referred to; that statute is not at present under consideration. When it was before a previous parliament for consideration I defended it. I thought it was proper legislation; I stated so then; I think so still; I state so still. It is an Act which is not now under the consideration of this House, the provisions of which need not be, so far as I can see, debated; at all events, it is not my intention to debate them. Under the statute, this parliament delegated to the judges of the district courts of that territory the duty of preparing the lists, having regard, as far as possible to the dates for the various steps prescribed by the provincial statute. Upon the judges that duty and responsibility rests, and that duty and responsibility is not being interferred with in any degree by the Minister of Justice, or, so far as I am aware, by any member of the government.

Mr. BOYCE. May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? He states that he knew at the time he gave the information to the House that the proclamation had been prepared. And that was the very question that I asked and that he did not answer. For he said, at page 10095 of 'Hansard' 'the matter referred to is not in any way in the hands of the Department of Justice.' As he had the knowledge that the proclamation had been issued, why, when I asked him the direct question, did he not give the informaton to the House instead of giving the information that the matter was not in the hands of his department at all?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. If the hon. gentleman (Mr. Boyce) reiterates in spite of what I said that I attempted to mislead the House, I have only to give that statement an unqualified denial.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Commitee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS — RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH (Algoma). Last Friday when we adjourned the debate, it was my misfortune to have the floor. And resuming that debate this evening, I do not expect to detain the House at any great length. However, the attitude of the government and its supporters leads one on this side of the House to the necessity of taking up a longer time than would be necessary had we not a lot of gentlemen on the opposite side who are not only bound but gagged and not able to take part in this debate. We might possibly shorten our remarks in this discussion had we enlightment from gentlemen who now sit opposite us as dumb as oysters.

There are some provinces of this Dominion from which no one has been heard, sitting on the government side of the House. But on this side, every province has been heard from, except Prince Edward Island, and the hon. member representing that island on the opposition side will be heard from in due time. On Friday last the Minister of Finance and myself had a little discussion over the lumber question, and I endeavoured to show that the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs did not know their business when they were dickering at Washington on the lumber question. I was endeavouring to show that these two gentlemen, these two wandering, weary Willies, wandered away to Washington with the idea in their noddles that they understood every phase of every question in regard to every industry of this country affected by this pact, but we find that they were very remiss in regard to the lumber interest. We have heard a great deal in this House about its importance. We have heard of its importance in British Columbia the other day, and last night we heard of its importance from the Minister of Public Works who represents a constituency in New Brunswick. Now the Minister of Public Works last night, I thought, was endeavouring to come to the rescue of his friend the Minister of Finance, and was endeavouring to enlighten the House on the shingle question. He laid great stress

on the fact that they had put the duty back to the old rate, from 50 to 30 cents a thousand on shingles. But that was not at all the argument this side was putting up. Here are two gentlemen invited down to Washington to make a bargain with regard to reciprocity, and the lumber question comes up, the lumber industries of the two countries. Now, my point is that, having been invited down to Washington to make this treaty, if they had had the interest of this country at heart, or the interest of the lumber industry at heart, they would have seen to it that Canadian shingles entered the United States on the same footing as United States shingles come into Canada. That would have been something like a reciprocity treaty. I endeavoured last Friday night to enlighten the Minister of Finance on this question, but the Minister of Public Works, in coming to the rescue of his colleague in regard to shingles, carefully avoided the question of the entry of lumber into this country, partly dressed, and in some cases fully dressed. He forgot to tell us that while the Americans are allowed to send their dressed lumber or partly dressed lumber into Canada free of duty, we are not allowed to send a single board into that country if there is one scratch of a plane upon it. I want to emphasize that. I say that if the hon. gentlemen who went to Washington to make this treaty had had the interest of the country at heart, they would have seen to it that the American duty, instead of being reduced from $1.75 to $1.25, was taken off altogether.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman says we should have asked for certain things in return for what we were giving. In this agreement, what were we giving the Americans in respect to lumber?

Mr. SMYTH. I am not taking that point at all. If the Minister of Public Works had known anything about lumber he would have seen to it that the Americans gave us reciprocity in lumber.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will allow me—he says that in return for what we were giving we should have got certain things which he described. I ask him what were we giving in this reciprocity agreement to the Americans as respects lumber?

Mr. SMYTH. Have they not enjoyed free lumber from Canada for many years?

Mr. FIELDING. That is not the question.

Mr. SMYTH. You have got nothing at all from them.

Mr. FIELDING. As respects lumber we did not give them anything at all, they are getting nothing with respect to lumber, that they have not had for nearly twenty years.

Mr. SMYTH. The hon. gentleman is not going to be allowed to give away the trade and commerce of this country into the hands of the United States. I say he was remiss in his duty towards Canada when dealing with them in any shape or form, that he did not secure the free entry of Canadian lumber into that country the same as we give to their lumber. The hon. gentleman says that he was giving them nothing. I do not know why he should have been so anxious to deal with them at all. The Americans do not dicker with anybody unless they see some profit in it. They got everything they asked for from Canada, and if they had asked for more they would have got it. When I was speaking on Friday night I referred to the danger of this country dealing with the Americans in this matter at all, and in the way proposed. I was trying to show the House, as the hon. member for Vancouver says, in my weak and squeaky voice, that there was a real danger in this country entering into this pact with the United States at all. Yesterday the Minister of Finance, when he was trying to make a little campaign speech, made light of some of the statements made by the senators and representatives on the American side. I can hardly understand why the minister should make light of those gentlemen, in face of some of the remarks they have made. This House has heard quoted over and over again the remarks of Mr. Champ Clarke, of Mr. Wilson, the Secretary of Agriculture, of Senator McColl, of Senator Cummins, of Iowa, of Mr. Prince, of Illinois.

I am not going to trouble you with them all, but I have one or two that I wish to bring to the attention of the House. Mr. Prince, of Illinois, in the House of Representatives some time ago, made this statement:

> What is the history of the American people?

I want to lay this before the hon. gentlemen who have British blood coursing through their veins, and to ask them whether they feel like entering into a pact with the United States, when the gentlemen who represent the United States have in their breasts this sentiment, which has been expressed by them time and time again:

> What is the history of the American people? We might as well be frank and honest. Americans went into Texas, Americanized it, and it was annexed as part of this great Union. Americans went into Hawaii, Americanized it, and annexed it. And if these bright young men that the President speaks of in his speech—these clever, active, virile, vigorous young men from the farms of Illinois and the northern states, the thousands and hundreds of thousands of them—go up into that northland, 92 or 100 and more on this side, as against seven on the other, what do you think will be the effect of it?

That is how they feel about it. What will the effect be once they get the upper hand in this country? They will Americanize it as they did Texas and other parts. I am not going to bother the House with any more extracts. This is a feeling that exists with nine-tenths of the American people to-day. In travelling all over this country, as I have done during the time that this subject has been up for discussion before the House, I have met a great many American people and I am safe in saying that nine-tenths of them consider that this is the first step towards being annexed to them sooner or later. I am sure there are dozens of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and some on the other side of the House who know that these people take that view. There is a real danger of the American people getting the upper hand in this country. There is a real danger of the American people getting the upper hand of our farming interests. We are one as against twelve. There has been much stress is laid on the fact that we are opening up a great market for our farmers, but the fact has been lost sight of that we are opening up a great market for the American farmers, a market of twelve to one for the goods that come into this country. If you are entering into negotiations with a corporation, whether you go into the deal with them or not, they stand out always for the best end of it. In this matter they have stood out and got everything they asked for. I think I would be remiss in my duty to my constituents, and to the people of Canada, and that I would also be ignoring the traditions that I was brought up to believe in, and my devotion to British institutions if I were to record my vote in behalf of this pact. I intended placing on 'Hansard' some other matters here that are very pertinent to this question, but I will reserve them until some future time. They refer to the trade and commerce of this country. This is the second time that I have had an opportunity of placing my views before the House on this matter, and I was most anxious to have the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) in his place. He may be home sleeping but he is not attending to what he is paid to attend to by the people of Canada. Here is a question so important that, according to the hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Oliver), all other business before the House has to stand aside. If it is so important why is it not necessary for the Minister of Customs to be in the House. We have also the right hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir Richard Cartwright). Where is he—asleep in the Senate chamber? When we require any information from his department we are told by the right hon. Prime Minister, or some other hon. gentleman who might be leading the House, that in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, he is not able to reply, but he will find out from the old gentleman just as soon as he can, and will bring the information to the House. The people of this country expect active gentlemen at the head of every department of this or any other government. I am not casting any reflection on any gentleman who is sitting in this House in that regard, but it is an outrage when we have an important matter such as this is before the House that we have not the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Trade and Commerce in their places. I have perhaps taken up as much time as I ought, and unless the hon. Finance Minister (Mr. Fielding) wants to tackle me on the lumber question, I do not know very well what I should say. But, just one matter comes to my mind in regard to the lumber interests as to how this measure affects the farmer. I said the other day that I would much prefer seeing a duty of $2 per thousand placed on southern pine and Michigan hemlock to seeing the duty removed from lumber entering Canada, and the Minister of Finance at that time said that it was not their policy and that they did not intend to do any such thing. But he forgot that he was throwing a stone in the face of the farmers in the newer parts of this country. The farmers of new or northern Ontario who are ocupying farms largely covered with hemlock and other cheap grades of timber heretofore have had a fairly good market, but owing to the fact that the gentlemen who own the southern timber have large tracts of land, and that their payments are now pressing them, they are making a dumping ground of Canada for their lumber. The gentlemen who own these limits in the south are only paying 50 cents per thousand feet stumpage, they are only paying a nominal yearly ground rent and they are geting their lumbering done at fifty and sixty cents per day by negro labour, as against the lumbermen and farmers of this country who receive from $2.50 to $3.75 per day. That southern lumber is being dumped into Canada as against the farmer of Ontario, at least,and I have no doubt the same condition obtains in Quebec, New Brunswick and British Columbia and is sold at much below the price at which the farmers are able to produce their hemlock and spruce timber.

As I said the other night, you will find every mill yard in the district which I have the honour to represent piled high with lumber that should be used by the Canadian people that is now standing rotting on the piles, while American lumber is allowed in to take its place. I hope our weak and humble efforts will have so affected the government and the gentlemen responsible for the delay and obstruction in the passage of the several measures

referred to by the Minister of the Interior, that they will at once grant an appeal to the people. The Minister of the Interior says that some very important matters have had to lie over because we chose to act in the interests of our constituents and to debate this subject, and he says we are obstructionists. I say the whole responsibility for any loss of time or of anything else that has been caused by this reciprocity debate rests on the government, because, at the beck and call of the American President, they have introduced what I might call a crime against the people of this country, this pact with the American government. If they had not introduced this measure the wheels of progress would have gone on in this House and we would have been able to pass the important measures about which the Minister of the Interior is so much concerned. The right hon. the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance understand that the wheels of progress can only go on in this House when they give way to the will of those who represent the majority of the people, I ask them to advance it and to advance it in the quickest way we know, that is by going before the people who have sent us here and asking them to tell us how we should vote on this very important question.

Mr. S. SHARPE (North Ontario) I had hoped that the government and their supporters would have seen fit to withdraw from this unfortunate pact after having had an opportunity during the recess of consultation with their supporters and after reflection and analysis, and after having fully digested the details of this agreement. Of course I quite understand that such an attitude would have entailed heart burnings and humiliations and possibly withdrawal from the cabinet of the two ministers responsible for this unfortunate agreement. I suppose it is too much to expect such self-sacrifice from the hon. gentlemen who went to Washington to negotiate this important treaty on behalf of the farmers of this country. I would like to know where the champions of this agreement are to-day. Their voices are silent as the tomb; outside of the cabinet ministers no voices are raised in defence of this agreement, it has assumed the position of an undefended case. When the Finance Minister first introduced this agreement an hon, member supporting the government rushed from the House and telegraphed to the paper supporting the government in his constituency that it was the greatest act of diplomacy in the history of Canada, of great importance to the farmers of Ontario and showed statesmanship almost divine. After the hon. gentleman had recovered from his spasm and after the facts in regard to the twelve favoured nations had been extracted from the hon. gentleman, I might almost say at the point of the bayonet, by the leader of the opposition, after the subject had been thoroughly discussed and the hostility of the people of the country aroused, the hon. gentleman to whom I refer was as dumb as an oyster, he has refused to raise his voice in the House in defence of the agreement.

One of the most remarkable features in connection with this whole treaty is the absolute lack of information on the part of our plenipotentiaries when they went to negotiate it. Our representatives going to Washington had no data or statistics or detailed information upon which they could form an intelligent judgment or negotiate an intelligent treaty for the farmers of this country. In their hurry and anxiety to complete this agreement and to accomplish something to divert attention from their long record of maladministration, of departmental inefficiency and their foolish naval policy, they neglected to fortify themselves with the necessary data which was in the possession of the American government.

On the 16th of March, I moved for a return in connection with certain important commodities which I, in my innocence, thought the ministers would have had under their hands. The return for which I moved called for the average prices of butter and eggs in London, England, for the past five years in comparison with the prices respectively in eastern provinces, in Montreal, in Toronto, in Minneapolis, in Chicago, in Detroit, in Buffalo, in Boston and in New York. The Minister of Agriculture took no exception to the order going and said he would supply the information in the course of a few days. After many days they refused to bring down the return and this was the letter that was laid upon the table of the House.

Trade and Commerce Department,
Ottawa, 25th March, 1911.
Order of the House.

Sir,—I beg to return you herewith your reference No. 172 for statement showing comparative prices of butter and eggs in London, England, and certain points in Canada and the United States. This department has no information upon the subject. Such average prices of butter and eggs, however, are published in trade papers all over the world which can be referred to by any one desiring the information.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. C. T. O'HARA,
Deputy Minister.

Thomas Mulvey, Esq.,
Under Secretary of State,
Ottawa.

The butter and egg industries are two of the most important branches of farming

in the province of Ontario, and you would at least expect that the two ministers negotiating an important treaty like this would have had detailed information in regard to the comparative prices in the three countries. I also asked some questions in reference to the lack of information on the part of our representatives at Washington. The questions and answers appear in the 'Hansard' of April 10, 1911. They are as follows:

1. Was the purpose of entering into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States to secure better prices for Canadian produce?

The answer by the Finance Minister was:

The purpose of entering into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States was to obtain that expansion of market for Canadian products which has been sought by all governments in Canada since the formation of the Dominion.

An absolute evasion of the question which conveyed no information to any one requiring the answer to that simple question. I further asked:

2. Were the representatives of Canada before entering upon the negotiations supplied with comprehensive data and statistics collected by experts and officials covering a considerable period and showing a comparative list of prices of all products in the principal markets of Canada and the United States?
3. If so, will data and statistics be available to the members of the House by laying them on the table of the House?
4. Generally speaking, how do the prices of farm products in the United States compare with the prices in Canada?
5. Upon what information is the answer to the preceding question based?

The answer to these questions was:

2 and 5. These questions have been fully discussed in the House since the hon. member placed his question on the notice paper and the views of the government thereon have been stated.

While the question was on the Order Paper, the discussion to which the Minister of Finance referred took place on the 6th of April, and during that discussion we had this remarkable statement by the Minister of Finance. Speaking of the commissioners appointed by the United States government to thoroughly investigate conditions in Canada, he said:

That commission has been conducting investigations not only here but in other countries, and the information was probably necessary for our American neighbours, when they were entering upon a new and radical departure from their past fiscal policy.

As though we were not entering on as radical a change in our fiscal policy as the ministers were in theirs. He further goes on:

No such tariff commission and no such information was required to enable this government to deal with the question of reciprocity in natural products. There was no need of statistics to satisfy this government that reciprocity in natural products was a good thing.

That is a most remarkable admission on the part of the Minister of Finance. He admits categorically that they had no information or statistics. He claims that they were possessed of sufficient knowledge in a general way that reciprocity in natural products was a good thing for Canada, and consequently, without fortifying themselves with detailed information such as was in the possession of the United States representatives, they went to Washington and negotiated this treaty. Therefore, they find that it is not meeting with the approval and endorsation of the people of Canada. The hon. Minister of Finance made this further statement:

What we have done is no departure from the policy of Canada; it is in accordance with the policy of Canada for forty years.

That was a most remarkable admission on the part of the Minister of Finance. Contrast the position of the representatives of Canada with the position of the United States government. The United States government during the previous months had a full staff of experts travelling through the United States and Canada gathering information in order to enable them to come to an intelligent decision upon these important matters. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton), in his discussion of this question, deals with this important phase of the matter. On page 4475 of 'Hansard' he says:

Then, we should have had, I think, some comparative statements of prices. This whole question relates to markets and to prices. It would have been a comparatively small matter for a body of experts employed by the government to have got for us a comparative list of the prices of the principle commodities, in the United States, in Canada, and in the other countries concerned. But we have not received it.

Then I ask, in the name of all that is reasonable, how can the members of this House come to an intelligent decision on this question without the necessary data and statistics which were in the possession of the United States plenipotentiaries when this treaty was negotiated? If we look at the documents prepared by the experts of the United States government, we shall see what mountains of information they were possessed of. They did not go into this negotiation blindfolded; they went with information that had been collected for months in the United States and in Canada. I have a copy of document No. 849 regarding reciprocity with Canada, prepared by

the experts of the United States government, and containing 132 closely written pages. We could not get any information from our representatives. They refused to produce it if they had any. That information would be detrimental to their side of the case; it would show that the prices of staple farm products are higher in this country than on the American side, and that consequently the whole purpose and object of this agreement falls to the ground. Any reasonable man who looks at the matter in this light must come to the conclusion that the action of this government, in negotiating this treaty at this particular time, was both premature and unwise. It was premature, because they were anticipating the action of the Democratic party, who had won the elections for Congress on the promise that they would reduce the tariff. They were, in fact, negotiating a live treaty with a dead party. Both the Reform party in Canada and the Republican party in the United States were becoming discredited by their long terms in office, and they sought to divert public attention from their records of mal-administration. If this government had held its hand for a short time, this country would have got in a short time all the advantages, if there are any, of the treaty, without making the sacrifices therein entailed. Not only was the action of the government premature, but it was unwise, because the facts extracted from the Minister of Finance, and the facts prepared by the experts of the United States government, show conclusively that the prices of staple farm products in Canada are higher than they are in the United States, and consequently the whole purpose and object of this agreement falls to the ground. It is not much wonder that this unfortunate agreement has been prematurely and unwisely entered into by our representatives, when we have signal displays of ignorance of its provisions on the part of various ministers of the Crown. We find the Minister of Agriculture, in discussing this treaty on the 28th of March, speaking of the important commodity of potatoes as follows:

> In 12 years of high duties the United States accepted from Canada $11,000,000 worth of potatoes more than they sent into Canada.

Now, the trade returns prepared by the Minister of Agriculture's own department show that during the years from 1901 to 1910 we exported to the United States less than $2,000,000 worth of potatoes, and that the total value of potatoes exported from Canada to the United States during the ten years from 1901 to 1910 was $1,958,886 worth, and that we imported from the United States into Canada $1,419,651 worth, a balance, in our favour, in the ten years of $539,235. So that the Minister of Agriculture was out only $10,500,000. Then we had the Minister of Inland Revenue, who is the owner and editor of the 'Daily Times,' published in Victoria, writing an editorial in that paper of the date of July 12, 1911, containing the following:

> It is our duty to point out that it is not part of the proposal under the reciprocity agreement to allow American-made shingles to enter Canada free.

As a matter of fact, the agreement provides for shingles to come in free.

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). They have always been free.

Mr. FIELDING. When the hon. gentleman makes the statement that they are free, it is an incorrect statement.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It is in the schedules, and the agreement ratified it.

Mr. FIELDING. There is nothing in the agreement respecting the admission of shingles into Canada free.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). So far as the tariff law of this country is concerned American shingles are allowed to come in free.

Mr. FIELDING. And we can change it any time we wish.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The hon. minister said it is not the object of this agreement to allow American made shingles to come into Canada free—another exhibition on the part of a minister of the Crown showing that he is not familiar with the terms of the agreement. We had another exhibition of this kind from the Postmaster General, who was dilating upon the excellencies of this agreement. The hon. Postmaster General is usually well informed, particularly in regard to matters connected with his own department, but when he comes to discuss the question of Fisheries and lobsters, he is in deep water. The hon. Postmaster General was telling us what an excellent thing it would be for the fishermen of the maritime provinces to have free access for their lobsters into the United States markets, when the hon. member for Digby (Mr. Jameson) arose and informed him that lobsters had been on the free list for a great many years.

Then we had the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) one of the plenipotentiaries who went to negotiate this all important treaty—a man supposed to know it from cover to cover. The hon. Minister of Customs was questioned with regard to an important commodity called talc. He

said that talc was the material from which talcum powder was made, and that talcum powder was used as a toilet preparation. But, the talc contemplated by this agreement is the talc used for the manufacture of paper, which the Americans wished to import into their country free of duty. If hon. gentleman will refer to page 6 of schedule A they will find it covers 'talc, ground, bolted or precipitated, naturally or artificially, not for toilet use.' Even the agreement did not provide for talc used for toilet purposes, being exported into United States free of duty.

When you have two ministers of the crown, supposed to be familiar with the contents of the treaty, and the industrial and commercial conditions of this country, so unfamiliar with the terms of their own agreement; how can you expect the members of this House or the public at large to pass an intelligent judgment upon the agreement, unless they are supplied with all possible data and statistics? What else can you expect when two Ministers of the Crown, one an ex-newspaper editor and the other a biscuit manufacturer, who took precious good care that the industry in which his money is invested is not to be prejudiced in any way, go to Washington, and negotiate for 5,000,000 farmers; without the assistance or advice of the representatives of the interests affected, and this is the result. It seems to me we were sending a couple of political quack doctors down to that specialist, Dr. Taft, at Washington, and that they brought back a reciprocity pill, the ingredients of which and the effect of which they were ignorant, and are asking the Canadian people to swallow it. It reminds me of the old nursery rhyme; 'Open your mouth, shut your eyes, and we will give you something that will make you healthy, wealthy and wise.' 'But' say the Canadian people 'supposing the pill kills us?' The answer is 'Then you will be none the wiser.' 'But, supposing it almost kills us?' The answer to that is 'if perchance you survive, then you can punish us by turning us out of office.' 'But supposing by any possibility it might help us?' 'Then, we are the heaven born statesmen, our friends describe us.'

I placed a question on the Order Paper, but the hon. Minister of Finance did not give me what I could call an unequivocal answer. I desired to know the object and purpose of this agreement. The hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and other members of the Cabinet said that this agreement was for the benefit of the farmers, but the hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) said that it was for the benefit of the consumer.

Mr. MURPHY. Where did the Secretary of State say that?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). In the Ottawa Free Press of April 7th, 1911, the hon. Secretary of State is reported to have said:

Finally, Mr. Murphy held that this was a poor man's agreement and that it cut down the vested interests and middlemen who were so clamorous against it.

The base of the agreement is the cheapening of the workmen's food; it is based on the elemental principle of the greatest good for greatest numbers (cheers).

The hon. Secretary of State was going around making campaign speeches and saying that this is a poor man's agreement, on the other hand other members of the government were saying that the agreement was for the benefit of the farmer—raising the prices. In the 'Ottawa Citizen' of April 2nd, the hon. Secretary of State is reported as follows:

'This was essentially a poor man's agreement,' continued the speaker. Onions, butter, cabbages, beans, milk and many other articles, staples of the workingman's domestic life, would all be cheapened. In fact, upon this the treaty was primarily based.

How can the ministry reconcile these two positions? They must either accept the one or the other Are they not fooling the country in some way or another?

On the floor of the House here we had the hon. Minister of Finance, the hon. Minister of Customs and the hon. Minister of Agriculture all stating that the object of this treaty was for the purpose of raising the prices for the farmers—that it was a farmers' agreement. The right hon. the Prime Minister in speaking in this House on March 7, 1911, used this language:

I stated a moment ago that the agreement we made is simply to get better prices for the products of the Canadian farmer.

In face of this we have the hon. Secretary of State going before the consumers and saying that this is a poor man's agreement, making for the lowering of prices. What has the hon. Secretary of State to say in reference to this matter. Or perhaps, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) will enlighten us upon the question, or maybe the hon. member for Hants (Mr. Black) would enlighten us?

Mr. BLACK. When a speaker gets so undignified, so flippant, the member for Hants (Mr. Black) has better business than to take any notice of him.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Not only are the members of the cabinet hopelessly divided on the objects and purposes of this agreement, but their candidates are also divided. When they address the mechanics and artisans, they declare this is the poor man's agreement, and say it will lower prices. But when they are in

the rural districts, the agreement is to be of the greatest benefit to the farmer because it will enhance his prices. Mr. J. G. O'Donoghue was the government candidate in South Toronto last election. He is the representative and salaried officer of the labour unions throughout the Dominion, and is the possible candidate again on behalf of the government in South Toronto. Addressing the mechanics at Toronto he say:s

The workingman has his choice of the following articles of food: apples protected 40 cents a barrel, bacon and ham protected, 2 cents a pound, cheese, 3 cents a pound, butter, 4 cents a pound, potatoes, 15 cents a bushel.

What change in the above will reciprocity bring forth? How will it affect the workingman's food? The following list will tell:

Present and proposed rate:

Apples, 40 cents a bbl., free.
Pears, 25 per cent, free.
Peaches, $1 per 100 lbs., free.
Turnips, 30 cents a bush., free.
Onions, 30 cents a bush., free.
Cabbages, 30 cents a doz., free.
Beans, 25 cents a bush., free.
Eggs, 3 cents a doz., free.
Butter, 4 cents a lb., free.
Cheese, 3 cents per lb., free.
Potatoes, 20 cents a bush., free.
Fresh milk, 17½ per cent, free.
Poultry, 20 to 25 per cent, free.
Fish, 1 cent per lb., free

Reduced rates are provided for beef, bacon and hams, pork, lard, meats generally, tomatoes, and other vegetables, oatmeal, &c.

The result to my mind will mean cheaper food for the worker. That is something devoutly to be wished. The worker will have two markets instead of one to buy from.

Rents are lower the more landlords there are, trying to obtain tenants. Food prices will be lower the more food owners there are trying to obtain purchasers.

The hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie), at page 7418 of 'Hansard,' speaking upon this important question says that it is absolutely illogical to say such a thing, that it cannot raise the prices to the farmer and reduce them to the consumer—it is absolutely absurd and ridiculous. But, to cap the climax, we have the statement of the Prime Minister himself. A meeting was to be held in Toronto by Mr. T. C. Robinette, who was the government candidate in Centre Toronto in the last election, and is the alternative nominee for North York, in case the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), is defeated, he will try to carry North York at the following election. Mr. Robinette wanted something to read to the electors, so he got a telegram from the Prime Minister, which appears on the front page of the 'Globe' and dated 21st March, 1911, as follows:

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario).

We have not hurt the manufacturers and will not do so. We have benefited the farmer and the consumer. When the time comes we will sweep the country from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Did you ever listen to such absolute humbug and nonsense? It promises everything to everybody. Is it not a perfect classic of contradiction? If the right hon. leader of the government can convince the manufacturers that he is not going to hurt them, and then if he can convince the farmer that he is not going to hurt him; and if he can convince the consumer that he is not going to hurt him, but benefit him—if he can perform that impossible task, I should not be surprised if he could sweep the country. The farmers are to be benefited—how? By raising their prices. The consumers are to be benefited—how? By lowering their prices. What kind of mental gymnastics is required to perform a task like that? It has become definitely known by the investigation and report of the experts appointed by the United States government, who, as I have said, went throughout the cities of the United States and Canada, that the prices of staple farm products in Canada are a great deal higher than they are in the United States. On April 10, I asked the Minister of Finance the following question:—

1. Was the purpose of entering into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States to secure better prices for Canadian produce?

And the Minister of Finance answered:—

1. The purpose of entering into negotiations for reciprocity with the United States was to obtain that expansion of market for Canadian products which has been sought by all governments in Canada since the formation of the Dominion.

The hon. gentleman speaks of the expansion of markets for our products. A glorious expansion to get into a market where they are exporting the same produce that we have to sell! a glorious expansion to get into a market where the prices are lower than our own! A glorious expansion when this is obtained at the expense of throwing open our markets not only to the ninety or one hundred millions in the United States, but to the three or four hundred millions that make up the favoured nations.

Now, personally, I am unalterably opposed to reciprocity, upon a great many grounds. Some of these grounds have been mentioned by others, but I make no apology for repeating them. I do not expect that any expression of opinion that I give in this House will change hon. members on your right, Mr. Chairman. But I do expect that my views will be conveyed to my constituents, and they will see

upon what grounds I am opposing this agreement. I think this is a most unfortunate junction in our affairs for the entering into a reciprocity agreement. As every person admits, Canada has been enjoying an era of great prosperity, and we should be content to allow ourselves to work out our own destiny without interference from or subjection to the United States. Hon. Sir George W. Ross, who occupied a prominent position in the ranks of the Reform party for many years, and who was premier of the province of Ontario, has spoken in no uncertain tone against reciprocity. He gave an illustration to the people of Canada of their position. He spoke about an aged man who, though in good health, wanted to get better. And his epitaph was:—

I was well; I wanted to be better; and here I lie.

There has been no demand or sentiment in Canada for reciprocity. In fact, the Minister of Militia (Sir Frederick Borden) in an interview in Boston on the 28th of October last, while these negotiations were in progress, stated, as reported in the Montreal 'Herald' that 'the attitude of the people of Canada was to let well enough alone.' That should be the attitude of the government which is boasting of its surpluses, and of the prosperity of Canada, which they claim are due to their ability in administering the affairs of the country, but which we claim arise in spite of their efforts, and in spite of the effect of their administration.

Another reason why I am opposed to reciprocity is the fact that if we are not ingrates, if we have any gratitude at all, if we have any commercial favours to give, we ought to give them to our own kith and kin, who are furnishing us with the money to develop our natural resources. It was British, and not United States, capital that developed Canada. It was British capital that constructed the Grand Trunk railway, that constructed the Canadian Pacific railway, that constructed the Grand Trunk Pacific, that constructed the Intercolonial. It was British capital that constructed our great canal systems, the Welland, the Soo, the Cornwall, and the Rideau canals. We borrowed millions from Great Britain to build extensions to these lines. We are looking to the British market to-day to build our Hudson Bay railway, the Georgian Bay canal, and a new Welland canal. British capital built our cities, paved our streets, organized our banks, supplied us with capital for our commercial and industrial enterprises. Then if we have any favours to offer we should offer them to Great Britain, and not to the United States.

Another reason why I am opposed to this reciprocity pact is the fact that in days gone by, when Canada was in a position that she required the markets of the United States, our overtures were rejected. Time after time when our representatives went to Washington seeking access to their markets, they slammed the door in our faces. Consequently now, when we have climbed the long hill of prosperity, when we are not in need of their markets, when we are independent of their markets, there is no reason why we should make sacrifices in order to gain access to those markets which we no longer require. This country, and especially the older portions of this country, have been settled by the United Empire Loyalists, men who were driven out of the United States in 1776, dispossessed of their property, whose wives and children were subjected to the rigours of a northern clime on account of their loyalty to the British Empire. Since that historic occasion the United States has time after time endeavoured to gain control of this country, but we have always swept back the Americanizing influences. We find in the constitution of the United States in 1776, incorporated in one of the articles, a standing invitation to the provinces of Canada to join the American union. But upon that occasion we swept back the American influences. In 1812 when Great Britain was engaged in a life and death struggle with the dictator of the world, the United States attempted to take advantage of her necessities, and we had the war of 1812. And again we swept back the Americanizing influences on that occasion. In 1866 the United States denounced reciprocity in order to starve Canada into annexation or submission. But the result was that instead of being starved into submission, with Canadian pluck, and energy, and enterprise, we built up the Canadian confederation, and again we swept back the Americanizing influences. In 1866 and 1870 we had the Fenian raids, which were fostered and abetted in United States territory, and again Canadians swept back the Americanizing influence. In 1891 we had the Reform party under the leadership of the present Prime Minister, again pandering to Americanizing influences, and introducing a policy which they called unrestricted reciprocity, a policy which was instrumental in driving a great many noted men from the Reform ranks, just as the policy of 1911 is driving many noted men from their ranks to-day. We had the greatest intellect that the Reform party possessed upon that occasion, the Hon. Edward Blake, denouncing the policy of unrestricted reciprocity of 1891, and forsaking the party on account of the Americanizing tendencies of that policy. Again the people responded nobly when they were asked, and they swept back the Americaniz-

ing influences. Now in 1911 we have our old friend reappearing in another guise. The unrestricted reciprocity of 1891 will ultimately come from the present agreement if it is carried into effect. The farmers of this country are not going to see their protection swept away, and allow the manufacturers to be in full possession of their protection. If the protection that is now accorded to the farmers is swept away, they will insist upon equal treatment being meted out to the manufacturers. Consequently the policy that is proposed to-day in this reciprocity pact if carried into effect will inevitably lead to unrestricted reciprocity, and we think to absorption and annexation to the United States. This present agreement is the skeleton of 1891. It reminds me of a story I heard of two small boys playing in the house of one of the boy's father who was a doctor. One of them was rummaging about the house and came to a closet where there was a skeleton. He asked the doctor's son what that was. Oh, he says, it is my father's first patient. This reciprocity pact is Doctor Laurier's first patient. We killed it in 1891, and I am satisfied that it will remain a skeleton after the election of 1911. We have, as I say, on all these numerous occasions swept back the Americanizing tendencies that have cropped up from time to time, and when the elections of 1911 are over I am satisfied the Canadian people will again demonstrate their loyalty to the mother of nations.

We have heard a great deal about the national effect of this agreement, what its ultimate effect will be on the future of Canada; and we have been taken to task some times very severely by hon. members to the right of the Speaker, notably by the Minister of Public Works only last night, ridiculing the suggestion that this agreement would ultimately result in Canada coming under the control of the United States. I want to show that these dangerous tendencies towards annexation with the United States have not been pointed out only by Conservatives, but that prominent Liberals all over this country, from one end to the other, have signalized the danger to our national institutions if this agreement is carried into effect. We had the Board of Trade of the city of Toronto, a representative body of men, condemning this agreement by 298 votes to 13. Mr. Gourlay, the president of the Board of Trade, voted in support of the resolution, and Sir Edmund Walker, who is a prominent Liberal, used this language:

For many years he had been in business in Canada and in the United States, and the people of the latter country he knew well. It was in the true interest of Canada, Sir Edmund said, for her to remain in the British connection, without interest or contact from the south. We should develop our own nation in our own way, and his experience had deepened the conviction that we should not become American.

Then we have the resolution of the associated Boards of Trade of the whole province of Ontario, by a vote of 97 to 18 condemning in the strongest language this reciprocity agreement. One of the preambles of that resolution was in this language:

And whereas the proposed agreement would weaken the ties which bind Canada to the empire, and to avoid the disruption of trade referred to, Canada would be forced to closer relations with the United States, which would still further weaken those ties, and make it more difficult to avert political union with the United States.

Be it, therefore, resolved, that in the opinion of this convention of the Ontario Associated Boards of Trade the proposed agreement threatens Canadian nationality and autonomy, and is opposed to the true interests and should not be ratified.

Mr. Gourlay, President of the Board of Trade and a very prominent Liberal, speaking upon that resolution, is reported to the Toronto press to have used the following language:

In this present agreement Mr. Gourlay declared that Canada was not trading on equal terms. 'The United States,' he said, 'have a population of 90,000,000, whereas we have barely eight millions. They have twelve traders who can come into the market for every one we can send into their market. It is practically a merger and we are asked to become minority stockholders in the continental partnership and any of you who have had experience with minority stockholding know what that means. . . The speaker felt that ratification of the agreement would do much to impair the strong autonomy and loyalty of the Canadian people as it would change the relationship of the whole of the provinces of the Dominion.

The Hon. E. J. Davis, who was in the Liberal cabinet presiding over the destinies of this great province of Ontario for a number of years, also spoke, strongly against the agreement:

Hon. Mr. Davis, while believing that the Canadian ministers and President Taft were sincere in their beliefs, was strongly of the opinion that the agreement spelled disaster to Canada. . . They should not make changes in the tariff except in the way pursued in 1897 after the people had been given an opportunity of expressing their views. He was steadfastly in favour of a United Empire. . . They should stand by the British flag and for the solidarity of the British Empire. Make it a tariff in the interests of Canada and the British Empire.

Mr. Chairman, it is not the Conservatives alone who are raising the annexation cry, it is not the Conservatives alone who are waving the old flag as it is contemptuously

called by speakers sitting on your right, but it is prominent Liberals throughout the country. I have in my hand a very strong resolution passed by a number of prominent Liberals opposed to the ratification of this reciprocity agreement. It is not my intention to read the whole of the resolution, but I am going to read two or three extracts from it. One of their objections to this reciprocity pact is set out as follows:

Because the present unexampled prosperity of Canada is the result of the policy which has been pursued in the development of her trade and of her natural resources. Because this has involved the expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars upon railways, canals, steamships and other means of transportation between east and west and west and east, and the obligation to incur further great expenditures for the same purpose; and because further developments along the same lines would be seriously checked by the proposed reciprocity agreement and the benefits of the expenditures referred to would be to a great extent lost.

3. Because it is essential to the continued national unity and development of Canada that no trade relations with any country should be agreed to by Canada on any basis which would check the growth and development of trade between the various parts of Canada with each other, or between Canada and the various parts of the empire; and because the proposed reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States of America would seriously check the growth and development of this trade.

8. Because the agreement as proposed would weaken the ties which bind Canada to the empire, and because the unrestricted reciprocity which would naturally follow would still further weaken those ties and make it more difficult to avert political union with the United States.

That is the language of fifteen prominent Liberals in the city of Toronto; it is not the language of flag-waving Conservative speakers throughout the country. It is the studied language contained in a resolution of fifteen of the most prominent men who have been identified with the Liberal party all their lives.

10. Believing as we do that Canadian nationality is now threatened with a more serious blow than any it has heretofore met with, and that all Canadians who place the interests of Canada before those of any party or section or individuals therein should at this crisis state their views openly and fearlessly, we, who have hitherto supported the Liberal party in Canada, subscribe to this statement.

Surely the language contained in that resolution could not be stronger, and surely the government ought to pay some attention to language which is couched in such strong terms coming from such prominent supporters as these gentlemen are. We find that all sections of the community from the Atlantic to the Pacific are opposed to this reciprocity pact. The Rev. Dr. McLeod, of the maritime provinces, a prominent Baptist conducting a religious and not a trade paper in the interest of his esteemed denomination, the Baptist denomination, expresses his opinion very decidedly upon this question. He was ill and unable to direct his paper and during his absence an item slipped into the paper unknown to him favouring this agreement. The moment Dr. McLeod noticed this article he gave expression to his disapproval of that sentiment in the following paragraph which appeared in the next issue of the paper:

The editor, still unable to do any work whatever on the paper, having had his attention called to the article, entitled 'Reciprocity,' on page one, of March 1, feels impelled to repudiate every sentiment and shade of sentiment in it which approves of the proposed reciprocal trade arrangement now under consideration by the parliaments of Canada and the United States.

He regards the proposed reciprocity agreement as a deadly blow at the true national life of beloved Canada. He wants this statement of his strong conviction to go to his readers, lest he may never pen another sentence. This is the day of our country's peril.

'GOD SAVE CANADA!'

It is very apropos at this juncture that I should read one or two extracts from that famous manifesto that was issued to the electors of Canada by our late, esteemed leader, Sir John A. Macdonald. On the first page, I notice this sentence which is peculiarly apropos at this juncture:

Our policy in respect thereto is to-day what it has been for the past thirteen years, and is directed by a firm determination to foster and develop the varied resources of the Dominion by every means in our power consistent with Canada's position as an integral portion of the British Empire. To that end we have laboured in the past and we propose to continue in this work to which we have applied ourselves of building up on this continent, under the flag of England, a great and powerful nation.

Further on he says:

It would, in my opinion, inevitably result in the annexation of this Dominion to the United States.

Speaking of the unrestricted reciprocity propaganda of the Reform party in 1891.

The advocates of unrestricted reciprocity on this side of the line deny that it will have such an effect——

Just as they are contending that this will have such an effect.

—though its friends in the United States urge as the chief reason for its adoption that unrestricted reciprocity would be the first step in the direction of political union.

Is it not a most remarkable parallel? We have hon. members of the government and their followers stating that the present reci-

procity agreement will not have the effect that a great many reformers think it will have, namely, bring us into annexation with and absorption by the United States, while upon that occasion we had the warning of our old chieftain that unrestricted reciprocity in 1891, would inevitably lead to annexation. The positions of the parties are similar in 1891 and 1911.

Mr. FIELDING. Did not Sir John Macdonald afterwards send a delegation to Washington to get reciprocity?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Not the kind we have here.

Mr. FIELDING. Just the kind of reciprocity that is in this agreement to-day.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Not a jug-handled, lop-sided arrangement such as is proposed to-day. Imagine astute, capable Sir John going down and being taken in with a reciprocity pact such as we have to-day!

Mr. FIELDING. They went down and got nothing.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It is true, Mr. Chairman, that Sir John Macdonald went down and did not get what he went for. The Minister of Finance says he got nothing. Well, we have got worse than nothing, because the sacrifices that we make more than overbalance any benefit we may possibly derive from this treaty.

Mr. DEVLIN. What sacrifices have we made?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The sacrifice that these fifteen Liberals speak about who say that we are going to sacrifice our nationality. The sacrifice that we are allowing the farmers of the United States and twelve other countries to come in and take possession of our markets, when the prices are higher here than on the other side.

Mr. LAPOINTE. The farmers of Ontario are asking for it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The farmers of Ontario are not asking for it, and I am somewhat familiar with the conditions in Ontario. I am satisfied the overwhelming sentiment of Ontario is against this agreement.

The closing sentence of this manifesto, issued on February 7, 1901 is as follows:

As for myself, my course is clear. A British subject I was born; a British subject I will die. With my latest breath will I oppose the 'Veiled Treason' which attempts by sordid means and mercenary proffers to lure our people from their allegiance. During my long public service of nearly half a century, I have been true to my country, and its best interests, and I appeal with equal confidence to the men who have trusted me in the past and to the young hope of the country, with whom rests its destinies in the future, to give me their united and strenuous aid in this my last effort for the unity of the empire and the preservation of our commercial and political freedom.

The wording of that appeal is very appropriate to the present occasion, because the position of the parties and the policy they advocate are almost identical upon these two occasions. These are some of the sentiments that have been expressed by prominent members of both parties: Liberals in Toronto, Liberals in the west, Liberals in the maritime provinces, all state that this is a blow at our nationality. But what shall we say about the views of the Americans? If you wish to get at the basic reason for this agreement from the point of view of the United States, you must read the utterances of their public men. Their public men have practically insulted the intelligence of this country by frankly admitting that their object and purpose is the annexation of Canada. If we were a sensitive nation, if we were not lovers of freedom of speech, we would take offence and their utterances would become a casus belli. If Great Britain was not a protector of freedom of speech she would take offence at these utterances. What do we hear from Mr. Champ Clark, who practically to-day occupies the position of Prime Minister of the United States? He is leader of the Democratic party in the popular House and if the last elections are any criterion of what will be the outcome of the next election he will be the President of the United States. His utterances, therefore, bear a particular force and have peculiar significance to any one who desires to read them with intelligence. Why, of course, says Champ Clark,——

Mr. DEVLIN. What about Haultain?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I understand Mr. Haultain's last utterance was that a hundred reciprocity agreements would not justify any sane man voting for the Liberal administration.

Mr. DEVLIN. Is that why you are opposed to reciprocity?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). At page 2624 of the Congressional Record of the United States. Hon. Champ Clark, when asked whether he would be willing to give reciprocal terms similar to those of other nations, said:

'Why, of course, wherever we can get the better of the bargain.'

Again, at page 2625 the same hon. gentleman says:

It is my judgment that we are getting the better of the proceeding in this treaty.

It is my judgment that we get the better of the proceedings in this treaty.

Further on he says:

The intelligent farmers of America know that the agricultural products of Canada are inconsiderable when compared with the agricultural products of the United States; to use a common phrase they do not constitute a drop in the bucket. They also know that wages are as high in Canada in many lines as in America, and higher in labour pertaining to the production of lumber; so they know too much to be scared by the overworked cry of 'pauper labour.'

In a recent address at Holyoke, Mass., Governor Foss, of that state, said:

The United States have much to gain and nothing to lose by this reciprocity movement. New factories in all lines will be established here, for with these conditions our capital will no longer seek Canada for the purpose of building up those factories which it is now forced to build in Canada by unnatural tariff conditions.

Then, on page 2930, Mr. McCall, speaking of the Louisiana purchase, says:

Why, if it were proposed to add to this country to-day another Louisiana purchase, if it were proposed to add two or three agricultural states, who would there be to deny that such a circumstance would augment materially the prosperity and wealth of the two countries? And yet, to the extent to which this Bill goes that is just what we are doing. One has but to look at the map to have the case conclusively shown. The common frontier between the two countries is 3,700 miles long.

On page 3275 Mr. Sherwood says:

I was elevated and highly entertained by the closing remarks of the able and experienced gentleman from Missouri (Champ Clark), in predicting that this proposed compact, if enacted, will not only promote our trade with our near-by Canadian neighbours,

Mr. Champ Clark says, in another place:

Peace, commerce and honest friendship with all nations; entangling alliances with none.

Speaking of the Panama canal, he proceeds:

We are not spending that vast sum because we are altruists, but as a business matter. I am for it, because I hope to see the day when the American flag will float over every square foot of the British North America possessions clear to the north pole. They are people of our blood. They speak our language. Their institutions are much like ours. They are trained in the difficult art of self-government. My judgment is that if the treaty of 1854 had never been abrogated the chances of a consolidation of these two countries would have been much greater than they are now.

Mr. MARTIN.—Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and making free trade with Canada on all products?

Mr. CLARK—By taking Canada in to become part of the United States; Yes.

Mr. Champ Clark again says:

I look forward to the time when the American flag will fly over every square foot of British North America up to the north pole. The people of Canada are of our blood and our language. If the treaty of 1854 never had been abrogated, our countries would be much further advanced than now towards this end.

Mr. Martin of South Dakota—Will the gentleman favour the abrogation of our tariff law entirely so far as Canada is concerned, and make free trade on all products?

Mr. Clarke—By taking Canada in, to become a part of the United States—Yes.

Mr. Norris of Nebraska—As I understand it, the gentleman favours the Bill for at least one reason, that it will have a tendency in the end to bring Canada into the union?

Mr. Clarke—Yes, I have no doubt about that.

Why, Sir, in the light of these utterances by representative public men in the United States, what must we in Canada be made of if we continue to champion and favour this reciprocity agreement?

A straw shows how the wind blows. We had the other day in the city of Detroit, a meeting of the most influential character of any ever held in the United States, the National Editorial Association. I suppose the members of that association have more influence in moulding public opinion and directing the affairs of the United States than those of any other association in America. The Toronto 'Star' publishes a dispatch from Detroit which shows that the editors of the newspapers and magazines of the United States are talking nothing but annexation, they believe that this agreement will ultimately lead to the annexation of Canada to the United States. The dispatch reads:

There is much speculation among the editors as to what kind of reception they will receive during their stay in Canada. On the opening day of the convention several speeches were made in which 'Union' with Canada was strongly advocated. So much was said along this line that a great many of the delegates have been dubbed 'annexation boosters.'

Here we have a society of editors in a regularly organized meeting on our very border discussing annexation and called 'annexation boosters' to further the reciprocity pact not only in the United States but in Canada. The discussions were so repugnant to the feelings of Mr. Justice Sutherland, of the High Court of Ontario, formerly a respected member of this House, that he publicly rebuked them at the convention, and this is the report of what he said:

Judge Sutherland, of Toronto, Ont., on the floor of the convention took exception to the union sentiment and spoke warmly against it.

In the light of these expressions of opinion, in the light of the trend of the press of the United States, can we close our eyes to the fact that the leading men and the leading newspapers of the United States are absolutely convinced that the destiny of Canada, if this agreement is adopted, will be to fly the Stars and Stripes instead of the Union Jack.

Another reason that has been advanced in this House against this pact, and it is a very valid and strong reason, is the diversion of trade that it will cause from east to west to north and south channels—what has been called the sectionalization of Canada. After the denouncement of the reciprocity treaty in 1866 Canada had a difficult task to perform. Farmers were ruined and people were in distress, but there was no surrender. Canada commenced by forming a confederation in 1867, and began the slow climb up the hill of prosperity, and the people toiled and worked in order to form the country into a confederation, and a strong nationality. Sir John A. Macdonald constructed the Canadian Pacific railway in order to have a transcontinental system to bind the provinces together. The present leader of the government inaugurated the Grand Trunk Pacific for the same purpose, and in introducing the Bill into the House, and in arguments in favour of it throughout the length and breadth of the country, he pointed out the desirability of Canada being free and independent of the United States. He said that it was desirable that we should not be bound up with the bonding privilege, which might be withdrawn by the United States at any time, that if we wanted to be a self-contained nation as a part of the British Empire, and independent of the United States, we must have more transportation facilities; and for that reason, and that reason alone, he asked the Canadian people for their endorsation of the Grand Trunk Pacific scheme. Then two Canadians, captains of finance, Mackenzie and Mann, have constructed the Canadian Northern railway. If there is one province which is vitally interested in this question, and which has been struck to the heart by this reciprocity agreement, it is the province of Ontario. It is the richest and most populous province in the Dominion of Canada. The farmers of that province have mortgaged their farms, the people have pledged their future, for the success of these great enterprises. They furnished the greater share of the capital that constructed them; and now when we are in a position to derive some advantage from them, why should we, because a few partisan Liberal grain growers in the west may possibly get a few cents more for their wheat, allow the traffic of those lines to be diverted to the south, and prevent the provinces in the east obtaining some advantage from those transportation facilities which have been provided at so great expense? In the very first year after the old reciprocity agreement went into effect, we transferred from Canadian channels over one-half of our shipping interest between Sarnia and the city of Quebec. In other words, our parliament gave to the United States about one-half of our carrying trade between those points.

Mr. FIELDING. If the old reciprocity treaty did us so much harm, will my hon. friend tell me why all statesmen in this country for forty years tried to get a renewal of it? That is a fair question.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am addressing myself at the present time to the shipping interest, in which the province of Ontario is vitally interested. The old reciprocity treaty may have benefited certain interests. I am speaking of an interest that is going to be vitally injured if the present agreement goes into effect, and I am going to show that the shipping interest was vitally injured by the old reciprocity treaty. In 1854 the Canadian carrying trade on the St. Lawrence amounted to $33,633,128. The very next year after the treaty went into effect this trade fell to $15,208,600, a decrease of over $18,000,000. In 1854 the vessels engaged in that trade numbered 1,416, rated at 618,926 tons with 20,301 sailors at Quebec. In the next year after the treaty went into effect these figures fell to 474 vessels, rated at 348,800 tons with 11,902 sailors at Quebec. In 1854 the tonnage of our sea-going vessels arriving and departing from four of the leading St. Lawrence ports amounted to 1,487,897 tons. The very next year after the treaty went into effect the tonnage fell to 870,794 tons. In 1854 the total value of the exports and imports at Montreal and Quebec was $42,000,000. The next year after the treaty went into effect they dropped to $28,000,000.

Another objection which has been raised and I think appropriately raised, against this arrangement, is its lack of permanence, the danger of entanglement with the United States, the danger of giving offence. Our trade routes have been established by successive governments from east to west. If this reciprocity pact goes into effect the trade routes will undoubtedly be changed to north and south channels. Eight millions of people have very little chance against one hundred millions of people. Uncle Sam will wield the Big Stick, as he has wielded it before. Once let our trade routes be turned north and south, and we develop and encourage vested interests which will fight to retain those routes, no matter how detrimental the arrangement

may be to other interests in the country. If this agreement goes into effect, and the routes are developed north and south, the United States can force other concessions from us by threatening to abolish and denounce the agreement, and throw our newly established trade relations into disorder. We have the great, free, open and independent market of Great Britain. Why should we hesitate what we should cultivate and preserve?

There are a great many constitutional and economical objections, as well as national and imperial objections, to this agreement. We are supposed to be living in a democratic age, enjoying responsible government. But, as has been said by the hon. member for Brandon, who was a member of the cabinet during the election of 1900, 1904 and 1908, there was no mention in any of those elections of this reciprocity question. He was in charge of the campaign for the Liberal party in the western provinces, and at none of those elections was this question mooted.

We are charged with inconsistency because the leaders of the Conservative party in days gone by endeavoured to secure reciprocity with the United States upon fair and equitable terms. I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if that is a reasonable argument? We had the right hon. the leader of the government, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Public Works, and the hon. Minister of Customs reading extracts from speeches made in bygone days, showing that the Conservative party in these days were in favour of reciprocity. They have charged inconsistency on the part of the Conservative party. If the Conservative party has been inconsistent, how much more so have the people of the United States been? For 45 years the United States opposed reciprocity. Why should they now endeavour to get it?

Every one knows that conditions in this country have changed. Every one knows that when we were endeavouring to get reciprocity years ago we required the market of the United States. We were a young country, undeveloped, and reciprocity in these days might have been some good to us. However, conditions are altogether changed now. It would be just as reasonable to say that because a grown-up man required a nursing bottle when he was a baby he would require it all his life. Infant Canada might have cried for the nursing bottle and the soothing syrup of reciprocity in days gone by, but to-day Canada has attained the full status of manhood, and we no longer require the reciprocity medicine. Again the charge of inconsistency does not lie at the door of the Conservative party. because the reciprocity which the Conservative party advocated in years gone by certainly had no resemblance to the Reciprocity Act as introduced by the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

Mr. FIELDING. What is the difference?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The difference is that Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir John Thompson, and the other leaders of the Conservative party wanted reciprocity in its true sense. They wanted tariff for tariff and if they reduced the duty on certain articles coming into Canada they expected the United States to reduce their duties to the same level on the same goods. Would Sir John A. Macdonald or Sir John Thompson allow the products of 90,000,000 farmers in the United States to be shipped in here in competition with our farmers, when the prices are higher here than on the American side? Would they allow their products of 300,000,000 people belonging to the 12 favoured nations to be shipped in here in competition with our people?

Mr. FIELDING. That is exactly what he offered in 1879.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Sir John A. Macdonald would not have been guilty of such indiscretion.

I say that condtions in Canada have changed since 1879 when the National Policy was introduced and when the offer of reciprocity was made to the United States. In 1879 there was no home market in Canada. To-day 80 per cent of our products are consumed at home. Canada has developed into a great industrial country, and we are providing home markets for our farm products. In 1879 the Canadian Northwest was practically unknown, and the natural resources of the other provinces were undeveloped. We had no Canadian Pacific railway, no Canadian Northern railway and no Grand Trunk Pacific. There were no exports of any kind to Great Britain, because we did not have the shipping facilities to carry our goods, nor did we produce the goods to carry.

Mr. FIELDING. What about 1891?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). To-day our shipping facilities are fully developed. Then, there is another very important point which must be borne in mind. In 1879, every Englishman in the old country was a free trader, whereas to-day even in the old country the majority of the people are in favour of tariff reform, and they believe in a measure of protection. Now that we are on the eve of forming Imperial federation—on the eve of bringing about an arrangement with Great Britain whereby our farm products will be allowed into Great Britain on a preferential basis, is it not foolhardy to enter into this agreement, which is the grave yard of Imperial federation?

In 1871 our population was 3,500,000; in 1911 it is 8,000,000. In 1868 our total trade was $129,000,000; in 1910, it amounted to $677,000,000. In 1869, our bank assets amounted to $44,000,000; in 1911, they totalled $1,224,000,000. In 1877, our railway system covered 2,278 miles; in 1911, our railway system covers 25,000 mlies. In 1871 our manufactured products amounted to $221,000,000; in 1906, they amounted to $712,664,000. In 1871, our dairy products amounted to $1,600,000; in 1908, they amounted to $36,000,000. In 1871, we grew 16,000,000 bushels of wheat; in 1908 our wheat crop amounted to 120,000,000 bushels. In view of these facts and figures can any reasonable person say that what might have been good for Canada in the early days is good for it at the present time?

I want to read a most extraordinary criticism of the attitude of the Liberal party and the members of the Cabinet, taken from their own leading organ, published in the city of Ottawa. I have often wondered, when I listened to the hon. members of the government reading the old time speeches of the Conservative leaders in favour of reciprocity, if they ever noticed this editorial in the Ottawa 'Free Press'. It gives the Liberal leaders and the Liberal party a lot of wholesome advice which they should take to heart. This editorial appeared in the issue of the Ottawa 'Free Press,' of March 3rd, 1911, and is entitled 'Throw Hansard Away.' It reads as follows:

The weakest link in the argument of the Liberals in favour of reciprocity with the United States is the iteration and reiteration of the views and opinions of political parties and individuals in the past on that policy.

What on earth difference does it make to the people of Canada in the year of our Lord 1911 what some politicians or some party thought about the advisability of closer trade relations with the United States fifteen, twenty-five, fifty years ago?

Why bore us with long and dreary extracts from the long winded speeches of Sir Charles Tupper and his ilk in the 80's? What do we care about Lord Elgin's opinions on the policy of reciprocity years ago?

Does it matter a tinker's dam whether the Conservative party a quarter of a century ago favoured or didn't favour reciprocity?

Is it worth more than a trivial passing allusion that the Liberal party was at one time in favour of unrestricted reciprocity?

It does give us a pain to hear men on the Hill quoting dead speeches of the years ago, and to read in the party newspapers long extracts giving the opinions of men who, if they had not altogether passed from this sphere, are now incapacitated for public life.

In the last fifteen years a tremendous change has come over this country. We Liberals think that the splendid administration of the Laurier government was largely responsible for that change.

Mr. FIELDING. Hear, hear.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am glad that this article meets the approval of the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) and hope he will take the advice here given, so that we may no longer hear these old dead speeches reiterated——

Mr. FIELDING. I am afraid you will have to listen to some of them yet.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario) reading:

You Conservatives attribute it to other causes.

But this is the point.

But whatever the object, we all admit that the change is there.

And I want to impress what follows upon the Minister of Finance; let it sink deep into his heart.

A policy, therefore, that might have suited Canada in 1896 may be the most unwise and inadvisable for Canada in 1911.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Does the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) say 'hear hear?'

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am glad of it.

Consequently, instead of devoting so much time to drilling into us the history, with tables of dates, of the reciprocity movement in Canada, the gentlemen who are now asking us to endorse the pact which Messrs. Fielding and Patterson have negotiated at Washington would be better occupied in telling us just how that agreement is going to work out in practice from the day it is put into force.

Is that good advice?

Mr. FIELDING. Yes.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Then, instead of reading speeches made at a time when conditions were entirely different from what they are to-day why does not the minister tell us what the effect of this arrangement will be upon our different industries. This agreement has never been referred to a committee composed of both political parties with power to summon witnesses and find out what the ultimate effect will be upon our industries. Instead of quoting speeches of bygone days, let the ministers busy themselves in telling us what the effect of this agreement is going to be.

They are wasting their time searching through 'Hansard' for opinions which nobody now gives a hang about.

When they should be directing a staff of experts in the obtaining of the fullest information as to the probable effect of the agreement when it is put into operation.

That is what I urged upon the minister —a staff of experts to obtain full information of the effect of the proposed changes in the tariff. Where are your experts on

the probable effect of the agreement? Where are data and statistics to which the people are entitled? Why is this not handed over to committees as in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States?—a committee who investigated it for two months. Why do not the ministers adopt that course and allow the interests that think they are going to be affected to appear before the committee of both Houses.

But there has been no investigation and there are no data, no statistics. In the case of the Grand Trunk Pacific, there was great haste because, as was said, Hon. George A. Cox could not wait. If this is the case it appears that the President of the United States can't wait.

Now I come to the closing part of this article:

What Sir John Macdonald or Sir Charles Tupper said twenty years ago is not going to affect in the slightest the opinion of the business man of to-day who is doubtful as to the proposed policy.

Why should we be bound by the opinion expressed twenty years ago when the conditions were different from what they are to-day. Why not face this policy in the light of present conditions and judge it on its merits. And here is the completing paragraph:

For goodness sake, let the liberal leaders chuck all the copies of 'Hansard' away and give us something up to date.

I put a series of questions on the Order Paper, and they are still on the Order Paper. The Minister of Finance asked to have them stand,—for what reason it is incomprehensible to me. The answers are well known to the minister——

Mr. FIELDING. If the answers are well known why does the hon. gentleman ask the question?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I want the people to read them. I want them put on record. And that, I fancy, is the reason he refuses.

Mr. FIELDING. No, my hon. friend will find that the questions will be answered.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If the minister will answer these questions and answer them unequivocally, the effect must be to enlighten the people as to the condition of affairs in regard to this treaty, and these are the questions I asked the minister:

1. Referring to the White Book known as Document No. 849, entitled 'Reciprocity with Canada,' being the message from the President of the United States transmitting to the Senate a report from the tariff board, and on March 1, 1911, ordered to be printed and laid on the table of the United States Senate, in which occur the following passages, viz.:

(a) On page 107, 'It is to be noted that the farm prices of more than half of the oat crop of the United States range from $0.27 to $0.35 a bushel, and that the farm prices of about the same proportion of the Canadian crop range from $0.28 to $0.36.'

(b) On page 109, speaking of the prices of horses, 'In all the Canadian provinces except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Nova Scotia the prices are higher than in any of our states.'

(c) On page 109, speaking of the prices of dairy cows, 'The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

(d) On page 110, appears the following table of comparative prices, average value per head in 1910:

In the United States, horses, $108.19; dairy cows, $35.79; other cattle, $19.41; sheep, $4.08; swine, $9.14. In Canada, horses, $133; dairy cows, $43; other cattle, $31; sheep, $6; swine, $11. And comparing the State of New York with Ontario: horses, $125; dairy cows, $39.50; other cattle, $18.20; sheep, $5; swine, $1.50. Ontario, horses, $133; dairy cows, $48; other cattle, $34; sheep, $7; swine $10.

(e) On page 110 appears also the following statements:

Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of prices is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.

Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada.

Prices of swine are slightly higher in Canada than in the United States.

(f) On page 113 appears the following:

As to horses Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario.

During the spring of 1910 it is stated on good authority that no less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time. The five provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, combined have but 1,863,744 head as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the state of Iowa alone.

When was the reciprocity agreement executed by representatives of Canada and the United States?

Mr. FIELDING. Does not the hon. gentleman know that?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I suppose that was in January.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman has it on record. Why does he ask the question?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I did not want to bother looking them up.

Mr. FIELDING. Then I am not going to bother looking them up for my hon. friend.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). What I desired, in putting these questions on the Order Paper, was that the Minister of Finance should answer them for the information of the people. I want the information official-

ly from the Minister of Finance to lay it before the electors of this country.

Mr. FIELDING. Let the hon. member read the agreement, that comes from the minister.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The next question I asked the minister was this:

Were the above statements and figures present to the minds of the Canadian ministers when they executed the agreement on behalf of Canada?

If the Minister of Finance had answered that question he would have answered, no, because no person, no representative of Canada negotiating the treaty in the interest of the farmers of this country, with those facts before him coming from the United States experts, showing that the prices of the staple products of the farm were higher in Canada than in the United States, would ever have entered into this agreement. Will the minister answer now?

Mr. FIELDING. I have told the hon. gentleman that he will get answers to his questions in due course.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). The next question, No. 4, was this:

Since the date of the execution of the agreement has the government made any effort to verify the above statements and figures as set out in the United States official document No. 849?

The Minister of Finance knew well yesterday the answers to all these questions; he knew yesterday that those facts and figures of the United States authorities, which were not made public until long after the treaty was signed, were not present to his mind, and he could have answered question No. 4. He knows whether the government, in view of those facts and figures, showing the prices on the Canadian side higher than on the American side, had made any effort to verify them. If the Minister of Finance answers that question correctly, he will answer that he has made no attempt to verify those figures. But the government had determined, obstinately and pertinaciously, to stand by the two ministers, no matter what their faults of judgment may have been in making this agreement, and now they are prepared, no matter what the consequences may be to the farmers, to force this agreement upon the country. Question No. 5:

5. Is the government aware that both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States referred the agreement to committees composed of both political parties before whom evidence was taken for months as to the possible effect of the agreement on the United States interests?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario).

If the Minister of Finance answers that question he will answer it in the affirmative. He is aware that this agreement was referred to committees of both Houses of Congress, composed of both political parties, with a view of ascertaining what effect it would have upon the great interests of the United States. What information has this House in reference to this agreement? We can go out and read the newspapers, we have a little knowledge of our own; but the proper attitude for the government to take in reference to this great question was to summon the interests that are going to be affected, and to hear them in reference to it. Were the members of any intelligent body ever before asked to commit themselves so thoroughly blindfolded to a proposal of such importance as this?

6. Is it the intention of the government to take any evidence before any committees touching on the relative prices of farm products in the United States and Canada, or on the effect the agreement may have on Canadian interests?

If the Minister of Finance answers that question he will answer it in this way: It is not our intention to take any evidence before committees touching the relative prices of farm products in the two countries, because so soon as we commence to take such evidence, we will find that the prices on the Canadian side are higher than the prices on the American side, and consequently it would be detrimental to the interests of the Canadian farmers to consummate this agreement.

7. Has the government any information now in their possession dealing with the relative prices of farm products in Canada and the United States?

I would like to ask the Minister of Finance now if they have any additional information dealing with this important matter in the nature of comparative prices. Have they sent any experts? Have they any authoritative information upon these important matters in which the farmers are so deeply interested? I will give the Minister of Finance an opportunity to answer.

Mr. FIELDING. The hon. gentleman ought not to seek two methods of procuring the same end. He has put his questions on the paper, and I have said to him that they will be answered. The hon. gentleman now goes on and presumes to answer them himself, so I suppose he does not want an answer from me.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I want an authoritative answer from the government so that the people of Canada may have some intelligent conception of what this

agreement means. The fundamental position for the government to take is to find out what effect it will have. The Minister of Finance says that it is an agreement in the interests of the farmers. If it is in the interest of the farmers, surely the first step the government should have taken was to ascertain how the prices of farm products compared in the two countries.

Now, Sir, I was speaking, before I digressed, upon the charge of inconsistency that was made against the Liberal-Conservative party for having once advocated reciprocity, and now opposing it. I want to say that the reciprocity agreement that has been entered into on this occasion is not such a reciprocity agreement as was proposed by Sir John A. Macdonald; that was not the ill-advised, unfair and illogical agreement that has been negotiated by the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Customs. I want further to say that since 1892 the Liberal-Conservative party has not been in favour of reciprocity, and since 1898 and 1899 the Reform party, under the present leader of the government, has been opposed to reciprocity. I want to read a few extracts showing the position the leader of the government took in days gone by. In 1899 Sir Wilfrid Laurier, speaking on this question, said:

If we know the hearts and minds of our people at present I am not making too wide a statement when I say that the general feeling in Canada is not in favour of reciprocity. There was a time when Canadians would have given many things to obtain the American market. There was a time when the market of the great cities of the union was the only market we had, but those days are past and over now. We are not depending on the American market now. It is possible they may come to us, if they do, we will teach them the lesson they have taught us.

In 1907 at the Imperial Conference the leader of the government made this statement:

There was a time when we were wanting reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside, and negatived. We have said good-bye to that trade, and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

Does any person now charge either the Liberal party or the Conservative party with inconsistency if they oppose reciprocity after the utterances of the leader of the government? At the Imperial Conference in 1907, the right hon. gentleman said further:

If we are to follow the lines of nature and geography between Canada, and the United States, the whole trade would flow from south to north, and from north to south. We have done everything possible by canals and subsidizing railways to bring the trade from west to east and east to west so as to bring trade into British channels. All this we have done recognizing the principle of the great advantage of forcing trade within the British Empire. . . There is no boundary line except a purely conventional one over the whole territory of North America. Their habits are the same as ours, and therefore we are induced to trade and cannot help it by force of nature. But so far as legislation can influence trade, we have done everything possible to push our trade towards the British people as against the American people. . .

There was a time when we wanted reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside. We have said good-bye to that trade and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

Mr. PATERSON. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he would read an extract or an utterance, or a resolution of any kind passed by the Conservative party, against reciprocity.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Mr. Chairman, in the past three general elections, 1900, 1904 and 1908 it was not an issue; it was not in active politics.

Mr. PATERSON. I ask the hon. gentleman if there is any repudiation by the Conservative party, or by their responsible men, of reciprocity. I defy him to read it.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If the hon. gentleman has been following the proceedings of this House he will see what the attitude of the Conservative party is upon the proposition that was made by the Minister of Finance. The Minister of Customs asks when the Conservative party was opposed to reciprocity. Why, was not the election of 1891 fought out on reciprocity? That is the kind of reciprocity that hon. gentlemen are trying to force upon the country now. Speaking about the constitutional objections, I said, Mr. Chairman, that I thought as a casual student of the principles of responsible government, that we were living in a democratic country, and that the people ruled, but we find that we are under a dictatorship headed by the right hon. leader of the government. The cabinet composed of a few members, meet in secret, they decide upon policies, they commit the country to them and then afterwards, when they have a general election, these matters are either passed over or by large campaign funds their policies are carried without a fair submission of them to the people. What do we find?—four matters of prime importance during the history of this government have been settled not by the people, but by the government themselves. The Grand Trunk proposition, by which this country was committed to an expenditure of $200,000,000, was made merely by the Liberal government, without the consent or know-

ledge of the then Minister of Railways and Canals, with Senator Cox and others. That was not submitted to the people until after it had been consummated. The honour of Canada was at stake and the country was so committed to this policy that my hon. friend the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden, Halifax) stated that if the Conservative party were elected in 1904, they would feel constrained to carry out that policy and to carry into effect the agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific railway showing that instead of having a tentative agreement and going to the country on that policy in a democratic way they made an agreement and crammed it down the throats of the people without a fair election. Then, in 1904 we had a general election. Was there a word then about the Autonomy Bills and the creation of the provinces in the west? Was there a statement or a whisper as to the creation of the new provinces, as to the emasculating of these provinces and taking away from them the control of their mines, minerals, timber and educational affairs? Not a word, but during the next session they passed the Autonomy Bills that deprived these provinces of the rights of self-government that they are now claiming. Then we had the Navy Bill. We had an election in 1908, but the Navy Bill was never discussed. There was no submission to the people and no mandate from the people to enter upon an expenditure of hundreds of millions of dollars. Surely that was an extraordinary proceeding in a country where responsible government is supposed to obtain. Here we had a policy involving an enormous expenditure which was never discussed in any general election although the people demanded that they should be consulted before a permanent policy was carried into effect.

Now, we have the reciprocity arrangement of 1911, making radical changes in the fiscal policy of this country, a policy that has enabled Canada to grow prosperous and develop, which policy is being changed without any consultation of the people. Personally speaking I do not shy at the word 'blocking.' Personally speaking, I am here for the purpose of blocking reciprocity until the people have had an opportunity of being heard upon it. There is no use shying at the word. The position of the opposition was made clear by my hon. friend the leader of the opposition, in the west that, in so far as reciprocity, is concerned, reciprocity will not go upon the statute books until the people have had an opportunity to pronounce upon it.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear hear.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Did I hear hon. gentlemen say anything?

Mr. BUREAU. Sure.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario).

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). It has been suggested to me, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. gentleman had the right to vote against the people being given an opportunity to express their opinon upon this question. We heard the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) grow eloquent last night. He said that they wanted a vote upon it. So do we want a vote upon it, but we want a vote of the people upon it, and not a vote of a few servile followers of the government——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario)—who will vote for whatever measure is introduced by the leader of the government and who have never been known, outside of the three gentlemen who announced themselves upon this important question, to take an independent stand upon any public question.

Canadians are living in a fool's paradise.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). Some people imagine that we are living under responsible government. We are living under an autocratic government, a government that is ruled by a dictator who forces his policies upon his supporters and upon the country. There are a great many economic objections to this reciprocity treaty and as time is of no moment to the government I purpose entering upon a discussion of a few of these objections.

Mr. FIELDING. That will be a pleasant diversion.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If time were of much moment to the government they would not remain here so long, they would dissolve and go to the country. We of the opposition have definitely made up our minds that we are going to stay here until this question is submitted to the people. Why do not the government be straightforward about the matter and let it go to the people? Why keep us here in the dog days, why bring us back in July and August to discuss reciprocity when the matter should be discussed on the hustings before the people who should be permitted to pronounce upon it? One of the greatest objections to this agreement is——

Mr. PATERSON. Cannot you vote on it and then let the people pronounce upon it?

Mr. SHARPE. (Ontario). I prefer that the people should pronounce upon it. I have not the slightest doubt that the Minister of Customs, if he had his way, would like to hang a man and try him afterwards. I prefer to give it a trial before the country and then we will come here and hang reciprocity after the elections are over.

Mr. BUREAU. Reciprocity may hang you before that.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I will venture to express the opinion that the Solicitor General will never hang anybody or anything. He has not made a practice in parliament of displaying energy enough to hang anybody.

Mr. FIELDING. Oh, he has hung several.

Mr. BUREAU. I am not a hanger.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario.) One objection to this treaty is that our natural products will become a prey to American trusts. Another is the fact that the United States with their hundred million people is an exporting country, exporting the very things that we have to sell. Another objection is that the United States and twelve other countries may compete in our market with our farmers. The fourth and strongest objection that I have discussed at some length is that the price of staple farm products are higher in Canada than in the United States. Speaking about our natural resources becoming a prey to the United States, everybody will admit that it is in the interests of every country to convert our raw material into the finished product within our own borders. We all approve of the pulpwood policy of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario. What does that mean? It means that these two provinces are compelling the people who produce pulp from Crown lands to manufacture it into paper in our own country. That means the establishment of factories, the creation of industries, the employment of labour, and the building up of our own country. The same argument that applies to pulpwood applies also to our wheat.

We should grind our wheat into flour and save the by-products for feed. Our coarse grain should be fed to the stock and thus enrich the soil. Our stock should be converted into beef and pork ready for the market. Standing timber and saw logs should be manufactured into finished products, woodenware, furniture, pianos, &c. The United States want raw materials, our pulp wood, our saw logs, our coarse grains wheat and stockers. In document No. 1418, Hon. James Wilson, Secretary of Agriculture, in his open letter to the National Grange of February 9, 1911, says of the United States:

> We get into the Canadian woods, 90,000,000 or more of us, for timber products, things very much needed, as our home supplies are so much reduced that prices have gone up markedly in the last few years, and our own development in the future will draw heavily on what remains.
>
> The trains that bring farm products to the United States will take farm, orchard and manufactured products back.

Mr. PATERSON. Then farm products will go to the United States?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario) reading—

> The raw material that comes from the Canadian farm will be manufactured in the United States, and what is not needed will be sent to foreign countries.
>
> The Canadian can furnish us with feeders, a large per cent of the number that come to the United States are of that class.
>
> We can handle the Canadian export grain crop with facility. If it is brought inside our borders and milled as it would be, our dairymen could use with great profit the by-products of the mills. This is the feature, bran and shorts—that makes dairy products and robs the soil.
>
> The United States could with great profit and benefit to the land, take all the grain Canada has to sell, and devote its lands to less exacting crops, as is evidenced by the older prairie states farmers who grow no grain to sell, buy their flour and thereby keep up the fertility of the soil. In the western states where the farmer has turned from grain raising for sale to the production of crops to be fed to domestic animals on the farm, the new departure has been so profitable that lands in those states have risen in value to $100 to $200 per acre, and rents from $4 to $6 per acre.

Mr. Beveridge, who was here a few days ago, said in a recent speech, which will be found at page 2340 of the 'Congressional Record':

> We have used up out natural resources so rapidly that the belated policy of conserving them has become one of our greatest national anxieties.

President Taft's message, January 26, 1911, contains this passage:

> We have reached a stage in our own development that calls for a statesmanlike and broad view of our future economic status and its requirements. We have drawn upon our natural resources in such a way as to invite attention to their necessary limit. This has properly aroused effort to conserve them. to avoid their waste, and to restrict their use to our necessities.
>
> Ought we not then to arrange a commercial agreement with Canada, if we can, by which we shall have direct access to her great supply of natural products without an obstructing or prohibitory tariff?
>
> The Dominion has greatly prospered. It has an active, aggressive and intelligent people. They are coming to the parting of the ways.

Would the Minister of Customs be good enough to explain what President Taft meant by that?

Mr. PATERSON. My hon. friend might ask the president to explain.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If that is the best answer he can give we will take it for what it is worth. The message continues:

> They must soon decide whether they are to regard themselves as isolated permanently from our markets by a perpetual wall or

whether we are to be commercial friends. If we give them reason to take the former view, can we complain if they adopt methods denying access to certain of their natural resources except upon conditions quite unfavourable to us. A notable instance of such a possibility may be seen in the condition surrounding the supply of pulp wood and the manufacture of print paper for which we have made a conditional provision in the agreement, believed to be equitable. Should we not now, therefore, before their policy has become too crystallized and fixed for charge, meet them in a spirit of real concession, facilitate commerce between the two countries, and thus greatly increase the natural resources available to our people?

Free lumber we ought to have. By giving our people access to Canadian forests we shall reduce the consumption of our own, which in the hands of comparatively few owners, now have a value that requires the enlargement of our available timber resources.

That the broadening of the sources of food supplies that the opening of the timber resources of the Dominion to our needs, that the addition to the supply of raw materials will be limited to no particulaar section does not require demonstration.

Are these messages not pregnant with warnings to us who pride ourselves on being Canadians? What is the burden of their song? To what do they attach importance? Raw materials! Every page bristling with the words raw materials. Raw mater ials! Raw materials! They want us to cut down our timber our grain crops, our pulp wood, harvest our raw materials—ship them in that condition to the United States, let them with their labour and capital work them up to manufactured goods and sell them back to us!

Are we to be a party to such a policy? Are we to be a party to such self-suppression? Are we to be the hewers of wood and the drawers of water to the United States people?

Mr. FIELDING. Is there anything that gives the Americans access to our raw materials that they have not now?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I say the minister by this agreement is facilitating the export of raw materials to the United States, and by thus encouraging that export and by allowing the clause regarding pulp wood to be inserted in the agreement, is trying to facilitate the export of pulpwood in the raw condition, and thus to put the screws on the provinces to change their laws in regard to the export of pulpwood.

I wish now to submit some figures that show that the United States are shipping less raw material, and more finished products from their country. They appreciate the advantage to any country of keeping within their borders the labour required to convert the raw materials into finished products, thus deriving the benefit of these secondary industries.

Figures showing United States is shipping less raw material and more of finished products each year:

I	Total Grain Export in 1906	117,062,000
	" " " 1909	99,953,000
	Decrease of Exports in Raw Materials	$117,109,000
II	Total Flour and Meal export in 1905	42,732,791
	" " " " " 1908	66,946,329
	Increase of exports of finished products	$24,213,588
III	Live Animals exported in 1906	49,139,563
	" " " 1909	22,645,438
	Decrease	$26,494,128
IV	Beef exports (cured and fresh) in 1905	47,055,040
	" " 1908	51,104,643
	Increase of finished products	$4,049,603
V	Pork (fresh and cured) 1905	106,085,977
	" " 1908	121,024,224
	Increase of finished products	$14,938,247

Showing that the United States is pursuing a policy of encouraging the working up of the raw materials into the finished product in their own country. The policy of this administration is to encourage the export of raw materials—to let the United States get the possession of our raw materials on which they can employ their own labour and capital, and send back the finished product to Canada. Such a course is suicidal. We should encourage the keeping of our raw materials in our own country, and working them up into finished products by our own Canadian labour, thus making the country more prosperous.

I would like to give a brief summary of the great natural resources of this country. It is estimated that the standing tim-

ber of Canada amounts to 500 billion feet; that our wheat fields are 600 miles by 1,000 miles in extent, making 117 million acres fit for wheat. Our coast fishing extends over 12,500 miles, our fresh water fishing over 440,000 miles. Our coal areas amount to 172 billion tons. We have inestimable riches in gold, silver, nickel and iron mines. Our gold mines have yielded $262,000,000 of production. Our silver mines are the richest in the world. Our nickel mines provide three-fifths of the world's supply. Our water-powers are estimated at 25 million horse-power. Our farm crops in 1910 amounted to 507 million dollars' worth. We produced $98,000,000 in dairy products, $90,000,000 in minerals, $63,000,000 in timber, $30,000,000 in fisheries. And this is only a partial list. We have the greatest undeveloped country in the whole universe. Is it any wonder that the United States desires to get access to this treasure house to exploit our natural resources for the benefit of their own people? I desire to emphasize the importance of the Canadian home market, built up under the protection of the National Policy, a policy that has not been materially departed from by the present administration. This country in a large measure owes its success to the fact that the National Policy has been maintained practically in its entirety by the present administration, and wherever it has been departed from or altered, that has been done to the detriment of this country. In 1910 the farm crops in Canada amounted to $507,185,000, the dairy crops to $58,000,000, a total of $605,185,000. Of this amount Canada exported only $105,079,300 worth, which shows that the home market consumes over $500,000,000 worth of those crops. The wheat exported to all markets amounted to $52,609,351. Of this we exported to Great Britain $49,267,736, and to all other countries only $3,331,615. The cheese we exported to all markets amounted to $21,607,692. We exported to Great Britain $21,481,566 and to all other countries only $126,126 worth. Canada to become a great country must develop its home markets. We must build up our home industries. No nation in the world ever yet rose in the scale of nationhood or amounted to anything that adopted a free trade policy. We must develop the different tastes, different aptitudes and different capacities of our own citizens. We must have diversified industries for that purpose. Every nation in the world except Great Britain realizes that, and over half of the people of Great Britain to-day are in favour of a moderate protection. Consequently I say that every nation except Great Britain believes in high protective duties for building up its home markets and creating diversified pursuits for the diversified tastes of its people.

As I am not through, Mr. Chairman, and as the hour is late, perhaps the minister who is leading the House will consent to an adjournment.

Mr. FIELDING. I will consent.

Committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.32 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

WEDNESDAY, July 26, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

THE RAILWAY COMMITTEE.

Mr. NESBITT moved that the Select Standing Committee on Railways have leave to sit during the sessions of the House, as recommended in the report of the Committee.

Mr. SPROULE. Are we trying to revive such resolution passed before the committee this morning. We have only one Bill to deal with and as the next meeting of the committee is called for 10 o'clock instead of 11 o'clock on Tuesday next when the House sits there is no need of this motion.

Mr. NESBITT. It was recommended by the committee on the 16th of May.

Mr. SPROULE. Oh, that was on the eve of adjournment, and when there were a lot of Bills to be disposed of, but there is only one Bill before us now.

Mr. BLAIN. I agree with the hon. member (Mr. Sproule) that this motion is absolutely unnecessary under existing conditions. The work before the committee is not heavy now.

Mr. NESBITT. The work is not very heavy, but the talk is.

Mr. LANCASTER. That one Bill before the committee will have to be carefully considered and it will probably be opposed by nearly all the members of the House when they understand it. I can well understand that certain interests would want this motion to pass, but they are not the interests of the people. If it does pass it will have the effect of compelling members to neglect their duties in the committee or else neglect their duties in this House. This Bill refers to a charter that has been absolutely dead for three years and that never was heard of in the House of Commons until the day before adjournment after we had been in session for six months.

Mr. EMMERSON. Did this Bill come from the Senate?

Mr. LANCASTER. This Bill came from the Senate, but they must have been late

in introducing it in the Senate or else it would have got to this House before it did. It is a Bill entirely in the interests of a private corporation, and in view of the urgent public business before the House it can very well wait until next session.

Mr. DEVLIN. The Bill could have passed the Committee this morning, as the great majority of the committee desired, but upon the request of the hon. member for East Grey and others we consented to allow the Bill to stand over in order that those who might possibly have any interest in opposing it should be notified. We did not touch upon the merits of the Bill this morning.

Mr. MACDONELL (Toronto). The hon. member (Mr. Devlin) says the majority of the committee were seized of the Bill this morning, and prepared to pass it, but now he says they did not even consider the merits.

Mr. DEVLIN. What I said was that the Bill was fully discussed and the majority of the committee quite prepared to pass it, but now these gentlemen opposite want to kill it entirely.

Mr. SPROULE. We are not endeavouring to kill the Bill but we are pointing out that the committee has adjourned until Tuesday next at ten o'clock, which is an hour before the sitting of the House, and we think there is plenty of time to consider the Bill, without passing this motion.

Mr. DEVLIN. The hon. member for East Grey will himself speak for an hour against the Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. Not at all.

Mr. DEVLIN. We will get to eleven o'clock when the House meets and then the committee will have to rise.

Mr. SPROULE. I do not think I spoke more than five minutes on the Bill this morning. The consideration of the Bill was adjourned in view of the fact that the committee were notified that the city council of Montreal and the board of trade desired to be heard and had no notice, and that the R. & O. Co'y had their representatives before the committee saying that only late yesterday did they receive intimation that the Bill would be considered to-day, and they desired to consider carefully whether or not it would prejudicially affect their interests. It is for that reason we asked delay.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is not a public Bill and the public interest can in no way be affected. The Bill came to us from the Senate and has been before parliament for a considerable time. In view of the attitude some hon. gentlemen assume towards the Bill it would seem to me that in the hour between 10 o'clock and 11 o'clock no progress could be made. It is to give those who oppose the Bill the fullest opportunity to be heard that this motion has been made.

Mr. GOODEVE. The government has thought it vitally important to call special morning sittings of the House for the consideration of an important public measure, and under these circumstances it is unfair that members of this House should be prevented attending to their duty here by obtruding on them the consideration of a private Bill in the committee. There is ample time to consider this Bill between ten and eleven in the morning and between two and three in the afternoon, if necessary, when the House is not in session. As a member of the Railway Committee it is unfair that I should be compelled to neglect my important duties in this House with reference to a measure in which my constituents are deeply interested, simply because I am forced to attend a meeting of a committee.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The Railway Committee is composed of practically nearly all the members of the House, and this motion would compel them to neglect their duty in the committee or to be absent when a public measure of vital importance is being considered in the House. The Minister of the Interior told us last night that many measures of great public importance would not pass this session because of insufficient time. He told us that the Grain Bill which was introduced in the interests of the farmers would have to stand aside, that the Bank Act, and important amendments to the Railway Act would not be allowed to go through this session for the same reason.

Mr. OLIVER. If the hon. member says that I stated that these measures would not be allowed to go through this session because of press of business he misunderstood me entirely. I said that these measures were claiming the pressing attention of the House, but had been compelled to give way to the discussion of the matter now before the House. I did not convey the impression that they would not be dealt with later on.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. The Minister of the Interior said that these were more important than the matter brought up by the hon. member for Portage la Prairie, and we all understand him to say they would not be able to get through this session. The minister said that the Bank Act would not go through because of want of time, and so we had to pass an interim Act.

Mr. OLIVER. I stated the fact with regard to the Bank Act, but Hansard will

bear me out that I did not convey any impression such as the hon. member (Mr. Middlebro) has referred to.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Does the Minister of the Interior think that the Grain Act, the Bank Act, and the amendments to the Railway Act, are less important than this private Bill?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not considered that question at all.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Will the minister say that we should give precedence to this private Bill before these important measures?

Mr. OLIVER. I have not thought of that.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO. Such a proposition as this is entirely unreasonable under existing conditions, and it should not be forced on us.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I do not know even the title of this Bill, nor what its merits are, nor the matter to which it refers, but hon. gentlemen will realize that there is a more important measure before the House, and that is the reciprocity agreement with the United States. This discussion is not only so much time consumed from the discussion of that important matter, and therefore I would ask my hon. friend (Mr. Nesbitt) not to press the motion but to withdraw it.

Motion withdrawn

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

RECIPROCITY WITH CANADA.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario):

1. Referring to the White Book known as Document No. 849, entitled 'Reciprocity with Canada,' being the message from the President of the United States transmitting to the Senate a report from the Tariff Board, and on March 1, 1911, ordered to be printed and laid on the Table of the United States Senate, in which occurs the following passages, viz.:—

(a) On page 107, 'It is to be noted that the farm prices of more than half of the oat crop of the United States range from $0.27 to $0.35 a bushel, and that the farm prices of about the same proportion of the Canadian crop range from $0.28 to $0.36.'

(b) On page 109, speaking of the prices of horses, 'In all the Canadian Provinces except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Nova Scotia the prices are higher than in any of our states.'

(c) On page 109, speaking of the prices of dairy cows, 'The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.'

(d) On page 110, appears the following table of comparative prices, average value per head in 1910:—

	Horses.	Dy. cows.	Other cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
United States	108.19	35.79	19.41	4.03	9.14
Canada.	133.	43.00	31.00	6.00	11.00
And comparing the					
State of N.Y.	125.00	39.50	18.20	5.00	11.50
With Ont. ..	133.00	48.00	34.00	7.00	10.00

(e) On page 110 appears also the following statements:—

'Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of prices is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.'

'Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada.'

'Prices of swine are slightly higher in Canada than in the United States.'

(f) On page 113 appears the following:—

'As to horses Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario.

'During the spring of 1910 it is stated on good authority that not less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time. The five provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, combined have but 1,863,744 head as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the state of Iowa alone.'

2. When was the reciprocity agreement executed by representatives of Canada and the United States?

3. Were the above statements and figures present to the minds of the Canadian ministers when they executed the agreement on behalf of Canada?

4. Since the date of the execution of the agreement has the government made any effort to verify the above statements and figures as set out in the United States official document No. 849?

5. Is the government aware that both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States referred the agreement to committees composed of both political parties, before whom evidence was taken for months as to the possible effect of the agreement on United States interests?

6. Is it the intention of the government to take any evidence before any committees touching on the relatives prices of farm products in the United States and Canada, or on the effect the agreement may have on Canadian interests?

7. Has the government any information now in their possession dealing with the relative prices of farm products in Canada and the United States?

Mr. FIELDING:

1, 2 and 3. The document referred to shows on its face that it was sent to the Senate of the United States by the President on the 28th of February, 1911, and on March 1 ordered to be printed. Consequently it could not have been in the possession of the Canadian ministers on the 21st of January, the date of the correspondence which constitutes the reciprocity agreement.

4. Consideration of the statements was not deemed by the government essential to

the consideration of the reciprocity agreement. The desire of all Canadian governments for reciprocity in natural products was clear beyond question and did not require any statistical support.

The quotations from the document contained in the question are incomplete and, in some respects misleading. For example, a quotation in the question reads:—

'Price of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada.'

What the document in question says concerning the price of sheep is as follows:—

'Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada, due to the fact that Ontario specializes on pedigreed flocks, as appears later on.'

And, later on, on the same subject, the document says:—

'Unfortunately Ontario conditions are such that no fairly comparable figures can be made up. No flocks approaching in size those shown by the Ohio tables are to be found. There is apparently no such thing as exclusive sheep farming known there, except in those instances where farmers are maintaining pure bred stock to be sold at special values for breeding purposes, and costs of production in such cases would range too high to be fairly compared with sheep raising as carried on in the great sheep-rearing counties of the United States.

In another case prices of oats are quoted in the hon. member's inquiry in such a manner as to apparently show that the United States prices range from 27 to 35 cents per bushel, while the Canadian prices range from 28 to 36 cents per bushel. In making this quotation no account is taken of the fact that the American bushel is thirty-two pounds, while the Canadian bushel is thirty-four pounds. A fair comparison, even according to the figures quoted, would show that the American prices are a shade higher.

5. Yes.

6. No.

7. The government have now, as they have always had, access to the various agricultural and other journals containing quotations of farm products in Canada and the United States. Some compilations made from these have already been submitted to the House, and there are others which will be brought down immediately.

MARRIAGE LAWS.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds):

1. Has the parliament of Canada the power to legalize or validate any or every marriage solemnized in Canada?

2. Does the government consider it desirable that steps should be taken to prevent cruelty and injustice by reason of marriages contracted in good faith before a duly ordained clergyman but afterwards declared invalid?

3. Does the government propose to take any steps for this purpose or in this connection?

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH:

1. The question calls for an opinion upon a matter of law in regard to which the government would desire to be advised if necessity arose.

2 and 3. The government is of opinion that it has no power or jurisdiction in the premises.

PRODUCTION OF CEMENT.

Mr. SEXSMITH:

What has been the total production of cement in Canada, annually, since 1900?

Mr. FISHER. The production of cement in Canada in the years 1900-10 is as follows:

Year.	Natural Rock Cement. brls.	Portland Cement. brls.
1900..	125,428	292,124
1901..	133,328	317,066
1902..	127,931	594,594
1903..	92,252	627,741
1904..	56,814	910,358
1905..	14,184	1,346,548
1906..	8,610	2,139,164
1907..	5,775	2,436,093
1908..	1,044	2,665,289
1909..	....	4,010,180
*1910..	....	4,753,975

* Subject to revision.

THE DUMPING CLAUSE.

Mr. MACDONELL:

Is it provided or proposed that the dumping clause in the tariff shall apply to articles enumerated in the schedules to the reciprocity agreement?

Mr. FIELDING. The agreement referred to contains no reference either to the dumping clause of the Canadian tariff laws or to the somewhat similar provisions of the United States tariff laws. Any questions that may arise with reference to the application of these provisions, on either side, will have to be decided by the customs authorities of the respective countries.

EXPRESS RATES.

Mr. SCHAFFNER:

Has the Board of Railway Commissioners full jurisdiction to regulate and determine the tolls or rates to be charged by all express companies for the carriage and delivery of goods and parcels in Canada?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, under Revised Statutes of Canada of 1906, chapter 37.

THE SEAL FISHERIES TREATY.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the orders of the day are taken up, I would like to ask the right hon. the First Minister whether he is prepared to lay on the table the Seal Fish-

eries treaty and papers and correspondence in connection therewith. I notice that it has been ratified at Washington some days ago.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. As soon as my hon. friend the Secretary of State comes to the House he will lay the papers on the table. They are ready.

PRECAUTIONS AGAINST CHOLERA.

Mr. SPROULE. I have noticed that some days ago certain cases supposed to be cholera were quarantined below Quebec, and I would like to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether he has any information on the subject that he is able to communicate to the House so as to relieve the anxiety of the people of the country in regard to this dreaded disease.

Mr. FISHER. The cases referred to were somewhat suspicious, and the physician in charge detained them for separate examination. A bacteriological examination has been made, and the doctors have declared that the disease is not cholera, so that there is no case of quarantine at present.

Mr. SPROULE. Are the cases discharged from quarantine, or are they still detained?

Mr. FISHER. They are still detained to recover from acute dysentery.

PRIVILEGE—MR. PERLEY.

Mr. PERLEY. I rise to a question of privilege. On the night before last, when I was not in the House, the Minister of Public Works made reference to me personally in connection with some correspondence addressed to the Minister of Finance by the Riordon Paper Company, in which I happen to hold some stock. Considering the statements made in the House by my hon. friend the Minister of Finance, I am rather surprised that he should have allowed this correspondence to be used in this way. On the 3rd of February the Minister of Finance said this in this House with regard to correspondence on the subject of reciprocity:

> With regard to correspondence respecting reciprocity with the government there is practically none. Many people made representations to the government but beyond a polite acknowledgment of their letters, there is no correspondence. In some cases these representations, although not marked confidential, are such as I would hardly feel free to bring down because they relate to particular interests that might be, or thought they might be affected by the negotiations, and I could not without their consent publish these.

This matter was discussed a good many times in the House, and I understood that the Minister of Finance was firm in the position that this correspondence was private correspondence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman not aware that this correspondence was brought down months ago and is on the files of the House?

Mr. PERLEY. I was not aware of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was from the files that I got it.

Mr. PERLEY. Even now I do not understand how that could be done after the remarks made by the Minister of Finance.

Some hon. MEMBERS. It was not brought down.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was, months ago.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was all the private correspondence referred to by the Minister of Finnace brought down?

Mr FIELDING. There was no private correspondence from anybody brought down —no letter marked private, or which in its nature was private. I do not remember the particular letter referred to. I happened to be engaged when the Minister of Public Works was speaking, and beyond some reference to that company in which the hon. gentleman is interested I did not notice any reference to the letter. But I can only say that if there was anything in that letter intended to be private, I would not have brought it down. I did not give it to the Minister of Public Works. I presume that he must have got it from the public files. I do not know when it was brought down, but up to this moment I have not heard that there has been any objection on the part of the company to its being brought down.

Mr. PERLEY. I have no objection to this correspondence being brought down at all. I did not know that it was on file, and I would like the Minister of Public Works to tell me when it was placed on the table of the House and why that was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know why it was brought down. It was brought with a great deal of other correspondence. I happened to see it with a letter from my hon. friend from York (Mr. Crocket) referring to a communication from a large lumber company urging a reduction in the United States duty on shingles, and with letters from people dealing in hay, which were laid on the table of the House a good many months ago.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will allow me, I will answer the question why it was brought down. It was brought down in answer to a demand of the hon. member for North Toronto (Mr. Foster), if I am not mistaken, that all correspondence on this subject should be brought down, and all

the correspondence which either was not marked private or was not, from its very nature obviously intended to be private, has been brought down.

Mr. PERLEY. That, I take it, is only another way of saying that the minister has brought down just what he thought fit to bring down, and nothing more. I have no objection to these letters being brought down, but it seems to me the minister ought to have some general rule in these matters and not apply special rules to suit the purposes of the government.

Mr. FIELDING. What rule would the hon. gentleman suggest?

Mr. PERLEY. I think that either everything not marked 'private' should be brought down or nothing should be brought down.

Mr. FIELDING. Can my hon. friend (Mr. Perley) tell me of any case of which he complains? I do not think that in the case of the letter from this company in which the hon. gentleman is said to be interested, that the manager who wrote it ever complained, and I do not think he would complain of our action. There was nothing private in the letter, nor anything to indicate that it was intended to be private.

Mr. PERLEY. I quite understand that, but it seems to me that all the letters should be treated alike.

Mr. FIELDING. They have been.

Mr. PERLEY. Has the hon. minister brought down every letter connected with the reciprocity pact not marked 'private?'

Mr. FIELDING. No.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. PERLEY. How does the hon. gentleman decide?

Mr. FIELDING. I received letters from my colleagues on this side, which though not marked private, were by their nature manifestly intended as private, and these I did not bring down.

Mr. PERLEY. In other words, the government brings down such correspondence as suits its convenience. However, I do not wish the House to think that I have any objection to the bringing down of these letters, or that there is anything in them that might not be made public. But I wish to say, in the first place, I have nothing to do personally with the active management of this compnay. I have so much work to do here that I have not tried to take part in the other. So, I found it necessary to telephone to Montreal to find out regarding these letters. I find that, in the first place, the statement of the Minister of Public Works, that this company urged very strongly that a reciprocal arrangement should be entered into, is not in accordance with the letter. This company has a large output of sulphite pulp, and it so happens that the ordinary terms 'pulp' and 'paper' as used do not include sulphite pulp, and this company simply wished to bring that point to the attention of the government in order that, if any treaty were made with the United States, the wording should be such as to cover sulphite pulp. This company is not a political company nor a Tory concern; it is a Canadian company. And if there were to be an arrangement with the United States they simply wished to bring proper information to the attention of the government. Now, the Minister of Public Works has said that he has been told that it would mean $90,000 to this company. It is easy for the minister to get up and make that statement. But there can be no foundation for it. This company will certainly derive some advantage, but the information the minister gives, if he has not got it from his inner consciousness must have been given him by somebody who knew nothing about the matter. It is utterly impossible that there should be such a benefit to the company. Further, the minister says that this will come about if the proposed arrangement goes into effect. The pulp and paper clauses depends on the will of the provinces, as this parliament has no power to put this into effect. It is true that if it comes into force immediately, pulp wood from private lands will be affected. But it is well known that the greater part of the business done by all these companies is done on Crown lands.

Now, with regard to the hon. minister's (Mr. Pugsley's) personal reference and insinuations regarding myself. I can only say that I am opposed to this reciprocity pact, because I think it is a bad thing for Canada; I am opposed to it on principle. And I extend to the hon. minister my sincere sympathy and pity that he seems utterly unable to understand how any one can regard a public question from any other point of view than the effect upon his own pocket.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am very glad to get the information which my hon. friend has given to the House that he has nothing to do with the active management of this company. Otherwise he would know of the very considerable quantities of pulp and paper which this company is to-day shipping to the United States and would realize the great benefits which would accrue to the company if pulp and paper were admitted free to the United States. I presume he knows something of the details of the work of the company.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does not the hon. gentleman think that my hon. friend from Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) knows as much about the subject as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley)?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The Minister of Public Works has had the very great advantage of reading the admirable letter written by the manager of the Riordan Paper Mills Company. And I wish to congratulate the hon. gentleman (Mr. Perley) being, as he says simply a stockholder of the company, upon the excellent ability and excellent judgment of the young man who is now in the position of general manager of the Riordan Company. I do not know that there is any man in this country or in the United States engaged in the manufacture of pulp and paper who is more qualified——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). If we are going to have a debate on this sub——

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) has heard enough?

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). On the contrary we have heard too little from the hon. gentleman; we are likely to hear more from him particularly with regard to some of the insinuations he gives out, which insinuations do not come very well from a gentleman with the record in dealings with the treasury of New Brunswick that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Pugsley) has.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Borden, Halifax) not to make insinuations. I have heard many insinuations in the past not only from the hon. gentleman himself but from others, and I think it is due to the position which the hon. gentleman occupies, that he should make no insinuations against another member of this House. But if he has any statement or charge to make let him make it openly and publicly. And I venture to tell the hon. gentleman——

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr Speaker——

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am not through yet. I tell the hon. gentleman that if he and the gentlemen associated with him in this parliament, and associated with him politically in the province of New Brunswick, would produce the correspondence and the records which some of them at all events have in their possession, there would be disclosed to the people of this country and to this House as great a conspiracy against myself as ever was concocted against any public man in this country. I have made the statement before in the press that this conspiracy was concocted against me, and I have dared the gentlemen whom I have accused to come into the courts against me and bring an action for libel for the charges I made against them. And I tell the hon. gentleman that if the correspondence which they have in their possession—I do not say my hon. friend has, but the gentlemen who have been associated with him in this House, and who are allied with him as prominent members of the Conservative party in the province of New Brunswick—if I do not show that they have been guilty of this conspiracy, that they have been guilty of making false reports, and being parties to false reports against myself, I will forfeit my seat as a member of this House.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I am not referring to any correspondence; I am referring to the records of the legislature of New Brunswick. Since the hon. gentleman wants them produced, I think they can be produced, and he can make his answer with regard to them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If there is anything the hon. gentleman can find out he is welcome to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I think perhaps the hon. gentleman will not be so entirely satisfied with the statement of facts with regard to that as he professes to be at the present time. I rose for the reason that the hon. gentleman made a most uncalled for insinuation against the hon. member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley), and then was proceeding to deal with a matter that was absolutely irrelevant to the question raised by the member for Argenteuil, dealing with the internal affairs of the Riordan Paper Company. That is what the hon. gentleman was doing, and I said that the insinuation came with very bad grace indeed, and I repeat it, from a gentleman having the record in the public life of this country which is possessed by the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am quite content to allow my record in public life to stand side by side with that of the hon. gentleman. From time to time, during twenty-six years, I have appealed to the people of my native province on my record, and I have always been sustained upon that record. When the last appeal to the people of New Brunswick upon my record was made, I came back with a majority of ten supporters, and when we go to the people again, be it very soon or be it at a later date, I venture to say that we shall come back with twelve supporters at least from the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. SPROULE. I rise to a point of order. Discussion is not possible on a question of privilege.

Mr. SPEAKER. I would remind the House that the debate is very irregular at this time.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was replying to the hon. member for Argenteuil, and I was saying that the letter——

Mr. SPEAKER. I think the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I accept your ruling.

Mr. SPEAKER. When a question of privilege is raised the custom of the House is that the member raising it has the floor. I allowed the Minister of Public Works to speak because I thought he was making some personal explanation. Beyond that, the debate was irregular, because there is nothing before the House.

SOREL SHIPYARD, OFFICIAL INQUIRY.

Mr. MONK. Before the orders of the day are proceeded with I would like to ask again when the report on the Sorel affair will be laid on the table of the House. It is required for the purpose of discussion. I do not know if my hon. friend has acquired the habit of withholding documents.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I told my hon. friend yesterday that Mr. Boyle, the inspector of agencies, has made an inspection in Sorel and has been there for some time. He has not yet put in his report; he is away from town just now, and is expected back at the beginning of next week, when he will make his report forthwith.

WAYS AND MENAS—DREDGING AT GASPEREAU HARBOUR.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. O. S. CROCKET (York, N.B.) Before you leave the Chair, I desire to call attention to a matter which has been investigated in the Public Accounts Committee, and which I think deserves the serious consideration of the House. I refer to the contract which was awarded by the Public Works Department to the Marine Dredging and Construction Company for dredging at the Gaspereau river, New Brunswick. I do not know whether this is another case of a conspiracy to destroy the character of the Minister of Public Works, but I leave it to the members of the House to judge after they have heard the evidence that was adduced before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Would my hon. friend tell me the date of that investigation?

Mr CROCKET. The investigation was held during the last session of parliament. I think the minister has the documents before him.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, I have not.

Mr. CROCKET. I see the minister has been examining the evidence since he came into the House, so he is just as familiar with the facts as I am. The evidence shows that this contract was illegally awarded to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, which I think the members of the House are aware is owned and controlled by the minister's personal and political friends, Mr. George McAvity and Mr. John A. Moore. The contract was not only awarded illegally to that company, in contravention of the law, but under it the sum of $33,900 was paid to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for work which the resident district engineer in charge of the work reported was of no value. Now this transaction began, so far as the records of the department disclose, in the month of July, 1908. Previous to that date there had been two reports sent to the Public Works Department upon the proposed work. One of these reports was made by Mr. Day, the resident engineer of the department, on the 13th day of May, 1903, when that officer estimated that the cost of the proposed work, which was a channel giving twelve feet at low water, would be $168,000. Mr. Day based his estimate on 20 cents a cubic yard. The matter rested then until 1907, when, on the 5th of March, Mr. Geoffrey Stead, Mr. Day's successor as resident engineer, made another report, estimating that the work would require about 330,000 cubic yards to be dredged, costing, at 20 cents, $66,000.

Mr. EMMERSON. What is the date of that?

Mr. CROCKET. March 5, 1907. There the matter rested until the 15th of July, 1908, when the general elections of that year were approaching. Then we find it suddenly revived by this direction from the deputy minister to the then engineer:

> Kindly let me know as soon as possible just what quantity of urgent dredging is required at the Gaspereau river.

The resident engineer was accordingly asked by the chief engineer for his estimate of the quantity, on the 16th of July, and on the 17th of July, Mr. Stead sent this telegram to the chief engineer:

> In reply to your telegram at Gaspereau river, a cut to give six feet at low water through bar necessitating removing 48,000 cubic yards, barge measurement, is most urgently required. Basin, 350 feet long, 200 feet wide; at wharfs also very necessary, requiring 14,000 cubic yards barge measurement, of dredging.

On the 20th of July the acting deputy minister, Mr. Hunter, instructed the secretary of the department to have advertisements sent out calling for tenders for dredging at Gaspereau river, at Buctouche beach and at Buctouche harbour and at Point du Chene in the province of New Brunswick.

The advertisements issued on the 28th and bears date the 28th of January calling for tenders for dredging at these places. On the 31st of July, three days after the issue of the advertisement calling for tenders, we have this extraordinary telegram received by the chief engineer at Otawa:

Chatham, N.B., July 31, 1908.

To the Chief Engineer, .
Dept. of Public Works, Ottawa, Ont.

John E. Moore, of St. John, says he has dredge ready to work on Gaspereau river, N.B., and expects to start Monday. Am I authorized to lay out the dredging for him there.

GEOFFREY STEAD,
Resident Engineer.

Hon. members will observe that although the advertisement for tenders was issued and bears date 28th July and called for tenders to be received up to the 14th of August, on the third day after the issue of that advertisement, the minister's friend Mr. John E. Moore had his dredge upon the site and intended to go to work on Monday, which would be the 2nd day of August, and ten or twelve days before the date fixed for the receipt of tenders. Then, on the 4th of August, Mr. Stead receives this reply to his inquiry of the 31st of July.

August 4, 1908.

Sir,—The work of dredging in the Gaspereau river has been given to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, of Saint John, N.B., providing they are willing to accept, in payment, per cubic yard, scow measurement, the lowest price to be obtained by tenders which are now being called for. Kindly place the company's dredge at work immediately, if they accept the conditions. You will please, however, note that the lesser work only is to be engaged upon.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd) Chief Engineer.

Geoffrey Stead, Esq.,
Resident Engineer.

So that the record shows the rather novel and ingenious method which has been adopted by the Public Works Department since my hon. friend took charge of it, of awarding a contract for the performance of work and of receiving tenders for that work after the contract has been awarded.

Mr. SPROULE. A very good idea.

An hon. MEMBER. Evidence of conspiracy.

Mr. CROCKET This would appear to be not evidence of a conspiracy against the character of the Minister of Public Works, but of conspiracy and fraud upon the public treasury of this country with the connivance of the Minister of Public Works. On the same day, the chief engineer informed Mr. Graham, who was Superintendent of Dredging in North Sydney of the awarding of this contract to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, assuming apparently that the Gaspereau river that was referred to was in Cape Breton.

Mr. SPROULE. He was out in his geography.

Mr. CROCKET. Now, the 14th of August, was the day fixed by the advertisement for the receipt of tenders and on that day tenders were opened and we find that but one tender was received, it being from the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, to whom the contract had already been awarded, and it was at 90 cents a cubic yard or four and a half times the figure estimated by two district engineers of the department. That fact became known to the department on August 14th, but we find that the intimation of that fact to the superintendent of dredging in New Brunswick, Mr. McCordock was deferred to the 29th of September. On the 29th September, the chief engineer advised Mr. W. J. McCordock, superintendent of dredging, St. John, N.B., as follows:

September 29, 1908.

Sir,—The only tender received for dredging in the Gaspereau river was the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, for 90 cents per cubic yard, scow measurement. At the time the tender was received, I thought that this price was considerably more than that for which the contract should be awarded. However, it has been represented to the department, that the conditions are such as to make this price fair and reasonable. I, therefore, have to ask you to go to the Gaspereau river immediately, looking to the circumstances in the case, and report by wire immediately.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) Chief Engineer.

W. J. McCordock, Esq.,
Superintendent of Dredging,
St. John, N.B.

When Mr. Lafleur, the chief engineer was upon the stand he was asked if he could state by whom the representation was made to him that on account of the difficulties that had arisen this price was fair and reasonable. The chief engineer could not answer that question. He was asked if he had learned it from the minister and his reply was, that he could not say whether it was the minister or not who informed him of the fact that there were difficulties existing there which made fair and reasonable a price of 90 cents per cubic yard, when the two district engineers on the ground had certified to the department that the work was worth only 20 cents per cubic yard. The next memo. of interest which the file discloses is a telegram which was sent to Mr. Lafleur, the chief engineer by the hon. Minister of Public Works from St. John, on the 3rd of October, and this is the telegram:

Kindly wire instructions to Scammell to visit Gaspereau as arranged.

(Sgd.) WM. PUGSLEY.

The House will observe that in the meantime the engineer had intimated his opinion that the price of 90 cents, the tender of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company was excessive, and it became necessary, therefore, to overcome the opinion of the resident engineer, so that this telegram signed 'Wm. Pugsley,' is very suggestive upon that point. The telegram to Mr. Lafleur was to wire instructions to Mr. Scammell, not the resident engineer of the district in which the work was being done, but the resident engineer of the district of St. John, and the telegram shows that the minister had intervened personally and arranged with Mr. Scammell for the purpose of visiting Gaspereau, manifestly Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of bolstering up the price which he desired should be paid to his favourite firm the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company. On the 5th of October, two days afterwards, the chief engineer telegraphs Mr. Scammell:

Ottawa, October 5, 1908.

J. K. Scammell,
Resident Engineer,
St. John, N. B.

Certain difficulties have risen in connection with dredging Gaspereau river. Please see the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, of St. John, who have the contract, and report.

(Sgd.) Chief Engineer.

On the same day the chief engineer telegraphed the Hon. William Pugsley at St. John to say that he had wired Mr. Scammell instructions to visit Gaspereau as arranged, and, as arranged by the minister personally with the resident engineer Mr. Scammell. There the record stands until the 9th of October when we have a communication received by the chief engineer of the department from Mr. McCordock, superintendent of dredging at St. John, passages of which I would like to put on record.

Offices, Department of Public Works of Canada—Dredging.
St. John, N.B., 9th October, 1908.

The Chief Engineer,
Dept. of Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir.—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 29th ult., No. 5615, as follows:

Then Mr. McCordock quotes the letter. The letter of the 20th September was the letter notifying the superintendent of dredging for New Brunswick for the first time of the receipt of the tender on the 14th of August some seven or eight weeks previously. After quoting the letter Mr. McCordock continues:

Expecting to receive the papers immediately from Mr. Graham, which you referred to, I immediately set about seeing where the Gaspereau river was located, to find one in Nova Scotia,——

This explains how it was that the first notification is sent by the chief engineer to Mr. Graham, of Cape Breton, there being a Gaspereau river in Cape Breton, and the officers of the department imagined that this river where the work was to be done was in Cape Breton.

--one on the Grand Lake, N.B., and one on the line of the Canadian Pacific railway in Sunbury county, N.B., but no others shown or the charts. I asked Mr. Shewan and Mr. Scammell if they knew of any other Gaspereau river, and they both looked over the charts with me and said they knew of no other.

Both Mr. Shewan and Mr. Scammell there referred to are resident engineers in New Brunswick, but they were unaware of the existence of this river in which the Minister of Public Works had, six or seven weeks before, his friend Mr. Moore dredging.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend does not suggest they were the resident engineers of the district, in which Gaspereau river is situated.

Mr. CROCKET. Not at all. They were the resident engineers at St. John, and they ought to be pretty familiar with the work going on in the province of New Brunswick and they were under Mr. McCordock the superintendent of dredging at St. John.

On inquiring of the minister, I found the work proposed at Port Elgin in Westmoreland county, N.B., and have visited and examined the place, and only to-day received from Mr. C. M. Graham the papers you directed would be sent to me.

We have the very peculiar fact that the superintendent of dredging in the province of New Brunswick was not able to ascertain from any of his own engineers or from the department at Ottawa, where this work was going on, and had to resort to the minister personally to ascertain the location of the river.

Mr. SPROULE. He had been running the whole job himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket) allow me to correct him?

Mr. CROCKET. Yes.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. McCordock was the superintendent of the government dredging, and he had nothing whatever to do with contract dredging and, therefore, this was not at all within Mr. McCordock's jurisdiction.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. McCordock was superintendent of dredging with jurisdiction all over the maritime provinces.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Only of government dredging.

Mr. CROCKET. What difference does that make about his not knowing where the river was. If he had nothing to do with contract dredging, why did the minister place the contract dredging under his charge?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is entirely wrong. This was not in Mr. McCordock's charge, but he was appointed as an expert by reason of his having thirty years' experience of government dredging work to go there and examine into the conditions and make a report.

Mr. CROCKET. Yes, to make a report upon this contract, because it was not government dredging, and that is the statement I made. Then, Mr. McCordock reports the result of his visit after having discovered the whereabouts of the work.

I report that up to yesterday 21,268 cubic yards are reported by the inspector as being removed. In many places in the river there is but two feet of water at low water, and to move the scows ahead to the spoil from the bucket may be deposited into the scow, first the dredge requires to dredge a trench twenty-five feet wide to eight feet depth at low water, throwing the spoil to one side, then when this trench is dredged a distance, the dredge is removed back to take out the remaining width, 35 feet, and the scow is floated in the trench just made.

I am of the opinon that from the exposed position of the dredging and the detention, from shallow water, and the difficulty in getting coal and water from the shore out two miles to the dredge, where it has to remain at anchor in all weather, that the amount of ninety cents named in the tender is a fair rate per cubic yard.

Notwithstanding that two resident engineers of the district had previously reported it at 20 cents per cubic yard, which of itself was a very liberal estimate, as I am advised, because the material to be removed consisted of nothing but sand and mud, and residents of the locality state that it was not really worth ten cents per cubic yard to remove it.

The contractor claims that he is, by custom, to receive an equivalent in yardage for the time spent in trenching and throwing on one side the spoil taken out of the trench, this to be calculated by the amount removed in the barges and time of dredging the same as compared with that during trenching.

The contractor has removed in 36 days working, 21,264 cubic yards, an average of 596 cubic yards per day, or, counting days not working, making 45 days, an average of 472 cubic yards.

This report will only refer to work on the Gaspereau river, Port Elgin, Westmoreland county, N.B.

I have the honour to be,
Yours obediently,
Sgd. W. J. McCordock, Esq.
Supt. of Dredging,
St. John, N. B.

Now, the next fact of interest which the record discloses is that on the 16th of October, the department had no record by which it could determine at headquarters the price of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company's tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not correct.

Mr. CROCKET. I say that it is correct and that the record shows it, and I propose to put it on 'Hansard' right now.

Ottawa, October 16, 1908.

Hon. Wm. Pugsley,
Minister of Public Works,
St. John, N.B.

Deputy minister informs me that you have Maritime Dredging and Construction Company's tender for dredging Gaspereau river, Westmoreland county. Would you kindly let me know prices quoted for ordinary materials and castng over so that progress estimate may be made out and paid.

(Sgd.) Chief Engineer.

Here we have a telegram sent to the Minister of Public Works at St. John, on the 16th October stating that he himself had in his possession at that time, and had carried in his pocket down to the city of St. John, the tender of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, and that the department had no means of finding out what the price of that tender was, and for that reason they found it necessary to telegraph the minister who had the tender in his pocket down at St. John, and from the minister, and from the minister only, did Mr. Lafleur get his information.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket), stated was that up to the 16th of October they had no record in the department.

Mr. CROCKET. I said that 'on' the 16th of October.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The record was on file with the department, and was taken by me to St. John.

Mr. CROCKET. What I intended to say, and what I am sure I did say, was that 'on' the 16th of October.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said 'up' to the 16th of October.

Mr. CROCKET. The minister will not contradict the statement which he made because he cannot, being confronted with this telegram sent to himself.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I contradict the statement I understood the hon. gentleman to make, namely that up to the 16th of October they had not the record.

Mr. CROCKET. On the same day the minister replies:

St. John, N.B., 16th Oct., 1908.

E. B. Lafleur,
Chief Engineer,
Department of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Price materials Gaspereau river ninety cents. Have mailed tender to deputy.

(Sgd.) WM. PUGSLEY.

St. John, N.B., Oct. 16, 1908.

Dear Mr. Hunter,—I return you tender of Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for work at Gaspereau river, &c. I understand that Mr. McCordock has reported that the price asked for Gaspereau is reasonable. I shall be glad if you will confer with the chief engineer and have the necessary recommendation to council prepared.

Yours sincerely,
(Sgd.) WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

J. B. Hunter, Esq.,
Deputy Minister of Public Works,
Ottawa.

On the 19th of October there is a report from Mr. Scammell, with whom the minister had personally arranged to visit the ground, with a view to certifying to the fairness and reasonableness of this excessive tender, and I will read Mr. Scannell's whole letter:

No. 1824.
Subj., Dredging Gaspereau river.
Ref., Westmoreland Co., N.B.

Department of Public Works, Canada,
Office, Engineer-in-Charge Dredging,
St. John, N.B., 19th October, 1908.

Sir,—In reply to your telegram of the 5th inst., I saw the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company of St. John, N.B., and visited Gaspereau river on October 7, where a personal inspection was made of the work being done at that place in connection with dredging a channel 60 feet wide to a depth of 8 feet at low water and making a face of from 5 to 7 feet in order to secure a passage into the village of Port Elgin, parish of Botsford, Westmoreland county, N.B.

I found the dredge 'Iroquois' at work at that place with a tow boat, 'The Calluna,' and two barges. The work there is progressing with extreme difficulty, which I have reason to believe will increase as the season advances and much time will be lost on account of the high winds as the dredge is very much exposed to easterly and southeasterly gales, and there is no shelter afforded in the least.

I found that dredging commenced on August 17, and from the 17th to the 26th, 2,946 cubic yards were removed, being 34 scows in nine days or an average of 325 cubic yards per day. Up to September 5, 7,677 cubic yards were removed, or 87 scows in 18 days, being an average of 426 cubic yards per day. During the two days previous to my visit, viz., October 5 and 6, I found 1,159 cubic yards removed on the first day or 5 barges, and 1,324 cubic yards or 6 barges on the second day, which shows that under favourable working conditions the dredge is capable of doing good work.

You will observe, Mr. Speaker, that this favourite firm of the minister's made over $1,100 on the 5th October and over $1,300 on the 6th October. Yet we had a certificate against the first judgment of the engineer of the department that this price was fair and reasonable.

At high water the place of deposit of soil is half a mile, and at low water two miles from the site of the work, the materials dredged being clay, sand and oyster shells.

Neither the dredge or the tug can get into the creek except on the spring tides and this necessitates the water supply being pumped by a gasolene engine and towed out to the dredge at a great expense, this also applies to the coal used.

Under the circumstances it would be fair and reasonable to pay the present rate as called for under the contract with the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company.

Yours obediently,
(Sgd.) J. K. SCAMMELL,
Resident Engineer.

That is the resident engineer of the St. John district with whom, the letter shows, the minister himself, personally, arranged to visit and examine the work with a view to getting that certificate. On the 26th October, there is a letter from the engineer of the district, covering the county of Westmoreland in which the work is being done, Mr. Stead. He writes to John E. Moore, Esq., manager of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, St. John.

In reply to your letter of the 23rd inst., I have been sending the reports of dredging at Port Elgin to Ottawa each week, but several have been returned to me, through a misunderstanding of the reports. I wrote explaining the matter and received a telegram on Saturday asking for the returned reports, which I at once forwarded.

Would you kindly make up your accounts, four copies of each, for dredging during the months of August and September. These must be certified by the inspector, and I will then forward them.

Though I have asked for it, I have had no notification of your having been awarded the contract and do not yet know your price.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) GEOFFREY STEAD,
Resident Engineer.

The resident engineer who was certifying these accounts as fair and reasonable on the 26th October, two days after the work was completed, states in his letter to Mr. Moore that he was not aware up to that time of the price of the contract. On October 28 there is a telegram from the chief engineer to Mr. Stead, the resident engineer at Chatham, as follows:

Dredging returns for Gaspereau river work do not state quantity cubic yards cast over.

This information required, please forward it immediately.

(Sgd.) Chief Engineer.

Mr. Moore was looking for some funds then, and it became necessary to have some further information. Mr. Stead replies on October 29:

Am on way to Gaspereau river to obtain information re dredging requested in your telegram of 28th inst.

(Sgd.) GEOFFREY STEAD,
Resident Engineer.

On the 30th a further telegram from Mr. Stead to Mr. Lafleur:

In reply to your telegram dredging inspector in dredging at Gaspereau river was removed when widening cut and is included in quantities in scow loads given in inspector's reports.

On October 31 the chief engineer wires Mr. Stead:

Telegram re Gaspereau river received. Dredging returns do not give number of cubic yards cast over, and that is the information I want. Please wire it immediately.

Stead replies on the 31st October:

In reply to your telegram dredging inspector Gaspereau river kept no account of cubic yards of material cast over. Therefore cannot give exact amount. I estimate about 6,000 cubic yards.

There is the statement of the engineer who was in charge of this work that there was no account kept of the material cast over and the department was dependent upon an estimate made by the resident engineer. On November 4 Mr. Stead is instructed by the chief engineer by telegram to ascertain from the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company their price for casting over at Gaspereau river. On the 6th November Mr. Stead telegraphs Mr. Lafleur:

In reply to your telegram, the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company state that two-thirds the barge measurement price is their regular price for casting over. They claim that 8,000 cubic yards were cast over at Gaspereau river.

Although the resident engineer estimated 6,000 cubic yards, the claim of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company of 8,000 yards was recognized and payment recommended to them on that basis. Now, on the 7th November, we have a certificate from the secretary of the Department of Public Works which was required in order to enable some payments to be made to the contracting firm:

I hereby certify:

1. That tenders were called under date of the 28th July, 1908, and were received until August 14, 1908, for the execution of dredging in Gaspereau river, N.B.;

2. That a tender was received from the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company;

3. That this tender being found correct in every respect was accepted by the department;

4. That the price of the above bid, viz., ninety (90) cents per cubic yard, was reported by the chief engineer of the Department of Public Works as being fair and reasonable;

5. That the cost of this dredging is to be charged against the appropriation of $650,000 for dredging maritime provinces;

6. That on the 4th November, 1908, the chief engineer has recommended that, pending the settlement of the company's account for dredging performed in the Gaspereau river, the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company be paid the sum of $13,700 (thirteen thousand seven hundred dollars), work to that amount having been performed by them.

And I have signed.

(Sgd.) Secretary, Public Works Dept.

On the 10th November Mr. Stead, the resident engineer who had reported that he estimated that only 6,000 cubic yards of material were cast over, was directed by the chief engineer of the department to send duly—

Certified accounts in duplicate, favour Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, for 8,000 cubic yards cast over at Gaspereau river, at 60 cents a yard. This should be accompanied by your report stating how figures mentioned were arrived at.

A document on file shows how this communication became necessary. The Auditor General had smelt a rat and had asked for some inquiry and some explanations. The letter is from the chief engineer to Mr. Stead, dated November 19:

Sir,—I would like you to try to ascertain by soundings and calculating the actual quantity of materials cast over at Gaspereau river, N.B., by the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company. A satisfactory explanation must be given the Auditor General before payment can be made the company. Kindly, therefore, give this matter your careful and immediate attention.

The next document on file is a copy of the order in council authorizing the contract to be entered into for this work. It is dated 20th November, 1908, nearly one month after the work was completed. This is the order in council:

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, advise that authority be given to accept the tender of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, of St. John, N.B., to perform dredging in the Gaspereau river, province of New Brunswick, at the price of ninety cents per cubic yard, scow measurement, the above bid being the only one received in answer to public advertisement. The tenderers have furnished an accepted bank——

The word 'cheque' apparently is omitted.

—for $6,000 as security for the due fulfilment of their dredging contracts in the said province. The expenditure in connection with this dredging is properly chargeable to the ap-

propriation of $650,000 for dredging, maritime provinces, granted by parliament at its last session. The chief engineer of the Department of Public Works has reported that the price above quoted is fair and reasonable.

Such contract to be for work done up to close of calendar year.

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE BOUDREAU,
Clerk of the Privy Council.

So that we have the peculiar anomaly of an order in council passed upon the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works on the 20th of November to authorize the department to enter into a contract for work which had been completed on the 24th of October and for which the contract had been actually let on the 4th of August Then we have on the 8th of January a further certificate from the accountant of the department, Mr. Kingston:

This is to certify that the work has been performed by the Maritime Dredging & Construction Company, under their contract with this department, for dredging at Gaspereau river, N.B., to the value of $16,669.60 in excess of all payments, which amount I have been authorized to pay so soon as funds for that purpose shall have been voted by parliament.

And this firm were paid the sum of $33,969 for the performance of the work.

One other document to which I wish to refer is a letter or report from Mr. Stead, the resident engineer, dated the 9th of March, 1909, in which Mr. Stead describes this work as being of no value. The letter is addressed to Mr. Lafleur, the chief engineer, and is as follows:

I have received your letter No. 8510 of the 4th March, asking a report on what further dredging is required in the Gaspereau river, Westmoreland county, N.B.

In reply I have to say that last season dredging, to the extent of 33,744 cubic yards at a cost of $33,969.60, was performed by the excavation of a channel 100 feet wide across the estuary of the Gaspereau river, but that the shoalest point of the estuary had not been affected.

That is the way the copy reads that was furnished to me from the Department of Public Works; but when the original letter was produced, we found that these words were omitted from the copy on the file which was brought down: 'But the shoalest point of the estuary had not been reached at the close of the season, and therefore no improvement in navigation has been effected.' And these words are reported in the proceedings of the Public Accounts Committee. The letter goes on:

Moreover, if the cut is left unfinished, it will probably fill up rapidly.

So that we have the statement of the resident engineer of the department that this work, which had involved an expenditure of $33,969, was of no value and resulted in nothing more than the digging of a hole which would probably fill up rapidly and which had effected no improvement in navigation.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No value unless continued.

Mr. CROCKET. I may say that it was not continued during the next year until the month of October. A government dredge, I think the 'George Mackenzie,' was sent in and worked a week or two in the month of October, and extended the cut, as reported by the Public Works Department, 500 feet. Everybody in the locality knows that that work was an absolute waste of public funds. It was the laughing stock of that community, the work going on at that time, and I have no hesitation in saying that the only object and the effect of that contract was to put into the pockets of the minister's personal friends, Mr. McAvity and Mr. Moore, the profits of this illegal expenditure, to help them discharge obligations which they had assumed with the Minister of Public Works in connection with the purchase of newspapers in the city of St. John.

Before I leave this return, I want the House to note these facts which have been disclosed by this evidence, produced from the department itself:

1. The well-timed arrival of the dredge of the minister's friend upon the site of the work within a day or two of the issue of the call for tenders.

2. The novel and ingenious proceeding of awarding the contract pending the call for tenders on condition that the contract price should be fixed by the amount of the lowest tender which should be received for work already awarded.

3. The result of this ingenious proceeding—the receipt of one tender from the contractor who already had the job at 90 cents per cubic yard, 4½ times the figure estimated by two district engineers.

4. The remarkable promptitude with which the superintendent of dredging in New Brunswick was notified on September 29 of the receipt of this tender on August 14.

5. The fact that the superintendent of dredging, six or seven weeks after the work had been in progress, found it necessary to apply to the Minister personally to learn its location.

6. The fact that when the chief engineer intimated his opinion that the price was excessive, the minister personally arranged with the resident engineer of another district to visit the work and report upon the reasonableness of the price.

7. The fact that upon October 16, the department had no record of the amount of the Maritime Dredging and Construc-

tion Company's tender, and that when the information was required at headquarters, it was found that the minister had the tender in his pocket at St. John.

8. The fact that the formal contract was signed on November 7, two weeks after the conclusion of the work.

9. The fact that the order in council necessary under the statute to authorize the contract to be entered into was passed on November 20, two weeks after the formal contract was executed, and nearly a month after the work was completed.

10. The fact that on March 9 following the resident engineer of the district reported that the work as left was of no value and effected no improvement in navigation.

Now, I have stated that the awarding of this contract was in contravention of the law of this parliament. In this connection I desire to quote section 36 of the Public Works Act, as follows:

Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works, except in cases,—

(a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest; or

(b) in which from the nature of the work it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department; or

(c) where the estimated cost of the work is less than five thousand dollars, and it appears to the minister, in view of the nature of the work, that it is not advisable to invite tenders.

2. Whenever in case of any work tenders are required to be or are invited, the minister having charge of the department concerned shall submit all tenders received therefor to the Governor in Council and the contract for the work shall be awarded under the direction of the Governor in Council.

By the documents from which I have quoted, being documents furnished by the Public Works Department, it is established beyond question that this contract was let in violation of that provision of the Public Works Act. That, I think, justifies my statement that it was an illegal contract, and the report of the engineer, Mr. Stead, of March 9, justifies the expression that it was a wasteful expenditure. This is just one of many matters that have been investigated by the Public Accounts Committee during the last year or two which illustrate the utter laxity, recklessness, illegality and, I think I am justified in saying, corruption which characterize the administration of that department of this government. We have had all sorts of cases investigated during the last two sessions of this parliament. We have had cases galore showing irregularities and crookedness in the awarding of contracts and the payment of bills. We have had cases exposed where untrue statements were contained in memoranda submitted by the Minister of Public Works to the Governor in Council. We had one case in which a contract involving over $1,000,000 was awarded upon an untrue representation to Council, the contract being awarded to this same Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, but at the Dominion Dredging Company's figures, in violation of the law.

Mr. EMMERSON. What were those figures?

Mr. CROCKET. The Dominion Dredging Company's figures were 39½ cents per cubic yard and the tender of the Maritime Dredging & Construction Company, 50 cts per cubic yard. The tender was awarded to the Maritime Dredging & Construction Co., at the Dominion Dredging Co.'s lower figure on the statement that tenders had been called for when tenders were not called for.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think that when the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) makes a statement of that kind he should produce the papers. I challenge him to produce the papers and prove his statement. It is absolutely untrue. Every representation made in the recommendation to council is absolutely correct and is verified by the record.

Mr. CROCKET. I will bear in mind the minister's challenge, and on another occasion——

Mr. WILSON (Laval). Do it now.

Mr. CROCKET. I will undertake to produce the proof of the statement I make which is absolutely contrary to the statement which the minister has just made. We have had other cases where it was shown that public moneys were expended for the improvement of private property, in one case a private property in which the Minister of Public Works himself was interested as a stockholder. We had another case in which it was shown that public moneys were expended illegally, as in this instance, without a proper tender for the performance of a private work for a company in which another member of this parliament was interested as a stockholder.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Where was it?

Mr. CROCKET. At Bathurst.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What member?

Mr. CROCKET. A member of the Senate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What name?

Mr. CROCKET. Senator Edwards. We have had other cases investigated where

dredging was done which was of no possible utility. We have had one case where a rum-seller was appointed a dredging inspector on the personal recommendation of the Minister of Public Works who had to employ a man to write out his dredging returns. We have had other cases where dredging contractors started dredging operations without any authority whatever from the department or any one else, and their bills were paid on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. What cases? Would the hon. gentleman be good enough to give these cases?

Mr. CROCKET. One of them, the minister will remember was at Loggieville. He has not forgotten it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman said 'cases.'

Mr. CROCKET. Another was at Bathurst.

Mr PUGSLEY What year?

Mr. CROCKET. In 1908.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Did the hon. gentleman say that had been paid?

Mr. CROCKET. I will undertake if opportunity is afforded me, to present a brief in each of these cases and to substantiate every statement I now have made.

Now, I think I have stated enough to show that a condition of affairs prevails in the Public Works Department which is absolutely rotten and alarming. It is, however, precisely what the Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) might have expected when, though well aware of the malodorous record of that hon. gentleman in the government of New Brunswick, he called Hon. Wm. Pugsley to Ottawa, and placed him in charge of the greatest spending department of his government. Hon. members of this House have already heard the story of the connection of the Minister of Public Works with the corrupt and illegal payment to his friend George McAvity of the sum of $36,000 as a rake-off in consideration of his political influence with the Public Works Department. Hon. members have also heard in this House the story of the Minister of Public Works' connection wtih the New Brunswick Coal & Railway Compnay, of which he was the managing director and leading spirit, and with reference to which a royal commission appointed by the government of the province of New Brunswick reported that $134,000 of the public money was missing and could not be traced. Hon. gentlemen are also aware—for it has been unfolded in this House—of the minister's connection with the Richibucto Sawdust Wharf steal, by which a favoured political heeler, Mr. Thomas O. Murray was paid by the Public Works Department $5,000 for the Sawdust Wharf which he bought for $700, the evidence in that case showing that over $2,000 of that sum was paid by Murray to a member of the Grit committee in Kent County, in five-dollar and ten-dollar bills a week or two before the last Federal election.

So, I say that the condition of affairs which prevails in the Public Works Department in this country is just exactly what the Prime Minister might have expected when he called the Hon. Wm. Pugsley to administer that great spending department. One would have thought that, these exposures having taken place in the matters to which I have referred and in reference to which the House already has the evidence, would serve as a warning to the Prime Minister to keep a more vigilant eye on his Minister of Public Works. But not so. The illegalities and irregularities have been accumulating at such a rate since the Prime Minister stated that he was 'prouder of Pugsley than ever' that it has become practically impossible for one to follow them. I have to-day submitted one of the cases which was investigated last year, and which there was no opportunity of presenting to the House during the last session of parliament. There were at least a dozen others equally flagrant and equally indefensible which can be presented, and will be presented if we are afforded an opportunity of doing so before the close of the present session.

Therefore, I move in amendment, seconded by Mr. Barker:

Resolved that the evidence reported by the Public Accounts Committee respecting a payment of $33,969.60 to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for dredging at Gaspereau river, N.B., as set out at page V 290 of the Auditor General's Report for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1909, discloses a wasteful and illegal expenditure of public money which deserves the censure of the House.

Hon. H. R. EMMERSON (Westmorland). I think it is a very unfortunate circumstance for my hon. friend who has just taken his seat (Mr. Crocket), that, in order to sustain a charge of misappropriation or misdirection of public money, he has to resort to vilification and abuse, and show an unwarranted animus in order to support the motion which he has just placed in your hands. My hon. friend has indulged, and I regret that it is characteristic of him, in conjecture and suspicion, and I would almost say, if it were parliamentary, in low insinuations against the hon. the Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend says there have been many cases brought out in the Committee of Public Accounts of misdoings of this kind. I can only say, with a knowledge of the

facts, with a knowledge of this particular case from its very inception down to the present moment, that if they are all as baseless as the one which has been brought to our attention to-day, the right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and his govern ment, and the people of this country need have no fear with respect to the administration of public works by the present minister. In matters of this character something more is needed, even by the members of this House, than mere insinuation and conjecture; and if it is not needed by hon. members in this House, it is demanded by the people of this country that men who sit in parliament and indulge in nothing but insinuation shall produce some evidence, or stand branded as worse offenders than those whom the hon. gentleman has sought to brand. I am willing to discuss this question upon its merits, and I shall strip it entirely of all extraneous matters of political animus, and leave it with the bare facts. I think I can demonstrate, even to the good sense and judgment of hon. members opposite, that there is nothing whatever in this structure which my hon. friend has sought to erect upon a foundation of sand.

In 1900 I had the honour of being elected as representative of the county of Westmoreland in this House. At that time, and for some years previous, the locality of the harbour of Baie Verte and Port Elgin had claimed the attention of previous representatives of that county, and the condition of those harbours and of the approaches thereto were matters of deep concern to the people interested. Under a previous government an attempt was made to afford transportation facilities by the erection of a ballast wharf in the open bay at Baie Verte, lying between Baie Verte and Port Elgin, between the streams known as the Baie Verte stream or creek and the stream known as the Gaspereau, which flows down by the village of Port Elgin. This ballast wharf was built there as a sort of loading wharf. There was no possibility of small steamers approaching the landings by the River Gaspereau, or up in the river of Gaspereau, or to approach near the village of Baie Verte. A former government, some twenty-five years ago, constructed this ballast, or load landing wharf, right out in the open, and it was necessary to scow out to that landing. It was thought that they could make improvements affording reasonable transportation and shipping facilities for the people of those communities. That had utterly failed, in fact it had been so constructed that soon afterwards it became a little restive in its position, and began wandering around the bay, and people were afraid that if they put anything upon it it might go adrift. So after a time it became obsolete as affording shipping facilities. Then the people of Port Elgin thought it was important that dredging should be done, so that vessels drawing at least 12 or 14 feet of water might have access to the wharfs, and to the mills and other industrial establishments in that community. Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the village of Port Elgin, while small, has many industrial establishments. In 1903, when the engineer of the department went there to inquire into the matter, it had five sawmills and four fish-curing and fish-smoking industries. At that time it was struggling to be recognized as one of the industrial centres of the county of Westmoreland. To-day it has reached a measure of its ambition. and is steadily improving and developing. Now those were the conditions. It was necessary to afford these facilities for the people, and in 1901, at the first session of parliament, when Mr. Tarte was Minister of Public Works, I brought the matter to his notice, and as a result of my conference with him, he sent officers of his department to make a survey. In February and March, I think, of 1901, Mr. Day, an officer connected with the Department of Public Works in the province of New Brunswick, under the direction of his chief, Mr. Shewan, went to Port Elgin, and there, during the winter months, on the ice, made a thorough survey and borings to ascertain the dredging that would be necessary. The report of that engineer is before this House, and it shows what dredging was necessary. There was at the very mouth of the river a bar, 1,200 to 1,500 feet in width, that would have to be dredged out.

A channel was necessary that they might make use of that and then they have penetrated that bar in order to reach the main channel to Gaspereaux river. He pointed out the necessity of widening the channel of the river and then going up to what is known as the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island drawbridge. There is a railway bridge across the stream, which bridge was supposed to have a draw, which did have a draw and which has one now, but it was necessary that the river should be widened and deepened in order to reach the basin where are the wharfs, private and public, and also to reach the Hickman & Co. mills.

Mr. CROCKET. What depth did the engineer recommend at that time the dredging should go to—four feet?

Mr. EMMERSON. Eight feet. At that time there was a little water in the basin at low water, but in the river there was from 4 to 6 feet of water at low water. Here were milling establishments, here were fishing establishments which requir-

ed shipping facilities. They wanted a depth of water that would enable ordinary schooners and sailing craft to enter the basin in order to enable them to reach the point of shipment.

At one o'clock House took recess.

House resumed at three oclock

Mr. EMMERSON. When the House took recess I was calling attention to the fact that a survey had been made by the Engineer of the Department of Public Works in the months of February and March, 1901 and a report was made to the Department shortly after the survey was made. A survey was made of the River from Port Elgin to four miles beyond the mouth 'for the purpose of accertaining the nature, extent, and probable cost of dredging that section of the river and entrance, to make it navigable for vessels frequenting the place.' The report of the Engineer, together with the plans, was sent to the Department and copies thereof have been presented to the House. The Gaspereau River takes its rise in Westmorland County, twelve miles or more from the point where it enters Baie Verte on the Southwestern side of Northumberland Strait. The officer of the Department reported that Port Elgin had then, May 1903, between 600 and 700 inhabitants; that it is practically the only town on the River Gaspereau, that it is situated about one mile from the outlet of the river. The engineer says that Port Elgin is situated in the Parish of Botsford, but, as a matter of fact, it is situated in the Parish of Westmoreland, which makes but little difference. It is situated on the line of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway about twenty minutes from Sackville on the Intercolonial railway and about seventeen miles from Cape Tourmentine, the Eastern terminus of the New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island railway, and the nearest point on the main line to Prince Edward Island. At Cape Tormentine, between 1886 and 1892, a pier was constructed by the Department of Public Works and the Engineer reports:—

The pier is now much used during the season of navigation as a place of shipment for most of the deals cut along the line of the N. B. and P.E.I. railway, and that section of Westmoreland county.

At and in the vicinity of Port Elgin are five saw mills, three cheese factories, four smoked fish factories, several lobster factories, and a number of mercantile stores.

Three miles to the south-west of Port Elgin and at the head of Baie Verte is situated the village of the same name. This with Port Elgin and the intervening section of country has a population of about 2,000. All vessels have to enter and clear at Baie Verte, whether discharging or loading there, at Cape Tormentine or Port Elgin. It is therefore very difficult to separate from the total shipments the actual amount shipped from each of the three places as the entries are made under one port, that of Baie Verte.

From the head of Gaspereau river to Port Elgin the river is not navigated and otherwise is little used except for log-driving, this during the stages of half tide to high water or vice-versa, there being but little water at low tide for that purpose. From Port Elgin to the mouth the channel is narrow (50 to 100 feet) and crooked, and is limited from 1 to 2 feet at low water spring tides. At the mouth, there are depths of from 4 to 5 feet, while a short distance outside the mouth, a bar 1,200 to 1,500 feet wide (between the 3 feet contours) is found, on which the limiting depth is 8 feet at low water spring tides.

Beyond the bar from 3 to 5 feet is found at low water while depths of 6, 12 and 15 feet are found in further distances of four-fifths, one and four-fifths and three miles respectively.

From the mouth to Port Elgin, the channel is bounded by sand and mud flats elevated from 2 to 3 feet above low water, and these are terminated by marsh and low lands on either side.

Lumbering, fishing and farming form the principal occupations of the people of the surrounding country.

Of the former, deals, laths, boards and shooks are the main cut of the mills. The deals are mostly taken by rail to Cape Tormentine and shipped from there while the other materials are exported from Port Elgin by schooner or rail. The value of the lumber shipment from Port Elgin and vicinity is placed at between $140,000 and $150,000 annually.

Of the fisheries, herring, lobster and smelt are the principal catch, the estimated yearly value of which is placed at $180,000. Most of the fish is taken to Sackville by rail and shipped from there again by water.

Of farming, potatoes, hay, cattle, hides, wool, hogs, lambs, poultry, butter and cheese constitute the exports and are valued at about $40,000 annually.

The imports consist mainly of coal and general merchandise. The shipping owned at Port Elgin in 1901, consisted of 5 schooners, having a draught of from 5 to 11½ feet, and a total tonnage of 223, and one tug boat of 25 tons.

About 155 boats, of 4 feet draught, and 20 feet keel are also owned at and in vicinity of Port Elgin, which are engaged principally in lobster and other fisheries.

From 1897 to 1902, the number of vessels entering and clearing for Port Elgin and Baie Verte was as follows: 1897, 136; 1898, 101; 1899, 97; 1900, 62; 1901, 41, and 1902, 83. These vessels varied from 25 to 100 tons.

At present, only the smaller vessels can ascend the river to Port Elgin, and then generally at high water.

To improve the entrance and river to admit of vessels of upwards of 200 tons navigating same, it is asked that a channel 100 feet wide giving depth of 12 ft. at low water be dredged from the 12 ft. contour up to the wharfs at Port Elgin and that a basin 200 ft. wide, giving same depth as the channel, be made at the latter place between the wharves and

the railway bridge, also that another channel 75 ft. wide giving 8 ft. at low water be dredged from the railway bridge up to what is known as Hickman's Mill wharf, situated 900 ft. above the bridge.

It is claimed that if the above improvements were made, the trade of the place would be considerably increased and that the large amounts of shipments now made over the railway to other points and eventually exported by water would be shipped direct from Port Elgin.

On the plan herewith enclosed is shown in red, a proposed channel 100 feet wide with sides sloping 2 to 1, giving depth of 12 feet at low water, from 500 feet below the railway bridge out to the 12-foot contour, a distance of 3 miles; a basin 325 feet in mean length and 200 feet in width, giving 12 feet at low water, and a channel 75 feet wide, giving depth of 8 feet at low water, extending from the upper side of the railway bridge to Hickman's mill wharf, a distance of 1,.90 feet.

To dredge the proposed basin and channel below the bridge would necessitate the removal of 799,400 cubic yards (barge measurement) of mud and clay, and for the channel above the bridge 41,000 cubic yards of the same kind of material, a total of 840,400 cubic yards, which placed at 20 cents per yard would involve an expenditure of $168,000.

In consequence of rock being found underlying the mud and clay bottom, the curvature of the proposed channel is unavoidable as will be seen by referring to the accompanying table of borings.

Figures in blue on the accompanying plan denote depths in feet reduced to low water spring tides. Figures in red denote heights in feet above low water spring tides. (Spring tides rise 9 feet.) Borings are in green, a table of which is attached to this report. Many more soundings and borings were taken than the scale of the plan would admit of being plotted.

As most of the deals cut, at and in the vicinity of Port Elgin for the European markets will, no doubt, continue to be taken to and shipped from Cape Tormentine, the vessels that will visit Port Elgin will generally be of the schooner class drawing 5 to 10 feet and engaged in the carrying of small lumber, fish and produce to local and other ports.

As the improvement asked for is extensive, no doubt much more so than the people of Port Elgin and vicinity think, or the trade warrants, I would suggest, that a channel 100 feet wide be dredged, giving depth of 4 feet at low water, and also a basin at the wharfs giving same depth and sufficiently wide to admit of vessels turning. This would, I think, be ample improvement for the class of vessels that frequent the port and would reduce the quantity of dredging to about 185,000 cubic yards and the cost to $37,000.

This report contains a recital of the conditions which prevailed at Port Elgin in 1903. Since that time the growth of business in that locality has been large, a number of fishing establishments have been erected, and yet it will be noted that year by year the numbers of vessels sailing in and out of the port of Port Elgin has decreased. It was alleged by the prominent citizens of that locality that something would have to be done, that the river was filling up with sawdust from mills up the stream, and that it would be necessary to remove these obstructions which had grown year by year, and were the cause, as they alleged, of decreasing the shipping in that port. They were very anxious indeed that these improvements should be made so that those who had invested money would have advantages which were their due, and in order that there might be further inducement to the investment of moneys in that locality. Although they did not get this improvement, although there was delay year after year, the business of the place has advanced and grown, and the manufacturers and producers have had to pay additional railway freights which has been a handicap to them. Appreciating the situation, familiar with it as I was, I from time to time, since I had the honour and responsibility of representing the county of Westmoreland, have brought this matter to the notice of successive Ministers of Public Works. My first application was made to the Hon. Mr. Tarte. Nothing was done because the cry then was that there were no dredges, the government had too few dredges, and it was impossible to get private owners of dredges to engage in this work. There were then practically none in the maritime provinces. The result was that during Mr. Tarte's regime I failed to accomplish anything in behalf of the people living in that locality. Hon. Mr. Hyman, during his term of office, also found it impossible to get dredges. During the interim, while Hon. Mr. Fisher was acting Minister of Public Works, I besought his interest in the matter, and repeatedly urged it upon his notice. Finally, I secured an amount in the estimates providing for the commencement of this work based upon the report then in the possession of the department, from which I have just read extracts.

Mr. CROCKET. Was there a specific vote for that particular work?

Mr. EMMERSON. I think it was specifically mentioned in the estimates in 1906 or 1907. The amount was not expended because of the department's inability to induce any private contractors to engage in the work, and because of the dearth of government-owned dredges. The serious difficulty that suggests itself to any one who looked over the situation was that in order to get a channel through the bar to a width of 1,200 to 1,500 feet, the dredges would have to be out in the open roadstead, a place of very great danger, open to the severe, and sometimes destructive, storms that are felt in that locality, particularly in the all of the year. It was al-

most impossible to have the government dredges meet the requirements of the maritime provinces, and so it was difficult to secure a government dredge for work at that point. I would say most frankly to this House that, having, as representative of the people, pledged myself to the carrying out of this work, because I deemed it to be of great public interest, I was determined that that work should be done. I was strongly determined that the work should be attended to in accordance with the wishes of the people and, I am candid enough to say, in accordance with the assurances that I had repeatedly given to my constituents. The efforts that I had put forth in 1901, 1902, 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907, had been unavailing; but I felt that the time had come when it was necessary, in the public interest, as well as in the keeping of faith with my constituents, and with the public, that this work should be carried on. There were no dredges in the spring of 1907, and I was disappointed again. Although money had been provided, the work could not seemingly be accomplished. In 1908 I went to the Minister of Public Works, and I said: This work must be done in the interests of the trade and navigation of that whole section of the shores of Bay Verte, in the interests of over 2,000 people who were engaged in agriculture, fishing, milling and lumbering operations. Efforts were made, and I did have hope, and I knew the Minister of Public Works at that time did have hope, that one of the government dredges could be sent, and would be sent in the early spring. But I was disappointed again, and I came back, because I do like to show some persistence and perseverance in these matters when they are matters of public interest.

Mr. CROCKET. And when elections are coming on.

Mr. EMMERSON. When elections are coming on, I want to stand before the electors as one who carries out his promises, and I am not ashamed to say it; and I am afraid that my hon. friend will die of a strange starvation, the starvation of a small nature, if he will bring up a matter of that kind in the face of this report, in the face of the interests and requirements of the port, in the face of the business that was carried on. Should I hold my hand because an election is coming on?

Mr. CROCKET. No, plunge it in.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was an additional incentive, I admit, and I am not hypocritical enough to contend otherwise. I was anxious that if I came before the people of Westmorland again, I should come before them with this feeling, that I had carried out my promises and had been true to my pledged word, and therefore it was that I insisted on the department doing this thing. The action was taken. The government dredge could not get there, and my hon. friend was in a position to secure this particular dredge, and he asked for tenders. It is true that pending the receipt of those tenders he made an arrangement with those people, who were taking a dredge from one section of the coast to another, that they should in the meantime commence this work, and if as the result of the tenders, another corporation should secure the contract, they would go on and engage in the work which they were under contract to do in another section of the province; but that, pending the determination of the call for tenders, they should do the work upon the express condition that they should receive only so much as the amount of the lowest tender, which would be the best way to determine the value of the work and the reasonableness of the price. My hon. friend indulges in conjectures, in small insinuations that are not worthy of him, that are not worthy of any man in this House. I am not here with any brief on behalf of the Minister of Public Works, nor on behalf of anyone connected with the Maritime Dredging Company.

Mr. CROCKET. The hon. gentleman has said that I indulged in small insinuations. I challenge him to name a single insinuation that I indulged in, in the course of my speech. What I did was to make straight, specific statements, which I substantiated from documentary evidence furnished from the files of the Public Works Department. The hon. gentleman may talk as he pleases of small insinuations. I wish he would address himself to the specific statements I made.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I ask your ruling if the statement made by the hon. member is permissible, that my hon. friend was indulging in small insinuations unworthy of him. If I understand the rules correctly, that is not permissible.

Mr. SPEAKER. The point of order is not well taken.

Mr. CROCKET. I ask the hon. member to name a single insinuation that I made.

Mr. EMMERSON. If my hon. friend will possess his little soul in patience, I will answer. If the speech of my hon. friend contained anything else than small insinuations, I failed to discover it. But the insinuation which I had in mind was this, that my hon. friend referred to the fact that the Maritime Dredging Company, which had secured an arrangement to do this work, comprised two gentlemen who were

personal and political friends of the hon. Minister of Public Works.

Mr. CROCKET. Will the hon. member deny the statement that I made? I challenge him or the Minister of Public Works to deny it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman will explain what he meant by the very eloquent word 'cronies,' I will answer his question. He said they were cronies of mine.

Mr. CROCKET. I stated that the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company was owned and controlled by two personal and political friends——

Mr. PUGSLEY. And cronies.

Mr. CROCKET. Yes, and cronies of the Minister of Public Works; and I stated further, that the Minister of Public Works was financially associated with those two men in an important business venture. I ask the minister if he will deny that statement.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. member contained an insinuation. Even if those gentlemen were personal and political friends of the minister, how does that fact in any way affect this matter? It is unworthy of my hon. friend to incorporate that into this matter. It may be a truth, and it is no disgrace to have either of these gentlemen as one's friend; and I hope that my hon, friend can count in the list of his friends gentlemen as high in the opinion of the citizens of St. John, as they are. But I say that in dealing with this matter we should rise above these puny insinuations.

I care not who it is that controls the Maritime Dredging Company, the point is simply this: How was it that tenders were asked for, and why was it that this company was engaged to do the work? Because of the necessity of the work; because I had urged it upon the government, in the interests of my constituents. I cared not who were the contractors. I would have much preferred it had the government been able to send a government dredge. But they did what they could, and the work was commenced. And what was the result? The figure is given at 90 cents per cubic yard, and that was the amount under the tenders received.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I desire to ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Emmerson) a question. He understands this subject very well. Was that price for rock dredging, for boulders or for clay? If that is made known, the public will understand the matter.

Mr. EMMERSON. It was for the necessary dredging to be done there. I am not familiar enough with these specifications or the borings or any of the data furnished by the engineers to be able to say just what portion was rock, what portion boulders and what portion clay or other soft material. But that makes no difference. The invitation for tenders had been issued, and there was nobody else who offered, although it was open to the dredging companies of all Canada to make an offer. Now I state it as a fact, that the dredging there at that time involved great danger to the dredge, the scows, and the steamer in attendance. As a matter of fact this firm lost their steamer in a heavy storm that season. The work had to be done at a season of the year when storms were to be anticipated, and as an actual fact the company did meet with very serious loss. Now, if this were a 'soft' contract, if it was one by which anybody could put dollars in his pocket would it not be reasonable to expect that this company would wish to continue the contract until the work was completed?

But, as a matter of fact, they left in the fall and did not come back, very much to my regret and to the regret of the people of that locality. They have never come back to this day and decline to continue their work though they had only a small portion of it to complete. I know from the statements of gentlemen upon whom I can rely that the company lost money by engaging in that work. But I was glad to have had that company operating there, because I was measurably in a position to show the people that I was true at least to my word on their behalf. As this company would not come back, I urged upon the department the necessity of sending one of the government dredges. But they were unable to meet my wishes in that respect. It was not until 1909 that, responding to urgent appeals made not only by myself, but by those who represented the trade interests of that port and by the citizens generally, the Minister of Public Works was enabled—disappointing, I believe, some other places—to send the government dredge the 'G. H. McKenzie' to the point and so continue the work. My hon friend (Mr. Crocket) has dwelt upon the fact that some statements appeared in the evidence that the work done was entirely thrown away. It would have been thrown away unless it had been continued. I am bound to say that unless you cut that sand bar and provide a channel that will carry out the silt that is borne down by the river the money expended would have been absolutely lost to the country, and of no avail to the people whom this improvement was intended to serve. The dredge 'McKenzie' continued the work there as long as the weather conditions permitted. In 1910, and since then, it was impossible to bring back other dredges, though I have seen to it that

strong efforts in that direction were made. But I believe the work is now being attended to or is about to be attended to with a view to completion. And I want to say to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) and his associates in the government, that if it is not completed, they forfeit whatever support I have and I am sure they will forfeit the support of the people in that locality—as, indeed, on such grounds they would forfeit, and would deserve to forfeit, the support of the people of Canada, for where necessary work is to be done and can be done any government neglecting that work should forfeit the support of the people. But I am proud to say that every effort is being made, and that the work will proceed. And I want to tell my hon. friend (Mr. Crocket), though he seeks to give the impression that this is a waste of the public money, and the work was not required, and will be of no service to anybody, but was done by the Minister of Public Works simply to aid some of his friends in the city of St. John, that nothing could be more contrary to the facts. He desires to assail and vituperate the Minister of Public Works. But let him bring facts before this House, and I am sure the House, irrespective of sides, will approve his action. He desires to have a motion passed condemning the Department of Public Works and the government because of the course they have taken in this matter. But when did these facts—he alleges them to be facts—come to his knowledge. In 1909, I believe, the matter was before the Public Accounts Committee. In 1910 last session—the matter was threshed out on this floor in Committee of Supply. I remember having something to say on the subject myself. Knowing the facts as I did, I confess I thought the case was merely trifling; I thought it was brought forward for the purpose of taking up time—and it is open to that suspicion to-day. But, if it be serious, why has he sat dumb so long this session, and why did he fail to bring forward in the session of 1910 the motion which he now proposes? If the facts justify the charge and the motion, if there is anything mysterious or corrupt or negligent involving misappropriation of the public funds, he should have had the courage to stand forth in this House a year ago, or certainly at some earlier moment of this session, to bring the matter to the attention of the House and the country.

I can only imagine that my hon. friend is bringing it up to-day for a purpose, it may not be simply for the purpose of obstruction. He may anticipate an election, and at that time he will be going from house to house in the back districts in his county and other sections of New Brunswick, and retailing for facts that which is only to be found in his diseased brain and imagination.

Mr. CROCKET. Mr. Speaker, I call your attention to the language which the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) has seen fit to use towards a member of this House. So far as I am concerned, I care not what language the hon. gentleman indulges in, having regard to the source from which that language comes. At the same time I am interested in the decorum of this House, and in the maintenance of its dignity.

Mr. SPEAKER. I was engaged at the moment, and did not hear what was said. What was the expression the hon. gentleman objects to?

Mr. CROCKET. He used the expression 'diseased imagination' or 'diseased brain,' I forget which.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is true that I am at loss to find language that can properly characterize the attitude of my hon. friend.

Mr. CROCKET. Come to the point.

Mr. EMMERSON. I am answering my hon. friend's complaint about the language I made use of. If he complains of the expression 'diseased imagination,' I may put it a little more mildly, and say that he is affected by a brain storm.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is better to allow all personal allusions to remain outside of the debate.

Mr. EMMERSON. I think my language has been moderate, and there is no one more desirous than I am that decorum in debate, that manliness and courtesy, should prevail in this House. But this is a matter of which I have a personal knowledge as a representative of the people, and when statements are made before the House in order that a wrong impression may go abroad, I feel it my duty to characterize them in terms that are mild, having regard to the utterances of the hon. gentleman. Because I have suffered from such insinuations, I know just what is the effect of insinuations against public men, whether they are uttered in this House or out of it, as I know what the effect is with respect to the character of men and women when made even by a shake of the head. I would prefer that men should stand up in their places and manfully speak out what they have in their minds, rather than indulge in these insinuations and inferences.

Mr. HUGHES. Dont be too hard on the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. EMMERSON. I do not think it is necessary for my hon. friend (Mr. Hughes) to interject himself into this debate; we

have enough unpleasantness about it now. Bear in mind that the instructions given by the officials of the department to the Maritime Dredging Company were that they should merely do the lesser work, that is in connection with the reports of Mr. Stead. They went there and faithfully performed their work, they earned every dollar that was paid to them, and indeed, as I am informed, they lost by reason of the dangers incidental to the situation of the work.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is no evidence of that.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is evidence, the statement made on March 10. On my honour as a member of this House, they lost their tug in a storm, and declined to go back because of the dangerous conditions there.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is absolutely no evidence.

Mr. EMMERSON. Now my hon. friend has said that this contract was illegal, and in violation of the Public Works Act. I am bound to say that that is not a correct statement of the case. This was a work of urgency, a work of necessity that justified the sending of dredges there. Has the public treasury of Canada suffered in any way? Men are engaged to do work that is absolutely necessary, and upon the best terms possible. How? Not by any hole and corner arrangement between the Minister of Public Works and the contractors, but on public competition throughout Canada. The amount was fixed, and I understand that the 90 cents which was paid applied only to a portion of the work, and that only 60 cents was paid on another portion. I would be glad to see the estimate of the engineer adhered to, if it could be, 20 cents per cubic yard. I can only say that the engineer must have had in his mind dredging within the river banks and within the harbour basin. The bottom of that harbour and of that basin consisted largely of silt and sawdust, and sand and clay, and perhaps he thought that his work would all be of that character. But we must remember that the work out on the bar, out in the open roadstead, was of an entirely different class, that it involved greater dangers and greater risks; and I venture to say that because of that fact there were no lower tenders, and because of that fact there were no owners of dredging plants who were disposed to engage in the work. I have understood, and think I can state it as a fact, that since then an earnest attempt has been made to find suitable dredging plant to go on and engage in that work. If it is to be put up to tender again, that bar being out of the question, the dredging of that channel through this bar across the harbour mouth, out in the open bay and roadstead, being finished, I think the work can be done much more cheaply within the river and within the harbour and basin.

Now I want to emphasize this fact. There are large industrial establishments there to-day that are handicapped. The Hickman Milling Co., Limited, is a concern doing a very large business. In the manufacture of deals they are compelled, and will be compelled, to avail themselves of the transportation facilities afforded by the railways from Port Elgin to Cape Tormentine, where shipments are made in steamers from the government pier to the ports in Great Britain. Incidental to the manufacture of deals—and there are other mills there, four I believe—incidental to the manufacture of deals for the markets of Great Britain, there is produced a quantity of small scantlings, boards and laths.

These must find markets elsewhere than in Great Britain. Despite the fact that there has been a duty of $1,25 a thousand on lumber going into the United States these people have been obliged to send their surplus in the United States and although they have open to them the market of Newfoundland and the local markets of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island, while they avail themselves of all of them, they are still obliged to send a great proportion of their lumber to the United States much to their disadvantage. They are obliged to transport that from Port Elgin by rail at additional expense to Sackville and Cape Tormentine and there ship to Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland, and United States ports. Would it not be an incalculable advantage to them if this dredging were completed? They would be enabled to have their schooners that could sail into the ports of the United States come to their wharf, take in their cargo, and they would thereby save expense and I am glad to say that with the prospect of a reciprocity treaty whereby lumber will go free into the United States and whereby they would have an open door they would have an additional advantage.

It seems to me that my hon. friend attempts to create a mountain out of a little ant hill so desirous was he of getting at the Minister of Public Works. I am not going to refer, nor need I refer, to any of the courtesies in which he indulged himself in his reference to the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works is quite able to defend himself and to deal with my hon, friend. We who do not go to the Public Account Committee and who perhaps are not always familiar with what transpires there might be led to assume that there are other transactions which demand at his hands a motion such

as he has proposed to the House this afternoon. But if there is no more in these others which he has hinted at than there is in this my hon. friend certainly has my sympathy because he is attempting to travel up a high hill and a very stony road in his anxiety to get at the Minister of Public Works. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this motion should be negatived. There is nothing in it. There is nothing in the statements which have been attempted to be alleged as facts. The work is a public work, a public necessity, it has been done by open competition, it has been done faithfully so far and I hope it will be speedily completed.

Mr. J. D. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, being a member of the Public Accounts Committee and having been present during this investigation, I feel that I would like to say a few words on this motion moved by my hon. friend from York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket). I listened to the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Emmerson) and I was very much amused. I remember the time when the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) acted as counsel for the hon. member for Westmorland and the result of it was that when the case was ended the Minister of Public Works was Minister and the member for Westmoreland was a member of this House. I wondered as the hon. member was speaking if he was acting in that capacity for the Minister of Public Works and expected that after this debate he would be Minister of Public Works and the Minister of Public Works would be occupying his seat in the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I followed the hon. member, it seemed to me that he took the whole of the time that he spoke in trying to prove that this work was absolutely necessary. He did not dwell to any extent upon the proposition or try to prove that the amount paid by the government was fair and just. He claims that it was a matter of urgency and that was the reason why it had to be let in the way it was. But, is that not a strange reason to advance with regard to a work that has stood for eight or nine years? The government did not think it was a work of necessity or urgency until just before the general election and until the Minister of Public Works with Mr. Moore and Mr. McAvity decided that they were going to purchase the St. John Telegraph. Then they decided that it was necessary to do this dredging at Gaspereau and not only at Gaspereau, but also at York Point and St. John. It was decided to do the work as a matter of urgency and that it should be let without tender just before the elections were coming on in order that they should get money enough to buy up the 'St. John Telegraph' so as to convert it from a Conservative newspaper to a newspaper working in the interests of the hon. member of Westmoreland. Is it not a fact that just at this time the hon. member for Westmoreland was afraid that he would lose his seat and the Minister of Public Works wanted to do one kind act and let this contract in order to assist him in his election?

Mr. EMMERSON. It was a needless alarm in view of my 1,400 majority.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Another point is that just after the election was over it was not a work of urgency or necessity, but just now when there is an election coming on the hon. member for Westmoreland and the Minister have decided that it is very urgent and they are going to start the work again. That is what the hon. member has just stated here a few minutes ago. What my hon. friend from York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) has stated is this; we have never raised the point as to whether the work was needed or not. That question was not raised. The question that we have raised is: was that contract given by the Minister of Public Works fair and honest? The evidence proves that it was not. In addition to that the hon. member who has just taken his seat has shown what the amount of the contract meant. He states that the report of Mr. Day showed one recommendation of 840,000 yards at 20 cents a yard. It was to be a contract that would amount to $168,000 according to his own admission. Here was a contract for $168,000? if at 20 cents a yard which was to be awarded without tender. Then, if the work had been proceeded with on the original estimate of 840,000 cubic yards at 90 cents a yard the total amount of the contract would have been $756,000. That is what the total contract amounted to, but in the end they saw it was going to be too much robbery to take $700,000 out of the public treasury and they reduced it to 185,000 cubic yards at 20 cents a yard, or, they say, that it was a contract for $37,000. But, 185,000 cubic yards at 90 cents a yard would amount to $166,500, of a contract that was let without tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Of a contract which was not let.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Of a contract which was let because there was an allowance of 90 cents a yard for all of that amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why does my hon. friend make those misstatements? That contract was simply for the amount in the outer bar consisting of 40,000 yards.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But the contract was for all that was to be dredged there.

It is all right for the Minister of Public Works to make that statement here, but these people had the contract for all the work that was to be done at Gaspereau at 90 cents a yard. That was the contract.

There is something wrong about letting such a contract to a man like John E. Moore, who is running the St. John 'Telegraph' and never was in the dredging business, and knew nothing about it. On July 10th, John E. Moore went to Montreal, purchased a second-hand dredge from the Gilbert people and went straight back to Gaspereau, and on August 4th he is at work on this contract at ninety cents a yard. The minister did not authorize the department to advertise for this work until some time afterwards.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was advertised at that very time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, but the tenders were not to be received until some time after they were at work

Mr. PUGSLEY. A few days afterwards.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Moore was at work on the contract before the tenders were opened, and if any one went there to inspect the work to be done, Moore would tell them he had the contract and say: If you put in a lower price I will have to take it, so what is the use of cutting me down. Every one knows that most of the contractors are Liberals now, and Moore could tell them: We want this money to help the member for Westmoreland to be elected, and we want to buy the St. John 'Telegraph.' If I understand it aright, the St. John 'Telegraph' is practically owned by John E. Moore, McAvity and the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry to say that is not correct as to the Minister of Public Works.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The Minister of Public Works is interested in it, and here is the money coming from the Gaspereau dredging to buy up the St. John 'Telegraph.' Outside of McAvity and Moore, I would like to know who are in that Maritime Dredging Company. But there was other work given in the same improper way, and with reference to the contract at York Point, I quote this letter from the report of the Committee of Public Accounts, 1903, page 315:

St. John, N.B., 28th Oct., 1908.

J. B. Hunter,
Deputy Public Works,
Ottawa, Ont.

Department Railways very anxious to have dredging done immediately at Intercolonial railway, York Point, and Intercolonial railway ballast wharf here. Kindly advertise for tenders and meantime authorize Maritime Dredging and Construction Company to proceed with the work on agreement to accept price of lowest accepted tender. Also have company notified that they may withdraw dredges from Gaspereau and Maquapit as season getting late and cannot work longer this fall.

(Sgd.) WILLIAM PUGSLEY.

Does any member of this House believe that a minister who will let a contract in that way at an exorbitant price, is administering his department in the public interest? He had a report from his engineer saying the work was only worth 20 cents a yard, and yet he gives the contract at 90 cents a yard to one of his personal friends, and from it he will receive personal benefit through the influence of the St. John 'Telegraph,' because the member for Westmoreland and the Minister of Public Works are receiving the benefit of the influence of that paper. I do not believe there is one member of this House who will say that it is fair and just to charge up to the people of this country that difference between 20 cents and 90 cents a yard for such a purpose. The member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) censured the member for York (Mr. Crocket) because he did not bring this matter up last session, but he knows it could not be brought up last session because it was before the Public Accounts Committee, and it was only at the end of the session the report was presented to the House.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was all discussed in Committee of Supply in November, 1910.

Mr. EMMERSON. Why was it not brought up earlier this session?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It does not make any difference when it was brought up. Why did not the member for Westmoreland tell us earlier in the session that he had arranged to have the Gaspereau work gone on with, because there is a general election this year, and he let it lie idle for the last three or four years?

Mr. EMMERSON. It would not be correct to say that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It would be correct. The hon. member told us that nothing had been done there since the last election.

Mr. EMMERSON. Excuse me; the Dominion government dredge was working there last year.

Mr. REID (Grenville). This work was not going on

Mr. EMMERSON. They have thrown up the contract.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Who threw it up?

Mr. EMMERSON. The Maritime Dredging Company

Mr. REID (Grenville). They threw it up because the contract was going to amount to $700,000, and the Minister of Public Works

knew the people would not stand for that, and he was forced to have John E. Moore withdraw. The member for Westmoreland admits that if they call for tenders again they will get a much lower price.

Mr. EMMERSON. I said that the dredging to be done now would be within the harbour, and necessarily the price would be lower. The Maritime Dredging Company had the hard part of the work to do at 90 cents a yard, and any one who does the present work will have a softer snap.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I never before heard of 90 cents a yard being paid for dredging mud or sand.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Mayes got 90 cents in the harbour of St. John.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But it is 30 feet in St. John harbour and only 6 feet at Gaspereau, and that makes a great difference.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is a vast difference between the position as to the danger to the dredges.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member is quibbling.

Mr. LOGGIE. I can tell the hon. member (Mr. Reid) that dredging in five or six feet is more difficult than in thirty feet.

Mr. REID (Grenville). It is well to hear the hon. member (Mr. Loggie) defending this, because he knows the dredging the Loggie Company got down in Bathurst and Loggieville which was given without tender in the same way, and John E. Moore and Loggie and others are walking around the maritime provinces with money they robbed from the people of this country.

Mr. LOGGIE. The hon. member has no proof that dredging was done at Loggieville or Bathurst without tender, unless it was for work under $5,000. There is nothing in the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee to sustain his statement.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. member's recollection is very bad. It does not matter whether it is $65,000 or $5,000, if it is wrongfully given and they have succeeded in robbing the country the principle is exactly the same. In the Public Works Department we have brought up matters of this kind where there is no question in the eyes of the people of this country that public robbery has been going on, and the Minister of Public Works has taken no steps to stop it. We brought up, for example, the amount expended for the sawdust wharf, where the difference between $700 and $5,000 was robbed from the people of this country through the neglect or influence of the Minister of Public Works, I do not know which, but by one way or the other, either by the minister in not attending to his business or else by giving this man the option of getting this $4,300.

Mr. LOGGIE. Would it not be fair for the hon. gentleman to say that the large part of the difference was repaid to the government for a part of the property sold?

Mr. REID (Grenville). The way it was repaid was that when the Minister of Public Works was in a hole in the eyes of the people of this country he sent down for the Loggie Dredging Company, and they came up and paid $3,700 for a part of it and it has never been used since.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is speaking absolutely without evidence when he says that I sent down for the Loggies. There is not a particle of evidence of that, and if we can truly characterize a gentleman who keeps so far away from the truth as my hon. friend by saying that he has a diseased imagination, I think his imagination is even more diseased than that of the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket).

Mr. REID (Grenville). If I have a diseased imagination the Minister of Public Works must have a diseased brain when he allows such rascality to go on in his department. He tells us he did not send for Loggie. Did he not bring Loggie here as a witness in the Public Accounts Committee? He was subpœnaed by the Minister of Public Works, not by Mr. Crocket.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The charge or insinuation made by the hon. gentleman was that I had sent for Mr. Loggie to come here to Ottawa to make a proposition to buy a part of this property. Is that not what the hon. gentleman meant to convey to this House? The hon. gentleman knows there is not a particle of evidence that could give a shadow of foundation for a statement like that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). What I wish to state to the House is that Mr. Loggie was brought here by the Minister of Public Works to try and prove that the sawdust wharf was worth $5,000. That was what he was brought here for and when he came here the only way in which he could prove it was to get Mr. Loggie to make an offer of $5,000 or whatever it was.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was not brought here, so far as I know, for any such perpose. It appeared in the evidence that he had said to Mr. Stead that the property, in his judgment, was well worth $5,000, and that he would give more for it, and had made an offer to Mr. Murray for it. That is why the committee subpœnaed Mr. Loggie. I had nothing to do with the subpœna.

Mr. REID (Grenville). But that was all after the hearing of the evidence was started and the case was before the Public Accounts Committee.

Mr. EMMERSON. Mr. Loggie did not come till after that.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Then, of course, Stead was sent by the department to Loggie because Loggie had been advised of what he was to do. He was to make this offer in order to help the Minister of Public Works out of the hole on the sawdust wharf; there is no doubt about that at all. So far as the Department of Public Works is concerned, with all this rascality and robbery and thievery, that is going on in that department, we wanted to have an investigation of that department; we asked for one some time ago. I believe it would have been in the interest of the Minister of Public Works to have allowed that investigation, because it would have either shown that these charges were quite unfounded or the minister would have had to explain it in a different way, because the people of this country believe that the Minister of Public Works either knows something about all this and is allowing it for the purpose of benefiting his friends or for political purposes, or else is interested in it himself. That is the impression that is going all over this country and the minister has not tried, except for some slight explanation here, to explain these serious charges. The very fact of his being interested in the St. John 'Telegraph,' and awarding to John E. Moore, who had never done any dredging before, contracts that would enable Moore to buy out the St. John 'Telegraph' out of the public treasury without his putting in a dollar of his own, is a disgrace to this country.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think it is simply scandalous that the hon. gentleman should make statements that have not a particle of evidence to support them. There is not a tittle of evidence anywhere that the owners of the St. John 'Telegraph' paid for it out of money they received for dredging contracts. If the hon. gentleman had thought that was the case, surely the time for him to make these statements was before the Committee on Public Accounts, and he should have subpœnaed these people to come here.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The hon. gentleman knows that just at the time these things happened the St. John 'Telegraph' was changed from a Conservative newspaper to a Liberal paper, supported by the Minister of Public Works, and these contracts were all let at the same time at prices which not one man in the Dominion of Canada believes were fair and upright. But we have other cases in other departments, and it seems to me that the Prime Minister and other members of the government do not seem to care how much robbery goes on. Even when the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) was Minister of Railways and Canals, look what went on in his department. If his brain is like that of the Minister of Public Works this must have been the time when it got warped or diseased, and he allowed these heelers to get in and rob this country. He remembers the land deals at Halifax when Pearson was down there robbing the country. Then, when they wanted land for the Intercolonial railway, the hon. member sent down for the proprietor of the Halifax Liberal paper, let him get in the scoop and rob the country there.

Mr. EMMERSON. My hon. friend is again drawing on his imagination, there is not the slightest evidence of anything of that kind.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, no.

Mr. EMMERSON. It is all very well to say 'oh, no,' but apparently the hon. member has no case, and he now wants to throw mud all around.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The evidence all came out.

Mr. EMMERSON. There is no such evidence.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Pearson was sent for at the time to see about these lands. We wanted an investigation, but we could not get it, hon. members opposite voted us down, and now the hon. member for Westmorland has to come to the defence of the Minister of Public Works because at that time all the hon. members came to his defence and would not allow us to expose the robbery and rascality that went on in the department he was running at that time. How is it with the other departments? They seem to be all getting in the same way. Seeing that the Minister of Public Works and others are allowed to act in this way, those in charge of other departments think they have the same right. Every one of these spending departments is practically in the same position, and it is impossible to prosecute the offenders because every one of the men guilty of this robbing of the public treasury does so with the knowledge or consent of the minister. What is the use of prosecuting them, because they are all like Moore and McAvity, men who are heelers and are putting up the money for the elections. We have seen how the Public Works and Railway Departments are run. But other departments are just as bad. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries will remember the investigations that were made into his department.

Mr. TALBOT. What has that to do with it?

Mr. REID (Grenville). It has a lot to do with it. It shows how members like you are ready to swallow everything, whether it is public robbery or not, in order to back up these men who allow it to go on. When we had these investigations into the Marine and Fisheries Department, were there any prosecutions? The minister knows that he dare not prosecute, because they would look after him. He was responsible, and I cannot understand how a minister who is sworn to do what is right, will allow this rascality to go on without prosecuting somebody.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman is absolutely mistaken. Somebody has been prosecuted and put into jail.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Name one of them. I would like to know who they are.

Mr. BRODEUR. If the hon. gentleman will consult the record of the proceedings of the court in Quebec last spring he will find the names.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister should tell who they are. He did not prosecute Merwin or Roy, the man who padded the lists at Sorel and then left this country.

Mr. TALBOT. The man is dead and buried.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He was not dead for a long time afterwards, but he was not prosecuted. Instead of prosecuting him, the minister promoted him to a higher position.

Mr. BRODEUR. That is not correct. The man was dismissed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). He was dismissed because we brought the matter up in this House, and raised so much trouble about it.

Mr. BRODEUR. The hon. gentleman stated that Roy was promoted.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Wasn't he transferred to Quebec at the time?

Mr. BRODEUR. Not at all; he was dismissed.

Mr. REID (Grenville). When a man robs the country, is dismissal all the action that the minister will take?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. I think you will agree with me that the hon. gentleman is wandering a long way off from the question before the House. The motion is to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and the amendment is to condemn the government for expenditure in the Gaspereaux river. I think in all fairness he ought to confine himself to the motion before the House. If we are going to take the vote on reciprocity in the near future——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I was referring to the other departments to show that the Minister of Public Works was not alone in allowing robbery and rascality to go on in his department, but that all the spending departments of this government are in the same boat.

Mr. SPEAKER. A reference may be made to other departments, but the main question before the Chair is contained in the amendment.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Speaker, I intend speaking to the amendment, but it is necessary to refer to the other departments to show how they compare with the Department of Public Works.

Mr. SPEAKER. It is also customary, when an amendment is moved in Ways and Means and in Supply for speakers to be confined to the amendment.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask you to rule whether or not what the hon. gentleman is doing can be regarded in any sense as an illustration of arguments in support of the amendment before the House. It is nothing but a waste of public time.

Mr. REID (Grenville). I am illustrating by showing how other departments compare with the Department of Public Works, and I claim that the Minister of Public Works is not doing his duty as a member of the Privy Council, not only with regard to his own department but with regard to the other departments for which he is also responsible, for the protection of the public treasury. To show that he is not doing his duty, but is allowing robbery to go on in this government, let me illustrate with another case. I take the case brought out the other day, in which the Trade and Commerce Department had men in British Columbia, who robbed this country of a million dollars, with the knowledge of the Prime Minister, or at least with the matter brought to his attention long before there was any prosecution attempted. The Prime Minister, the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Customs, the Minister of Inland Revenue and the Minister of the Interior all had knowledge of this thing, and it was brought up in council with the Minister of Public Works there. Was he doing his duty as a minister to allow such a robbery of the people of this country to take place without taking any steps to prosecute? Did he do his duty as a minister, so far as the Interior Department was concerned, when a man in the northwest who robbed the

people of money, that was Wagner, was taken on again, and his salary increased from $50 to $100 a month? That is the way they were prosecuted. There is no possibility of the Minister of Public Works prosecuting any man in his department. We know how Merwin and John E. Moore robbed this country, and then got off scott free. No man can get a contract from his department unless he is a Liberal heeler and a follower of the minister. And he knows there is no possible chance of his being prosecuted. There has not been one case of prosecution. See how the tender was let in the Gaspereaux case. The minister says that it was let at public competition. He knows that in that case there was a dredging man who wanted to get some of that work. He came to the department for information on the subject and the department referred him to the engineer in charge. But the engineer in charge knew nothing about it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Who was that man?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Mr. Mayes. Here is the letter:

St. John, N.B., December 18, 1908.

Eugene D. Lafleur, Esq.,
Chief Engineer, Department of Public Works, Ottawa.

Dear Sir,—Your favour of 14th inst. received last evening. I called with my son on Mr. Scammell this morning, who you stated would give all information regarding the dredging of York Point and Ballast wharf, St. John. Mr. Scammell informed me that he had not one bit of information to give, that others had inquired and he had given the same answer. I asked him if he was aware that York Point work was being dredged by Mr. Moore's dredge 'Saugus,' for some weeks, and was being dredged this very day and that outside talk said that it was about finished; also that the same dredge had worked some few days on the Ballast wharf work, at the same time the newspapers contained advertisements asking for tenders which close to-day.

There was a man who wanted to put in a tender. If the minister wanted why did not the minister let Mr. Mayes have a form of tender? If he had, Mr. Moore would not have got 90 cents a yard.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman asks why the forms of tender were not sent to Mr. Mayes. I say, the evidence shows that these forms were sent to Mr. Mayes.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Yes, but why did not the minister give him the information necessary to work out the tender? The minister, through his official may have sent the form but he absolutely refused to give information to Mr. Mayes which would enable him to judge what was a fair price to put in his tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. He was not refused, but was given what information was in the department.

Mr. REID (Grenville). Here is what he says further in his letter:

Mr. Scammell said that he was quite aware of it but did not understand it. Of course it is perfectly useless for one to tender as it is quite evident that the work was and is intended for Messrs. Moore & Co. It would seem to the ordinary mind that the government might save the expense of advertising.

I regret that you and your officials could not give the information asked for.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) G. S. MAYES.

Mr. Mayes had dredges and wanted work for them, and was willing to take that work at a fair price. But, here at Ottawa, and on calling on the engineer in charge, he was refused the information on which to base a tender. Mr. Moore put in a tender. Now, the minister must admit that in regular course when a tender is put in a deposit accompanies it. But this is the way Mr. Moore tendered:

St. John, N.B., December 17, 1908.

Napoleon Tessier, Esq.,
Secretary, Department of Public Works, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,—We herewith inclose our tender for dredging at York Point Slip, St. John, N.B., duly executed by us. We are not inclosing any deposit cheque, as we have this work about completed, and we already have a number of deposits on all the other work which has been awarded to us.

We shall be glad to be advised promptly if our tender is accepted.

Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) Maritime Dredging and Construction Company.
John E. Moore,
Manager.

That work was completed and nothing needed to be done but to draw their cheque for the work. Yet they write to know if their tender is to be accepted. Did any person ever know anything more ridiculous than that? That tender was given verbally by the Minister of Public Works to Mr. John E. Moore, the man who bought the St. John 'Telegraph' to work in his interest in that city. There is the story of York Point. But there are several other cases I might mention, all of a similar kind. The Minister of Public Works, for instance, gives a contract either for a sum of less than $5,000 or on the ground of its great urgency; and we find that in the end it means a contract which, given at the figure of the engineer's recommendation would mean a total of $168,000. And, at the prices that the minister gave these men when they started out, by which the country would have been bound if it had not been stopped by the exposure by the oppo-

sition in the Public Works Committee, it would have meant a payment of $756,000. This would have meant a loss to the country of $588,000, and that is the amount that the opposition saved by this exposure in one contract.

Mr. PUGSLEY. When did they expose it?

Mr. REID (Grenville). Last year, and the minister had to withdraw it and make that company go on with other work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the Public Accounts Committee were the means of stopping it by an exposure in 1910, how does the hon. gentleman account for the fact that they did not resume their work in 1909, the year before these alleged high prices were found?

Mr. REID (Grenville). They worked up to the fall of 1909.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman is wrong, they worked up to the fall of 1908, and declined to go on with the work in the summer of 1909.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister knows that they had the Gaspereau work, the St. John harbour, and other contracts, and they had not enough dredges to do all their work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not the point. The hon. gentleman said that I got frightened, because the matter was exposed in the Public Accounts Committee in the year 1910. But this company did no dredging there after the fall of 1908, and in 1909 declined to come back.

Mr. REID (Grenville). The minister can explain that when he is making his speech. The point I want to know is this: This department gave J. E. Moore work at Gaspereau, York Point, and other places without a tender. That is, the minister gave it himself, and instructed his department that they were to advertise for tenders and give the contract to the lowest bidder. I do not think the minister will dispute that. But when the tenders were asked for the York Point work had not only been begun but completed. In the Gaspereau case they had not done all they intended, but they were working at York Point and other places in order to hold the contracts. There was no rush at Gaspereau and other places, for they had waited for years. But the matter was disposed of in 1910, and you did not see them going back after this exposure. But when the colleagues of the Minister of Public Works saw that this was being exposed, and it was known that it meant a robbery of $588,000, they called a halt on the Minister of Public Works, and he had to tell these people to give some excuse that they could not accept it again, that it was too hard work and they refused the contract.

In my opinion that is the reason they did not go back again. I know the Minister of Public Works is anxious to try and get out of this in some way, but there is no explanation he can give that will satisfy the people of this country. Those contracts were let by him to men that were never in the dredging business, men who met in Montreal when John E. Moore purchased that dredge and went straight to Gaspereau, on the authority of the Minister of Public Works, and did that work. Then the minister asked for tenders when the work was all completed at one point, and when it was going on at another point. There is no one who will believe that it was an honest, straight and fair contract. People will believe there is something behind the whole deal. And who has benefited from that? It was brought out in the Public Account Committee that John E. Moore was benefited by that. Although he was no dredgeman, he made a lot of money out of it. He purchased the St. John 'Telegraph,' and the Minister of Public Works and his party has benefited by the fact that the St. John 'Telegraph' was changed from being a Conservative to a Liberal paper. I do not believe it was in the interest of the people of this country that that should be done, and I believe the Minister of Public Works is entitled not only to the censure of this House, but of this country for allowing such a rascally piece of business to go on in his department.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend, the member for Grenville, (Mr. Reid) has such a peculiar mental make-up, if he will consider that parliamentary, that it is exceedingly difficult to understand what part of his remarks he wishes us to consider as statements based on facts, what part he means to be conclusions or deductions evolved by his own understanding and what part is pure imagination. The hon. gentleman certainly leaves one in grave doubt as to what part of his argument he desires us to understand is based on fact. He deals in strong language, certainly; he speaks of robbery, and he even says that John E. Moore has robbed the treasury of this country.

Mr. REID (Grenville). And so he has.

Mr. PUGSLEY In what respect?

Mr. REID (Grenville). I explained it, and if I did not make it plain to the Minister of Public Works I may try again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Whatever has been said of myself as Minister of Public Works in awarding the contracts to the Maritime Dredging Company, I think nobody will say but that the company did what they had a perfect right to do.

Mr. REID (Grenville). To rob the country?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon gentleman says they were robbing the country. He knows that they simply tendered in the ordinary way for public works, pursuant to public advertisements, and that the contracts were awarded to them. But I think nobody who knows the hon. gentleman, and who has had opportunities of hearing him in this House on different occasions, will take much stock in these wholesale charges which he so glibly makes in a very serious manner. I am sure that after the hon. gentleman has called a man a robber and a thief, if he met him outside he would take his arm and let him understand that he was one of the most decent and honourable fellows in the world. That is the kind of man the hon. member for Grenville is. Now he stated that it was intended to give a contract to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for some 700,000 cubic yards of dredging at Gaspereau, and that the only reason why it was not given was that the matter was exposed before the Public Accounts Committee; that the minister became freightened, and therefore did not go on with the intended operation of giving this very large contract to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company. Now, the hon. gentleman made that statement just as positively as he made the other statements to this House. When I pointed out to the hon. gentleman that the Public Accounts Committee did not deal with this matter until the session of 1910; that all the work this company did at Gaspereau was in the summer and fall of 1908, and that left a whole season when dredging operations might have been carried on before the matter came at all under the consideration of the Public Accounts Committee, the hon. gentleman did not deem it to be his duty to express any regret for the misstatement which he made. However, I suppose we must not hold him entirely responsible for all his statements, by reason of the conditions which I have mentioned a short time ago with regard to the hon. gentleman's make-up. My hon. friend must have seen that this statement was calculated to mislead the House. Now the facts are that in the summer of 1908 my hon. friend who represents the county of Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), as he has stated, represented to me in the strongest possible manner the desirability, indeed the actual necessity, from the standpoint of the public interest, of doing this dredging in the Gaspereau river.

Mr. HUGHES. Was he then Minister of Railways?

Mr PUGSLEY. I was Minister of Public Works at the time.

Mr. HUGHES The member for Westmoreland was not Minister of Railways then?

Mr PUGSLEY. Not at that time; the hon. gentleman was in the same position which he occupies to-day as representative of the county of Westmoreland. Now, if hon. members will look at the map they will see that Port Elgin is not in what you might call the zone of dredging contractors. There are no dredge owners in that vicinity, nor within a long distance of that point. The mouth of the river is very much exposed, and apparently it was that very fact which prevented this dredging work from being done, and caused the delay which took place for a number of years, since 1900, when the member for Westmoreland first began to urge that this work should be done. In 1908 the matter was pressed strongly upon my attention, and I tried to make arrangements for one of the government dredges to go there. There was none available, they were all engaged in other important work. I determined, however, to advertise for tenders, and after tenders were called for, or about the time I called for tenders, I think it was afterwards, I learned that the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company had bought a dredge called the 'Iroquois,' on the St. Lawrence, and that they were bringing it down to the Bay of Fundy where they expected to carry on dredging operations. Now, in coming down to the Bay of Fundy they had to pass directly by Port Elgin; they had to go through Northumberland straits, and through the Straits of Canso, and round to the Atlantic, and so on around to the Bay of Fundy which was the ultimate destination of their dredge. I had grave fears that, although tenders were being called for, there would be none put in. Now, let me say to those gentlemen who make these attacks upon me, attacks I think without due consideration, that there are many places in different sections of this country where, although tenders for dredging work have been called for year after year for the last three years, no tenders whatever have been put in for those works.

They are considered undesirable or dangerous places, they are very much exposed and there is very great risk of loss to a dredging plant. I could mention two or three places in Nova Scotia. Some of my hon. friends in that province have complained very much that we have delayed going on with dredging works. The reason has been that tenders have been called, and we have not been able to get any tenders for these works. Learning that this dredge was going down to the Bay of Fundy, I saw Mr. Moore, who was the president of the Maritime Dredging Company. I told him that the time would be up in a few days, and I

asked him if his company would be willing to put a dredge into the Gaspereau river, commence dredging on this work which was most urgently required and accept an amount no higher than the amount of the lowest tender, explaining that if some other company's tender should be lower than their's they would take their dredge away from there and continue on to the place to which it was destined; that the work would go to the lowest tenderer, and that in the meantime for the few days' work they would do they would accept the price at which the contract would be awarded. They agreed to that and there was some correspondence that took place consequent on my seeing the president of the company, which confirms that. I remember that the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) when this matter was before the committee on Public Accounts rather took the ground that the company would be entitled to go on and do the work even though there might be another lower tender, that is that they could take the price of the lowest tender and go on and finish the work. There was no such understanding.

Mr. BARKER. The hon. gentleman's statement is directly contrary to Mr. Moore's understanding at the time. The hon. gentleman is thinking more about it now, perhaps, than he did at that time.

John E. Moore of St. John says he has dredge ready to work on Gaspereau river, N.B., and expects to start Monday. Am I authorized to lay out the dredging for him.

GEOFFREY STEAD,
Resident Engineer.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, that is the dredging upon which he was working pending the receipt of tenders. But I affirmed then and I affirm now, and if Mr. Moore had been called before the committee on Public Accounts, he would have verified under oath what I say, that it was clearly understood that they should do the dredging during a few days until the time was up for the receipt of tenders, and that if any other company should tender lower than their tender, that company would be awarded the contract, and they would receive, for the work they did in the meantime, the price of the lowest tenderer. That is a practice which in cases where dredging is urgently required has been pursued by the Department of Public Works ever since the Department of Public Works has been awarding dredging contracts. It was done years ago, so I am informed by the proper officials of my department and done under a Conservative as well as a Liberal government.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). Was this arrangement purely verbal as between the government and Mr. Moore?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was confirmed by correspondence later and that correspondence is before the committee.

Mr. BARKER. Page 241.

Mr. PUGSLEY. These are the words; following up my conversation the chief engineer sends this letter to Mr. Stead, the resident engineer:

August 4, 1908.

Sir,—The work of dredging in the Gaspereau river has been given to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, of St. John, N.B., providing they are willing to accept, in payment, per cubic yard, scow measurement, the lowest price to be obtained by tenders which are now being called for. Kindly place the company's dredge at work immediately, if they accept the conditions. You will please, however, note that the lesser work only is to be engaged upon.

Yours obediently,
Chief Engineer.

Geoffrey Stead, Esq.,
Resident Engineer,
Chatham, N.B.

I refer to that for two reasons. In the first place, it was carrying out what was the arrangement between the Maritime Dredging Company and myself, that they should do the work simply temporarily. They said that they would tender upon the work, and if there should be other tenders for a lower figure than their's, the department would naturally award the contract to the lowest tenderers, and they, for the few days' work that they would do in the meantime, would accept the price of the lowest tenderer.

Mr. BLAIN. Will my hon. friend name a case similar to that acted upon by a Conservative administration?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I cannot at this moment, because I would have to go back over fifteen years. All I can say is that when I became minister I was informed that this was the practice in cases of urgency, and had been the practice for years. I was so informed by the late Deputy Minister, Mr. Gobeil, who had been in the department for a great many years, and I understood it was the practice. Very often it is necessary to get a work done in order to meet public requirements.

Mr. SPROULE. What created the urgency just then? Was it the election?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at all; it was the dredging season. The season was getting well along. My hon. friend from Westmoreland had urged as early as May or June that we should get a dredge at work. I had been unable to do so and I will say to the House frankly that I was afraid that if the Maritime Dredging Company brought their dredge to St. John we would get no

tenders and probably not be able to get the work done that year at all.

This whole matter was fully ventilated before the Committee of Supply in this House in the month of February, 1910, and I desire to add my opinion to that of my hon. friend from the county of Westmoreland that if the hon. member for York, New Brunswick (Mr. Crocket) thought there was anything in this dredging at Gaspereau which was deserving of the censure of this House he should have early in the session, some time between November and the latter part of May, while this House was sitting, taken the necessary steps for the purpose of bringing it before the consideration of the committee. Hon. gentlemen will find that in the month of February, 1910, this matter was brought to the attention of the committee by the hon. member for Hamilton (Mr. Barker) and I then gave a very full statement which will be found on pages 3838, 3839, 3840 and following pages of 'Hansard.' The matter was gone into very fully at that time and now that we have before the House a question of vital importance to the people of this country it does seem to me that, upon reflection, hon. gentlemen will see that it is scarcely in the public interest that they should, by a motion like this, take up a good many hours of the valuable time of the House and so prevent a vote being taken upon the great question of reciprocity in which the people of this country are taking so deep an interest. I feel that I cannot properly take up the time of the House which would be necessary in order to answer the different statements which have been made by the two hon. gentlemen who have spoken upon this amendment because, as I have said, there is not only this important question of reciprocity waiting, but, when it is disposed of, if hon. gentlemen will allow it to go to the vote, and if they desire to get an expression of the opinion of this House, there are other matters such as the question of the branch railways and supply to provide for works of the very greatest importance to the country which should be considered.

If this motion carries, the question that will come before the committee is the important question, which has the right of way. I must say a few brief words, however, in answer to the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket). The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), has charged him with making unfounded attacks on me. Sir, I am accustomed to attacks of that character from the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket), and from those who have been associated with him. I do not intend to reply to his insinuations. I have learned during a pretty long political career that there are a good many men in this country, as I suppose there are in every country, who seem to love making insinuations, who seem to listen to the tales of slander they hear on the street corners, and who delight wherever they can get an opportunity to tear down the character of men, who stand very much higher in the community than themselves, and who have been more successful in the world than they have been. It is evidence of a mean and contemptible spirit; it is evidence of a small and narrow mind.

Mr. SPROULE. Mr. Speaker, is such language within the rules of order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The language itself is not necessarily out of order unless applied to a member of this House. If applied to a member of this House I would think the language unparliamentary.

Mr. LANCASTER. I thought he was speaking of the editor of the 'Globe.'

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is my view, Mr. Speaker. As I walk the streets I find it is not desirable to turn and pay attention to every cur which barks at one's heels. That rule I have adopted through life and, therefore, I shall go on to deal with the points raised in regard to this dredging matter. The hon. member for York saw fit to convey to this House the impression that this dredging was utterly a waste of public money, and he insinuated, I believe he charged, that this work had been given to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for the sole purpose of putting money into the hands of Mr. John Moore and Mr. George McAvity, because they were interested in the St. John 'Telegraph' which was supporting the Liberal party. The hon. member (Mr. Crocket), and the hon. member from Grenville (Mr. Reid), laid great stress on the fact that Mr. John Moore and Mr. George McAvity bought the St. John 'Telegraph' from the Conservative party and turned it into a Liberal newspaper. Well, the 'Telegraph' had for upwards of a quarter of a century been a Liberal newspaper and the Liberals of New Brunswick had for years confidence in it. On one occasion there appeared in New Brunswick one of these gentlemen who get rich quickly and he bought the 'Telegraph' by some means or other, and turned it over to the Conservative party. These two gentlemen being good Liberals thought it was right to get it back home again and make it a Liberal newspaper. That is all they did.

They are gentlemen of very considerable means, both of them carrying on a very large business. Every one knows the firm of T. McAvity & Sons , of which Mr. Geo. McAvity is now the head. From the Atlantic to the Pacific that firm is known and enjoys in a marked degree the confidence of the business men of Canada. Mr. John

E. Moore is a man who has, by his own exertions, risen from a comparatively humble position in the city of St. John, until to-day he is carrying on, and has for a number of years carried on, one of the largest lumber shipping businesses in the maritime provinces if not in the dominion. Mr. John E. Moore stands high in the estimation of the general public, and his reputation is of the very best. Those gentlemen are both Liberals, and that is no crime. They were desirous that this newspaper should be brought into the fold and placed where it properly belonged. Fortunately it happened that this man who had got rich quickly got poor almost as quickly. While he was very rich, and while he had been taken into the councils of the Conservative party, and while he thought at one time of going over to Scotland and running for the constituency of Dunfermline, he was not fortunate enough to receive a recommendation for knighthood at the hands of the leader of the Unionist party in Great Britain. In that respect he did not attain the height of his hopes and ambition, but he unfortunately for himself lost his money and he was willing to sell out these newspapers at a reasonable price and they were bought by these two gentlemen. There is not a particle of evidence that one single dollar of the moneys which the Maritime Dredging Company obtained for this contract or for any other contract was used for the purchase of these newspapers. If these gentlemen wanted to purchase the newspapers they have ample means of their own to do so. And yet, the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) makes these insinuations without a particle of evidence.

Mr. MEIGHEN. May I ask what the insinuation is?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The insinuation is that they have been assisted by me as minister to get these contracts for the purpose of enabling them to make large profits in order that they might buy these newspapers.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is a direct charge.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Call it a direct charge if you like.

Mr. LANCASTER. It is a natural inference.

Mr. PUGSLEY. A diseased imagination may draw such an inference. There is not a particle of evidence to sustain a charge of that character. The dredging plant which this company bought cost far and away more money than up to the time of the purchase of these papers, they had received from the government. A good dredging plant is not cheap to buy; we know that the dredge 'Fielding,' which is now at work in the harbour of St. John, was built at Sorel and cost about half a million dollars. These gentlemen are both experienced business men, and successful business men, and I take it for granted they purchased a good plant to enable them to do efficient work. The hon. gentleman from York made that foundationless statement, and had it not been for the reply of the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson) he would have induced some members of this House to believe that that work was wholly unnecessary and that it was done simply to benefit the dredging company. Then the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) said there was further evidence that the work was unnecessary because the resident engineer said it would accomplish no good purpose.

What the resident engineer said was, and hon, gentlemen will find it in the report, that unless this dredging was continued on up into the inner channel, and so on towards the town, it would not be of value because it would not be an aid to navigation for the whole distance for which it was desirable that vessels should be able to navigate. That is the same everywhere. Take the harbour of St. John. To-day we are deepening the entrance to the harbour, but if we were to leave that work half finished, or even three-quarters finished, the work we have done would be no benefit to navigation. The strength of a chain is to be measured by the strength of its weakest link and so it is with dredging. If you have a harbour all dredged but 100 feet and that 100 feet has not the requisite depth of water, or is not easy or safe to navigate by vessels drawing the depth of water in the deepest part of the harbour, and it is the line of navigation, your deep harbour is of no value. You must have a channel for vessels to go right up to the point of destination or the dredging is of no value. So it was with Gaspereau, until the dredging is carried on to the place where the vessels are in the habit of going, the dredging would be of no value. But as a part of the dredging work it was of the greatest value.

The member for York (Mr. Crocket) says that the price was too high, because some people up there tell him it was simply silt and sand and could be done for 10 cents a cubic yard. The complete answer to that is that tenders were invited by public advertisement and the usual time was given.

Mr. BARKER. And you obstructed them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We never obstructed them. I stated before the Committee of Public Accounts and before the Committee of Supply of 1910 that I defied any hon. gentleman opposite to show that any dredging contractor had been debarred from tendering by reason of this company being

temporarily put to work. They cannot do it. They will never be able to show that any contractor was debarred from tendering. The reason we received only one tender was that the work was in a comparatively remote, although a very important locality, that this particular work of dredging the bar was in an exposed and dangerous locality and it was not an inviting prospect for dredging contractors. There was only one tender for 90 cents a cubic yard. The hon. gentleman says we actually let the contract to this company at their tender price when we had a report of the engineer that it was only worth 20 cents per cubic yard. That is a mistake, all that we had in the department was a report of the engineer who had been formerly resident engineer for that district, Mr. Day, a report made in 1903, in which he speaks of the quantity of the material to be dredged and he says: Which at 20 cents a cubic yard would amount to a certain sum. When Mr. Stead made his report he did not give his own estimate because he was not called upon to do so, he referred to the report which Mr. Day had made some years before.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the hon. gentleman give his authority for that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Stead did not give the 20 cents as his own estimate.

Mr. MEIGHEN. At the top of page 247 the very opposite is stated.

Mr. PUGSLEY. (reading):

Mr. Day considered that four feet at low water would be ample and for this depth 180,000 cubic yards of dredging was necessary, costing, at 20 cents, $37,000.

A six-foot channel, giving about 15 feet at extreme high water, is however desired, and appears to me to be necessary, as it would give about 13 feet at neap high tides which is required for the larger schooners. At your request I sent you on the 5th March, 1907, an estimate of this work which requires about 330,000 cubic yards, costing, at 20 cents, $66,000.

Mr. MEIGHEN. His estimate.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, Mr. Day's estimate.

Mr. LANCASTER. What was his estimate?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. Stead is making no estimate. You will observe that in this report, he is taking the survey which Mr. Day had made. Mr. Day is the man who had made the borings and survey some four or five years before.

Mr. BARKER. Read the three following lines:

Mr. PUGSLEY. (reading):

Q. That refers to Mr. Stead's report of March, 1907?—A. His report of 5th of March, 1907.

Q. In which he also estimated the dredging as worth 20 cents?—A. 20 cents, yes.

This occurs in Mr. Lafleur's evidence, but it does not occur anywhere in the correspondence. Mr. Lafleur might argue as my hon. friends might that because Mr. Stead sent in that report he was adopting Mr. Day's estimate of the cost.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Mr. Stead was asked to make an estimate of the cost and that is his reply.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have not been able to see that. He sent in Mr. Day's report and took Mr. Day's estimate of 20 cents. The best test of whether or not that estimate of 20 cents could be relied upon is to be found in what it cost the government dredge 'George Mackenzie,' to do easier work in 1909 at the same harbour. Bear in mind that this company were doing the most difficult and dangerous work, the outer bar where it was most exposed and where it would be necessarily more costly. Mr. Day had figured upon a four foot channel at low tide while we were proposing to give a six foot channel at low tide. You will observe that Mr. Stead says that if the old channel were used and dredged out while it would be very crooked yet there would only be dredging of silt and sand whereas, if you made a straight channel you would get into the stiff clay and, of course, that is much more expensive to dredge than ordinary silt that has flown in from the tide within a few years. In 1909, the 'George Mackenzie,' a government dredge, was employed and the actual cost of the operation of that dredge was 41.76 cents, very nearly 42 cents per cubic yard for easier work. I took care when this matter was before the Committee of this House in February, 1910, to get a statement from the proper officials of my department as to what would be the actual cost of the work done by the government dredge 'George Mackenzie' in the Gaspereau river, if there were to be added to this 42 cents per cube yard a reasonable alowance, such as a contractor would always make for wear and tear, interest upon cost of plant and a reasonable contractor's profit.

Hon. gentlemen will find this in my statement on page 3843 of 'Hansard'—and I am very sorry to go over it again. In reply to the statement of the hon. member for Hamilton that I should not have let the work within the ten days, but should have waited for the opening of the tenders I am reported to have said:

How has the country suffered by that? My hon. friend says that if I had not done that somebody else might have come in and tendered. But he cannot find the slightest evidence that any contractor was prepared or would have tendered for that work, whether the dredge was at work or not. Is not this the important thing, that I advertised for tenders and nobody evidently wanted to go there to go to work? And is it not an important fact that, the next year, these people, the

Maritime Dredging Company, having the opportunity to go there to work, did not want to go? If it were the 'soft snap' my hon. friend would have the committee believe, would not they have been anxious to go there? But they had had enough of it; they had worked there under most disadvantageous circumstances. And, when we actually put the government dredge to work, we found that a fair and reasonable cost was $1 per cubic yard. Now, does the hon. member think the price is too great? Does he think that the late W. J. McCordock gave a fictitious valuation for that work? Will my hon. friend who represents the city of St. John (Mr. Daniel) rise in his place and say that he would not rely on the statement which the late superintendent of dredging made? I do not think he will, for he knew W. J. McCordock as well as I did, and he knows there was not a more careful and conscientious official in the employ of the Dominion than that gentleman. And will he say that Mr. Scammell, an engineer of ability and integrity, would go up there, and, having examined the work, make a false certificate? And would he say that Mr. Stead, who also saw the work, had to go on it day after day, made a false report when he said that it was worth 90 cents a yard?

In another part of my remarks I think I made the statemeent that this amount of $1 per yard, which was the cost to the government of the dredging of the 'George Mackenzie,' making a reasonable allowance for interest on the cost and depreciation of plant, was given to me by the deputy minister; at all events, I remember distinctly that I made the statement as to the official who had given the assurance that the items would amount to $1 per cubic yard. This, I think, completely disposes of the assertion, wholly unwarranted by any evidence, that this work could be done at 20 cents per cubic yard.

Now, to show whether or not we acted with prudence, what did we do after we found that this company was the only tenderer and after it had got the work? The hon. gentleman says, whatever you did do, you did not notify Mr. W. J. McCordock, and that was one of the grounds of his indictment against me. Sir, I pointed out to the hon. member for York, when he was addressing the House, that Mr. McCordock had nothing whatever to do with the operation of the contract dredges. The superintendents of dredging are confined in their duties absolutely to the work being done by the government dredges, and, therefore, Mr. McCordock would not have any notice of this work awarded to a private company. The man to be notified is the resident engineer. Mr. Stead was the man who laid out the work, and he was the man who was notified. He laid out the work for the contractors, and showed them where they were to begin their dredging. My hon. friend seems to make a great point of the fact that Mr. McCordock did not know where Gaspereau was. Well, as he had nothing to do with the dredging, he would not be likely to know. The hon. gentleman says that it was strange that I sent Mr. McCordock up there to inspect this dredging, and to consider as to the cost. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that that was the most proper thing in the world for me to do? Mr. McCordock was the man who had been in charge of the dredges in the maritime provinces for upwards of thirty years; he had been appointed either by the Conservative government or by the Mackenzie government; he had held office under both governments, and had given satisfaction to all. If there was one man connected with any department of the government who if he erred at all it was on the side of the public interest against the individual, it was the late W. J. McCordock. That was the reputation he had—as close as could be, always looking out for the interest of the government, always cutting down those who had furnished supplies to the government dredges to the finest possible point. That was the complaint made against him for years under both governments. He was felt to be a safe officer to see that only just bills were paid, and that government interest were protected.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Will the minister explain what his duties were in connection with the government dredges?

Mr. PUGSLEY. His duties were to see that they carried out the different dredging operations laid out for them, to see that they did the most efficient work possible, to keep control of their operations from week to week, and to make a report as to whether they were working satisfactorily or not; also to visit the dredges from time to time, to purchase supplies for them, and to send in regular reports to the department. The superintendent of dredging is supposed to be constantly looking after the business of the government dredges. Mr. McCordock, with that large dredging experience, was a man who I felt could be absolutely trusted to give a fair judgment on the matter, and I asked the chief engineer to send him to Gaspereau for the purpose of looking into the dredging work being done, to consider all the circumstances, and to report whether or not 90 cents per cubic yard was a fair and reasonable price. The hon. gentleman would, I suppose, have it believed by this House that I had in some way influenced Mr. McCordock. Let me say that I had very little personal acquaintance with the late W. J. McCordock, and I had no communication with him on this subject beyond asking him if he could go and visit Gaspereau, and then the communication was with the chief engineer, who gave him his directions in writing.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the minister try at any time to send this gentleman to do this work as government work, when it was so urgent?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I did not, and the reason is that two things are necessary in order to do government dredging: One is to have the superintendent, and the other is to have the dredge.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did you have them?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No. The dredges were employed in other places.

Mr. LANCASTER. This was urgent work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. So were the others, and it was impossible to take the dredges from them.

Mr. LANCASTER. Then this was not so urgent as the others?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman has read from Mr. McCordock's report. Let me call your attention to what Mr. McCordock says. After stating what they were doing, he says:

I am of the opinion that from the exposed position of the dredging and the detention from shallow water and the difficulty in getting coal and water from the shore out two miles to the dredge, where it has to remain at anchor in all weather, that the amount of 90 cents named in the tender is a fair rate per cubic yard.

Surely these are considerations which ought fairly to enter into the judgment of a person certifying as to the value of the work. They are considerations which would enter into the judgment of every contractor tendering for the work. A contractor looks at many things when tendering.

He looks at the exposed position of the work or otherwise. He makes some soundings for himself usually and learns concerning soundings or borings that have been made. He considers the quality of the materials to be moved, whether clay, sand or slit, or whether there may be boulders. And a very important question with him is that of a fresh water supply for his dredge and tug, and also the question of the coal supply. He must consider also the question of the distance he has to tow his dredges and barges, both to reach the work and to get back into winter quarters after the season is finished. No doubt all these things were taken into consideration by the Maritime Dredging & Construction Company, when they tendered at 90 cents for this work. Before we agreed to pay this 90 cents Mr. Scammell, the resident engineer of St. John, a young man who had a good deal of experience under Mr. Shewan, being afterwards in charge of dredging operations for the department, was sent, at my request, up to the Gaspereau river for the purpose of looking into conditions and making a report. Let me call attention to what he says. I read, not from the printed copy but from the files which, I presume, is the same as my friend has.

Mr. BARKER. What date?

Mr. PUGSLEY. October 19th, 1908.

Mr. BARKER. That is after the work was finished.

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, they were still working there. His letter is as follows:—

The Dept. of Public Works, Canada.
Office, Engineer in charge dredging.
St. John, N.B., 19th October, 1908.

Sir,—In reply to your telegram of the 5th inst. I saw the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company of St. John, N.B, and visited Gaspereau river on October 7, where a personal inspection was made of the work being done at that place in connection with dredging a channel 60 feet wide to a depth of 8 feet at low water and making a face of from 5 to 7 feet in order to secure a passage into the village of Port Elgin, parish of Botsford, Westmoreland county, N.B.

You see there is a very considerable difference between dredging to a depth of eight feet at which getting below the surface soil, you strike either hard pan or solid clay, and simply dredging in the channel where there would be only the loose silt carried in by the tide. This estimate of 20 cents had been for dredging to a depth of four feet, and it was based upon the assumption that it would be done by a government dredge, whereas Mr. Scammell says that this Company would go to a depth of 8 feet.

I found the dredge 'Iroquois' at work at that place, with a tow boat 'the Calluna,' and two barges. The work there is progressing with extreme difficulty, which I have reason to believe will increase as the season advances, and much time will be lost on account of the high winds as the dredge is very much exposed to easterly and southeasterly gales, and there is no shelter afforded in the least.

Again, he says, at the close of his report:—

Neither the dredge nor the tug can get into the creek except on the spring tides and this necessitates the water supply being pumped by a gasoline engine and towed out to the dredge at great expense. This also applies to the coal used.

Under the circumstances it would be fair and reasonable to pay the present rate as called for under the contract with the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company.

It is all very well for the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket), to say that somebody told him that this dredging could be done more cheaply. And my hon. friend

from Hamilton (Mr. Barker), who is a lawyer and a very excellent lawyer, one I would like to have represent me if I had a case in court,—it is all very well for him to talk about what dredging is worth. Or it is all very well for me to talk about it. But whose judgment is best, the judgment of these gentlemen or the judgment of the engineers, experienced men, who went upon the ground and saw these dredges at work, saw the difficulties under which they were labouring, these unfavourable conditions as to coal and water supply and who knew what dangers this dredging plant was exposed to in case of a storm, being out in the estuary and outside the shelter that would have been afforded could they have got well into the river?

Mr. SPROULE. I would like to ask the hon. minister a question. Were not all these things present to the mind of the engineers of the department when they estimated that the dredging could be done at 22 cents a yard?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Sproule) must not make a mistake about that. This estimate of 20 cents was made before the work was undertaken at all and was made for work to be done by a government dredge.

Mr. LENNOX. What difference does that make?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Why, it does not take into account the cost of the plant the interest upon investment, the depreciation or——

Mr. MEIGHEN. What is the hon. gentleman's authority for that statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. My authority is my knowledge as Minister of Public Works. I know these things are never taken into account.

Mr. LENNOX. They ought to be.

Mr. PUGSLEY. They are not. All that is taken into account is the ordinary repairs of the dredging season. Even the large repairs, which in the case of dredges are necessary almost every winter, are not included. The depreciation and wear and tear are not included. No interest on construction is allowed for. The dangers involved in having a dredge in a place like that are not taken into consideration. But all these things must be taken into consideration by a dredging contractor when he makes a tender for work. My hon. friend from Westmoreland has told us that these contractors lost a tug, wrecked in connection with these dredging operations, and this accident involved a loss of quite a number of thousands of dollars. I have in mind the case of Mr. Connolly who was taking a very valuable dredge from one part of the Atlantic coast to another and the dredge was wrecked in a storm. The other day at St. Andrews a dredge that was operating under the Dominion Dredging Company, under contract with my department sank through some unexplained reason, and it took a good many days before the dredge could be raised, and it will take a good many days more before its machinery can be put right and the dredge set in operation again. When any expense of that kind occurs, not only is there the loss involved by reason of the wreck itself, but there is also the expense of the crew and the loss on investment. Particularly when a contractor is working in an exposed position he runs the risk of losing his plant or of having it greatly injured. He necessarily takes into consideration also the cost and risk of taking the dredge to the point of operation and, after the season is over returning it to winter quarters. And there is another very important matter, and that is the availability of a machine shop for repairs while work is going on. The facilities in this respect at a place like Port Elgin—and particularly when the dredge was working two or three miles out in the roadstead or estuary, would be very different indeed from what they would be in the port of St. John.

Now, I want to repeat what I stated when this matter was before the House in February, 1910, that you cannot judge what the real, fair value of dredging work in one place is from what it costs in another; you cannot form any fair judgment upon the subject. The contractor would, as I have said, have to take all these conditions into consideration, and then after the work is begun, the engineer going upon the spot would be the man who would be able to form the best conclusion. We have the evidence of these two engineers, Mr. McCordock and Mr. Scammell, verified by Mr. Stead after this work is done, and this certificate of Mr. Scammell, and verified by the chief engineer of the department, who certified, before I presented the recommendation to council, that the price of 90 cents per cubic yard is fair and reasonable. There you have the certificate of Mr. McCordock, who has been thirty years superintendent at St. John; you have the certificate of Mr. Scammell, and you have the certificate of Mr. Stead, the resident engineer, after the work has been done, a certificate based on all these reports, that the price of ninety cents was fair and reasonable. Now, I ask this House if, upon these certificates, it was not my duty to pay to these contractors the amount at which they had tendered to do this work? How could I do otherwise in face of these certificates?

Mr. MEIGHEN. Where is Mr. Stead's report that the price was fair and reasonable?

Mr. PUGSLEY. You will find it in the accounts which he sent into the department.

Mr. MEIGHEN. That is not in evidence.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is not my fault, it is the fault of the gentlemen who were seeking to produce a part of the evidence and not the whole. Now, you will find that this order in council was based upon the certificate by Mr. McCordock; we had that before us; we had the certificate of Mr. Scammell before us; we had also the certificate of Mr. Stead that these prices were fair and reasonable, and we have the certificate of the chief engineer of the department, who had all the certificates before him, that the price was a fair and reasonable one. The chief engineer of the department made the final certificate upon which I, as the minister, asked the government to base this order in council.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). When the government invite tenders for works, do they not usually have surveys, borings, diagrams, so that they can have an estimate of their own engineers? Was not that done in this instance, or is it the custom of the Public Works Department when they invite tenders for dredging?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have stated that four or five years before this dredging was done, in 1903, the late Mr. Day was asked to make borings and to make a report. He reported for a channel four feet deep at low tide, and his estimate was that it would be worth 20 cents per cubic yard. I say that frankly, there is no dispute about that. Then later on, in 1908, Mr. Stead appears to have adopted Mr. Day's estimate. What I say is that that is based, I have no doubt whatever, upon what he thought would be the fair cost of doing the work by a government dredge. Then after the work was done, we have Mr. Stead's certificate, and this would show the conditions under which the work was being done, the exposed situation on which this particular work across the bar was being done. He joined with the others, and forwarded these certificates to the department. You may ask me why Mr. Stead changed his mind. Perhaps he was influenced by Mr. McCordock and Mr. Scammell, because it is a matter of judgment. But it is enough for me that, having sent down these two independent officers of the department and the chief engineer, having got their reports that the prices were fair and reasonable, it seems to me I was quite justified in paying the amount of the tender price. But more than that, we have the further proof that in the following year, even upon the inside work, which was less exposed than this work across the bar, the actual cost of the operation of the government dredge was 41 cents per cubic yard.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I understand the hon. gentleman to say that at the time he asked for tenders for that work, the department did not have sufficient information to give the contractors; the government was going it blind and the contractors were going it blind, and they estimated the work after it was done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend must realize that we would have a report showing the rate at which the work would have to be done. It was estimated by Mr. Day for a four foot channel. Of course, any difference between the four feet and the six feet we would not know, the contractor would have to take his chances. But that is the engineer's report upon the actual experience of the quality of the material, and also having reference to the exposed condition, and the danger of operating the dredge.

Now, let me call attention to a matter in regard to which I would have supposed that my hon. friend would have made a motion before this House, and that is the dredging of the Miramichi river. When I first became minister and called for tenders for dredging upon the Miramichi river, the lowest tender was for 60 cents per cubic yard. The lowest tenderer was Mr. W. J. Poupore, a gentleman who has devoted a great deal of attention to dredging matters, and no criticism has been made of that contract being awarded to Mr. Poupore. Mr. Poupore is an experienced contractor, he was formerly the Conservative member for the county of Pontiac, a very worthy gentleman, and a very experienced contractor. But I have heard no criticism upon that contract. Now, there were two descriptions of work in the Miramichi river somewhat corresponding to those in the Gaspereau river. There was what was called the bar and horseshoe. Then inside that there was the Grand Dune flats, where the dredge operating would not be so much exposed to danger. Mr. Poupore had contracted for the Miramichi work, including the Grand Dune flats, and I was urged strongly to extend the contract. I looked into the matter very carefully with the chief engineer of my department. The chief engineer estimated that the work of dredging at the Grand Dune flats outside the bar would be about 45 cents per cubic yard, that was some 15 cents less than we had been paying the year before. I declined, however, to negotiate with the contractor, even at the reduced price. I called for tenders, and in such a way that we could consider the dredging tender for the horseshoe and bar, and for the Grand Dune flats.

Mr. LANCASTER. In that case did the minister allow the work to go on preceding the receipt of tenders?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No.

Mr. LANCASTER. What has that to do with this case?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I expected to get a bouquet from my hon. friend for this,

Mr. LANCASTER. I am afraid that I could not give it to my hon. friend under any circumstances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not under any conditions?

Mr. LANCASTER. Not for anything that you have ever done.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That proves how very shortsighted my hon. friend is.

Mr. LANCASTER. No, it is because I have kept my eyes open.

Mr. PUGSLEY. We called for tenders and got separate tenders as well as joint tenders for the whole of this work. We are doing the work upon the Grand Dune flats at 11 cents per cubic yard as against 60 cents which would have been paid if the whole work had been let together. That is very much less than the estimate of the chief engineer. I do not find fault with the chief engineer. Engineers, as well as architects, are liable to make mistakes. The whole work consists of a million cubic yards and at the engineer's estimate of 45 cents per cubic yard is would have cost the department $450,000. As a matter of fact, we are getting that work done for $110,000 thus saving to this country $340,000. I would have supposed that my hon. friend, the member for York, would have called attention to this as well as to other matters which could not help appealing to any fair minded man, which could not help almost certainly commanding his approval.

Mr. CROCKET. Is the hon. gentleman referring to a contract which was let this year?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes, the Grand Dune work.

Mr. CROCKET. That is not before the Public Accounts Committee and will not be before next session.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman heard of it because it was brought to his notice during the session. But if the hon. gentleman were to speak of anything in connection with my department or in connection with myself in terms of approval, I am sure it would arouse astonishment amongst his constituents, and you might hear the remark made upon all sides that suddenly the hon. gentleman had grown to a better manhood and a bigger intellectual condition than that with which they had hitherto credited him, and it would be a very great surprise.

At six o'clock House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Before the dinner hour I had dealt with nearly all the points made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) and the hon. member for Grenville (Mr. Reid) but if I have omitted anything, if hon. gentleman would refer to Hansard for February 1910, they will see that I covered all the points brought up at that time which were I think the same as to-day. I thought it necessary even at the risk of taking up the time of the House, however briefly, to make some reply to-day, and I very much regret being compelled to do so because I feel that the presentation of this motion is clearly only a part of what I regret to observe has been the policy for a considerable time past of the members of the opposition, viz.: to prevent by continuous talking the taking of a vote in this House upon the great national question of reciprocity. There are just two matters remaining to which I shall briefly refer. One is the observation made by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) with regard to my having taken the tender with me to the City of St. John. He seriously put that forward as a suspicious circumstance, but the explanation is very simple. The company had done considerable work and they asked for payment on account of it, and as there was only one tender the question arose as to whether the tender price was fair and reasonable, and whether we ought to endeavour to secure some reduction from it or whether we should enter into the contract. Before recommending the order in council which would fix the price, I thought it desirable to make full inquiry, and I did not know of any better source from which to get information, outside the chief engineer of my department, than Mr. McCordock and Mr. Scammell. I took the tender with me from the files of the department. The hon. gentleman Mr. Crocket said that up to the 16th October the records of the department did not show there was any tender upon file, and when I called his attention to that mistake, he stated that what he intended to say was that on the 16th October it was not on file. The chief engineer knew I had the tender with me, and he wired to know what were the conditions of the tender, with regard to the price of dredging.

Mr. BARKER. Will the hon. gentleman point to any evidence to show that the tender was ever on the file of the department at Ottawa?

Mr. PUGSLEY. When the investigation was held before the committee it would be taken for granted it was on file and the

onus would be on those who made a charge to the contrary to prove their contention. However, here is the tender on file here, and addressed by mail to R. C. DeRochers, Assistant Secretary of the Department of Public Works, Ottawa, and stamped by him as received by him, and there you have the strongest possible evidence that the tender was on file. You find that the tender was sent through the post office to the secretary of the department, stamped as having been received by him, and subsequently opened in the ordinary way by the proper officials of the department. Then the hon. member for York attempted to show that either I or the department was so easy with these contractors and so desirous of putting money into their pockets, that although the resident engineer certified that in his opinion the quantity of material cast over was 6,000 cubic yards, the minister and the department had taken the estimates made by the contractor in preference, and paid him for 8,000 cubic yards of material cast over. The object of that was to show that we had disregarded the report of the engineer and chosen to accept instead the estimate of the contractor. Now, Sir, when I show you that the estimate of the contractor was not taken but that the certificate of the engineer was accepted, and that the payment was made on 6,000 yards and not 8,000 yards, you will ask whether the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) made that misstatement wilfully or ignorantly.

Mr. MEIGHEN. What was the statement?

Mr. PUGSLEY. That the resident engineer certified for 6,000 yards, that the contractor claimed 8,000 yards, and that the department was not guided by the engineer but accepted the estimate of the contractor.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member made no such statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I say he did make that statement and there are hon. members here who heard it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for York said that the chief engineer of the department, notwithstanding the estimate of Mr. Stead, directed that it be paid at 8,000 yards instead of 6,000 yards, and he did so direct.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Now, Sir, when I show you that so far from that being the case the chief engineer acted upon the report of the resident engineer and directed payment for 6,000 yards, you will agree with me that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) has made a mistake at least.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The telegram of the chief engineer will be found on page 259.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Here is the letter of the chief engineer to the Deputy Minister of Public Works.

Department of Public Works of Canada,
Chief Engineer's Office,
Ottawa, Jan. 7, 1909.

Gaspereau River, N.B.

Sir,—With reference to the dredging performed by the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company during the past season in the Gaspereau river, N.B., certified weekly reports of operations are herewith inclosed showing that the company removed a total quantity of 33,744 yards of material.

In connection with this dredging, the company performed a certain amount of trenching, or casting over, and I have the honour to transmit herewith two reports from Mr. Geoffrey Stead, resident engineer, in which he comes to the conclusion that the quantity cast over is 6,000 yards, for which the contractors should be paid at the rate of 60 cents per cubic yard, the amount due them for casting over being therefore $3,600. A certified account for this amount is herewith inclosed, and I have the honour to recommend that it be paid.

I have the honour to be, sir,
Your obedient servant,
(Sgd.) EUGENE D. LAFLEUR,
Chief Engineer.

J. B. Hunter, Esq.,
Deputy Minister,
Department of Public Works,
Ottawa.

Account for $3,600 will require certificate of chief engineer.

(Sgd.) A. G. K.

8-1-'09.

Does my hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) say that that was changed afterwards?

Mr. MEIGHEN. No, but I say that on November 10th previously, he wired Mr. Stead directing him to report in favour of 8,000 cubic yards, and that is what Mr. Crocket said and it will be found on page 259.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I do not know of what took place before, but the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) said that 60 cents a yard was paid for 8,000 yards.

Mr. MEIGHEN. He did not make that statement.

Mr. PUGSLEY. In the very report of the Auditor General to which the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) refers in his motion it will be found that what was paid for was 6,000 yards of material cast over at 60 cents a yard. I leave it to you Mr. Speaker, and I leave it to the hon. members of this House, as to whether the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) did not convey the impression that the department had recognized the claim of the contractor in face of the certificate of the resident engineer and paid for 8,000 cubic yards of material cast over, instead of 6,000 cubic yards as certified by the engineer.

I regret to say that the hon. gentleman made that statement in the face of what he must have known from the papers which are on file such as the letter of the 7th January, 1909 addressed by the chief engineer of the department to the Deputy Minister of Public Works, and also the entry in the Auditor General's Report, showing clearly and distinctly that the amount of material cast over and paid for at the rate of 60 cents per yard was only the 6,000 yards. It is an old saying which I have found to be a very true one in the long experience which I have had in the practice of law in the courts, that when you find a witness reckless in his statements in one particular, you may judge from that of the value of all his evidence. When you find him in one particular careless as to the truth, you may judge from that of the value of his testimony. And when I find the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) starting out with a suggestion to this committee that this dredging was wholly useless, of no value whatever to the public, and telling this House deliberately as his solemn judgment that I had put that dredge to work there not in the public interest, not because the dredging was required to afford navigation, but solely in order to put several thousand dollars into the pockets of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company,, and when you find again that he tries either recklessly or for some other reason to convey the impression that we were so anxious to put money into the pockets of Messrs. Moore and McAvity that we absolutely disregarded the certificate of the resident engineer and paid on the estimate of the contractor, in the face of the letter of January 7th from the resident engineer to the deputy minister, in the face of further evidence which he had upon the very page of the Auditor General's report to which he refers in this statement, which he has moved, you, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members of this House will have to judge as to whether the hon. gentleman has been actuated by a desire simply if he could, by whatever means he may be able to command to make a point against a political opponent or whether he has desired to place the true facts before the House and before the country.

I wish to refer to remarks having no bearing on this matter, made by my hon. friend in an effort to prejudice me in the eyes of the members of this House, and the people of the country, referring to certain things which took place or are alleged to have taken place while I was a member of the provincial legislature. I noticed that while I was having a pleasant discusson, not an acrimonious discussion, but a courteous discussion with the member for Argenteuil (Mr. Perley) the leader of the opposition (Mr. Borden) evidently influenced by angry passion caused by I know not what, rose, to his feet and at once made an insinuation in regard to my conduct as a member of the provincial legislature. Are we to infer from the attitude of these two gentlemen, now that everybody thinks we may be approaching a general election, that they have an intention to try and make this contest a contest of slander? Are we to infer that they intend indulging again, as in 1908, in a policy of raking up all kinds of scandal and throwing mud in every way they can? Let me say that in 1908 they tried that course upon me and upon some of my fellow Liberal candidates in New Brunswick. They signally failed. Let me call their attention to the fact that when they could not defeat me by scandal they tried to defeat me by having false affidavits read at a public meeting held in the city of St. John. They tried by every trick and by every device at their command, by any means, no matter how foul, no matter how unjustifiable, to attack my character, and prejudice me in the eyes of the people of the country. But, Sir, the people who knew me, the people who had watched my career for upwards of a quarter of a century, while I had been in public life, have rallied to my support and my own constituency of the city and county of St. John, returned me to this parliament by a magnificent majority and the people of New Brunswick sent me ten good and sturdy supporters of this government. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that if they want to repeat that policy of slander, that policy of resorting to false affidavits, let them come on, we are prepared to meet them, and I am prepared again and I am sure my friends are prepared again to trust ourselves to the good judgment and sense of justice of the people of the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. BARKER (East Hamilton). Mr. Speaker, I shall read again the paragraphs in the Revised Statutes of Canada which ought to govern the conduct of the Minister of Public Works, in the matter with which we have been dealing this afternoon; and I beg most respectfully the attention of this House to the wording of this statute because it is the law defining the obligations of ministers in the conduct of such matters as we are dealing with. The clauses apply not merly to the Minister of Public Works, but to the ministers of all departments conducting works on behalf of the public in this Dominion.

Whenever any works are to be executed under the direction of any department of the government, the minister having charge of such department shall invite tenders by public advertisement for the execution of such works except in cases,

(a) of pressing emergency in which delay would be injurious to the public interest.

I need hardly say that no such case is pretended to have been in existence or to have been made out. If it were necessary to go further into that at this moment I would be prepared to do so, but I shall not delay the House with it now.

(b) In which, from the nature of the work, it can be more expeditiously and economically executed by the officers and servants of the department.

There is no pretence that any such case existed here.

(c) Where the estimated cost of the work is less than $5,000.

I need not read further because there is no pretence that that case existed.

Whenever, in case of any work, tenders are required to be or are invited, the minister having charge of the department concerned shall submit all tenders received therefor to the Governor in Council, and the contract for the work shall be awarded under the direction of the Governor in Council.

The hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) undertook to lecture gentlemen on this side of the House for their conduct in discussing this matter.

The discussion on this side is based upon the resolution before the House, which charges two things, and only two things: one is that this work has been performed by the Public Works Department illegally; the other is that in consequence of the illegal method adopted by the minister the cost of this work is more than it ought to have been. No question has been raised as to whether this work ought to have been done, or ought not to have been done, However necessary it might have been to do this work, there was a method prescribed by the statutes as to how the contract should be entered into. We charge that the minister did not follow that, but that he acted illegally, and deliberately and wilfully evaded the statute by every means in his power. Yet we have the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) coolly charging gentlemen on this side of the House with wasting the time of the House and obstructing reciprocity, and then himself occupying the time of this House for over an hour on a subject which is not referred to in the resolution—the desirability of this work in the interest of the county of Westmoreland. We are not discounty of Westmorland. We are not discussing whether it might have been desir- argues as if the fact that a member wanted the minister to do work in his constituency was an ample justification for an evasion of the law of the land. The hon. member spoke of the unwarranted animus displayed against the minister. Well, I hope I shall say what I have to say without displaying any unwarranted animus or any animus. I know nothing against the minister outside of his public position and his public reputation, and I propose to adhere strictly to this resolution. Then the hon. member for Westmorland waxed very warm on the subject of vilification and abuse, and immediately entered into vilification and abuse of the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution. He objected to conjecture and suspicion, but before he got through he got so deeply into conjectures and suspicion that he had nothing else to talk about. The hon. gentleman used all the time of his speech, occupying a large part of the afternoon, in discussing what the resolution before the House had nothing to do with.

For a few years past nothing has more engaged the attention of the people of this dominion than the evasion of the public statutes by officials, by men in prominent positions, who have neglected to do what the statutes of the country require them to do. So much has that agitated the country, so strongly has it taken hold of the people that the Minister of Finance has before this House a Bill to remedy some of the evils complained of, especially as regards the Banking Act. It has been said that certain men in very high and important positions in the banking community have evaded the duties imposed upon them by the law of the land. We all know that one unfortunate man who neglected his duty in complying with the statutes of the country served his time in the penitentiary. Another unfortunate man, the head of a great institution, is now serving time for having evaded his duties under Acts of Parliament. Are we to treat one class of cases differently from another? If these men go to the penitentiary for evading their statutory duties, why should a minister of the Crown be allowed to set at naught the statutes of the country at his sweet will? That is the point we are here to discuss; that is the object of the resolution. The hon. gentleman has carefully observed that, no doubt, and he has with equal care avoided referring to it.

Now, I propose not to go into outside discussions. It is my desire to confine my remarks strictly to the resolution, and in doing so I hope it will not be necessary for me to do much more than refer to the actual written testimony in the report of the Committee on Public Accounts. I may have to refer to a word or two of explanation here and there by the witnesses, but the whole story is really set forth in the documents of the department. There is no doubt in my mind that not one of those men who have been punished for evading their statutory duties has been more guilty than the minister is in this case.

The cases in which the minister can act without the order of the Governor in

Council are very plainly put, the first is 'a pressing emergency, in which delay would be injurious to the public interest.' I suppose the hon. gentleman would argue that this is such a case. The hon. gentleman has shut himself out from any such pretense. It is absurd to suppose that the hon. gentleman even thought that he was acting under that clause. He acted arbitrarily; his high mightiness the minister did it all, and there was no pretense of an inquiry as to whether there was any emergency in which a few weeks or ten days' or thirty days' delay might cause serious injury to the public. Not at all. The hon. gentleman did this at his own sweet will; that is the only consideration that entered into his mind; and he has absolutely shut himself out from the pretense that he acted on any other grounds, because after the work was over, after the expenditure was incurred, at the last moment he goes to the Governor in Council and seeks to get from them what he ought to have obtained at first, and he seeks to obtain it by a deliberate misrepresentation of the facts. I propose to prove that. But I want to be as short as possible, and avoid anything in the shape of vilification which will hurt the feelings of the minister. The first important matter appears at page 239 of the report of the inquiry before the Committee on Public Accounts in a message of 3rd July, 1908.

And just here I would like to point out to this House the fact that our position to-day is very like the position when the minister undertook to let this contract. We are to-day on the eve of the dissolution of the parliament. The day this message was sent forward was the eve of a dissolution. We are likely to have a general election within three months; some people—many people—say, in October. They actually had the general elections within three months after this message was sent. So we can look sympathetically at this case, and make the application to the proceedings of the minister. Here the first message we have is not from the minister, but from his acting deputy 'J. B. H.'—I suppose, Mr. Hunter. And let me here say that in the remarks I make I do not intend in the least to reflect on the officers of the minister, either his deputy or the chief engineer, Mr. Lafleur. I know very well what a difficult position these men occupy, especially with a powerful minister with a will of his own, and backed with authority, and all else. Such men have to be very careful to obey orders and not inquire too much. Mr. Hunter, on the 3rd of July, sent a written memorandum to the chief engineer, Mr. Lafleur.

Ottawa, July 3, 1908.

Chief Engineer,—Kindly secure a report from resident engineer regarding dredging at Buctouche, Shediac and Gaspereau (Port Elgin), with a view to sending out a notice to dredge owners asking for tenders.

These three places should be commenced by July 20, and a portion, to be designated by the resident engineer, be finished this season.

(Sgd.) J.B.H.,
Acting Deputy Minister.

Mr. BARKER.

On the 15th of July there was another message from Mr. Hunter:

Chief Engineer,—Kindly let me know as soon as possible just what quantity of urgent dredging there is at Gaspereau river, N.B.

It is represented all that requires to be done at present is removal of bar at mouth. Please say how much that will be.

J. B. H.

Then, there is a message the following day from Ottawa to the resident engineer New Brunswick. Mr. Lafleur in his evidence said:

On the 16th July, 1908, I wired to Geoffrey Stead, resident engineer, St. John, Chatham, N.B.: 'Please wire me immediately what quantity of urgent dredging is required in the Gaspereau river, N.B. It is represented that all that requires to be done is removal of bar at mouth. How much would that be?'

He was asked how he knew that that was represented, or as to the necessity for any dredging, but he could not say. Here is the chief engineer of public works, the man who has charge of these things, and he says that 'it is represented,' but he does not know by whom. Here is a quotation from his examination:

Q.—You had no knowledge of that?—A. No official knowledge, because there is nothing in the correspondence before me to show that.

Q. Have you any knowledge, official or otherwise?—A. Not to my memory.

Q. As to, by whom that representation was made?—A. No, sir.

This message, sent on the 16th of July required the resident engineer's report upon the quantity of work that had to be done on the Gaspereau river, a work which we find soon afterwards involves an expenditure of about $34,000. Well, the gentleman at Chatham is able to answer that next morning by telegram. Mr. Stead's reply was written July 17, and is the following:

In reply to your telegram at Gaspereau river, a cut to give six feet at low water through bar necessitating removal 48,000 cubic yards, barge measurement, is most urgently required. Basin 350 feet long, 200 feet wide; at wharfs also very necessary, requiring 14,000 cubic yards, barge measurement, of dredging.

That was a pretty sharp return from the gentleman at Chatham, New Brunswick, as to the requirements of the Gaspereau. It was required from him by his chief in order that he might issue calls for advertisements. And Mr. Lafleur is asked:

Q. You have no knowledge, however, of his visiting the round?—A. I have no knowledge.

Then follows another letter addressed to the secretary of the department by the acting deputy minister, Mr. Hunter, as follows:

20th July, 1908.

Secretary,—Please have advertisements sent out calling for tenders for dredging at Gaspereau river, Buctouche Beach and Buctouche harbour and Point Du Chene, in the province of New Brunswick.

J. B. H.,
Acting Deputy Minister.

Now, as a fact, the advertisement was issued according to that instruction from the acting deputy minister. That advertisement was published in the St. John, New Brunswick newspapers on the 28th July, and it called for tenders by the 14th of August. On the 31st July we find this extraordinary message from the resident engineer at Chatham, N.B., to the chief engineer at Ottawa; you will observe that this is only three days after the advertisement appeared in the newspaper, and eleven days before the tenders were to be put in:

John E. Moore, St. John——

That is the secretary we have heard so much about, of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company.

—says he has a dredge ready to work on Gaspereau river, N.B., and expects to start Monday. Am I authorized to lay out the dredging for him there?

Now this is going pretty rapidly. Three days after the advertisement is published and eleven days before tenders are due this Mr. Moore has it all arranged—not through the department, because they have no knowledge of it, but with somebody; surely it was not with the hon. member for Westmorland—it could only have been with the Minister of Public Works. Nobody else would have dared to make such an arrangement. The hon. minister wont say he did not make it. And Mr. John E. Moore goes himself to the resident engineer at Chatham, N B., and tells him: I have got the work, I have got my dredge ready, and I expect to start on Monday next. And this is arranged by the minister who was bound by this statute I have just read and ought to have laid the tenders before the Governor in Council. He meets this contractor, Mr. Moore, who he admits is a friend of his in St. John, where the minister himself resides; he meets this Mr. Moore, and tells him he is to have the contract. Now the minister to-day has made a rather clever variation of what actually took place, no question about it. He has added now on second thought words that were never in the original proposition. He says what he told Mr. Moore was that he could begin the work, and on the 14th when tenders came in, if any other person were to tender lower that Mr. Moore, Mr. Moore was to withdraw his dredge and the other man would get the work at the cheaper rate. That is what the minister says, but it is absolutely contrary to the fact. Here is the letter of the chief engineer on August 4. He could not have written this letter without the authority of his chief, and we have here the statement in businesslike form exactly what Mr. Moore has been told, not all what the minister states to-day:

Sir,—The work of dredging in the Gaspereau river has been given to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, of St. John, N.B., provided they are willing to accept in payment per cubic yard, scow measurement, the lowest price to be obtained by tenders which are now being called for. Kindly place the company's dredge at work immediately if they accept the conditions. You will please, however, note that the lesser work only is to be engaged upon.

Now where is there a word here that if there was a lower tender put in the lower tenderer was to get the work? It was the very opposite. If there was a lower tender they, the Maritime Company, were to take that price. That is what he says, and the fact is that on the 4th of August he actually gave them the work, the only condition being that they were to accept the price of the lowest tender. The hon. gentleman wishes us to believe he was so anxious to get on with this work between the 4th of August and the 14th, that he wanted to put a dredge at work there, and keep it going for ten days, and that it was to be removed and go away if somebody tendered for less. That is absolutely incorrect. There is the letter written at the time by the chief engineer, undoubtedly by dictation. The work was given at that moment to the Maritime Dredging Company, the only condition being that if there happened to be a lower tender they were to take that. Now I ask hon. gentlemen opposite, there are business men over there, and they understand what this means, they understand the effect of it —I ask if there is an hon. gentleman opposite who believes for a moment that, with Mr. Moore's dredge on the work, with the engineer on the spot placing him in charge of the work, and setting out the the work for him, any other rival dredge owner would go to the trouble and expense of tendering on the 14th of August? Is there an hon. gentleman opposite in business who, if he found a friend of the government, of the minister, a fellow townsman of the minister—I think he objected to the word 'crony' used by the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket)—but if he found a fellow townsman in charge of the work, if he found him on the 4th of August placed in possession of the work by the resident engineer, would any man of ordin-

ary common sense go to the trouble of putting in a tender at all? It is absurd to pretend such a thing, it is absolutely childish to think that any man in the dredging business, finding a government work, of all work, and a friend of the government in charge—and all these dredge owners know each other, they know who is inside and who is not—to say that a man would go and make a tender under these circumstances is absolutely ridiculous, and the hon. gentleman knows it as well as any one. Now what was the result? It was worse, actually worse, than giving him the contract, and for this reason. Mr. John E. Moore knew that not only would he get the contract, but he knew that no other person was going to tender under those circumstances. Then what was the result? Why, if John E. Moore, instead of tendering at 90 cents, as he did, had actually had the impudence to tender at $1, he would have got it just the same, he knew that nobody else would get the work. All he had to do was to put in his own tender. Therefore, I submit, it is a reasonable inference that that 90 cents was understood and agreed upon when the arrangement was made for him to put in a tender. I think no one would hesitate to come to that conclusion. I think if the question was left to a common jury, and they were asked: Do you think it is a reasonable inference that when the minister told Moore he could go to work and afterwards tender, it was then agreed the tender should be 90 cents. The jury would answer in the affirmative. Otherwise it would be still worse for the minister, because the man might have put in as much as he liked.

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is not a particle of evidence to sustain the hon. gentleman's suggestion, not a particle of evidence that I ever knew what the tender was before it was opened. As a matter of fact I did not.

Mr. BARKER. I did not say there was evidence, it is a reasonable inference from reading this letter.

I repeat, who would be so densely stupid as to think that there would be another tender? It is monstrous to think that the minister ever expected there would be another tender. He simply said, in effect, whatever your tender is, I will give you that price and if the minister did not agree with him that it would be 90 cents I think it would have been prudent for him to have done so because he might have had to pay more.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Prudent or not, he did not do it.

Mr. BARKER. The minister may be faulty in his recollection as to some trifling circumstances.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not a bit as to that.

Mr. BARKER. I think it would have been a business act to have taken care at all events that it should not be more than 90 cents. It might have been more and the hon. gentleman would have been bound, as there would have been no other tender. Now there is the letting of this contract. That is the way that this minister thought he was carrying out the statute governing all the departments of this government. He took care that ten days before the advertisements came in the man was in possession of the work, everything was perfectly understood and arranged, and there was no trouble to the end. The work went on and this trifling job that was entered into—I do not use the word 'job' in any improper sense—this contract, although there was no actual written contract, involved a sum of $33,969, and the government paid it. Is there any doubt as to that? There is no question at all about it. What is the fact?—that a verbal arrangement, confirmed by the letter of the chief engineer, was the only contract the minister ever entered into while the work was under performance. The whole of that $33,969 was earned and payable upon the word of the minister and no formal contract whatever was entered into. There is no question at all about that, and the minister cannot deny it. We have the telegram from Mr. Stead that he had been informed that the man was to have the work, and the letter from the chief engineer telling him that he was to have that work, and that with the tender which was put in on the 14th August was the only contract that was entered into; in fact, there was no contract whatever until the gentleman found for some good reason that he had to get an order in council, and then and only then, months after, was a contract prepared. That is clear. There is no question about it and it cannot be denied.

Then, the 14th of August was the day for the opening of tenders, and the next thing in order is the memorandum by the assistant secretary of the department for the minister at page 243:

> Dredging in New Brunswick.
> Buctouche beach, Buctouche harbour, Gaspereau river, Point du Chene.
> Tenders for above work due Friday, August 14, 1908. One tender received at this office herewith. Appropriation: dredging maritime provinces, $650,000.

We have not taken up the three other cases. We have confined ourselves to Gaspereau river as if he went into all together it would likely be confusing, and this one raises the whole question of this resolution. This witness is asked:

> What is the amount of the tender?

And the answer is 90 cents per cubic yard for each place included:

Hon. gentlemen can see that it is a much bigger question than appears from the discussion here. Here is the letter sent by the chief engineer on September 29. We have heard a good deal from the minister about the view of his chief engineer as to the reasonableness of the price for this work. I think this is a very significant letter that I will read:

Sept. 29, 1908.

Sir,—The only tender received for dredging in the Gaspereau river was the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company for 90 cents per cubic yard, scow measurement.

Here are the words of this chief engineer who, it is said, thought the price was reasonable:

At the time the tender was received I thought the price was considerably more than that for which the contract should be awarded.

Yet the hon. gentleman accepted everything because it was recommended by his chief engineer, the gentleman who actually thought the price was considerably more than ought to be given.

However, it has been represented to the department that the condition is such as to make this price fair and reasonable.

He was asked where that representation came from. He did not know; he could not recollect. There was nothing on the files of the department to show where it came from. Here is the question:

You say, however, it has been represented to the department that the condition is such as to make this price fair and reasonable. By whom was that representation made to the department?

The chief engineer says:

That I cannot remember at this date.

Q. Did anybody represent that to you?—A. Not to me personally.

Q. Who did represent it to you; from whom did you get that information?—A. I must have had it from some of the officers of the department.

Q. Did you get it from the minister?—A. I cannot say that.

Of course he could not. Who would have expected him to recollect that?

Q. Will you say that you did not get it from the minister?—A. I cannot say that I did not.

There is the evidence of the chief engineer who led the minister to accept the tender, the man who told him that he thought the price was considerably more than ought to be paid. But the engineer yields to it, unwillingly evidently, because it was represented to the department that there were circumstances that he was not told about, that he knew nothing about, which made it fair and reasonable. Well, there may have been circumstances to make it reasonable for somebody, but to say that it was fair and reasonable to the country is an absolute enormity, there was no justification for such a thing, and it is a ridiculous farce to pretend that there was. I leave for a moment the routine of the procedure. I will remind the House that this work was finished about October, 1908, just about the time of the election. I think the election was on the 24th October, and that is just about the time that this contractor finished the work and got paid.

Then, as to this work which was so urgent that it had to be done immediately, here is a report of the chief engineer dated 9th March, 1909.

Chatham, N. B., 9th March, 1909.

Sir,—I have received your letter No. 8510, of the 4th March, asking a report on what further dredging is required in the Gaspereau river, Westmoreland county, New Brunswick. In reply I have to say that last season dredging to the extent of 33,744 cubic yards at a cost of $33,969.60 was performed for the excavation of a channel 100 feet wide across the estuary of the Gaspereau river, but the shoalest point of the estuary had not been reached at the close of the season, and, therefore, practically no improvement in navigation has been effected.

Here was $34,000 expended for this so-called urgent work, and we have it set forth here that they actually did not get to the shallow part at all, and the work done was no good. That is what the hon. member (Mr. Crocket) said, and not the way the minister put it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket), said that the way it was left in the autumn of 1908 it was no good.

Mr. CROCKET. And the way it is to-day, it is no good.

Mr. BARKER. And it still remains no good, and it was done in defiance of the statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. During the last year, work was continued by the government dredge, and while there is still some further work to be done to carry it to the railway bridge, I am told the channel is very good to-day, and that the work has become very beneficial.

Mr. BARKER. Here is work done on the minister's own personal order as urgent work, done in defiance of the statute, and the way it was left in 1908 it was absolutely useless. In another part of the evidence it is proven that a part of the shoal left untouched had nine and six-tenths inches of water, and lo, this was to be a navigable harbour. I am confining myself almost entirely to documentary evidence, so that there will be no question about it, and on the 3rd of October, the month in which the general election was held, the contractors were urgently requiring that they should get paid $34,339 for

this work. At that particular time they had not quite finished the work, but they wanted to get the money, and we find the Hon. William Pugsley at St. John, New Brunswick, on the 3rd of October, 1908, telegraphing to the chief engineer at Ottawa:

Kindly wire instructions to Scammell to visit Gaspereau, as arranged.

Scammell was wanted down there to get the thing settled up so that the department could pay, and the chief engineer on the 5th of October telegraphed Scammell at St. John, New Brunswick:

Certain difficulties have arisen in connection with dredging Gaspereau river. Please see the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company at St. John, who have the contract, and report.

At that time there was no formal contract signed by anybody, and no pretense of a contract, and nothing but the letter of the chief engineer and the tender. On the 16th of October, just eight days before the election, there was a telegram sent to the Hon. William Pugsley at St. John, New Brunswick. No doubt the minister was down there looking after the elections, and here is a very extraordinary telegram sent to him from Ottawa by his chief engineer:

Deputy Minister informs me that you have Maritime Dredging and Construction Company's tender for dredging Gaspereau river. Would you kindly let me know price quoted for ordinary material and casting over so that progress estimate may be made out and paid.

Just fancy that. Fancy the president of a railway company or any other concern, contractors wanting urgently to be paid $33,000, and he a thousand miles away from his office with the tender in his pocket. It is an extraordinary thing.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And particularly if he is visiting the locality where the work is going on.

Mr. BARKER. I did not charge that the minister was personally superintending this work.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It is in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. BARKER. And the minister was at St. John, New Brunswick, the headquarters of this dredging company. Now, this is where the extra came in. There was no price in the tender for the casting over, but they wanted to make an extra charge for it, and it brought that 90 cents a yard pretty close up to a dollar, and the chief engineer at Ottawa wanted to see what that tender was, and just fancy the condition of things in an office where there was not even an entry in a book as to the terms upon which the contract was let.

The chief engineer could not find out what the terms were, because the minister had taken the tender down to St. John. What for, may I ask? Is it anything suspicious for me to ask the minister what he was doing with the tender that belonged to the office at Ottawa, down in St. John?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I explained that.

Mr. BARKER. Will you explain it again.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I have already done it quite fully.

Mr. BARKER. It is not explainable.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry if the hon. gentleman did not hear it.

Mr. BARKER. What right has a minister to take the public documents, the only evidence of the terms of the tender, away from the office? What right has the minister to go hawking around the country papers belonging to the office, to see the contractors? What does he do it for?

Mr. PUGSLEY. There is no suggestion in the evidence that I took the tender to see the contractors.

Mr. BARKER. I am suggesting that. The chief engineer cannot check the account sent in, he has not the price, there is not an entry in the department showing what that tender was. There is no letter, there is no contract. If the hon. gentleman had entered into a proper contract he would have had the terms there and the chief engineer would have been able to check the account. But the whole thing rested on that tender and the minister had that in St. John.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sorry my hon. friend did not hear my explanation. I stated that there was a question with regard to whether the department would properly pay to the contractors their tender price of 90 cents. I stated, and it appears also by the evidence that the chief engineer had felt that the price was somewhat higher than it ought to be. I intended to arrange for Mr. Scammell to visit the work. I took the tender, not in my pocket, as the hon. member for York says, I took it in my official dispatch box, where many other papers coming to me as minister which I have to look over, are always kept. The minister has to take many papers with him, from time to time to examine. I took it for the purpose of conferring with Mr. Scammell with regard to it, and the moment I got word from the chief engineer that he wanted it the record shows it was sent back to the deputy minister.

Mr. BARKER. I did not need that admission from the hon. gentleman, because it is here. That is just what occurred, they were trying to get the thing settled, these people were claiming extras, claiming for casting over and the chief engineer could not certify or settle the account. There was no document, that tender was the only thing in the department. That scrap of paper was the only thing the government had and the minister took it off to St. John. That is what I said and I do not think the minister has altered it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman made the statement that I took it to St. John to the office of the contractors, to show to the contractors. I say that statement is not worthy of my hon. friend in view of there not being a particle of evidence to support it.

Mr. BARKER. I admit that I am drawing an inference there. I did not suppose that the minister went to St. John to the head office of the dredging company. If the hon. gentleman says he did not intend to see Moore about it. I will accept his statement but until he does so I do not believe he went there except for the purpose of seeing these men.

Mr. PUGSLEY. All I can say is I have not the slightest recollection of seeing them on the subject.

Mr. BARKER. There are many things in my life which I do not recollect. The evidence continues:—

Q. He was at St. John?—A. Yes.
Q. And you asked him to quote you (that is reply back) the price of the tender, (for ordinary materials and for casting over?)—A. Yes.

The casting over was the disputed question.

Q. Both for ordinary materials and for casting over?—A. Yes.
Q. So that the progress estimate might be made out and paid?—A. Yes.
Q. Have you the minister's reply?—A. Yes. (reads).
St. John, N.B., October 16, 1908. Price materials Gaspereau river, 90 cents. Have mailed tender to deputy.

You will observe that the chief engineer asked particularly about the cost of the casting over. That is where the extra came in. There is no answer upon that part of the question. I should say that a minister who got an inquiry of that kind pointing out clearly to him that they wanted to know the price for the dredging and the price for the extras so claimed for casting over, should not be so careless as to reply, 90 cents, saying nothing about the casting over. That is one comment I would make. It would seem wise, when parliament has passed an Act requiring observance of certain regulations in such matters, the business should not be dealt with by a minister taking down, even in a hand bag, the papers of the department. The evidence continues:

Q. And in the department you have no record of that, but the minister had the tender with him down at St. John—A. Evidently.
Q. Now, you have already pointed out that the tender did not quote any price for casting over—A. No, sir.
Q. And the minister replied that the price was 90 cents?—A. Yes.

Why the chief engineer could not be blamed very much for paying 90 cents for the casting over as well as for the rest upon that reply. I would not like to accuse the minister of having sent that answer back so that it might be taken either way but it is certainly a most reckless reply on his part.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. member has just read from the evidence that the tender said nothing about the price for casting over. Therefore what could I say about what the price was to be. All I could do was to send the tender back to the officers of the department and allow the officers to work it out for themselves.

Mr. BARKER. All the chief engineer wanted was to have the tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. This was sent back to him.

Mr. BARKER. In addition to the 90 cents they were claiming for casting over, and he asked the question 'material and casting over.' The minister says nothing about the casting over, he says 90 cents.

Mr. EMMERSON. He sends the tender though.

Mr. BARKER. That was a most reckless reply for a business man to send by telegraph.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is it or is it not the case that the hon. gentleman has read from the evidence showing that the tender made no reference to and did not name any price for casting over? Is that not so?

Mr. BARKER. Certainly.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Then if that is so how can my hon. friend say that it was a reckless reply on my part that I made no reference to casting over when the tender itself that I forwarded to the deputy minister said nothing about casting over.

Mr. BARKER. When the chief engineer asked for the price of materials and of casting over, to send him the simple answer '90 cents for materials' was very

apt to mislead him; the matter should not have been left so that there was any question about it. It is a bit of careless work that no competent clerk would be guilty of.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Should I have fixed a price for casting over in my reply?

Mr. BARKER. You should have said there was nothing about casting over in it.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I mailed the tender at once

Mr. BARKER. On October 16, eight days before the election I find a letter from the minister to his deputy.

I return you tender of the Marine Dredging and Construction Company for work at Gaspereau river, &c. I understand that Mr. McCordock has reported that the price asked for Gaspereau is reasonable.

So that the minister was not merely in possession of the tender, but was interviewing the officers down there, and I suppose he argued very strongly with Mr. McCordock against allowing that extra. I presume that he would consider that his duty. However, we do not see any evidence of it, and he takes care to inform the department he understands that Mr. McCordock is in favour of it. Then, here comes the point of this letter, written on the 16th of October, when the work was just about finished for the season:—

I shall be glad if you will confer with the chief engineer and have the necessary recommendation to council prepared.

There we begin to see a new feature. It was quite clear by this time that there was some trouble about extras and other things, and that the Auditor General was looming up before the eye of the minister. When he started on this work, there was no necessity for an order in council; but when there came to be a dispute about extras, and the 90 cents got up nearly to a dollar, naturally the minister thought, 'this will go before that awful man the Auditor General,' and visions of the Auditor General directed attention to the necessity of getting up an application to the Governor in Council to cover up this thing; and, here the great farce and humbug of the whole thing comes in. You must remember that the hon. member for Westmorland argued that this was an urgent thing that the minister had a right to do himself, and that there was no question of illegality about it. The whole question we raise is one of legality, and now the minister admits all that we contend, that that work ought never to have been given out until all the tenders and every paper relating to it had been laid before the Governor in Council. Here is what was now prepared for the Governor in Council:

Mr. BARKER.

Ottawa Nov. 14, 1908.

To His Excellency the Governor in Council:

The undersigned has the honour to recommend that authority be given to accept the tender of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, of St. John, N.B., to perform dredging in the Gaspereau river, in the province of New Brunswick, at the price of 90 cents per yard, scow measurement, the above bid being the only one received in answer to public advertisement the tenderers have furnished an accepted bank cheque for $6,000 as a security for the fulfilment of their dredging contracts in the said province. The expenditure in connection with this dredging is properly chargeable to the appropriation of $650,000. For dredging in the maritime provinces granted by parliament at its last session.

The chief engineer of the Department of Public Works has reported that the price above quoted is fair and reasonable.

WILLIAM PUGSLEY,
Minister of Public Works.

On November 14, 1908, after the work is all done, he gravely asks His Excellency the Governor General to consent to the acceptance of the tender. Most marvellous thing, this—the tender was accepted and the work put into the hands of these men before the tenders were opened; and months afterwards, when they were trying to settle the accounts for payment, he gravely and solemnly makes this request. Two resident engineers, one in 1903 and the other in 1907, had examined the work to see what it would cost if the government proposed to go on with the work, and they both valued it at 20 cents; and here in 1908 the minister solemnly signs a document recommending the acceptance of a tender at 90 cents; and there is no one to tell His Excellency the astounding fact, that the minister had arranged to accept the tender of these people before the time for putting in tenders had elapsed. He says further:

The tenderers have furnished an accepted bank cheque for $6,000 as security for the due fulfilment of their dredging contracts in the said province.

Was that true? On the 14th of November, no contract having been made, he makes that statement.

The expenditure in connection with this dredging is properly chargeable to the appropriation of $650,000 for dredging in the maritime provinces granted by parliament at its last session. The chief engineer of the Department of Public Works has reported that the price above quoted is fair and reasonable.

I have already read what the chief engineer said. He said that when he saw that tender he thought that it was considerably higher than ought to be paid, but he approved of it because somebody had told him that there were circumstances not disclosed to make it favourable. Well, we have a little more. This recommendation

of the hon. Minister of Public Works is laid before a committee of the Privy Council and is approved by His Excellency the Governor General on the 20th of November, 1908. This is the recommendation that His Excellency approved:

The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Minister of Public Works, advise that authority be given to accept the tender of the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company of St. John, New Brunswick, to perform dredging in the Gaspereau river, in the province of New Brunswick at the price of 90c. per cubic yard, scow measurement, the above bid being the only one received in answer to public advertisement. The tenderers have furnished an acceptsd bank cheque for $6,000 as security for the due fulfilment of their dredging contracts in the said province. The expenditure in connection with this dredging is properly chargeable to the appropriation of $650,000 for dredging for the maritime provinces granted by parliament at its last session. The chief engineer of the Department of Public Worke has reported that the price above quoted is fair and reasonable.

And here is the most precious bit in the whole lot:

Such contract to be for work done up to the close of the calendar year.

Clearly conveying to the Governor General that he was approving the acceptance of a tender for work that was yet to be done between October and the 31st of December. That was a deliberate taking-in of His Excellency, a deliberate and wilful deception. I wonder what he thinks of his ministers when he is made to approve a document of that kind. One can hardly believe it possible, and yet there is the document. After the work had been proceeded with from July to the middle of November, they go to His Excellency to get his approval of a contract to be entered into to perform the work between then and the end of the year, and he is induced to approve that.

What can His Excellency think of the Minister of Public Works? Can he place reliance in that minister? And it is not only the Minister of Public Works, but also his colleagues, for they must have known it; they could not avoid knowing that that work had already been done and without authority. If that is not the case, then, the Minister of Public Works must have deceived not only His Excellency, but his own colleagues. Surely, he would not betray his colleagues in that recommendation. They must have winked at the whole thing in order to get the money—that was the essential.

Mr. LOGGIE. I understood the hon. gentleman (Mr. Barker) to say that the work was commenced in July. Where is the evidence to be found of that?

Mr. BARKER. I am quite willing to be corrected; it was laid out on the 4th of August.

Mr. LOGGIE. Where is the evidence that it was commenced on the 4th of August?

Mr. BARKER. The evidence shows that the order to lay out the work was on the 4th of August. They must have started about that time, and the work proceeded in August, September and October.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Mr. McCordock or Mr. Scammell said it commenced on the 16th of August.

Mr. LOGGIE. No, the 17th of August.

Mr. BARKER. There is no question about the main facts. On the 4th of August, Mr. Stead got authority to lay out the work for Mr. Moore, and dredging must have begun about that time. He said that he would begin on the Monday following, and it could not be many days after that when he did. I do not care whether it was on the 4th or the 14th. In October there were claims for $34,000. And on the 20th November, though no contract whatever had been signed for this work beyond taking the man's tender, they asked the Governor General to authorize the contract, and they informed the Governor General that the tenderer had put in a cheque for $6,000 to secure the performance of the work already done.

Now, I said that I proposed to confine my remarks practically to this testimony. And on that testimony I would say that the minister deliberately and wilfully evaded the statute governing this department. I repeat that, and I say that the conduct of which he has been convicted on this evidence is as bad as the conduct of those bankers who are now serving time in the penitentiary.

Mr. ALEX. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I listened with a good deal of interest to the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson), who held a brief for his colleague, the Minister of Public Works. And he followed the usual tactics—'No case; abuse the plaintiff's attorney.' There were the usual charges of exaggeration and insinuation. But it appeared to me, upon an attentive hearing of what has been said by both sides, that the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) was very clear, very distinct and very direct in his charges. He framed an indictment covering a direct charge of maladministration, and every count in that indictment was in unmistakeable Anglo-Saxon. The parties against whom these charges were directed are the Minister of Public Works and his political friends from the province of New Brunswick. The minister is charged with being

at least an accessory before the fact in that he enabled these political friends of his—and social friends also; I believe they were called cronies—to make money from the public treasury in a way which the statutes forbid. It was not an evasion of the statute which required works of this kind to be let on tender, but it was a direct violation of that statute. The statute says that it must be by tender. The minister (Mr. Pugsley) himself tries to get away from that and to say that this case comes within the exceptance that exceptions are allowed. He says this was a case of urgency and so comes within the exceptions. If that were the case, why in Heaven's name did he advertise for tenders? No doubt after he had determined to give these men that work to do his attention was called to the fact that work of this nature must be given by tender. Was this a case of emergency? We are told by the counsel for the Minister of Public Works that this matter was brought before the late Hon. Mr. Tarte when he was Minister of Public Works and before some of his successors. Was it any more a case of urgency in 1908 than it had been when Mr. Tarte and his successors were in office?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Will the hon. gentleman (Mr. Haggart, Winnipeg) allow me to correct him? I certainly did not intend that the case should be put under the subsection which provides in cases of emergency the work may be given without calling for tenders. What I claim is that, pending the calling for tenders, when work to be done in the meantime was comparatively small, when there was every reason to anticipate that it would not amount to $5,000—it would not amount to over $2,000 or $3,000—it would be perfectly competent for the minister to let the work temporarily if he thinks it in the public interest to do so, on condition that when the tenders come in the person who performs the work shall accept for it the price at which the contract may be awarded to the lowest tenderer.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). The case of works involving small expenditure is another exception, and I believe now that the minister brings it under that head.

Mr. PUGSLEY. The minister may let a work under $5,000.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). But this was for more than $5,000, it was for an indefinite amount.

Mr. PUGSLEY. But in the meantime it could not possibly amount to $5,000.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). What, the whole?

Mr. PUGSLEY. No, but between the time when the company should go to work and the due-date of the tender. It could not amount to anything like $5,000.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). I think I can show the minister that he did not know what it did amount to and that he placed himself in the peculiar position where he had no control over the amount.

What are the facts? The minister learned that one Mr. Moore had bought a dredge and followed him up and tried to get him, on the way down to the Bay of Fundy, ascertain if he could do that work.

Now it is arranged subsequently, I think it is by verbal understanding between the minister and Mr. Moore, although it was afterwards reduced to writing, whether by correspondence or by special document I do not know, but the arrangement was that the work done should be paid for on terms, or at the prices that should be mentioned in the lowest tender. Now let us see how many dredge owners we have in this country looking for jobs of that kind. We have the Loggie firm down east; we hear of the McAvity firm down east; we have heard occasionally of the firm up in the west of Lake Superior, in which the hon. member for Port Arthur is supposed to take an interest. But are there half a dozen firms, owners of dredges, in this country looking for work of that kind? Then if that is the case—and I believe all these firms are friends of the government, all of these dredge owners that are doing government contracts are active friends of the government—all that was necessary for Mr. Moore to do was to drop a note and convey an intimation to some of those firms saying: I am going to do this work, and giving the particulars. There would be no other tender but his own, and it ought to be known by the minister, and was known by Mr. Moore at the time, that such was the fact. Mr. Moore tendered alone, and he fixed his own price at the exorbitant figure of 90 cents per cubic yard. That I think is a correct statement of the case. Now the minister and his department were committed in other ways. When you want work done by tender you must offer some data to the proposed tenderer. Were there any plans, any specifications, any surveys made, any soundings, any measurements made? We are told that an engineer, some six years ago, had got some data together. That information was either correct or incorrect, it was either good or it was valueless. It is true that the minister had had nothing before that time. But he hurriedly makes that arrangement, this verbal arrangement, with this man Moore. He was to go on with the work, we will fix the price. Yes, but it is Mr. Moore who will fix the price. As to the engineers, there is nothing from them. Now Sir, if any work such as that was done by any city council, or town council, or municipal council, or even a village council, and if the proceedings were taken there that were taken here, and the work done there as it was done here, the

manager or engineer of that council would not hold his job very long. I submit that this is an amendment which ought to commend itself to the good sense of this House, and I shall be glad to support it. Look at the counsel for the Minister of Public Works, the gentlemen sitting around him, who are to constitute the jury who is to try this case They remind me of another case which was tried in another court A man was indicted for larceny, the charge was stealing a load of hams. The jury was sworn, the prisoner had no counsel, and a lawyer was assigned to him by the judge. This lawyer, on consultation with the prisoner, advised him to plead guilty. He had not the ghost of a defence. The case was tried, and the evidence was conclusive. The lawyer had hardly a pin to hang the shred of an argument upon. The judge directed conviction. But very much to the astonishment of every one in court, the jury found the prisoner not guilty. Leaving the court with his new found client, the lawyer says to him: How do you account for that remarkable verdict? Why, says the man, it is the simplest thing in the world, every one of the jury had a ham.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). I cannot affect even to be surprised that no one can be found to come to the rescue of the Minister of Public Works after the debate has proceeded to this hour. The hon. member for the county affected did rise in his place and endeavoured to justify the conduct of the minister. If it could be said that a loud voice, and a profusion of gestures, and a violent demeanor constitute the elements of argument, then the hon. member for Westmorland [Mr. Emmerson] certainly is a prince at debate. The Minister of Public Works himself emulated his example, but to my mind, he did not exercise even his usual skill in deflecting the argument from the actual issue at stake. One would listen to both these hon. gentlemen and be quite surprised to find that the motion before the Chair was a censure of the Minister of Public Works, and his department on the ground that the evidence before the Public Accounts Committee reveals a wasteful and illegal expenditure of public money in improvements on the Gaspereau river.

Now, what is the situation? First of all, let me give the House a few dates, and a review of the dates will make it appear that there is a case that can with difficulty be explained by any one, however ingenious. On the 3rd of July, 1908, it developed in the Department of Public Works that certain dredging in the Gaspereau river was urgently needed, and that there would be immediate public peril if it was not undertaken at once. A note was sent by the deputy of the department to the chief engineer accordingly, asking him to institute an investigation as to the cost and extent of the work required. Notwithstanding that that note was sent then, it took the department between the 3rd and 16th of the month to take the next step, notwithstanding the fact that this public work was so desperately urgent as it was claimed to be at the time. On the 16th another note was sent, asking that the engineer report, and a wire followed it to Gaspereau asking Mr. Geoffrey Stead to report on the 16th of July. Now nothing further is done until the report comes in on the 20th, and that report states that it is very urgent indeed that dredging to the extent of so many cubic yards be done in order to get through a sandbar at the mouth of the Gaspereau river. On the 28th the advertisement for tenders goes out, so that between the 3rd when the urgency developed and the date the advertisement went out, 25 days had elapsed. Advertisements for tenders go out on the 28th, and three days after a wire goes from Mr. Geoffrey Stead that the friends of the Minister of Public Works are right at the point with their dredge, and ready to go to work next day; and not only that they are ready to go to work, but the wire actually states that they expect to go to work.

The minister has not explained to the House what built that expectation in the mind of Mr. John E. Moore. He expected to get the contract the following day, and he could never have seen the advertisement for tenders published. Then, on the 4th of August, four days afterwards, the contract was actually let and this country bound to the contract. The minister has endeavoured to lead the House to understand that all they were authorized to do was to start until tenders were received. The actual fact of the case is set out in the report of his own engineer who says that the contract had been let to them. They had been authorized to do all the work that was intended to be done, namely, all the work required, dredging through the sandbar to the river. They were authorized, the price to be fixed in a certain way, the price to be fixed on the basis of the lowest tender to be received from amongst those already advertised for. This was a perfectly fixed contract to which the minister committed this country and the words of the resolution state that the minister so committed this country illegally to it. The minister tries to get out from under that by representing that the work was urgent. I stand to say, and the minister can not contradict me—he would not in a court of law—that, no matter how urgent that work, the contract that was let was absolutely illegal. The Public Works Act does state that in case of urgency work may be done without tender. That is quite true, but the same

statute says that if tenders are called for then the contract shall be let in accordance with those tenders, and a recommendation to council shall follow the receipt of the tenders. The Act expressly forbids the letting of the contract prior to the receipt of the tender. The letting of this tender can not come under the provision of the Act relating to urgent public works.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does my hon. friend take the ground, that, under the statute which authorizes the minister to let a contract, apart altogether from the question of urgency, to an amount not exceeding $5,000, the minister could not, pending the date of the receipt of tenders, if he thought it in the public interests to do so, let a man go to work temporarily on the condition, that, having worked for a few days temporarily for a period extending over a week or ten days he would accept in payment for it the price of the lowest tender? Does the hon. gentleman say that the minister could not do that under the statute?

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister's question is so prolix that I am not certain that I apprehend it. My exposition of the statute will be quite plain to the minister. He certainly could let a contract under $5,000 irrespective of the question of urgency. There is no question about that, but the minister can hardly contend that in letting this contract as it was so let, by the statement of his chief engineer to Mr. Geoffrey Stead on the 4th of August, he was letting a contract under $5,000. Mr. Geoffrey Stead had reported on the character and extent of the work that was urgent, and that was the amount of work that was let according to the letter of the 4th of August.

Mr. PUGSLEY. My hon. friend is a good lawyer, an excellent lawyer, no doubt better than I am, but I would like to know whether, if I am right in my contention that the work was only given to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company temporarily until the date of the receipt of tenders, and that would be under $5,000—as a matter of fact it could not have been over a couple of thousand dollars at the outside—the hon. gentleman says that the minister acted illegally under the statute in giving a contract to do that temporary work on these terms?

Mr. MEIGHEN. I say that the premises that the minister lays down are not true.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Suppose they are true.

Mr. MEIGHEN. There is absolutely nothing in the course of the contract to show that it was only temporary work. I will show the minister from the evidence that there was no temporary letting of a contract, that that word was imported into the discussion simply to deflect the argument. How could there be a temporary letting of the contract in view of this letter seen on page 241 of the evidence?

August 4, 1908.

The work of dredging in the Gaspereau river has been given to the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company, of St. John, N.B., providing——

And the only provision is that they accept for this work the lowest price that in future may be decided by tender.

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is for work done in the meantime.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does that say part of the work, does that say work done until tenders are received?

Mr. PUGSLEY. If you are going to let a contract what is the point of calling for tenders? That would be simply a farce if you are doing the whole work.

Mr. LENNOX. So it was a farce.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It was not a farce.

Mr. LOGGIE. Will the hon. gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Some hon. MEMBERS. Louder, louder.

Mr. LOGGIE. Suppose the lowest tender would have been 20 cents a yard, would the Maritime Dredging Company have been obliged to continue the work when they had received notice that the department would only pay 20 cents per cubic yard?

Mr. MEIGHEN. At law they certainly would have been obliged to, but in practice certainly the minister never would have made them. Mr. Stead was asked by telegram on the 15th July:

Kindly let me know as soon as possible just what quantity of urgent dredging there is at Gaspereau river, N.B. It is represented all that requires to be done at present is removal of bar at mouth. Please say how much that will be.

That is the telegram to Mr. Stead and Mr. Stead reports the amount as 48,000 cubic yards. Then follows a telegram to Mr. Stead stating that the work has been let. How can the ingenuity of mortals argue into that that only a small part of the work had been let until possibly they would be ousted by a lower tenderer on the 14th August? That is imported into the debate by the Minister of Public Works with a skill in which he is practised and for an object that he surely conceives to be utterly aside from the issue. So that, the contract is let. Then, you are to take the lowest tender and, under the circumstances pictured by the minister himself,

he must have been aware that there could not be any other tender. The men are put on the work, they are right in the river and there is no other dredge in sight. Any person who might have a dredge would only have ten days to look it over.. If the minister figures up the dates he will find that is correct, and the minister has painted this as being an isolated spot out of the dredging zone. So, here are men, friends of the minister, reputed and known throughout the maritime provinces, to be close to him, politically, socially and in every other way, actually at work in that isolated place doing the job, ready to tell anybody that comes that they have the work, away out of the dredging zone and certainly without the danger zone. Under these circumstances does the minister expect that anybody else is going to tender? The minister tells us that he made that arrangement and there is no one else in the world who could have made it. He made the arrangement illegally with that company to go on and do the work, knowing that tenders should have been called for and were called for. So that, the first part of the amendment is established without the possibility of excuse that the contract was illegally awarded.

Now, what is the result of it all? Before I go on with that let me proceed with the dates that I was going to give. The contract is awarded and these men are put to work on the 4th of August. On the 14th tenders are to be received and, as everybody would expect, only one came in.

Whether that ever got to the department or not there is no evidence to be found on the record. The tender came in on the 14th of August and Mr. McCordock who is the officer in New Brunswick to oversee such work is only notified on the 29th of September, when the work has been in progress for six weeks. In the meantime they had notified the resident engineer of the province of Nova Scotia, but all they notified him to do was to tell the company that the contract was theirs. Then, Mr. McCordock, whose duty it is to supervise these works in New Brunswick, on being notified, sets to work to find where the Gaspereau river is. It is remarkable that in the case of this work of such tremendous urgency that unless it be proceeded with at once disaster would overtake the Dominion, the river where the work is to be done is not only utterly unknown to the supervisor of dredging of the province, but to the resident engineers of the government at St. John, both of whom inform Mr. McCordock that they do not know where the Gaspereau river is. The minister tells us that the work was so important that it had been urged on the department for 8 years by the member for the county, and yet no report had ever been asked for as to whether there was any traffic to warrant the expenditure that would be required. To this hour the department is absolutely without a report to show that there was any prospect of traffic over that river which would warrant the expenditure of this large sum of public money. True they have two reports to show what the cost would be, but these reports do not seem to be much good because according to the minister they are 500 per cent astray in the estimate. After Mr. McCordock found out where the river was he made a report on the 8th October, and in the meantime he had seen the Minister of Public Works, and Mr. Scammell had seen the Minister of Public Works, and the minister had arranged that Mr. Scammell should make a special report on the Gaspereau river. The fact that these gentlemen had seen the minister is clear from several statements in the letters, but if for no reason it is quite clear from the fact that in their letters after that they always used the words 'fair and reasonable' which constitute a favourite expression from the lips of the minister. The minister is at the city of St. John and from St. John he wires to his officer at Ottawa to wire back to St. John to tell Mr. Scammell to go and make the report as arranged. That is to say, after the price is finally fixed, this gentleman is asked to make a report as to certain difficulties. Now, this difficulty matter is peculiar. The minister has let the contract and has committed the country to the payment of 90 cents a yard for the work. On the 14th of August the lowest tender is in and the price is then fixed at 90 cents a yard once and for all, and the people of Canada have to pay for it. But the minister knew, as everbody down there knew, that the price was exorbitant, and that something would have to be done to explain it before the Auditor General and the Public Accounts Committee, and so he sets to work to bolster up this exorbitant price. How he did it is evident from the telegram of his chief engineer, sent to Mr. Scammell on the 5th of October, in which he says that certain difficulties had arisen. What these difficulties were nobody knows yet. The price had been determined on then, and the Maritime Dredging Company could have sued for it, and what these difficulties were or what they had to do with the contract we are at a loss to understand. We do know that the Minister of Public Works knew that the price was exorbitant and that he had to bring in something to bolster it up, and so he represents to his engineer that there are certain difficulties and that he should send someone out to report so that there would be evidence before the Public Accounts Committee as to what a terrible struggle these men had to carry on their

contract. Mr. Scammell and Mr. McCordock go out on the work, and the minister is in St. John at the same time, and between the three of them they get two reports sent in that the price is fair and reasonable. And the minister thinks he is justified before parliament and the country for having entered into an illegal contract if he is able to produce a report of a couple of his subordinates, saying that the price is fair and reasonable. If that is so what is the good of the statute; what is the use of asking for tenders on any contract? We might just as well have the statute read that any payment whatever may be made by the Department of Public Works providing two subordinate officers are ready to certify that it is fair and reasonable. What the Department of Public Works should have done was to ascertain in the first place by reliable engineers what the work would cost, what would be a fair amount to charge for it, and govern itself in accepting the tender by the report of these reliable engineers. The Minister of Public Works tries to make the House believe they had only one report, but as a matter of fact they had two reports, namely the report of Mr. Day in 1903, and the report of Mr. Stead in 1907, and each fixing the cost at 20 cents. The Minister of Public Works says that the dredge was exposed in this work, that it was not covered by a mountain or hidden behind rocks or something of that sort, and that the difficulties were appalling and justified the price of 90 cents a yard. Well, was not every physical and geographical difficulty on the Gaspereau river just the same at the time the engineers reported that the price should be 20 cents a yard as when the work was given out at 90 cents a yard. Worse than that; the minister says the report only meant that it would cost the government 20 cents a yard if they did the work themselves, and while the resolution says that the evidence shows the money was illegally and fraudulently paid out, the minister endeavours to defend himself by reading into the engineer's report something not contained in it.

There is nothing whatever to show that the engineer reported that if the government were to do it, and take no account of interest on capital or operating expenses or wear and tear, it would only cost them 20 cents. In the first place there is nothing to show that, and in the next place if the engineer reported on that basis, the government was not justified in advertising for tenders at all, because he should have had a report on the basis on which tenders were to be called for. That is the only report that would be of value to him, and that is the report he was bound to have if he had done his duty in the department. But where does the minister stand in this regard? Does he say he had an engineer who reported 20 cents as the price if it had been done by a government dredge, and took no account of these changes? If he did not take account of that what did he take account of, what did the 20 cents include? I can conceive of nothing which the country would be out except interest on capital, operating expenses, and wear and tear. I state this to the minister that in the minister's estimates, in the reports of his engineers as to what it cost the country, they do include interest on capital, wear and tear and operating expenses. Does the minister deny that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Then we will take the minister's own statement. Last spring he gave an estimate to this House as to what it cost government dredges per day. He said it cost, including operating expenses, interest on capital and reasonable wear and tear——

Mr. PUGSLEY. Is the hon. gentleman speaking of the arrangement with regard to the dredge 'International' with Messrs. Dussault at Quebec?

Mr. MEIGHEN. It makes no difference what the dredge is.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It does, my hon. friend ought to answer.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister stated that in estimating the cost the government took into account wear and tear, operating expenses and interest on capital.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I was not speaking of the cost of the government dredges, but of a special arrangement which had been made between the department and Messrs. Dussault for the hiring of the dredge 'International,' and stated that we had fixed the rent at a sufficient amount per day to cover all these items, and keep the government absolutely clear in the matter, and if my hon. friend will reflect he will see that is what I was dealing with.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I do not know what dredge he was dealing with——

Mr. PUGSLEY. That is what it was, an entirely different proposition.

Mr. MEIGHEN—nor do I care. The minister stated that in estimating what it cost the government to operate a dredge, they included all these.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I entirely deny that. I do not know the record to which my hon. friend refers, but I shall be extremely surprised if it bears that construction.

Mr. MEIGHEN. At page 4780 of 'Hansard,' 1910, the minister gave an estimate of $91 a day, and stated that that

estimate included wages, operating expenses, interest on capital, and wear and tear.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Quite so, for the dredge 'International.'

Mr. MEIGHEN. Certainly, and does he say that for one dredge the government estimates cost per day on one basis, and for another dredge on another basis?

Mr. PUGSLEY. In that particular case we were making a special arrangement to lease the dredge 'International' to Messrs. Dussault and Company, and we fixed the amount sufficiently large to cover all the items to which my hon. friend refers. But that is not at all the same as the operating expenses on a dredge which are set forth in the Auditor General's report. That was the special case of the dredge 'International.'

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister surely does not think he has convinced anyone that he has answered the question. The minister there states that his department in ascertaining what the running of a dredge cost per day included all these items. If they included that in one case, common sense would indicate that they included it in others. They should include everything in each case, and the fact is that they did because if they did not include those items what could they include? The $91 includes interest on capital, wear and tear, wages and operating expenses. That shows that Mr. Stead's estimate was about correct, that Mr. Day's estimate was about correct, because according to the report of Mr. McCordock, if the Maritime Dredging Company had got 20 cents per cubic yard instead of 90 cents, they would still have made a profit of about $18 per day. But on the basis of 90 cents per yard, they got an average per day of $536.40. They could have taken the $91 a day off and still have had a profit of $445.40 per day, so that the minister's statement in this House on March 4 last, clearly goes to show that the estimates made by these men were conservative and fair, and would have done justice between the Maritime Dredging and Construction Company and the government. They would have made a fair and reasonable profit even on the basis of the cost per day of the dredge 'International,' and yet in the face of that, because the dredge was out in the water, and was not sheltered by a mountain or rock the minister thinks they should be paid 70 cents more, or four and a half times the figures.

What further are the facts? On the 16th of October they found at Ottawa that these people were demanding money, and they did not know what to pay them. The Deputy Minister of Public Works informs Mr. Lafleur that the minister has the tender down in St. John so they wire the minister on October 16 to be good enough to let them know what the price is, and the minister advises back that the price is 90 cents per cubic yard. Then, on October 29 they quit working, and on October 26 Mr. Stead sends a letter to John E. Moore, telling him he has been reporting right along on the work, sending in the reports and notwithstanding that up to that hour, he did not know what the price was, in so far as the evidence goes and it appears to be complete.

Mr. PUGSLEY. It says sending in the reports of quantities, but not of cost.

Mr. MEIGHEN. He does not say what they are; he simply says he is sending in the reports. The minister himself said he certified to the price.

Mr. PUGSLEY. Not at that time.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The minister will find that at page 256 of the evidence. Here is the way it reads:

> In reply to your letter of the 23rd inst., I have been sending the reports of dredging at Port Elgin to Ottawa each week, but several have lately been returned to me through a misunderstanding of the reports. I wrote explaining the matter and received a telegram on Saturday asking for the returned reports, which I at once forwarded.

Now, does the minister feel that he was justified in interrupting me to read into that letter something that it certainly does not contain?

Mr. PUGSLEY. Does not the hon. gentleman see that it must be reports of quantities and not of prices?

Mr. MEIGHEN. If the department were properly run, it might have been. But an engineer who will certify that 90 cents is fair and reasonable after reporting the value of the work at 20 cents would scarcely be above reporting that the price was right, though he did not know what the price was. Do not forget that this was a work of tremendous urgency, that unless it were done something terrible was going to happen to the hon. member for Westmorland, and he would be in a bad position in his county. In the light of this urgency, let us reflect for a moment on the position of the hon. member for Westmorland. He tells the House that he had made a promise to his constituents, and that unless this work was done that promise would be violated, and he says that he had to see that it was done because he wanted to go back to his constituency as a man who had kept his promise. Therefore, his promise to his constituents must have been that he would

see that that money was spent on the Gaspereau river. Now, what a state of affairs it is in which an hon. member for a county can make an absolute pledge to his constituents, though he has no authority, no official status, no direct or legal power, that money will actually be spent. Does it mean that the hon. member for Westmorland was in possession of facts that he might reveal unless this were carried out? I venture to say that no member of the House of Commons who had not some bludgeon to hold over the head of the minister would make such a promise to his constituents as the hon. member for Westmorland made. But he says: 'The work was so urgent that I was justified in pledging the government and pledging myself.' Was it so urgent? On the 24th of October, two days before the election they stopped the work. They started the work in August; they could have started it in May; and they quit it two days before the election, and Mr. Stead in his report of the 9th of March following, said it was not worth a dollar. So that up to the election nothing was done that was of any value to the constituency of Westmorland except that the money was spent among some of the people there. Not only that, but in the next year, May passed by in which they might have done work. June, July, August and September went by, and they did not move a foot of earth until the month of October, 1909,. So that $33,969 was sunk and the country got absolutely nothing for it. Not one iota of value had been added to the traffic facilities of the Gaspereau river. They allowed the whole summer of 1909 to go by without doing anything to make the work of any value; but some time in October, we do not know the date, the government put a dredge on and kept it on for nearly two weeks, and took it away on the 28th of October; and from that time to this hour they have left the work just in the shape in which it was. 1,650 feet had been taken out, and 500 feet more were taken out in October, 1909, and the report says that they are not through the bar yet.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am sure that the hon. member is wrong. I am sure that we had the government dredge working there practically all through the summer season of 1910.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Does that appear anywhere?

Mr. PUGSLEY. It appears in the accounts of the Department of Public Works. The report for the year ending the 31st of March, 1911, has not yet been published; but we kept the government dredge, the 'George Mackenzie,' at work all through last season.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The hon. member for Westmorland made the statement that nothing had been done since October, 1909, but that something is being done now. Something had been done for two weeks in 1909, but he stated that they were not through the bar then.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I happen to know that in the year 1910 the dredge got away up the river pretty close to the railway bridge.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The Minister of Public Works, on the 4th of August, lets a contract for a work that involves an expenditure of $33,000, has the tenders come in on the 14th of August, has the work completed on the 24th of October, has the contract signed on the 7th of November, and after all that is done recommends to Council that the tender be accepted on the 17th of November, and the Governor in Council on the 20th of November authorizes the signing of a contract that had been signed two weeks before, for a work that had been ended a monther before. And he justifies that on the urgency of the work; and yet it was left in 1908 in a state in which it was no good, and was not resumed until October, 1909; and now he undertakes to say, in the face of the statement of the hon. member for Westmorland that they have been doing something this summer.

I do not doubt the statement of the hon. member for Westmorland, that they are geting busy now. The election is close at hand, and I have no doubt that the hon. member is still committed to his constituents and has told his constituents that he can make the Minister of Public Works do this; and if the minister does not do it something serious is going to happen. That is the position we are in today. The hon. member for Westmorland spoke for about an hour and a quarter. The charge against the government is that this contract is let in an illegal and highly improper way and that far too much money was spent on the work. And the member for Westmorland thinks he has created a defence when he tells us that there are quite a lot of lobsters to flow over it when it is done and that they raise so many steers in that county every year. He seems to have taken example by the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) who told us, in trying to defend that notorious and colossal fraud, the Newmarket canal, that a certain number of cattle were raised every year in the county of York, Ontario.

Now the minister has made certain statements with reference to the address of the hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) I will not vie with the minister or with the hon. member for Westmorland in the use of vituperation or the hurling of epithets. I have never been taught to believe that an

argument is met in that way. I can hardly conceive that the hon. member for Westmoreland feels proud of himself in that, after spending an hour and a quarter in hurling names at the hon. member for York, because, as he stated, that hon. gentleman had made use of low insinuations, yet, when repeatedly challenged he did not state one insinuation that that hon. gentleman had made. Nor could the Minister of Public Works, when challenged name an insinuation that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) had made. If there ever was a speech made in this House, if there ever was an attack made that was utterly void of insinuation, that was direct, plain and open in every sense, it was that of the hon. member for York to-day. The hon. member takes the sworn evidence and says that that evidence shows fraud and illegality, and he proves it. He says that Mr. John E. Moore and McAvity are two close political associates of the hon. Minister of Public Works. He does not insinuate that they are; he states that they are; and the minister knows it and does not deny it. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Crocket) says that these men got a contract illegally, hurriedly, under most suspicious circumstances, at prices four and a half times what his engineers stated it should be let at. And he says that they took the money—whether the same bills or not does not matter—and in association with the Minister of Public Works bought the St. John 'Telegraph' and made it the Liberal organ, instead of a Conservative supporter and so helped him to win the province of New Brunswick. These statements are plain and they are proved and no one denies them.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I deny them.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Which one does the minister deny?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I deny the three or four assertions that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Meighen) has just made.

Mr. CROCKET. I have never understood the minister to deny that he was associated with Mr. Moore or Mr. McAvity in a financial way in the purchase of the St. John 'Telegraph' and 'Times.' I ask him now if he denies that?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I am replying to the statement of the hon. member (Mr. Meighen) who has just been speaking. He makes three assertions. One was that the contract was let illegally. The second was that it was let at four times its value——

Mr. CROCKET. I ask the hon. min——

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member for Portage la Prairie (Mr. Meighen) has the floor.

Mr. PUGSLEY. And I am answering with the consent of the hon. member for Portage la Prairie——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. PUGSLEY. If the hon. gentleman does not consent, I will not speak.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I ask the minister to tell me the statement of facts I made that is not correct?

Mr. PUGSLEY. The hon. gentleman made the statement that the contract had been illegally let that it had been let for four times its value and that the money was used for the purchase of the 'Telegraph' in association with the Minister of Public Works. I say there is no foundation for these statements. And the reason I rose is that the hon. gentleman said that nobody denied that these statements were correct: I deny them absolutely.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I made four statements, and I stand here until I show every one of them to have been correct. The first is not a statement of fact, but is a conclusion of law—that the contract was illegally let. And who will say that a contract is not illegally let which is let after tenders are called for and before the tenders are received? Does the minister say that that is authorized by the Public Works Act?

Mr. PUGSLEY. What was done in this case is authorized by the Public Works Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I say, if it is authorized by the Public Works Act, then we might as well burn that statute.

Mr. PUGSLEY. I complained that the hon. gentleman said that nobody denied it. I say I deny it.

Mr. MEIGHEN. If I stated that the Minister of Public Works would not deny it I did it without appreciation of his character. I made the statement that these men were awarded this contract in that hurried, illegal and suspicious way at prices four and a half times what two of his engineers estimated it should be let at. The evidence absolutely proves that, and there is no contradiction. It is true that the minister got two men afterwards to come and find the difficulties—to find that the wind was blowing, to find that they had to fetch water over I forget how many yards in order to have water to drink, and that they had to fetch coal over a similar distance. But that had nothing on earth to do with the cost or with the fixing of the price, for the price was fixed no matter how far they had to bring the coal, and everybody knows that a dredge, except in a sheltered harbour is exposed to the wind; we do not expect to carry on dredging by

the fireside. It is true, the minister raised the spectre of these difficulties and was able, by the power he wields to bring two men who would testify on that subject. But these statements are not backed up, and they are made under circumstances that reflect no credit on the department. I say these men were given this work at four and a half times what it was estimated it should cost, and that they bought the St. John 'Telegraph' and bought it in association with the Minister of Public Works. I do not say that they took the same identical bills to make this purchase. I do not know that my case would be particularly stronger if I did. The fact that they got the money and bought the St. John 'Telegraph' contemporaneously is a fact practically undenied. And the minister was associated with them in the purchase and reaped the result. And still the minister ventures to say that all this is covered up, that the multitude of sins is wiped away simply, by the fact that by this corrupt purchase of newspapers in city and county of So. John. He knows New Brunswick he was able to carry the the appeal he made to the people of St. John city; that he would as soon be defeated himself as have his colleague Mr. Pender defeated, and that he would not take it as vindication unless Mr. Pender were elected. And he knows that St. John turned down his appeal and elected the hon. member for St. John (Mr. Daniel). The patent undenied facts, the mere recital of the dates, makes the case that appeals to the people of the country.

I state here that the minister is in no better position, whether that contract was technically legal or illegal. I say without question that in my opinion it was illegal. I cannot see how anybody can conscientiously say it was not. But if it was not illegal, then we might just as well burn the Public Works Act, because it leaves the Minister of Public Works absolutely free to do just as he chooses under all circumstances. An urgent public work, he says, excuses the whole thing. Why is it urgent? Because, he says, this was the dredging season. The dredging season started two months before. If a public work is urgent because it is the dredging season, then every dredging work in this country is always urgent, because it can only be done in the dredging season. So I repeat, that unless the Minister of Public Works admits the illegality of this Act, he might just as well burn the Public Works Act out and out, because it puts no restraint upon him whatever.

Now, the Minister of Public Works devoted a part of his time to some other reflections. He has a very strange idea. We are here with the evidence before us, and with the resolution which says that the evidence bears out certain facts and conclusions. The hon. member for York (Mr. Crocket) supports that resolution on the evidence. The Minister of Public Works offers something else. I ask him on what authority he offers it, and he says on his own. Then he goes on in reply, and not only does his reply consist of an attempt to read page after page and sentence after sentence into the evidence, but he also answers by reading his own speeches made some time last spring. Let the Minister of Public Works take the evidence here, let him take the dates, let him reflect on these dates, and he will conclude, in his own heart at least, that it will take a lot more than his own speech and that of the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Emmerson) to square himself and his government with the country.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Crocket).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,	Kidd,
Armstrong,	Lancaster,
Arthurs,	Lennox,
Barker,	Macdonell,
Barnard,	McCall,
Best,	McCarthy,
Blain,	Maddin,
Blondin,	Meighen,
Borden (Halifax),	Middlebro,
Bradbury,	Nantel,
Broder,	Osler,
Burrell,	Paquet,
Campbell,	Perley,
Chisholm (Huron),	Porter,
Clare,	Reid (Grenville),
Cowan,	Rhodes,
Crocket,	Roche,
Crothers,	Russell,
Currie (Simcoe),	Schaffner,
Doherty,	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Donnelly,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Edwards,	Sproule,
Elson,	Staples,
Fraser,	Taylor (New Westminster),
Gilbert,	Thornton,
Goodeve,	Wallace,
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Henderson,	Wright.—59.
Herron,	
Hughes,	
Jameson,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,	McIntyre,
Allen,	McKenzie,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	McLean (Huron),
Béland,	McMillan,
Black,	Marcile (Bagot),
Borden (Sir F.),	Martin (Montreal, Ste. Mary's),
Boyer,	Martin (Regina),
Bureau,	Martin (Wellington),
Cash,	Mayrand,
Champagne,	Michaud,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Miller,
Chisholm (Inverness),	

Clark (Red Deer),	Molloy,
Clarke (Essex),	Nesbitt,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Neely,
	Oliver,
Delisle,	Papineau,
Demers,	Parent,
Devlin,	Paterson,
Dubeau,	Pickup,
Emmerson,	Proulx,
Ethier,	Prowse,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Rankin,
Fortier,	Richards,
Fowke,	Rivet,
Gauvreau,	Ross (Middlesex),
Geoffrion,	Ross (Rimouski),
Girard,	Roy (Dorchester),
Hodgins,	Roy (Montmagny),
Hunt,	Rutan,
Knowles,	Savoie,
Kyte,	Schell,
Lachance,	Seguin,
Lafortune,	Smith (Middlesex),
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Sperry,
	Templeman,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Tobin,
Lapointe,	Todd,
LeBlanc,	Turcotte (Nicolet),
Lemieux,	Turcotte (Quebec County),
Loggie,	
Lovell,	Turgeon,
Macdonald,	Turiff,
MacNutt,	Verville,
McAllister,	White (Victoria, Alta.) and
McCoig,	
McColl,	Wilson (Laval).—92.
McGiverin,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Taylor (Leeds),
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Graham,	Bristol,
Murphy,	White (Renfrew),
King,	Northrup,
Pardee,	Stanfield,
Guthrie,	Foster,
Harty,	Price,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,	Beattie,
Talbot,	Owen,
Sinclair,	Monk,
Brown,	Lortie,
Low,	Thoburn,
Chew,	Smyth,
McCraney,	Magrath,
Carvell,	Daniel,
Bickerdike,	Marshall,
Carrier,	Wilcox,
Conmee,	Lalor,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Lake,
Gordon (Kent),	Worthington,
Warburton,	Stewart,
McLean (Sunbury),	Crosby,
Gervais,	Forget,
Tolmie,	Lewis,
German,	Sexsmith,
Meigs.	Boyce.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (North Ontario). Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose last evening, I was discussing some of the economic disadvantages of the reciprocity pact from the view point of Canadian interests. When we consider that the United States people are large producers of the articles that we desire to export the folly of this agreement from the Canadian point of view is self-evident. The United States is really not a customer in the large sense, but a competitor of Canada. I desire to place upon 'Hansard' a list of some of the articles of which the United States is a large exporter to show that so far from being a consumer of Canadian products, the United States offers the least desirable market of all the markets that are open to Canadian shippers:

EXPORTS OF UNITED STATES, 1908.

		Valued at.
Wheat and flour ..bush.	151,338,121	
Corn.. .. ..bush.	37,633,040	
Oatmeal.. .. ..lbs.	14,823,000	
Oats.. .. ..bush.	2,333,817	
Barley.. .. ..bush.	8,262,961	
Flax seed.. .. .. ..lbs.	4,277,313	
Flax or linseed oil..lbs.	9,303,346	
Eggs.. .. ..doz.	5,207,151	$1,199,522
Butter.. .. ..lbs.	5,981,265	1,268,210
Cheese.. .. ..lbs.	6,822,842	857,091
Lard..		52,712,569
Pickled pork..		4,599,431
Ham and shoulders, cured		23,525,307
Bacon..		25,920,490
Fresh beef..		12,699,594
Salted beef..		3,438,048
Total..		$166,521,949

The United States people are large exporters of these very articles that the Canadian producers and farmers desire to sell. The price of any article that Canada has to export and any surplus that the United States people have to export is fixed by the European market. The European market governs the price of the surplus of all exporting countries, including Canada. The United States with 100,000,000 people is an exporting country the same as Canada with her 8,000,000 or 10,000,000 people. Consequently it is folly to expect that much advantage will result to the Canadian producer by negotiating a trade treaty with a people who are exporters of the very same commodities as those which we export. Speaking about the market that fixes the price of the surplus products of exporting countries, the Hon. James Wilson, on page 76 of his open letter to the Grange, of February 9, 1911, says:

While Canada is exporting wheat or other grains and the United States is also exporting wheat, there is no particular reason why Cana-

dian wheat should come here, unless it be that a mixture of Canadian and American wheats may be desirable on the part of our milling exporters, and our millers may find it profitable to handle the Canadian surplus. But the price to the Canadian for his surplus wheat will be substantially the same whether sold in Europe or the United States. However, if the hauling of Canadian wheat by the United States railroads, merchants and mills, has a tendency to reduce the price, it will be reduced to Canadians.

The balance of trade as between Canada and the United States in regard to the important products of butter, cheese and eggs has been against Canada to a very large extent, showing that the United States people ship more of these commodities into Canada by far than we ship into the United States. Taking the total dairy imports from the United States, we find that in the years 1906-10 they amounted to $745,545 worth, while the exports of Canadian products to the United States amounted to $513,951 worth, an excess of imports from the United States into Canada over exports from Canada to the United States of $231,594 worth. The total value of eggs imported from the United States from 1906 to 1910 was $869,568. The total value of eggs exported to the United States from Canada for the years 1906 to 1910 was $59,665, an excess of imports from the United States over exports to the United States of $809,903, showing that in the commodities important from the point of view of the Canadian farmer, the United States, notwithstanding our duty, has an immense advantage over the Canadian exporter.

Another economic disadvantage of this agreement arises from the fact that not only the United States and the British Empire are free to enter into our markets and compete with our home producers, but twelve other countries, known as the favoured nation countries, may also compete with our farmers. I would like to call the attention of the government to the fact that neither of the Canadian plenipotentiaries is in his seat listening to the discussion. I do not know whether the hon. member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) is leading the House or whether he is taking the place of the minister of the Crown.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Go on.

Mr. SHARPE (North Ontario). I think it is due to hon. gentlemen who are discussing this treaty that at least one of the ministers who negotiated this agreement should be in his place. I was saying, Mr. Chairman, that not only the United States farmer competes with our farmers in the home market, but Australia, New Zealand and the rest of the British Empire are allowed to compete under this arrangement in our markets, with our farmers, and that also twelve other countries with a population of between 300 and 400 million people are allowed to compete in our markets where the figures conclusively prove that our prices are higher than the prices prevailing in the United States market. They may enjoy our market free although we have not access to their markets because of their high duties. I might also say that the products of these countries are not admitted into the United States markets free, although we have to admit them free into Canada. These twelve favoured nations are the Argentine Republic, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Denmark, Switzerland, Venezuela, Japan, Norway.

These countries are large producers of farm products and live stock, and they will be formidable competitors to the Canadian farmers. They are favoured by climate, by cheap labour, and by easy access to ocean ports. I see the member for South Grey (Mr. Miller) has surrendered the reins of office to the Minister of Customs, who has resumed his accustomed place, and I suppose is now leading the House. Australia although situated a great distance from the Canadian market is a formidable competitor with us, and by this reciprocity pact Australia can ship her farm products into Canada free of duty. Australia exports annually from 40,000,000 or 50,000,000 lbs. beef, 90,000,000 to 100 million lbs. of frozen mutton and lamb. 50 million to 75 million lbs. of butter, and the wheat crop of Australia last year was as large as the crop of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan combined. Most of it was produced within 300 miles of ocean ports, and every one knows that ocean rates are so low that the Australian farmer can ship his products to the consuming markets cheaper than the Canadian farmer can transport his crop by rail to the same centres, New Zealand is also entitled to ship her products into Canada free of duty, and New Zealand is famed for her woollen, wheat and dairy products. In 1909 New Zealand exported 18,500,000 lbs. of frozen mutton and lamb, 13,500,000 lbs. of butter and cheese, and she sends 12 times as much butter as Canada sends to foreign markets. The Argentine Republic is growing tremendously in agricultural production. By reason of her favourable climatic conditions and cheap labour, the Postmaster General told us labourers can be employed there for 64 cents a day and board themselves—the Argentine is a dangerous competitor to our Canadian farmers. She exports 400,000,000 dollars worth of goods, 90 per cent of which is farm products and live stock. She ships to Great

Britain 6 times as much beef as Australia and New Zealand together and 1½ times as much mutton and lamb as the two combined. In 1909 the Argentine produced wheat to the value of $320,000,000 and exported over 100,000,000 bushels. If there should be a glut in the English market at any time the Argentine could on account of cheap water transportation ship her wheat into the maritime provinces and compete with the wheat of western Canada transported there by rail. It is stated that the carriage of a bushel of wheat by water from the Argentine Republic to St. John, New Brunswick is about 5 cents, while it costs the Regina farmer about 16 cents to send a bushel of his wheat there. When you compare the cheap labour of the Argentine with the high-priced labour of western Canada and the cheap ocean rates from the Argentine with the high railway rates from Regina, you can see what a formidable competitor the Argentine would become with western Canada if this reciprocity agreement goes into effect. It is estimated that Ontario, Quebec and the maritime provinces consume 30 million bushels of wheat more than they grow and if this reciprocity agreement goes into effect, the time may come when the Argentine will be supplying a certain quantity of this wheat to Quebec, Ontario and the maritime provinces. On March 15th I asked for a return in connection with the yearly importations and the quantity and value for the past six years into Canada from these various countries and this return shows that notwithstanding the present duty a number of these countries are exporting a very large quantity of farm products to Canada in competition with the products of our Canadian farmers. In 1910 the United States shipped into Canada 11,507,971 bushels of wheat; in 1905 the United States shipped into Canada 11,519 horses; in 1906, 17,147 horses; in 1907, 16,219 horses; in 1908, 6,428 horses; in 1909, 3,604 horses; and in 1910, 6,601 horses. In 1905 the United States shipped into Canada 2,249,961 bushels of oats; in 1906 3,613,847 bushels; and in 1910 it had fallen to 26,571 bushels. Of cattle, the United States shipped into Canada in 1905, 19,620 head; in 1906, 14,297 head; in 1907, 4,554 head; in 1908, 3,000 head; in 1909, 2,795 head; in 1910, 1,000 head; and paid the duty. Let me ask the Minister of Customs what quantities the United States would send to Canada were they not restrained by our present duty which this pact proposes to remove. Of sheep, the United States sent to Canada in 1905, 84,817 head; in 1906, 69,900 head; in 1907 73,500 head; in 1908, 52,200 head; in 1909,43,000 head; in 1910, 35,844 head. We find that the United States shipped into Canada in 1909, 289,751 lbs. of mutton, and that Australia, which they say is situated too far away to become a competitor, in this same year shipped in 667,885 lbs. and paid the duty. What would they not have shipped into Canada if there was no duty to restrain them? In the year 1910 the United States shipped to Canada 781,031 lbs. of mutton, and Australia shipped into Canada 1,149,979 lbs. in competition with the products of our Canadian farmers, and paid the duty. What would they have shipped in were there no duty to restrain them. Of eggs, the United States shipped to Canada in 1910, 757,316 dozen; in 1909 1,102,254 dozen; and in 1908, 1,123,336 dozen. If the duty were removed, as this reciprocity pact proposes, and this importation of eggs largely increased, can the Minister of Customs tell us what effect that would have upon the price which the Canadian farmer receives for his eggs? Of butter, the United States in 1909 shipped in 688,915 pounds, Australia 422,744 pounds; New Zealand, 16,128 pounds; and in 1910 the United States shipped into Canada of butter 67,568 pounds, Australia 547,149 pounds; and New Zealand 21,840 pounds.

Of cheese, which is a very important product of the farm, the United States, Belgium, France and Holland, which come within the class of the 12 favoured nations, all shipped in important quantities in competition with our own farm produce. In 1910 the United States shipped into Canada of cheese, 231,752 pounds, Belguim 4,639 pounds; France 86,647 pounds; Holland 21,957 pounds and paid the duty in every case. What would be the quantities shipped into Canada in competition with our farmers were the duties removed as contemplated by this pact? We find the United States shipping into Canada poultry to the value of $57,390. Of vegetables the United States shipped $1,004,426; Australia shipped in over $7,000 worth; Belgium over, $9,000; and France $99,000, and New Zealand $3,653. It was the same way with green fruits: In 1910 the United States shipped in $1,261,343, in competition with our farmers and France shipped in about $14,000 worth.

From a perusal of these figures, it must be admitted that these favoured nation countries are dangerous competitors, even at the present time, and with the present duty against them, of our Canadian farmers. If they can so compete with our farmers what would be the result, were the duty removed as contemplated by this treaty? I said that these countries are dangerous competitors in regard to these commodities by reason of their cheap labour and climatic conditions, and their easy access to the ocean ports. I call in support of this position the Minister of Agriculture who, speaking on December 13, 1910, told the House that the Canadian farmer was not in a position to compete with the

Australian farmer in raising sheep and cattle owing to the conditions in that country. He said:

My hon. friend is quite right in saying that the number of sheep have decreased in Canada, but when he compares that with the increase in Australia, Argentine, South Africa and other countries, he is drawing a comparison with countries in which the climate and other conditions are entirely different.

Australia, both as regards sheep and cattle, is a ranching country. The cattle there run wild over enormous areas and are not taken care of at all. Sheep are in the same position. They have illimitable expanses for pasturing, which we have not, and they have a climate more suitable for that kind of wild life than ours. Therefore, a comparison between Canada and Australia in this regard is not a fair one.

I venture to express the opinion that the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance when they journeyed to Washington to negotiate this treaty had not the slightest conception that the favoured nation treaty clause would be operative in connection with this agreement. The matter was finally investigated, and when the leader of the opposition extracted from the Minister of Finance the facts in regard to this feature, the sentiment of the whole country in regard to this reciprocity agreement changed. It is absolutely unfair and illogical of the ministers to negotiate a treaty of this kind which will open the home markets where the prices are high to these competing countries where the conditions are so different, and this illogical position has brought on the ministers the condemnation of the farmers all over the country. I cannot conceive that the ministers had in their minds that this favoured nation clause would be operative or they would have hesitated about putting into effect this illogical, unprofitable and unfair agreement.

Mr. PATERSON. Do you mean we did not know?

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am inclined to believe that it was not present to the minds of the ministers when they negotiated the treaty, basing that view as I do on the lack of information the ministers had in regard to these matters, and their reluctance to disclose this phase of the question. It showed that their consciences bothered them in connection with this matter, and that they were trying to conceal the import and effect of this agreement as they knew it would be a serious matter to the farmers of this country to subject them to the competition of the twelve favoured nations in addition to the farmers of the British Empire, and those of the United States.

As I have pointed out the object of this agreement, as announced by the government, was to secure a market where there were higher prices, but it is shown conclusively that the average prices for the majority of the staple products of the farm are higher in Canada than in the United States, and consequently the whole purpose and object of the agreement falls to the ground. This is the strongest economic objection to this agreement. This information was not present to the ministers because they had not taken the trouble to secure information, they had not sent experts around the country as the United States did. The United States took time by the forelock and sent out experts to prepare lists of comparative prices on the two sides of the line. The United States did not publish these lists until after they had got the two representatives of Canada to sign and attach their signatures to this agreement. If they had done so, these gentlemen would not have signed the agreement because the disadvantage of the agreement from the point of view of the Canadian farmer would be thus shown. We have been unable to extract information from the ministers. Either the Minister of Customs and the Minister of Finance had not the information when they went to Washington or if they had they were afraid to produce it to the House because it would conclusively prove that the prices of Canadian farm products are higher than the prices on the other side. What a parody on the quality of Canadian statesmanship, and the manner in which this treaty was negotiated by our representatives! Let me read an extract to show how carefully and diligently the plenipotentiaries on the American side, how President Taft zealously sought information before attempting to negotiate a treaty of this importance and magnitude.

On page 113 of the document No. 849 on reciprocity with Canada that was issued by the experts of the United States government, speaking on the importance of the sheep industry, they say:

Coming to sheep we approach a phase of agricultural production that has for several months past been the subject of a painstaking inquiry at the hands of the Tariff Board. Representatives of the board have visited some 700 typical farms in the leading sheep-breeding sections of Ohio, Southern Michigan, Western Pennsylvania, West Virginia, New Hampshire and Vermont, obtaining facts and figures concerning cost and prices. The method pursued in obtaining first-hand information as to the cost of keeping sheep was through schedules filled out by expert agents who personally visited the farms studied.

Will the Minister of Customs give the House the names of the experts who were sent out by the Canadian government to ascertain the comparative prices of farm products in Canada and in the United

States? The minister does not answer. They never sent out an expert or an official to ascertain whether the prices of sheep on the Canadian side were higher or lower than the prices on the American side. What a parody of statesmanship is exhibited by the gentlemen who negotiated this treaty on behalf of Canada as compared with the statesmanship and foresight of the President of the United States! The latter says that for several months past the raising of sheep has been the subject of a painstaking inquiry at the hands of the Tariff Board. Representatives of the board visited 700 representative farms to inquire into this industry. I would like to ask the Minister of Customs whether any of our representatives visited farms to ascertain the cost of raising sheep in order to compare it with the cost of raising sheep on the United States side?

Mr. PATERSON. Go on with your speech.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am asking the hon. gentleman for certain information in regard to this treaty.

Mr. PATERSON. The hon. gentleman says he has got the information.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). I am asking the hon. gentleman if the government had any officials of the department or any experts visit any farms to ascertain the cost of raising sheep or other live stock in Canada?

Mr. PATERSON. I am not playing the obstruction game.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario). If that is the best information the Minister of Customs can give the House, I will leave it to the House and the electors throughout the country to judge as to his course.

I desire now to deal with the separate commodities that come within the purview and operation of this treaty. We have heard a great deal on the subject of wheat. When discussing this subject we should remember that there is a difference between winter wheat and spring wheat. I represent an Ontario constituency, in which the farmers are more interested in the production of winter wheat. On page 94 of the book prepared by the experts of the United States government, I find the following comparison of the production and price per bushel of wheat in the United States and in Canada in 1910:

	Spring Wheat.		Winter Wheat.	
	Production. Bushels.	Price per bushel.	Production. Bushels.	Price per bushel.
United States	231,399,000	$0.898	464,044,000	$0.891
Canada	133,379,600	.738	16,610,000	.87
Ontario	2,429,000	.894	15,376,000	.882

The difference in price between the fall wheat sold in the United States and the fall wheat sold in Ontario is so small that we are not vitally interested in obtaining the American market for our fall wheat. The prices in the two countries are practically the same. In regard to spring wheat, it has been said, and I think it cannot be contradicted, that the surplus price is fixed by the price in Europe, and if Canada has any surplus it should be ground into flour within our own borders and not shipped to the United States in order to elevate the grade of their wheat and employ their mills and labourers. Prices in the different States vary greatly, and hence the duty does not account for the difference in prices. For instance, in Washington state the average price is 78 cents; in Kansas, 84 cents; in Montana, 86 cents; in Wisconsin, 92 cents; in Vermont, $1.03, and in Maine, $1.02, a difference ranging up to 24 cents between the various States. The average price of fall wheat in Washington state is 78 cents, in New York, 96 cents, a difference of 18 cents. I might point out that the price of wheat to-day in Winnipeg is higher than the prevailing price in the United States, which, I believe, is accounted for largely by the dread of reciprocity coming into effect. The mere prospect of reciprocity coming into operation has had that result.

It is a matter of importance to ascertain why the people of the United States are so anxious for our wheat. I have in my hand an extract from the Northwest 'Miller,' the chief organ of the United States flour and milling trade, published in Minneapolis, and it is very illuminating on this subject. It says:

> The future of American milling with Canadian wheat is a grand one. With this enormous and steadily increasing crop flowing into the mills and elevators of the states, a splendid tide of activity and prosperity should follow in its wake. Assured of their future supply of raw material, the mills of America could go forward on their developing course, continuing the march of progress which has brought them to the front.

New mills would be built, and capacities enlarged. New markets abroad would be sought and conquered. The returns from this renewed and extended activity would be felt in increased commercial prosperity. American railroads carrying the flour from the mills would secure additional freights; American banks would obtain increased deposits and greatly enlarged exchange accounts; American mill operatives would be in demand, and pay-rolls would be increased; mill machinery, bags, barrels and other mill supplies would be required in larger quantities; more money would be in circulation; and the benefit would be felt in every artery of industrial life touched by milling. There would be an increase in grain firms, in elevators, and in every branch of the grain handling and flour making interests. This would be felt in the added value of (American) real estate and in the solid and substantial development of every undertaking and enterprise that makes a community prosperous.

If by securing our wheat these beneficial results accrue to the United States, why should not we keep it ourselves, and have our wheat ground into flour within our own borders in order to obtain these advantages for Canada?

Now, the question of barley is one that comes closer, perhaps, to the Ontario farmer, than any other, and we often hear it discussed on the ground that barley was at such high prices during the old reciprocity treaty. There are two answers to that argument. One, which is patent to every reasonable man is that barley during the old reciprocity treaty sold at an artificial value, a value that did not result merely from access to the American market, but from the conditions which prevailed owing largely to the Crimean war, and the war between the north and south in the United States. The price of barley also has fluctuated from time to time with the duties. Referring to page 101 of the document issued by the United States government it will be found that the duty on barley was 30 cents per bushel from 1890 to 1894, when the average price was 49 cents. When the duty lowered to 30 per cent ad valorem between 1894 and 1897 the price of barley was reduced to 34 cents. But when the duty was raised to 30 cents after 1897 the average price for three years was 40 cents, showing that the prices of barley fluctuated with the duty. Many think that the Ontario farmer went out of barley cultivation when the reciprocity agreement of 1854 was denounced by the United States. As a matter of fact the Ontario farmers grow many millions of bushels more than they did at that time. But, instead of looking for an export market, they consume it on their own farms thus receiving good returns for it and also enriching their own soil. It is found that it is more profitable to feed it than to export it. It is estimated by the Agricultural College at Guelph, that 3 to 3½ pounds of barley will produce 1 pound of pork; and if we take the Toronto 'Weekly Sun' as authority, we find that the average price received for the last five years for pork has been $7 per 100 pounds. At this price barley is worth to the farmer from 96 cents to $1.12 per bushel. And the land will not be impoverished but enriched by these operations. The United States Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wilson, says that 'barley is as a soil robber next to wheat in its exactions upon the soil.' Consequently it is to the interest and advantage of the Ontario farmer not to sell his barley for export unless he can get a price in excess of 96 cents to $1.12 per bushel. The United States exports of barley have been as follows:

1908	$6,671,013
1909	4,589,397
1910	8,262,961

Being exporters of barley the United States are our competitors rather than our customers in respect to this grain. It is to be noted also that the malting operations of the United States have shifted from Buffalo to Chicago and Milwaukee, and the farmers of the western states supply all the malting barley that the large brewers require. Consequently, even if this reciprocity agreement did go into operation, there would not be the same demand for our Ontario barley to-day as in the old reciprocity days.

Now, speaking on the question of oats, the document issued by the United States, already referred to, shows, at page 107, that the range of prices in the United States is from 27 cents to 35 cents a bushel and in Canada from 28 cents to 36 cents a bushel. I may say that the duty does not always account for the difference in the price. There are great differences in price as between Ontario and Quebec, and yet there is no interprovincial duty to account for that difference. The price in Quebec is 44 cents, and in Ontario 36 cents. This shows that the fact of the existence of a duty does not affect prices in the manner we would be given to understand by those who discuss this matter from the point of view of the government.

A staple industry in Ontario is hogs, one of the most important that is conducted by the Ontario farmer. In the United States there are 45,000,000 hogs, and there are something less than 3,000,000 in Canada. Of course, Chicago is the great centre for the hog industry of the United States. But if you compare the average prices in Chicago with the average in Montreal for a period of five years, you will find that

the advantage is with Montreal. The table is as follows:

Year.	Chicago.	Montreal.
1906..	$6 20	$7 77
1907..	6 10	7 93
1908..	5 70	7 10
1909..	7 35	8 64
1910..	8 90	9 60
Total for 5 years.	$6 85	$8 10

For the five years 1906 to 1910 included, the average in Chicago was $6.85, and in Montreal $8.10. The advantage, so far as the price of hogs is concerned, is altogether with the Canadian market. It is also within the knowledge of the members of this House, that petitions have been received from the farmers of this country asking the government to raise the duty on the importation of hogs and their products. It has been stated that the farmers favour reciprocity and are in favour of free trade in their own products. But these petitions from the Ontario farmer asking that the duty be raised show that the farmers desire to be protected against the keen competition of the packers of Chicago.

Now, turning to the subject of live stock, we find at pages 109 and 110 of the United States government document entitled 'reciprocity with Canada,' in regard to horses that 'in all the Canadian provinces except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba, and Nova Scotia the prices are higher than any of our States.' With regard to dairy cows, this document says:

In eastern Canada prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48 and in western Canada from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price. Prices of other cattle vary in the United States from $14.30 a head in Minnesota to $27.40 in Montana, while in Canada the range of price is from $31 in Saskatchewan to $34 in Ontario.

Prices of sheep are much lower in the United States than in Canada. In the United States they range from $2.90 per head in Texas to $5.30 in Illinois and Iowa, while in Canada the range is from $4 in Nova Scotia to $7 and $8 in Ontario, Manitoba and Saskatchewan.

With regard to swine, it says that the prices are a little higher in Canada than in the United States. In regard to sheep, I had a communication forwarded to me the other day from a friend in Toronto. It is dated July 7, 1911 and addressed to S. S. Sharpe, M. P., Uxbridge:

My dear Sir,—A day or so ago I was in conversation with one of the junior members of the firm of ——, dealers in hides, wool and skins, having their place of business for wool and skins on ——. The young man informs me that this year they have purchased on the Toronto market the sheepskin pelts of American sheep. All told some 15,000 American sheep had come into the cattle markets here. The average duty is about $2.50 per head. Nearly all have come from Chicago, although one shipment of 1,500 had come from Texas to New York and then had been sent here. He said that the average cost of freight would be $1 a head. These sheep are smaller than our own and of a dark colour. The pelts after the wool was taken off are sold to the manufacturers of gloves and heavy winter shoes for an inner lining. These brought them 40 cents. In other years the manufacturers had paid 70 cents. If we have reciprocity where will your farmer friends come in when it comes to raising sheep? Please do not mention the names of —— as other dealers no doubt bought them.

Yours truly,
CHARLES H. BELL.

That throws a flood of light upon the competition that our farmers are being subjected to under existing conditions. I ask, in the name of common sense, what severe competition will they be subjected to if the duty is entirely removed? Now I have in my hands some figures with regard to the butter and egg industry, very important industries, although the Agricultural Department has not encouraged them to any extent. It has neglected that important industry that pays off so many mortgages on farms, and buys so many farms in the province of Ontario. The extract is from the Buffalo and New York 'Commercial,' February 14, 1909. Speaking of the butter and egg industry, it says:

The total exports of butter from Canada to Great Britain in 1909 were 5,353,770 pounds, and to the United States 92,468 pounds. The latest available figures for the United States are contained in the census reports for 1900, when New York state alone produced upwards of 70,000,000 pounds, and the aggregate production of the entire United States was more than a billion pounds. In the year 1909 we imported from Canada less than 100,000 pounds of butter, Canada imported from this country 473,805 pounds. Now when Canada removes her 4 cents a pound duty upon this product who can measure the amount of butter that this wider market will create for our own farmers? It will be our butter that will be flooding the Canadian market instead of this country being overwhelmed with the Canadian articles.

The egg statistics are equally illuminating. In 1909 Canada's total exports of eggs amounted to about 52,201 dozen. In the same year her imports of eggs aggregated 1,136,120 dozen, so that it appears the country bought twice as much as she exported. The Canadian duty on eggs amounts to 3 cents a dozen, and with this duty removed the burden is on the political farmer to show why he would not be benefited by this greater market instead of being injured by competition. All the eggs that Canada exports in a year would, if sent into Erie county, give every inhabitant just about 12 eggs a year or one a month. The rest of the United States would depend as usual upon the domestic supply.

Now in regard to the egg industry I want to point out that the imports of eggs in the fiscal year 1911 for home consumption were as follows: From the United States, 2,201,727 dozen; from Great Britain, 12,040 dozen; Hong Kong, 62,012 dozen; other countries, 91,861 dozen. The total quantity of eggs imported was 2,378,640 dozen, with a value of $439,066. What would be the importations into this country if we had no duty at all on these articles? In connection with these various commodities I desire to place upon 'Hansard' a table that has been prepared by experts of the United States in regard to horses, dairy cows, other cattle, sheep and swine. I presume, as the hour is late, there will be no objection to the table going on 'Hansard' without being read. The table is as follows:

——	Horses.	Dairy cows.	Other cattle.	Sheep.	Swine.
Number of live stock on farms (in 1909)—					
United States	21,040,000	21,801,000	47,279,000	57,216,000	47,782,000
Canada	2,132,489	2,849,306	4,384,779	2,705,390	2,912,509
Average value per head (in 1910)	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
United States—					
Maine	125 00	33 00	16 90	3 70	11 50
New Hampshire	106 00	36 20	20 30	3 70	11 50
Vermont	106 00	34 20	14 40	4 00	10 00
New York	125 00	39 50	18 20	5 00	11 50
Indiana	122 00	41 00	24 50	5 20	10 00
Illinois	124 00	42 80	26 40	5 30	10 90
Michigan	126 00	39 50	18 50	4 70	10 50
Wisconsin	121 00	36 60	16 40	4 50	11 80
Minnesota	111 00	33 00	14 30	4 00	11 50
Iowa	120 00	36 00	22 20	5 30	11 30
North Dakota	114 00	33 90	20 50	4 00	11 00
South Dakota	105 00	33 00	21 50	4 00	11 10
Texas	73 00	29 50	15 30	2 90	6 60
Montana	80 00	46 50	27 40	4 20	10 10
Idaho	102 00	41 40	21 40	4 70	8 70
Washington	108 00	41 80	19 90	3 90	9 40
Oregon	103 00	39 60	18 50	3 70	8 20
Average	108 19	35 79	19 41	4 08	9 14
Canada—					
Prince Edward Island	107 00	32 00	23 00	6 00	10 00
Nova Scotia	113 00	37 00	29 00	4 00	11 00
New Brunswick	131 00	34 00	28 00	5 00	12 00
Quebec	139 00	31 00	31 00	6 00	13 00
Ontario	133 00	48 00	34 00	7 00	10 00
Manitoba	107 00	40 00	23 00	7 00	13 00
Saskatchewan	156 00	41 00	31 00	7 00	13 00
Alberta	126 00	39 00	30 00	6 00	12 00
British Columbia	....	....	....	....	....
Average	133 00	43 00	31 00	6 00	11 00

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario).

LIVE STOCK AND MEATS.

(Prices quoted January, 1911.)

Commodity.	Price.	Buffalo, N.Y., and Toronto, Canada.			
		Producer's Price.		Wholesale Price.	
		Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Beef steers and heifers	A.	$6 20	$4 00	$6 75	$6 25
	C.	5 65	4 00	6 25	4 50
Beef cows	A.	4 80	3 55	5 35	4 00
	C.	4 75	2 60	5 25	3 00
Stockers and feeders	A.	4 75	3 30	5 25	3 75
	C.	5 00	3 75	5 50	4 25
Calves	A.	6 55	5 35	7 25	6 00
	C.	7 80	2 50	8 50	3 00
		Per head.	Per head.	Per head.	Per head.
Milkers and springers	A.	$61 00	$18 00	$70 00	$20 00
	C.	71 00	26 00	80 00	30 00
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Lambs	A.	$5 90	$4 15	$6 50	$4 75
	C.	5 70	5 20	6 25	5 75
Sheep	A	4 00	2 25	4 50	2 70
	C.	4 15	2 55	4 65	3 00
Hogs	A	7 75	5 40	8 50	6 00
	C.	9 30	6 50	10 00	7 15

Commodity.	Price.	Detroit, Mich., and Windsor, Ontario.			
		Producer's Price.		Commission Price.	
		Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Beef steers and heifers	A.	$5 30	65	$6 00	$4 25
	C.	5 60	3 95	6 25	4 50
Beef cows	A.	4 00	3 00	4 50	3 50
	C.	4 65	2 50	5 25	3 00
Stockers and feeders	A.	4 15	2 45	4 75	3 00
	C.	4 90	3 70	5 50	4 25
Calves	A.	8 75	3 40	9 50	4 00
	C.	7 25	2 50	8 00	3 00
		Per head.	Per head.	Per head.	Per head.
Milkers and springers	A.	$47 00	$20 00	$55 00	$25 00
	C.	70 00	$25 00	$80 00	30 00
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Lambs	A.	$5 60	$3 90	$6 25	$4 50
	C.	5 65	5 15	6 25	5 75
Sheep	A.	4 71	2 00	4 25	2 50
	C.	4 15	2 55	4 65	3 00
Hogs	A.	8 40	5 50	9 15	6 25
	C.	9 20	6 50	10 00	7 15

LIVE STOCK AND MEATS—*Continued.*

Commodity.	Price.	Ogdensburgh, N.Y., and Prescott, Can.			
		Producer's price.		Wholesale.	
		Highest.	Lowest.	High.	Low.
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Beef Cows	A.	$ 5 00	$ 3 00	$ 5 60	$ 3 50
	C.	4 50	3 00	5 00	3 50
Calves	A.	*4.50		5.00–5.10	
	C.	5 00	3 50	5 60	4 10
		Per head.	Per head.	Per head.	Per head.
Milkers and springers	A.	$ 60 00	$ 28 00	$ 75 00	$ 35 00
	C.	65 00	25 00	75 00	30 00
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Lambs	A.	$ 5 60	$ 5 00	$ 6 20	$ 5 50
	C.	6 60	5 50	7 25	6 00
Sheep	A.	4 00	3 75	4 50	4 00
	C.	4 25	3 75	4 60	4 25
Hogs	A.	8 00	5 90	9 00	6 50
	C.	8 50	7 00	9 20	7 60

Commodity.	Price.	Burlington, Vt., and Montreal, Canada.			
		Producer's.		Wholesale.	
		High.	Low.	High.	Low.
		Per head.	Per head.	Per head.	Per head.
Milkers and springers	A.	$ 60 00	$ 20 00	$ 75 00	$ 25 00
	C.	63 00	25 00	75 00	30 00
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Lambs	A.	$ 5 90	$ 4 15	$ 6 50	$ 4 75
	C.	6 60	5 40	6 25	6 00
Sheep	A.	4 00	2 25	4 75	2 75
	C.	4 20	4 00	4 75	4 50

Commodity.	Total number of Comparisons.		Times Canadian price equal to or above American price.	
	Producer.	Wholesale.	Producer.	Wholesale.
Beef steers and heifers	2	2	1	1
Beef cows	3	3	1	1
Stockers and feeders	2	2	2	2
Calves	3	3	1	1
Milkers and springers	4	4	4	4
Lambs	4	4	3	2
Sheep	4	4	3	4
Hogs	3	3	3	3

*Average.

DRESSED MEATS.

[February, 1911.]

WHOLESALE PRICES PER 100 POUNDS.

—	Chicago, Ill.	Toronto, Canada.	Montreal, Canada.
No. 1 beef carcass	$9 50	$9 50	$9 50–$10 75
No. 2 beef carcass	8 00	9 00	.....
Lamb	$8 50–9 00	12 00	.....
Mutton	6 00	9 00	8 00– 8 50
Pork	10 00–12 00	10 50	12 00–13 00

RETAIL PRICES PER POUND.

—	Buffalo, N.Y.	Toronto, Canada.
	Cts.	Cts.
Beef—		
Rib roast	14–18	15–25
Rump	12–14	10–15
Steak, porterhouse	18–24	25
Steak, sirloin	18–20	18–25
Lamb—		
Leg	12–16	20–25
Chops	14–32	20–22
Veal chops	18–22	50
Pork—		
Loin	16	17–20
Fresh shoulder	12	11

Consequently you will see, Mr. Chairman, by the report issued by the United States government, based on information collected by the experts that were sent out for the special purpose of ascertaining prices in Canada as compared with prices in the United States, that all these commodities have a higher price in Canada invariably than they have in the United States. Therefore, I ask upon what ground do the representatives of Canada undertake to negotiate this agreement and designate it as an agreement in the interest of the Canadian farmer.

Now, I come to an all important commodity that is raised on the farm. I refer to horses. The county of North Ontario the north riding of which I have the honour to represent is distinguished for many things, generally, but there is one particular industry in which the county of Ontario stands foremost amongst all other counties in the Dominion of Canada, and not only is it foremost amongst all other counties but it stands ahead of every other section of the North American continent as breeding the best quality of farm horses. By way of proof I desire to quote from a paper read by Dr. Rutherford, Live Stock Commissioner, and head of the veterinary department of the Liberal government here at Ottawa. Speaking at the Fairs Association in Toronto in February, 1911, he said:

In the county of Ontario we find there were in 1906, 113 stallions, of which 106 were registered, two being passed as unsound, while only seven grade stallions, all passed as sound, were discovered by the inspectors. This shows that 92 per cent of the stallions in the county were registered and sound.

No county in the province shows so many stallions and good ones (to say nothing at present of other horses), as does the county of Ontario, which has long been deservedly regarded as the head centre of live stock breeding intelligence on the North American continent.

Thus the facts, statements and conclusions of Dr. Rutherford prove the high excellency of this industry in the county of Ontario, an industry which has been developed by the intelligence, ability and brains of residents of the county of Ontario and of such men as the following:

Hackney class:
Hodgkinson & Tisdale.. .. .. Beaverton.
Graham Bros.. .. .. Claremont.
Standard breed and carriage class:
Hodgkinson & Tisdale.. .. .. Beaverton.
W. J. Cowan.. .. .. Cannington.
Graham Bros.. .. .. Claremont

Clydesdale class:

Hodgkinson & Tisdale	Beaverton.
W. J. Cowan	Cannington.
Smith & Richardson	Columbus.
Graham Bros.	Claremont.
John Bright	Myrtle.

and a great many other breeders of standard bred horses. These and others used to grow barley in the old reciprocity days. When the McKinley Bill came in it practically killed that industry, but with that foresight and intelligence that characterize the Canadian breeders all over that county they saw that they had to change their methods. A great many years were spent in this readjustment, and the results have been shown in the splendid tribute that has been paid to the county of Ontario by Dr. Rutherford. Now, after developing this great horse industry and bringing it to its present state of efficiency, the United States come forward and ask us to reciprocate. When the average value of a horse in the United States is $108 and the average price of a horse in Canada is $133 the United States come over to us and say that they would like to reciprocate. The best horse that is raised in North America is raised in the county of Ontario, and the best market for the Canadian horse is the Canadian Northwest. New settlements always require large quantities of horses. Uncle Sam opened up a dozen wests in the past but did he ever reciprocate on those occasions? Did he ever throw open his market to the Canadian horse breeder in those days? Did he ever give us a chance with our horses when he opened up his great west? Not at all. But now that we have a demand for horses and the average price is higher in Canada than it is in the United States they come forward and propose that we shall have reciprocity. Look at the price of horses in the western states:

North Dakota	$114
South Dakota	105
Texas	73
Montana	80
Idaho	102
Washington	108
Oregon	103
Ontario	133

It is not much wonder, when you compare the average price of horses in the United States with the average price in Canada that these experts inserted in their report the following sentence:

As to horses, Canada has no surplus of importance outside of Ontario. The agricultural development of the north western provinces has put prices of work stock and heavy draft teams at a premium in the territory tributary to Winnipeg. During the spring of 1910 it is stated on good authority that not less than 20,000 horses were sold out of Ontario alone for shipment to the market just mentioned, and prospective loss of this trade is giving Ontario some concern at this time.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario).

The five provinces of Quebec, Ontario, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta combined have but 1,863,744 head as compared with 1,600,000 head now in the state of Iowa alone.

Then we have a statement from Mr. C. A. Burns, one of the best known horse buyers in Ontario, who addressed a letter to the press in which he declares that reciprocity will ruin the horse business in Ontario. I will not trouble the House by reading the whole of the article but he says:

The only protection now of the Ontario farmer is the duty. On a $200 horse, the duty is $65, and on a $150 horse there is a $30 duty at the present time. Remove this duty and let American horses come in here, and make it easy for Canadian buyers to go to the United States markets, and the Ontario farmer will get fully $40 to $90 per head less than he does now for his horses.

Some people think that the western farmer wants reciprocity, but I am convinced that it is the American element alone that is crying for reciprocity, and there are a large number of American farmers in the Canadian west. We must preserve Canada for Canadians, and the Ontario farmer will make a big mistake to think that he is going to benefit by reciprocity.

I am convinced that reciprocity as proposed will strike the very heart out of the most conspicuous industry of our country, and one in which our farmers excel before all others on the continent of America. In the next ten years in our west there will be demand for an ever-increasing number of horses, the standard should be maintained, and I for one am not going to be a party to handing over our great Northwest markets to the scrub horses of the border states.

Now, Sir, in conclusion I will say, that the Liberals of Canada, in fiscal as in other matters, have proved false to the pledge made to the people. Theoretically and traditionally the Liberal party is supposed to be a free trade party in Canada. Before 1896 the Liberals denounced protection and the manufacturers; they declared protection to be legalized robbery and they pledged themselves to remove the last vestige of it from the statute-books. But on the eve of the elections in 1896 we find them sending a secret representative to the manufacturers telling them that if they were returned to power they need have no fear. One result of that pledge is seen in connection with the duty on binders. Prior to 1896 the duty on a binder which was valued at $80 was 20 per cent, and the amount of duty paid by the farmer was $16, but after 1896 the binder was valued at $100, and although the duty was supposed to be reduced to 17½ per cent the farmer had to pay $1.50 more duty than he paid previously. We find that the Liberals instead of

removing the protection they denounced when in opposition, have really increased protection. Let me ask what has the Liberal party done for the farmers of Canada for whom they now profess so much solicitude? They raised the duty on farm implements, and not satisfied with making the president of the Massey-Harris Company a Senator they have recently had him knighted. Then, Mr. Frost, head of the Frost and Wood firm was also made a Senator. The Liberals in power maintained the protection to manufacturers which they condemned in opposition, and by this reciprocity agreement they are about to sweep away the protection that the farmers are enjoying, and are maintaining the protection for their friends the manufacturers. The leader of the government has announced that they do not intend to do anything more for the farmer, and that they have reduced the protection to the manufacturers as low as they intend to reduce it.

Sir, the issue between the parties at the approaching election is clear and definite and distinct, and I am glad it is so. The two political parties in this country are back to their old fighting ground. The Liberal party is offering to the people of Canada reciprocity with the United States with all its dangers and entanglements and difficulties, and with our home markets thrown open to the farmers of the United States, and the farmers of the twelve favoured nations. The Minister of Finance and the Prime Minister asked us on this side. Why don't you give reciprocity a trial, but the answer to that is that you might as well ask a man to give suicide a trial. If Canada adopts reciprocity, we shall have taken an irrevocable step which we cannot retrace. If we, eight millions of people, merge our interests with the United States with ninety millions they will control the situation, and it will be impossible for us to withdraw. The Conservative party on the other hand offers the National Policy with moderate protection to all classes, to the farmers, as well as to the manufacturers and artisans, and with the goal before us of preferential trade within the empire. The Liberal party in this country is offering continentalism to the Canadian people, and the Conservative party is offering imperialism. You have the Liberal party directing the eyes of the Canadian people to Washington, and you have the hon. R. L. Borden, the honoured leader of the Conservative party asking Canadians to keep their eyes directed on London. If the policy of the Liberal party prevails, the Stars and Stripes will inevitably be floating over the northern part of this continent, but if the policy of the Conservative party prevails the Canadian people will still continue to float the old Union Jack. If I judge rightly the temper of the Canadian people, and if one considers the large accession of Liberals to our fighting strength, it seems to me clear that the Americanizing tendency of this reciprocity agreement will be swept away, and that never again will the Liberal party dare to champion the cause of the United States people within our Canadian borders. I am unalterably opposed to reciprocity on the terms proposed, and I shall use every legitimate effort to defeat this ill-advised, unprofitable, and unpatriotic agreement.

Mr. DONNELLY. As it is now after midnight I desire to move that the committee rise and report progress.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. FIELDING. We have to meet at eleven o'clock to-morrow morning.

Motion agreed to, and progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 12.28 a.m., Thursday.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

THURSDAY, July 27, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

AMERICAN WAR VESSELS PASSING THROUGH CANADIAN CANALS.

Mr. MACDONNELL:

1. Has the government received a request from Washington to permit the 'Dubuque,' an American war vessel, to pass through the Canadian canals? If so when, and what is her armament?

2. Has the government permitted any United States war vessel to pass through the Canadian canals since the 'Dubuque'?

3. Has the Canadian government observed the provisions of the Rush-Bagot Convention, and is Canada, at the present time, adhering to such Convention?

4. In what respects, having regard to number, size, speed, armament and crews of vessels, is the United States government at the present time, not adhering to the said convention?

5. Has the United States, on all occasions, had the consent of the Canadian or British government in its departures from the said convention?

6. Has the government considered the desirability of negotiating with Washington for the purpose of securing a permanent treaty, because of the fact that the Rush-Bagot Con-

vention is terminable on six months' notice by either country, and thereby avoid the risk of the abrogation of the agreement?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER:

1. The government received a request to allow the steamer 'Dubuque' to pass up through the canals. It was permitted, the steamer 'Nashville' being taken down out of the lakes.
2. No.
3. Yes.
4, 5, and 6. The matter is under consideration.

INQUIRY RE REVENUE AND EXPENDITURE, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What was the revenue and expenditure of the Post Office Department for each year from 1900 to 1911?
2. When and where was the free rural mail delivery route established in Canada?
3. In how many counties are there free rural mail delivery routes, and how many miles of such routes in each county?
4. What is the extra cost to the Post Office Department because of the establishment of said routes?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I would ask my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) to move for a return in regard to this question.

SUB-TARGET GUNS.

Mr. BLAIN:

How many sub-target guns have been purchased by the government, from whom were they purchased, and what was the price paid?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I would say to my hon. friend that this question was fully answered in the month of May, and the answer will be found at page 8752 of the unrevised Hansard. There have been no purchases of sub-target guns since then, and the situation to-day is exactly as it was at that date.

CENSUS ENUMERATORS IN PEEL COUNTY.

Mr. BLAIN:

How many census enumerators were appointed in Peel county, what is the name and post office address of each, and on whose recommendation were they appointed?

1. 39.
2. The names and post office addresses of census enumerators in the county of Peel are:—

Albion Township—
William T. Wellwood, Macville, Ont.
John F. Horan, Lockton, Ont.
Geo. Mackenzie, Bolton, Ont.
Samuel Jefferson, Palgrave, Ont.
W. H. Monkman, Castlederg, Ont.
J. H. Rutherford, Caledon East, Ont.
James Killeen, Sleswick, Ont.

Caledon Township—
James Davidson, Belfountain, Ont.
Jas. F. MacDonald, Inglewood, Ont.
R. W. Burrell, Caledon East, Ont.
John Heard, Star, Ont.
Daniel McArthur, Caledon, Ont.
Richard Hawkins, Alton, Ont.
David Smith, Belfountain, Ont.
A. N. Adams, Melville Cross, Ont.

Chinguacousy Township—
Fred Sinclair, Brampton, Ont.
David H. Cation, Mayfield, Ont.
William Bowels, Sandhill, Ont.
John C. McClure, Brampton, Ont. (Box 368).
H. A. Dolson, Alloa, Ont.
John McQuarrie, Cheltenham, Ont.
James Laidlaw, Snelgrove, Ont.
Archibald McGregor, Claude, Ont.

Toronto Township—
John Craigie, Port Credit, Ont.
Percy Adamson, Streetsville, Ont.
A. E. Tolman, Cooksville, Ont.
Thomas Allison, Burnhamthorpe, Ont.
Wismer Hall, Churchville, Ont.
P. G. Dunton, Britannia, Ont.
John McIntosh, Hanlan, Ont.
Henry Milner, Malton, Ont.
Wm. Shook, Clarkson, Ont.

Toronto Gore Township—
John O'Reilly, Crahamsville Humber.
J. Harrison, Castlemore.

Brampton—
M. Treadgold, Brampton.
Fred Early, Brampton.
Charles R. Findley, Brampton.

Bolton—
D. B. Kennedy, Bolton.

Streetsville—
C. H. Falconer, Streetsville.

POST OFFICE—STE. MARIE DIVISION.

Mr. MONK:

1. Has the site of the new post office in the Ste. Marie division of the city of Montreal been found defective, the soil being unsuitable on account of the alleged presence of springs, to support the intended building?
2. Have these defects been pointed out to the government? If so, by whom?
3. What measures will be taken under the circumstances?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I think this refers to a post office in the division represented by my hon. friend (Mr. Martin). It was discovered after the examination of the site for the building was made and after borings had been made in the usual way, that owing to the nature of the subsoil we would be obliged to go to a greater depth than was originally expected, in order to make a proper foundation. This we decided to do. The question of driving concrete piles

is now under consideration, and I have no doubt any difficulties which might exist in regard to the foundation will be overcome by the plan which has been decided upon.

DOCK AT OWEN SOUND.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

Is it the intention of the government to proceed wtih the building of the continuation of the dock or revetment on the west side of the harbour at Owen Sound? If so, when?

Mr. PUGSLEY. As to the first part of the question it is the intention of the government to proceed with the work. With regard to the second part of the question, the requisite appropriation for the work is contained in the estimates, but owing to my not being able to get a full vote—for reasons which my hon. friend understands—I have not felt myself able to proceed as rapidly as would otherwise have been the case; therefore, I cannot tell my hon. friend the exact date at which the work will begin.

DRY DOCK AT COLLINGWOOD.

Mr. MIDDLEBRO:

1. What is the capital cost of the first dry dock built at Collingwood, the amount of interest or bonus paid yearly by the government thereon, and the number of years such bonus or interest still has to run?
2. What is the capital cost of the second dry dock at Collingwood, the subsidy or interest or bonus to which it is entitled, and for what period will such be paid?
3. What are the dimensions and capacity of each dry dock and the name of the company to whom such subsidies, bonus or interest is paid?

Mr. PUGSLEY. I would ask my hon. friend to have that question made a motion for a return.

THE SEAL FISHERIES.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to lay on the table the information asked for as to the electoral lists which are not completed.

I beg to lay on the table of the House the text of the pelagic sealing treaty signed at Washington July 11, 1911. I noticed yesterday that my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Sproule) asked for the production of this treaty and the correspondence. Now, the correspondence is very voluminous, extending over a number of years. I think my hon. friend will find the treaty gives all the information he requires, but if this should not be the case, I will produce any correspondence he may desire, but I do not think it would be any advantage. My hon. friend can read the treaty, and if he thinks he wants any further information I will give it to him.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE PROCEEDINGS.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I beg to lay upon the table the report of the minutes of the proceedings of the Imperial Conference of 1911. This matter came up for discussion the day before yesterday. I called upon His Excellency the Governor General, who had just returned from a holiday, and ascertained from him that the report of the conference had reached him that very evening. At the same time a despatch was sent to His Excellency which I have his permission to lay before the House. It is as follows:

Downing Street, 14 July, 1911.

My Lord,—I have the honour to transmit to Your Excellency, to be laid before your ministers, the accompanying copies of memorandum of conferences between the British Admiralty and representatives of the Dominions of Canada and Australia on the subject of the status of Dominion navies.

2. This matter was mentioned at the last meeting of the Imperial Conference on the twentieth of June and it was agreed that it should be published simultaneously in this country and in Canada and the Commonwealth.

3. I have asked the Governor General of the Commonwealth to inform me by telegraph when it is proposed to publish the memorandum there, and I shall at once telegraph to you so that arrangements may be made for a simultaneous issue of the report in Canada.

I have the honour to be, My Lord,
Your Lordship's most obedient,
humble servant,
(Signed) L. HARCOURT.

Governor General,
His Excellency,
The Right Honourable,
Earl Grey, G.C.M.G., G.C.V.O.

A despatch anticipating this had been received a few days ago before by His Excellency to this effect:

FROM MR. HARCOURT TO LORD GREY

London, 11th July, 1911.

Immediate.

Please inform Brodeur that it is understood by the Admiralty that time of publication of arrangement with regard to Dominion naval force would be settled in concert as was done in 1909 and that in the mean time terms will not be made public. You will be informed later as to proposed time for publication. Copy goes to you by next mail.

(Signed) HARCOURT.

In due course this despatch was sent to the Office of External Affairs, and by them referred to the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and the hon. Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Hon. Mr. Brodeur) sent me the following letter:

Office of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries
of Canada.
Ottawa, 18th July, 1911.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier.
Prime Minister of Canada, Ottawa.

Dear Sir Wilfrid,—I beg to send you herewith copy of the despatch of which I spoke to you to-day, on the subject of the publication of the memorandum on the agreement arrived at between representatives of Canada and Australia on one part and the Admiralty, on the other.

I fail to see why this document should not be published at the same time as the proceedings of the Imperial Conference though, indeed such may be the intention. At all events, I send you the above despatch to keep you in touch with the matter in case it should come up in the House.

Would you be of opinion that it would be well to cable the Secretary of State asking him to hasten the publication of this document?

Yours very sincerely,
(Signed) L. P. BRODEUR.

I called the attention of His Excellency to these despatches, and I stated to him that, in my opinion, I did not understand the resolution of the 20th of June, which is referred to in the despatch which I read a moment ago, as implying that the resolutions of the Defence Committee were not to be laid before the House at same time as the report of the conference. I call the attention of the House to these words of Mr. Harcourt of the 20th June, 1911:

Mr. Harcourt.—Then there is the report of the Committee of the Imperial Conference convened to discuss defence, military matters, at the War Office. That is before the Conference now in a paper. Assuming that that report is approved, it is proposed that the précis of to-day and the proceedings of the Conference when published should contain the following statement on the matter: 'The Conference received and approved the report of the Committee on Military Defence, which had held two sittings at the War Office, under the chairmanship of the Chief of the Imperial General Staff,' and the report will be included in the papers of the Conference.

(Mr. Pearce here referred to the question of the conferences which were taking place at the Admiralty with the representatives of the Dominion of Canada and of the Commonwealth of Australia with regard to the status of the Dominions' naval forces and their co-operation with the Royal Navy, and it was agreed, on the suggestion of Mr. Harcourt, that a memorandum embodying the conclusions reached should be incorporated among the papers published in connection with the Imperial Conference.)

These resolutions of the Defence Committee were not, however, included in the report which I now lay upon the table. Having called the attention of His Excellency to this, His Excellency was pleased at once to send the following cable to Mr. Harcourt:

Your despatch of July 25, 1911, No. 573, Prime Minister will be very grateful if permission could be given to lay enclosure before parliament immediately. He wishes if possible to lay it simultaneously with a full report of proceedings of Imperial Conference just received and is anxious not to have to wait till memorandum of conference on naval question is received in Australia.

Please telegraph reply as soon as possible.
(Signed) GREY.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). No reply has yet been received to that?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I understand a reply has been received, but I have not yet got it. I will communicate it as soon as possible.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What does the Prime Minister propose to do in regard to the printing of this document or putting it in such a position that it may be available to members of the House—in both languages?

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. I should have stated that 50 copies are on the way, but 50 copies will be quite insufficient. I therefore move:

That the rules of the House be suspended and that the minutes of proceedings of the Imperial Conference, 1911, be ordered to be printed forthwith.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). In both languages.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Why, of course.

Motion agreed to.

POSTAL REGULATIONS.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. I wish to ask the Postmaster General a question. It has been the practice for certain newspapers previous to an election to accept short date subscriptions from candidates or their supporters, and these newspapers are very generally distributed throughout the country at ordinary newspaper rates. The postal regulations state that this practice is against the regulations of the Post Office Department. Clause 62 of the regulations reads:

62 On all newspapers and periodicals posted in Canada other than those provided for in the foregoing sections, when addressed to places in Canada, the United States, or Mexico, the rate is 1c. per 4 ozs. or fraction thereof to each separate address, which must be prepaid by postage stamp.

This resolution was in force previous to the last general election, but it was flagrantly violated by many of the Canadian newspapers. Clause 60 reads:

60. Copies of newspapers sent to advertisers in connection with the publication of their advertisements, and copies sent to addressss furnished by advertisers, or to persons whose subscription have been paid in whole or in part by interested parties, or marked copies, cannot be considered as addressed to sub-

scribers or as specimen copies, but are liable as transient newspapers to postage at the rate of 1c. per 4 ozs. to each separate address.

I ask the Postmaster General whether it is his intention to enforce these regulations and whether he should not send out a copy of clause 60 to the newspapers of the country so that they may know if they violate that regulation they are liable to punishment.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Clause 60 shall be enforced. Any complaint that may be made to the department will be fully inquired into, and any infringement will be stopped. There is no reason why this clause should be violated by any of the newspapers. The clause shall remain as it is and it must be enforced.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If the post office authorities are notified that the regulation is being violated, will they at once take action?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). We all know that the law was broken immediately before the last election and that tons of mail matter were sent out by several of the daily newspapers. Of course, they knew they would receive the protection of the government, and after the election there would not be much said about it anyway. It would even up matters if the same freedom to send out this material was given to all newspapers alike immediately before the election. There might be an amended regulation, by which, for thirty days or sixty days prior to an election, this matter would be sent out at the same rate of postage as is charged on an ordinary newspaper. At all events, the regulation so long as it exists should be enforced against all newspapers equally.

Mr. LEMIEUX. The regulations will be enforced and I will see to it.

Mr. BLAIN. The answer of the Postmaster General will hardly be sufficient.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. The right hon. gentleman says 'hear, hear,' but I would remind him that the regulation was flagrantly violated by his government before the last election and the right hon. gentleman sat quietly by and said nothing about it. I was going to suggest that such a violation of this regulation at the last general election should be sufficient to warrant the Postmaster General to issue special instructions to every postmaster in this country, directing his attention to the violation which took place at the last general election, and warning him that if such a thing took place again, there would be prosecutions and dismissals.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I have no objection to issuing special instructions to postmasters that that be done forthwith. I may say to my hon. friend that no discrimination was made at the last general election, nor will be made if an election should take place this year. The only complain that was made to the department, if I remember well, in the last general election was against a Grit newspaper.

Mr. BLAIN. What one was that?

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think it was published in the county of the Deputy Speaker, or in the county of my hon. friend for Grey, a local newspaper. There was a certain number of papers addressed to political friends, or to the public at large, and the complaint was made by the postmasters themselves. The postmasters are interested in seeing that a large number of papers does not come in at night and keep them at their office later than they should be. I may say to my hon. friend that, much to my personal regret, I had to enforce the regulation against that paper. There is no discrimination, there is the same law for the Grits and for the Tories.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to ask the Postmaster General a question on another point. It is a common practice—I will not charge it against one party more than another—but I happen to know of a case where that thing was done against me, and I have no doubt possibly it may have been done in favour of the Conservative candidate in some other places. Post offices are in the habit of taking mail bags from the newspaper offices without opening them. For instance, a mail bag is sent out from Ottawa addressed to Almonte. The postal department here see the label Almonte, and takes it for granted that the newspaper office is acting honestly, and is not sending out anything but legitimate newspaper matter to regular subscribers. Unfortunately, advantage has been taken of this in many instances to put in, not merely extra newspapers addressed, or unaddressed, to persons wishing to get them in an election, but also campaign literature. I know this positively, and this literature is sent, as a rule, only to postmasters who, it is known beforehand, will accept it. I took the matter up on one occasion, the only time I ever made a personal charge. I personally conducted the investigation against the postmaster, and had him dismissed. His defence was that he did not hand it through the post office, that he received it in the post office mail bag and took it out and distributed it over the counter. Then I drew his attention to the fact that if he had placed it in the hands of the persons addressed through the wicket of the post office, he would have to put a half cent stamp on each one. But he thought

that because he handed it over the counter he was not obliged to put a half cent stamp on it. He had to vacate the office. I think the Postmaster General, in view of the fact that we are going into a contest, should do his part to see that each party is treated alike.

Mr. EMMERSON. I concur in the suggestion made by the hon. member for Simcoe. I see no reason why, in the interest of the education of the people of this country, there should not be some special regulation on the occasion of a general election. We know that at the cost of the country there is literature going out to-day franked by the Hon. Clifford Sifton, documents that are published by a league known as the Canadian League. Now, I am not complaining of any efforts to educate the people.

Mr. BLAIN. Is he violating any law?

Mr. EMMERSON. No, he is not violating any law. I think perhaps he may be considered as abusing a privilege, but he is not violating any law, and I have no complaint to make with respect to it. But if there is an election there will be one great issue, the issue will be reciprocity; and I would like to have every man, woman and child in this country who is capable at all of exercising a judgment, to have all the literature possible on both sides of the question, and then the responsibility will be upon the individual having the information. I believe it to be in the interest of the country that newspapers containing information on this subject should be circulated, and I think that the Post Office Department should make some regulation whereby newspapers can, upon the same, or proportionate terms, that they are paying the department to-day for their general circulation, be permitted to send out special issues in view of the urgency of the case, as it may exist. I heartily concur in the suggestion of the hon. member for Simcoe.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. If I may be allowed another word in reply to the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Emmerson). My reason for bringing this matter up was that I know certain constituencies where wealthy candidates are running, with plenty of money, and they are able to send out, for instance, the whole of the voters' lists in their riding, and they did it at the last election to a great extent; while the candidate on the other side was not able to do anything of the kind. It was a most unfair advantage. That is one kind of literature. If hon. gentlemen could send out independent literature that was perfectly free from bias, it would be a different story.

Mr. EMMERSON. I was referring to literature that could be considered as unbiased.

Mr. HUGHES.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The hon. gentleman may have a different opinion to my own as to what is unbiased literature. However, that is the position I have taken. And I sincerely hope the Postmaster General will see that some instructions are issued to postmasters not to allow anything of that kind to occur.

EMBARGO ON BRITISH CATTLE.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the orders of the day are called, I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Fisher) if there is an embargo against the importation of cattle from Great Britain; if so, when was it put in force and for what reason?

Hon. SYDNEY FISHER (Minister of Agriculture). There is an embargo. When it was put in force I do not remember exactly, but I think it was two or three weeks ago. It was put in force because of the outbreak in that country of the foot and mouth disease, and we had to protect ourselves.

Mr. SPROULE. Would that apply to any country except Great Britain and Ireland?

Mr. FISHER. The order does not apply to any other country but the United Kingdom. But my hon. friend is aware that for a long time cattle have not been allowed to be imported from the continent of Europe.

Mr. SPROULE. I was desirous of ascertaining also whether cattle could be brought in from the United Kingdom through any other country; for instance, through the United States?

Mr. FISHER. No.

USE OF MILITIA IN STRIKES.

Mr. KING. A week ago to-day my hon. friend from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) took exception to an inference which I had drawn from some words he had used in a correspondence, and I stated I would bring to the House the communication which I had in mind.

I had the letter here on the day following and I was watching to see if my hon. friend were in the House, but except for a few hours yesterday I have not seen him in the House since. This is, therefore, the first opportunity I have had of placing before the House in his presence the communication that I had in mind. The letter is addressed to the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, Minister of Labour, Ottawa. My hon. colleague the Postmaster General (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) was at the time no longer Minister of Labour, I had been taken into the government on June 1st, and this communication was transferred to me and was replied to by me. The communication is written on the paper of the Hillcrest Coal and Coke Company, Limited.

of which my hon. friend from Leeds was president, I think, at the time of writing. The letter is as follows:—

The Hillcrest Coal and Coke Company, Limited.
Hill Crest Mines, June 7th, 1909.
Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa.

My Dear Lemieux,—On the strength of your letter of May 26th, and also of conversations with you previous to that date with reference to the strike out here I left home on June 1st and came to Hillcrest fully expecting that the mines in this district would be in operation by the time I arrived, but regret to say that things are in the same unsettled condition. I think it is outrageous that this state of affairs should be allowed to continue without the department interfering. It is true that a Board has been appointed but no agreement has been reached and it is doubtful that any will be from all that I can learn here. The mines have been idle now for over nine weeks and surely if the Department of Labour had applied itself they could have forced matters to a conclusion before this time. I think Mr. King should appear on the ground at once and if a settlement is not reached the mine owners should be allowed to import men whom the government should protect with soldiers. If the Labour Act is to be enforced some stringent legislation must be enacted to prevent occurrences of this kind.

I am,
Yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) GEO. TAYLOR.

There is a concluding paragraph and then the signature, yours faithfully, George Taylor.'

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I would ask the hon. gentleman to read the continuation of that letter and the further correspondence where I made a suggestion in response to the reply of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. KING. The concluding paragraph is as follows:

Had this been in winter half the people might have perished. I am also surprised that the man who was entirely responsible for the present condition of affairs (viz., Mr. Sherman) should now be sitting as one of the judges on the case, and but for whom a settlement might have been reached.

That is the conclusion of that letter.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Read the correspondence.

Mr. KING. My hon. friend is at liberty to read any correspondence he may have had in mind when he was speaking. I have read the correspondence I had in mind when I was speaking.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Then there is nothing in the correspondence that would lead the minister to make the statement he did. The minister certainly misrepresented the fact. He had the correspondence in his possession and he rose and made the statement and authorized the leading papers from one end of the country to the other to publish a photograph of myself——

Mr. HUGHES. That is right.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds).——and 'Soldiers driving miners into the pit at the point of the bayonet'—that is what the Grit papers are doing throughout the country to-day. There is nothing in the letter that the minister has read that I am ashamed of, and if he will read, as he should read, the balance of the correspondence, he will find the statement I made suggesting what the government should do. I challenge him to read the balance of it.

Mr. KING. If the House permits me I shall only be too pleased.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You will find no bayonets in any of it.

Mr. KING. I might say that I have here another letter dated June 28, 1909. It is a suggestion for compulsory arbitration.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Read the letter.

Mr. KING. This is probably what my hon. friend has in mind:

The Ontario Wheel Company, Limited,
Gananoque, Ont.
June 28, 1909.
Hon. W. L. Mackenzie King,
Minister of Labour,
Ottawa, Ont.

My Dear King,—Your letter of June 15th addressed to me at Hillcrest Mines has been returned to me here. I wrote from there to the Hon. Mr. Lemieux and he acknowledged receipt of my letter and told me he had transferred the matter to you.

I have not heard from our manager since I left there, but I did learn through the press that a report, had been made by the board signed by the chairman and Mr. Sherman, the miners' representative and that the mine owners' representative, Mr. McLeod, had signed the minority report. Therefore, I presume no agreement was reached, nor have I seen anything to indicate that the men have gone to work. With Mr. Sherman on the Board I did not anticipate any good results. From all I could learn out in that country both from the men and the mine owners the whole trouble was caused by Mr. Sherman. I certainly think you will have to amend the Labour Act or introduce legislation to prevent strikes, making it illegal for men to make strikes——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). That is right.

Mr. KING (reading)

—or to interfere with men who take the places of men who quit work. These miners

have all been idle since last March and should that have happened last fall the people of the district would certainly have suffered. There should be a regular commission appointed to whom all matters between capital and labour should be referred for adjustment and in the meantime the men should costinue work, or if they should leave their employers other men could take their places. I certainly think now after three months the time has arrived when you should undertake to settle this dispute. The men are all anxious to go to work so far as I could learn, but are afraid to do so owing to the union miners preventing them. I think you should visit the ground personally and ascertain both from miners and men the true state of affairs and prepare such legislation as will for all time in future prevent the recurrence of a strike like this.

I am, yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) GEORGE TAYLOR.

I think that possibly is the other communication. I have two or three here, but they are all, as I understand it, suggestions for the introduction of a measure in the nature of compulsory arbitration to compel the men to remain at work whether they desire to better their conditions by seeking other employment or not.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). No, nothing of the kind. Do not misrepresent me. Read the letter.

Mr. KING. I must allow the House to put its own construction on the words 'making it illegal for men to make strikes.' They can only have one meaning in the minds of all men who consider this question. In regard to what my hon. friend has said about the expression I used, if there is any different meaning to be attached to the words than that which they would be generally understood to bear, I am prepared that he should have the benefit of any different meaning which may be drawn out of them, but I repeat now that the method that is common in Pennsylvania and has been common on the part of some of the mine owners there in fighting labour has been to import men and use the state militia as a means of keeping them at work, and I say it is precisely that kind of action which the following words seem to imply:

The mine owners should be allowed to import men whom the government should protect with soldiers.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Has the government not done this down at the mines in Nova Scotia?

Mr. KING. No, the government has not.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Have the soldiers not been called out there to protect the men? Will the minister get up and deny the statement that the soldiers have been called out?

Mr. KING. My hon. friend asked me the question: Had the government not done this? The government has had nothing whatever to do with the calling out of any soldiers.

Mr, TAYLOR (Leeds). The soldiers were there and protected the men when they went to work.

Mr. KING. The soldiers were there at the instance of the mine owners, not at the instance of the government, exactly the kind of thing that the hon. gentleman suggests here.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). But the minister got up and voluntarily made the statement that he did make here the other day. I will quote his words; I will not misrepresent them:

My recollection is that the hon. member from Leeds (Mr. Taylor) suggested the government should drive the men back at the point of the bayonet.

When the minister got up and made that statement and when he had the documents in his possession, he did so with one purpose only—to try to injure me and the party behind me with the labour men of this country. The papers published that broadcast throughout the country. I say that there is notning in the correspondence nor can the minister show that there is, to verify the statement that he has ascribed to me here. I say it was a malicious——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am perfectly in order. I say it was done maliciously by the Minister of Labour to try and injure me politically.

Mr. HUGHES. He could not do that.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). He could not do it in this country because I have a reputation a good deal better than his, politically and otherwise. If the Minister of Labour will keep his seat till I get through, I will give him an opportunity to meet me here or on any other platform. I will discuss the matter with him in his own constituency, or in any town he likes before the labouring men of this country. I will go out to Hillcrest among the miners and I will face him there if he dares. How dare he charge me with suggesting to drive the men back at the point of the bayonet, when my suggestion was that there should be a labour commission, and that its rulings should be obeyed by the employers just as well as by the men, and that if a man wanted to leave his employment he could, but he had no right to prevent another man taking his place. There is the Minister of Labour drawing his salary for doing nothing and the people of the west likely to freeze to death this winter. It is a disgrace

to the minister and a disgrace to the government to allow that strike to go on, for they have the power to settle it. A deputation is coming down here to ask for free coal, and if the government grant that request the strike will be settled at once.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. member has made a personal explanation, and there is nothing now before the Chair. There has got to be an end to this discussion.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I am surprised at the Prime Minister calling me to order when I am chastising one of his ministers for having made such a malicious statement, a statement which the Prime Minister must know was not in accordance with the facts. The Prime Minister should call his Minister of Labour to order and say to him: Until you apologize to the House for making that false statement you cannot sit at the council board over which I preside. But in place of that he wants to surround himself with a lot of gentlemen who will do his bidding. Compare the government of to-day with his cabinet when he came into power. The men he could not control he elevated to the bench, like Mowat, Mills and half a dozen others, and he has called around him a lot like the Minister of Labour. He will back up the Minister of Labour or any other minister in making statements that he himself knows are not in accordance with the facts. Let the minister accept my challenge and we will go into some mining district, either in Nova Scotia or out in British Columbia.

Mr. EMMERSON. Marquis of Queensbury rules?

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). I will leave it to the verdict of the labour men there whether I am right in making this statement.

Mr. KING. I just want to say——

Mr. SPEAKER. I cannot allow the debate to go on further; there is nothing before the Chair.

Mr. HUGHES. Is not every dollar of the expense of the militia at Sydney and elsewhere coming out of the pockets of the people of Canada?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No, the municipalities pay.

Mr. HUGHES. Did not the government pay at Montreal and Sault Ste. Marie?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. No. the municipalities did.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The Minister of Labour has made a very grave statement against the Militia Department and it is up to the Minister of Militia to explain. The Minister of Labour said that in cases of strikes the militia were called out at the instance of the mine owners. The Militia Act permits nothing of the kind. The militia can only be called out by the order of the civil authorities. The Minister of Labour has let the cat out of the bag as to the policy of the government in case of strikes.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I presume the Minister of Labour meant that——

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I have been asked to explain, and I wish to do so. As I understand it, in case of a strike any person can go to the proper municipal authorities, and if such authorities are satisfied that there has been a serious breach of the peace, then application is made under the Act in a proper way for the calling out of the militia. That is what happened in this case.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). The government passed the Act and they are responsible.

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. The Act is on the statute book for 50 years.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). It comes back to the government all the same.

Mr. BOYCE. What is the position of the claim made by the government against the town of Sault Ste. Marie for assistance rendered at the time of the trouble in 1903? Action was taken against the town at the instance of the Crown to recover the cost of the militia. Has that judgment been enforced?

Sir FREDERICK BORDEN. I will get the information by to-morrow.

ARGENTINE CANNED MEATS.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I wish to ask the Minister of Agriculture whether there is an embargo against Argentine cattle coming into Canada, and what steps are taken by the government to ascertain whether the canned meats from the Argentine, which are being brought into Canada in large quantities, are packed under sanitary conditions. These meats are advertised all over Canada in the daily papers, and I have here a sample tin. In view of the passing of this reciprocity treaty is the government taking any steps to protect the people of this country against unsanitary canned meats, and the herds of this country against the importation of Argentine cattle. I will place this can on the table of the House for the benefit of the Minister of Agriculture.

Mr. FISHER. The cattle of the Argentine are not permitted to land in Canada, and so far as the canned meats are concerned

the department is preparing an Act to deal with that question.

WAYS AND MEANS—CORONATION CELEBRATION IN OTTAWA.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BEATTIE (London). In connection with the coronation celebration in Ottawa and the absence of the ministers therefrom I call attention to the following which appears in the Ottawa 'Journal':

Mayor's Office, June 16, 1911.—Yourself and ladies are cordially invited to enclosure on Parliament Hill on the morning of June 22, beginning at 11.15 sharp. Your presence and help upon that occasion will be very much appreciated in connection with the Coronation Day celebration.

This is the letter which the mayor dictated to his secretary in connection with the Coronation Day celebration, and which the secretary states he sent out to all the cabinet ministers who were in the city, as well as the four local members.

He ascertained the ministers who were in the city, he states, by calling up their offices. Those who were in England were not sent invitations. The others, he says, were sent invitations.

This is the mayor's answer to the statement made by the Hon. Wm. Pugsley in the House of Commons day before yesterday, that the reason the three cabinet ministers who were in town on Coronation Day did not attend the Coronation celebration on Parliament Hill was that it was a civic affair, and they had received no invitations.

At the coronation celebration on parliament hill there were 10,000 people assembled in the presence of Lord Grey and Lady Grey, and the newspaper account of the ceremony says:

Led by Earl Grey, Governor General of Canada, ten thousand people on Parliament Hill this morning sent forth a cheer for King George V., the echo of which resounded throughout the city, and the spirit of it throughout the empire. It was Coronation Day, and in spite of the rain Ottawa citizens showed their appreciation of the fact.

The only real lack was the absence of prominent citizens and—cabinet ministers. Earl and Lady Grey occupied a place on the flag draped platform, with a party from Government House. Mayor Hopewell was there, and Sir Richard Scott. There was not a cabinet minister to be seen, however.

There is Mr. Speaker a growing feeling of uneasiness in Canada at the anti-British attitude of this government, and that feeling has not been allayed by the Premier's boast in Quebec of having preserved Canada's autonomy at the Imperial Conference, and his coolness towards pro-British proposals generally. It is a lamentable fact that at the coronation ceremony in the capital of the country not a single cabinet minister thought it worth while to attend His Excellency, or to step on to the lawn in front of their offices where the celebration was being held. Indeed, it was said that some of them were looking out the windows at the ceremony in their shirt-sleeves. We spent a good deal of money to send a delegation to London to participate in the ceremony there, and the people of this country will want to know why there was not a cabinet minister to attend His Excellency at the Ottawa celebration. As to the statement that the ministers did not receive an invitation, whatever question there be as to that, I think they might very well have gone without an invitation.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH. As I am one of the three ministers who enjoyed the privilege of remaining here during the two months' recess of parliament, and as this is a repetition of some newspaper attempted attacks made on some one or other, perhaps I should say a word about it. I do not know in what manner the alleged invitation to attend this function was sent to the three ministers in question, but I certainly would be a little interested to know. I have no doubt that my hon. friend the Postmaster General who was one of the three ministers who were here during the day of coronation would be equally glad to know whether or not the post office was utilized for the sending of the invitations. So far as I am concerned I have nothing to add to what was stated by the Minister of Public Works when this matter was mentioned in the House the other day. I do not pretend that I did not know, that there was going to be some sort of parade upon the lawn. I was at my office during each of the previous days, and I saw the building of the platform, and I should have been a very strange man if I had not supposed that it was in connection with the coronation, and that it was intended there should be some sort of celebration upon that occasion. But while that is so, and while for that reason I attach no consequence to the fact that no invitation came to me in any way in connection with the matter, I was equally of opinion from what I saw in the newspapers that the matter was of a purely municipal or civil character. I understood an invitation had been extended to His Excellency and that His Excellency intended to be present, and that there was to be some sort of review or inspection of the Boy Scouts, and some parade of school children, and something of that sort. But that it was in any sense a government affair, or in any sense a national affair, or in any sense one that it was my duty as a minister of the Crown to attend, never occurred to

me. I am not much given to that sort of thing; I do not commonly attend such things, whether they are of a public character or something to which I would go merely as a spectator. In this instance the day being a holiday in the departments I was not in my office at as early an hour as usual, but I reached there just about when the small gathering of perhaps 150 or 200 boys and young people were separating on the lawn. If I had had the good fortune to reach the buildings a few minutes earlier, I think I should have gone to witness what was going on, but in the circumstances until somebody tried to make a great grievance of the absence of the ministers, and a slight even to His Gracious Majesty himself, it never occurred to me that there was the slightest importance attached to the matter one way or another. It should also be borne in mind that the fact of there being so few people present was because of a heavy rain shower in the morning, and the notifications that were put up about the city that the whole function was at an end, and that there would be no ceremony at all. I mention that, not as accounting for my own absence, because I did not know of the notices of cancellation until afterwards, but the circumstances are these I have described, and I can only say that if anybody thinks to make any political capital out of it, or to cast upon any of His Majesty's ministers in Canada aspersions as to their loyalty, it seems to me that it is about parallel to the waving of a pocket edition of the Union Jack.

Mr. BEATTIE. Perhaps you did not go there because the platform was draped with the Union Jack.

Mr. PUGSLEY. As I stated the other day I was informed by the Secretary of State, and by the Minister of Justice that they had not received an invitation, and the Postmaster General told me that the day after the coronation, when the whole affair was over, he did receive an invitation.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I cancelled an engagement I had in Montreal district to address a public meeting in order that I should be here to attend any coronation ceremonies that might take place in the capital. I received an invitation to attend the coronation dinner at Rideau Hall, and as befitting a minister of the Crown I was present with His Excellency there. Had there been an invitation received by me from the city authorities I would only have been too pleased to attend. I saw the ceremony which took place from the window of my office where I was working that day, but I may say that on my way to the office, I saw a notification posted that everything had been cancelled on account of the heavy rain. I am surprised to see the statement of Mayor Hopewell in the newspapers that the ministers were specially notified. That is not a fact. The day after the ceremony, I did receive at my private residence an unsigned typewritten notice stating that I would be received on the platform, if I should attend the ceremony.

Mr. PERLEY. Is not the hon. gentleman a citizen of Ottawa?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Certainly.

Mr. PERLEY. Then, was it sensible or right that he should stand upon his dignity on an occasion of this kind?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Might I ask my hon. friend if, as a citizen of Ottawa and a member of the House of Commons, he was present himself?

Mr. PERLEY. It so happened that I was many miles away from here. However, I did attend two celebrations of that kind on that day.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I also was many miles away the day before, but I came here expressly to attend.

Mr. OWEN. When the House adjourned on May 20 a supply was arranged for up to September first. I must say that since the House resumed, about two weeks ago, the business of this country has not gone along very rapidly. In the riding I have the honour to represent there are about 2,000 men employed on government public works, and I would like to know if it is the intention of the right hon. the leader of the government and the hon. leader of the opposition to make arrangements for supply before prorogation takes place. If we are to believe what we read in the daily press prorogation may take place in the very near future, and we may have a general election at no very distant date. If anything should happen which would result in these 2,000 men being turned idle, during the early winter, I think it would be a great hardship. Therefore, I would like to know if it is the intention to arrange for Supply before prorogation.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The House is engaged at the present time in passing the reciprocity agreement. We have had it before us for some months, and it seems to me that for all the information drawn from the debate we could pass upon it to-day. At any rate we could have a vote upon it and know whether we are in favour of it or not. As soon as we have voted upon this question we shall have to take up to the matter of Supply.

THE POSTAL SERVICE.

Mr. BLAIN. Before you leave the Chair, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct the attention of the hon. Postmaster General to a very important matter. Some weeks ago I put a question on the Order Paper asking how many post offices in the county of Peel were receiving less than a daily mail. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) was good enough to give an answer to the House. I am one of those who support, and will continue to support, a rural free mail delivery.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Hear, hear.

Mr. BLAIN. My hon. friend the Postmaster General says hear, hear. I can show to my hon. friend that I supported a resolution in favour of a rural free mail delivery when my hon. friend voted against it in this House, but afterwards acted on the suggestion of the opposition. However, I did not rise for the purpose of discussing that. My hon. friend must remember that his department has the support of, and is contributed to, by almost every elector in Canada. The Post Office Department shows a very considerable surplus, but, in my humble opinion, that surplus is at the expense of the poorly paid postmasters in rural districts—notwithstanding the fact that since my hon. friend has been Postmaster General some increases have been made in the salaries of these rural postmasters, for which I compliment my hon. friend.

To-day we have telephones in many parts of the country, and I think my hon. friend should see to it that a telephone is installed in every rural post office in this country where there are rural telephone systems and where the Bell Telephone Company's system reaches.

I think in addition to an examination into the twice-a-week mail service and three-times-a-week mail service, which we have in some of the older sections, my hon. friend should see to it that we have a daily mail service to these points, and that where we have a rural telephone system there should be a telephone in each of the post offices, at the expense of the government. I think the hon. Postmaster General would receive the co-operation of the hon. members of this House, and that he would be endorsed by the people of this country if he were to introduce some system of that kind.

Mr. EMMERSON. Is it my hon. friend's suggestion that the government should pay the rental for the telephones?

Mr. BLAIN. I should say yes. I do not think it could be expected that a postmaster receiving a salary of only $35 a year should be asked to contribute $10 or $15 a year for the rental of a telephone, which would be used for the general service of the community. In my opinion the rental of the telephone should be paid out of the revenue of the Dominion, in connection with the Post Office Department.

Mr. EDWARDS. I wish heartily to concur in the remarks made by the hon. member for Peel. Since I have had the honour of a seat in this House I have frequently called attention to the lack of proper postal facilities in my part of the country. I endorse the hon. gentleman's statement that in these older provinces, throughout the country districts wherever there are post offices, there should be a daily service, and in many places where there are no post offices they should be established. There are many reasons why the country districts in Ontario should receive more consideration than they have received in the matter of postal facilities. In many of the outlying districts the people live anywhere from five to fifteen miles from a post office, and in many districts they get a mail only twice a week, which is practically no service at all. I think the facilities should be extended, and a daily service should be given to all those country places. I will go further, and say that I think this government should take up the whole matter, and lay out a regular system of rural routes for post offices, and even to assist those country districts in maintaining good roads connecting many of those points. In some parts of my own constituency, the postal facilities have been so poor that the people have been obliged to put in little telephone systems of their own as their only means of communication. I have taken the trouble to compare the number of post offices in the province of Ontario in 1895 and the number in 1909, and I find that during that period the number has increased by 17 per cent. In the province of Quebec during the same period the number of post offices has increased forty-one per cent; in Nova Scotia, twenty-two per cent; in New Brunswick, twenty per cent; in Prince Edward Island, twenty per cent; in British Columbia, one hundred and twenty-two per cent; and in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, one hundred and ninety-eight per cent. Of course, we can readily understand that in the newer sections of the country where population is rapidly increasing there would be many demands on the Postmaster General for new offices. But we find that while the province of Onatrio has contributed more than any other province to the revenue of the Post Office Department, the increase in the number of post offices in that province has been considerably less than in the other provinces. That strikes me as unfair. Not only is that the fact in

regard to the province as a whole, but I think that very little consideration has been given to the country districts throughout that province. I am certain that so far as the county of Frontenac is concerned, they have received very little consideration. Now the Postmaster General has boasted of a surplus in the Post Office Department. I want to say that if there is one department in this country which is not entitled to a dollar of surplus it is the Post Office Department. Every dollar of the revenue of that department comes out of the pockets of the people, and I maintain that every dollar of that revenue should go back to the people in the form of increased postal facilities. I go further, and say that if there is any department of government which would be justified in making an expenditure in excess of the revenue, that department is the Post Office Department. Therefore the boast of the Postmaster General that his department shows a surplus is a boast that, in my estimation, reflects no credit on the management of the department. I wish to raise my voice against any policy of laying up a surplus by withholding postal facilities where they are required. Now the county of Frontenac contributes considerably towards that surplus. The post offices in that county contribute nearly $4,000 a year in revenue, over and above the amount paid by the government in salaries and allowances to postmasters. I could refer the Postmaster General to some thirteen offices in the county of Frontenac where the surplus revenue over and above salaries and allowances amounts altogther to over $1,173, and the average salary paid to the postmasters in those thirteen offices is only $108 a year. None of those offices are allowed to issue postal notes or money orders, and that is a matter that I wish to draw to the attention of the Postmaster General. I think he is not treating the people of the rural districts fairly. I think the revenue from these post offices I refer to is large enough to warrant the Postmaster General in granting them the right to issue postal notes and money orders. I have had experience heretofore with the Post Office Department in regard to obtaining better postal facilities in my county, an experience which has not been encouraging. For instance, I asked him to establish a post office on the border of the city of Kingston at the junction of the city with the township of Kingston. I pointed out to him that within a hundred yards of the proposed location of this office there was a school, and that the daily stage went right past it. I pointed out that the cost would only be a matter of the postmaster's salary, which might be taken out of what revenue there would be from that office.

As things are now the people in the adjoining country have to travel down into the city three-quarters of a mile to get their mail, whereas, if this office was established at, you might say, no cost at all to the government, at the point I have indicated, the convenience to the people would be very great, indeed. For a time the Postmaster General agreed to establish that office at that particular point. Apparently he was convinced that the people were entitled to that convenience. Then the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Harty) intervened and raised an objection to the post office being established just inside the city limits. He objected to the people of the adjoining country coming inside the city a matter of a few feet in order to get their mail. The point selected was the only available place for a post office. The people kept a little store and were very popular in that section. The people of Kingston in the neighbourhood of the locality signed a petition, a copy of which I have here, which was sent to the Postmaster General asking him to establish an office at that point. The people of that section of the city have their mail delivered to them two or three times a day by letter carriers. They are not asking the Postmaster General to do away with any office. The convenience to the people in the city would be very slight. It would be some convenience, I dare say, but it would be slight, whereas, the convenience to the people of the surrounding country would be very great, indeed, and the cost to the department would be practically nothing. The Postmaster General gave his consent to that, but the hon. member for Kingston objected to a post office being established within the city limits, and apparently the hon. member for Kingston was able to overcome the convictions of the Postmaster General that a post office should, in justice to the people, be established, for up to the present time, that post office has not been established.

I want to call the attention of this House to another matter. I was asked by some people living in the north of my county to bring this matter to the attention of the Postmaster General and this will serve to illustrate the lack of postal facilities in rural districts. I endeavoured to have a post office established between Maberly and Sharbot Lake at a place called Fall River. I asked the people to get up a petition, and I would present it. They did so, the petition was presented, and I have in my hand here now the acknowledgment from the Postmaster General of the receipt of that petition requesting the establishment of an office at that place. The letter acknowledging the petition was dated April 3, 1909. On January 18, 1910 the hon. Postmaster General sent me this letter with regard to the request for that office. I wish to place this letter upon 'Hansard' in order that mem-

bers of this House will realize the difficulties in getting proper postal facilities in country districts:

Ottawa, Jan. 18, 1910.

Dear Mr. Edwards,—I have your letter of the 13th inst., relating in part to a proposed post office at 'Fall River,' on lot 12, concession 7, township of Oso, county of Frontenac, at a distance of 4½ miles south from Maberly, and beg to say that it is found, on inquiry, that not more than 18 or 20 families would benefit, that it would cost $70 a year for a semi-weekly exchange of mails with Maberly, and that the office would collect a revenue of probably not more than $10. It is understood that for three or four miles the road is not open in winter between Crow lake and Fall River, and that it would, therefore, be impossible for the mail courier between Crow lake and Sharbot Lake to travel by way of the proposed office site.

In view of the cost involved, namely, $70, for the service, and $35 as the postmaster's salary, as against an anticipated revenue of only $10, the department has been unable to see its way to open an office.

Yours sincerely,

(Sgd.) RODOLPHE LEMIEUX.

Here is a letter signed by the Postmaster General and giving as a reason for the non-establishment of this office that the department could not afford to spend possibly $90 a year in giving these people a semi-weekly service, that there are only eighteen or twenty families involved and that these eighteen or twenty families, we must infer, must remain without postal facilities, because, forsooth, the cost to the government would be $90 per year. I think I am justified in making the severest kind of criticism of the Post Office Department when they speak of the surplus of that department with such conditions prevailing in my county. I think I am justified in making the severest kind of criticism of sawdust wharf transactions, Aylesworth ditches and expenditures of money along that line when one of the members of the government will sign a letter stating that in his opinion the government would not be warranted in expending a matter of $90 a year to give this convenience to some eighteen or twenty families. I want to read in connection with that a few words which passed between the Postmaster General and myself in this House in regard to the establishment of post offices. The hon. Postmaster General, speaking this session, as reported at pages 2143 and 2144 of 'Hansard,' said:

As regards postal facilities in a whole township, I do not know that there is any reason why the people should not be provided with these postal facilities where the distance is about five miles from a post office. It is certainly the policy of the Post Office Department to grant any request which is made with such a distance in view. Whenever my hon. friend on behalf of his own township in Frontenac or any other hon. gentleman makes a request to provide postal facilities, where there is a distance of about five miles, the Post Office Department cannot but accede to that request, and I appeal to him and to members of the House on both sides whether, whenever a request of that kind is made to the Post Office Department, it is not granted.

These are the words of the Postmaster General. In answer to his appeal I recited the case which I have recited here to-day and at the same time I expressed my pleasure at his making use of those words because I saw, or thought I saw, in those words of the Postmaster General, some hope for certain sections of my county where they have absolutely no postal facilities whatever. We had in those words the distinct promise of a minister of the Crown to relieve the situation, to grant postal facilities in places where these facilities do not at present exist.

In spite of the plain words of the Postmaster General he turns a deaf ear regardless of his own statement. I would not be doing my duty to my constituents if I did not under the circumtances state the facts in this House. I do not think that the people in the country districts have received proper and just treatment from the Post Office Department. I want to be most emphatic in being understood that I do not think the Post Office Department is entitled to boast of any surplus. The money comes from the people, and the money should go back to the people in increased postal facilities. I want to impress also on the Postmaster General and the members of the House the further fact, that the relative increase in the population of the various provinces does not in my estimation warrant the great difference which prevails in the increase of the number of post offices granted to the various provinces. If we consider the increase of the population of Ontario and of the other provinces, between 1895 and 1909, and if we take into consideration, as we have a right to, the post office revenue obtained from these various provinces, then, I say it is worthy at least of a little thought on our part, that the increase in the number of the post offices in the province of Ontario—which contributes most towards the revenue of the post office, which has the largest population and the greatest wealth—is relatively much less than the increase in the number of post offices in any of the other provinces. Taking the years 1905 to 1909, there has been an increase of 17 per cent in the number of post offices in the province of Ontario, an increase of 41 per cent in the province of Quebec, an increase of 22 per cent in Nova Scotia, an increase of 20 per cent in New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island, an increase of 122 per cent in British Columbia, and an increase of 198 per cent in Manitoba and the prairie provinces. I

appeal again to the Postmaster General to give the country districts more consideration in the matter of increased postal facilities, than he has given in the past. I would rather not have to adversely criticise, but I do not think I would be doing my duty, if I allowed this opportunity to pass without saying a word on behalf of the people of my county. I am perfectly sincere, in making this statement that whatever has been done in the way of improvement—and a good deal has been done in various parts of the country—I do not think that more consideration has been given to the cities and towns than has been given to the country districts. This or any other government would be well advised in establishing well defined postal routes in the country districts, and I think a considerable sum of money might well be expended by this government in helping to maintain the roads on these well established postal routes. A post office means a great deal to the people of a rural district. I have no objection whatever to the free rural mail delivery routes, and I think it is a step in the right direction, but I do say that before free rural mail delivery is given to these centres which now have a daily service, or even more than a daily service, consideration should be given to these sections of the country where the people get their mail only twice or three times a week. I believe in giving to the various districts a daily mail and then extending your free rural mail delivery limits just as rapidly as your finances will permit. If the Postmaster General or any member of this House, tells me that greater postal facilities cannot be given to any section of my county, because so much money has to be expended on free rural mail delivery routes, that they cannot afford to give proper facilities to the outlying districts, then I think it is my duty to state here my objection to such a policy. I hope the Postmaster General will give this matter the consideration it deserves.

Mr. LEMIEUX. I think the hon. gentleman for Peel (Mr. Blain) for the compliments he has paid the Post Office Department, and I trust he will convince my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that in the administration of the post office, I am generally fair in my dealings with members on both sides of the House. When I took office the rural postmasters were receiving only a maximum salary of $10 a year, and I have increased that on two different occasions until it is now $35 per annum. My intention is to continue that until it is raised to $50. I am heartily in favour of the extension of the rural telephone system, because I know the advantages which would accrue from it. In the county of Nicolet, which I once represented in this House, I found in nearly every parish a good system of rural phones, and it was a great facility to the people. In many European countries, and even in Japan, the Postmaster General is called the Minister of Communications, and has under his control not only the mail system, but the cables, telegraphs and telephones. In these countries the system works well and it pays well although the rates are far from being high. The day may not be far distant when in Canada a similar system will prevail. Speaking for myself only, I am personally in favour of a government controlled rural telephone system. I think it would be quite an addition to the advantages now enjoyed by the farmers. I think public opinion in the country, especially in the western provinces and in Ontario, is shaping itself in that direction. For my part I have no hesitation in stating that I would view with favour the establishment of a rural telephone system, under the control of the Post Office Department. Of course this is only my personal opinion, and I do not wish to commit any one but myself to it.

As regards the service in the older sections of the province, I would like to answer the mild arraignment of my hon. friend. I think I am right in saying that whenever it has been shown to me that an extension of the service should be made, I have never hesitated in granting the request. As a matter of fact I can state that for the last year at least, it has been an exceptional case when I refused such a request. I consider that a semi-weekly or tri-weekly service in the older sections of the country at the present time is an out of date system, and should be replaced by a more modern one. My hon. friend (Mr. Edwards), spoke a moment ago in reference to the average number of post offices opened in the new provinces as compared with the older provinces. I must say there is some truth in the statement of the hon. gentleman, but, the explanation is not very clear. The postal system has been in vogue in the older sections of the community—in the eastern part of Canada as we call it—for over a century; since the time of Benjamin Franklin, who was the first Postmaster General. In the new provinces those people who come from the old country ask to have the postal facilities as they had them in England. This is not a matter to be trifled with. We must meet their legitimate demands. We bring them to the western provinces by advertising our country, and having brought them there the least we can give them is proper postal facilities. I may tell the House that up to the present time I have not refused one per cent of the requests which have been made for new offices in the western districts. I might

say that same thing for New Ontario and New Quebec.

My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), compared the number of post offices in Ontario and Quebec. I hope my hon. friend does not think I am in any way sectional in connection with this matter.

Mr. EDWARDS. Will the hon. Postmaster General permit me to say a word? I did not confine my statement to Ontario and Quebec. I gave the increase in the number of post offices for all the provinces; so the hon. gentleman is not justified in saying that I confined my comparison to Ontario and Quebec; neither should the hon. minister think I expressed any idea that he was sectional.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Last year I gave, of my own accord, a statement showing the average number of offices opened in the various provinces, in which the hon. gentleman will find the figures he quoted. My hon. friend must know that the province of Ontario has been for many years the best equipped province in the whole Dominion, so far as postal facilities are concerned. Now, there were obvious reasons for that. In Ontario the people go to the post office nearly every day, whereas in the province of Quebec it has been for many years the custom of the habitants to go to church on Sundays, and get their mail at the church door. That custom is passing away now, and as the new colonization movement goes on we have to provide the people in the far away districts with better postal facilities. As I say, there has been no favour shown to the people of my province in the establishment of post offices; I have simply given them what they were entitled to get in all justice.

As regards rural mail delivery, I am glad my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), and my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), support me in the new policy which has been put into force for the last two or three years. I might lay on the table of the House a statement which will show what progress has been made in connection with rural mail delivery routes in the Dominion of Canada up to the 31st of January, 1911:

Statement in connection with Rural Mail Delivery Routes, in the Dominion of Canada for the period ending January 31, 1911.

Division.	Number of Routes authorized.	Number of Routes on which authorized rate was accepted.	Number of Routes on which authorized rate was refused.	Total Number of Box-holders reported.	Cost of Service of Boxes for Four Years.	Increase in cost of Mail Services for Four Years.	Total Increase in cost of Mail Services (including service of Rural Delivery Boxes) for Four Years.
					$ cts.	$ cts.	$ cts.
Prince Edward Island.	40	28	9	598	2,175 76	4,180 88	6,356 64
Nova Scotia	9	8	1	141	515 00	212 00	727 00
New Brunswick	23	17	3	598	2,143 48	3,276 80	5,420 28
Quebec	8	5	3	65	259 00	2,120 00	2,379 00
Montreal	3	2	1	35	140 00	1,273 40	1,413 40
Ottawa	12	6	4	211	803 00	1,530 40	2,333 40
Kingston	35	21	10	1,177	4,638 00	8,859 20	13,497 20
Toronto	63	37	16	1,825	7,197 00	11,698 64	18,895 64
London	149	82	50	4,054	15,708 00	38,521 84	54,229 84
North Bay	1	1	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....
Winnipeg	30	16	11	241	744 00	7,297 52	8,041 52
Moosejaw	8	8	.....	128	345 00	1,040 00	1,385 00
Saskatoon	4	4	.....	40	113 00	.....	113 00
Edmonton	15	14	1	223	644 00	220 00	864 00
Calgary	7	6	.....	89	261 00	78 40	339 40
Vancouver	7	4	3	219	836 00	4,399 88	5,235 88
Victoria	8	7	.....	56	198 00	3,628 00	3,826 00
Totals	422	266	112	9,700	36,720 24	88,336 96	125,057 20

During the course of next week, I will give the House a statement showing the operation of the rural mail delivery up to date. I may say there has been a very large increase in the number of routes during the last few months—in fact during the last few weeks. We were short of boxes until late in February this year, which will account for this. As I stated the other day, we gave an order for 100,000 boxes, and they are being manufactured at the present time, so that all the requests which have been granted for the opening of these routes will be covered, and there will be no delay in putting on the rural mail service.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). This hurry up order is on account of the coming elections. I suppose.

Mr. LEMIEUX. Not at all. I do not believe in the elections, and I do not think my hon. friend believes in them.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). You said in Quebec that they were coming.

Mr. LEMIEUX. That is not exactly what I said. There must have been a rider to it. At all events I do not believe a rural mail box will influence the electors in the section where it goes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. My hon. friend the Postmaster General (Mr. Lemieux) tells us that he will probably make some statement early next week. Might I ask him whether he will make that statement Monday or Tuesday?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Let us say Tuesday.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. That will be a general statement with reference to the progress made in the rural mail routes?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. In reference to the statement which has been laid on the table by my hon. friend, might I ask him whether that $125,000 is all attributed to the increased cost in reference to rural free mail delivery?

Mr. LEMIEUX. Yes. Whenever there is a rural mail route established, new tenders are asked for from the couriers. They are entitled to so much per box, and as they have to serve every box they ask more for the service.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask whether the hon. minister has deducted the original cost, or the former cost of carrying on the service on these routes?

Mr. LEMIEUX. No. It is included.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Then, this increase cannot be attributed to rural free mail delivery?

Mr. LEMIEUX. In my judgment the cost of serving a rural mail route as contrasted with the cost of serving an ordinary mail route is 25 to 30 per cent more; that is the general opinion in the department, taking it all in all. To my hon. friend from Peel (Mr. Blain), I must say that if he has in mind any post offices which suffer from the fact that they have only a semi-weekly service, and if he will make a list of them and send it to me I will deal with the matter at once. Now the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) spoke of the Kingston and Frontenac imbroglio. Well, my hon. friend represents Frontenac, and another hon. gentleman (Mr. Harty) represents Kingston and my hon. friend was encroaching on the Kingston territory. He wanted to make a charge which would affect an existing post office near the border of the county. That is the information I have from the hon. member for Kingston. But I will tell the hon. gentleman now that if he will find within the borders of his own county a suitable place for a post office, I am quite willing to open one there. I think the objection was that there was a hotel at that point, and it was not a suitable place for a post office. At all events, if my hon. friend will find a suitable spot for a new post office, the order is ready, and I am waiting the hon. gentleman's choice of a site. As regards the surplus, I quite agree with the remarks that have been made by hon. gentlemen opposite. I think we can spend freely, spend liberally, and be generous towards the public, and yet do more than make both ends meet. I would be unworthy to hold the position of Postmaster General if I did not follow the traditions of my predecessors, and I think I would receive the criticism of hon. gentlemen opposite if, after taking charge of the department, I now came forward with a deficit instead of a surplus. The service has expanded, we have nearly doubled the expenses of 1896. I have certainly spent liberally for the service, both in the rural and in the urban sections; and with all that, and notwithstanding the decrease of the postal rates, if I am able to show a surplus, I should not be blamed for it. As long as I remain Postmaster General, I will spend liberally and fairly, in order to meet the wants of the public, but I am not going to give away the surplus. I maintain that it is better to meet the expenses and at the same time have a surplus, than to spend too largely and have a deficit at the end of the year.

At one o'clock, House took recess.

House resumed at three o'clock.

THE ALIEN LABOUR LAW.

Mr. G. H. BARNARD (Victoria, B.C.). Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of the Minister of Labour and the Minister of the Interior to a question of some importance which is troubling the minds of some of the people of my constituency. There is at present a large amount of railway construction going on in the neighbourhood of the city of Victoria, and also upon the mainland of British Columbia. The statement is made, and I believe it is founded upon fact, that a large number of labourers are being brought into the province under contracts which are contrary to the Alien Labour Law from the State of Washington and the adjoining states. I have here a sample of one of these contracts, which is as follows:

Deliver this ticket to the employer, Lilyman & Renard, employment agents, 108 West Main street, No. 187.

Seattle, Wash., June 12, 1911.

Name, Gust Anderson; hired as labourer; for Knowles & Thompson, care Grant Smith & Company; at Victoria; wages, $2.50 per day; board, $5.25 per week; signature, Gust Anderson; report at office 8 a.m.; Lilyman & Renard; by, C.S.; 6-13-11

That is a sample of several contracts which have been shown to me. While I understand that the Minister of Labour is of the opinion that this is a matter which can be adjusted under the Alien Labour Act, I am informed that the labour people in Victoria, who have been taking this matter up with the view of entering prosecutions under that Act, have been advised by counsel that owing to the form of construction of the Act it is impossible for him to proceed. I have received a letter dated the 18th of July from Mr. J. Aikman, a counsel of standing, well-known in the city of Victoria, who writes to me as follows:

Dear Sir,—On behalf of the Victoria Building Trades Council I beg to call your attention to the provisions of an Act of the Dominion of Canada, known as the Alien Labour Act, being chapter 97 of the Revised Statutes of Canada, and to point out to you that in section 3 thereof it is provided that every violation of section 2, leaves any person, &c., who violates the same liable to 'Forfeit and pay a sum not exceeding $1,000 and not less than $50,' and by section 4 of the said Act it is provided 'That the sum so forfeited may with the written consent of any judge of the court in which the action is intended to be brought, be sued for and recovered as a debt, &c.' But there is no provision in the Act authorizing any court to declare what the forfeiture shall be, and I can find no provisions covering the matter in any statute, and it seems to me that the offence being a statutory one, there must be jurisdiction conferred upon a court or courts authorizing a declaration of what the forfeiture shall be. Having this in mind I call the matter to your attention so that you will be enabled to lay the matter before the proper authorities at Ottawa and have the Act amended so that two justices of the peace or any magistrate having the power of two justices of the peace may declare a forfeiture, and I would also suggest that it would be advisable for you to urge upon the authorities the necessity of having a more simple method of collecting such forfeiture than the present one provided for in the Act.

What is the necessity of having the collection of a forfeiture left in the way it is in the Act, by recovering the same as if it were a debt when nearly every other penalty provided for in the Acts of parliament are collected by means of jurisdiction being conferred upon the court that declares the forfeiture by distress and in default of distress imprisonment. It does seem to me that the Act is simply a piece of legislation designed for the purpose of satisfying claims that have been advanced by the labour unions throughout Canada, but made unworkable for some ulterior purpose.

There are at present hundreds, and I might say with safety, thousands of labourers landing in the different ports in British Columbia from the American side penniless, and whose fares have been paid by agencies on the American side, who are acting for contractors in this province, and I inclose herewith a form from a firm in Seattle to a firm in Victoria which is self-explanatory, and shows that the intent of the above Act is being broken daily.

This you must be aware is most unfair to our own labouring men and is a thing that must be remedied, otherwise we will have troubles somewhat in the nature of those that occurred in the state of Nevada and other states in the neighbouring Republic during the last few years.

I may say that I have now in my possession nine other tickets similar to the one inclosed herewith and there are several more that can be obtained from men that have been sent over here, and when they get here find that there is no work for them

Trusting that I have made myself clear and that you will be enabled to have the Act amended so as that it will be possible to enforce the provisions of the same in a summary manner.

I am, yours truly,
J. A. AIKMAN,
Solicitor for the Victoria Building Trades Council.

I would like to point out to the Minister in the first place the difficulty, delay and expense which are necessarily incurred in working out the provisions of that Act. Even if the legal gentleman who wrote that letter has an erroneous opinion, which I am very much disposed to doubt, and if the Act is workable, then the only way in which the penalties provided in the Act can be enforced is by an action at law. That is a matter of great expense and great delay, and it does seem to me that the proper and efficacious way of enforcing the Act would be by a summary conviction. The matter could then be decided in a

very short time and without expense to the labouring men, who, as a rule, are not in a position to incur the expense of protracted litigation. Further, I am informed that evidence can be adduced to show that these labouring men, when coming into those parts of British Columbia, are not put through the course of questions to which immigrants from other countries are subjected. As I understand, all immigrants—and these men are clearly immigrants within the meaning of the Act—are compelled under the regulations to have a certain sum of money. I do not wish to make any charge against any particular official in the minister's department, but I am informed that these regulations are being ignored as regards these men, and I would ask the minister to institute an investigation into this matter.

Hon. MACKENZIE KING (Minister of Labour). Mr. Speaker, I must confess that I am not a little surprised at the communication that has been read to the House by the hon. member. It seems to me that it was written without a full knowledge of the Act. That is the only explanation that seems possible, in justice to any professional man who would give advice such as that contained in this communication. In reading over the letter carefully, I find that it has reference only to one part of the Act. And that the suggestion which is made in this letter as one which it would be advisable to have embodied in an amendment to the Act is, as a matter of fact, a part of the Act already. The letter states:

> There is no provision in the act authorizing any court to declare what the forfeiture shall be, and I can find no provision covering the matter in any statute, and it seems to me that the offence being a statutory one, there must be jurisdiction conferred upon a court or courts authorizing a declaration of what the forfeiture shall be. Having this in mind I call the matter to your attention so that you will be enabled to lay the matter before the proper authorities at Ottawa and have the Act amended so that two justices of the peace or any magistrate having the power of two justices of the peace may declare a forfeiture.

That is exactly what is in the Act at present. The Act contains two methods whereby it may be enforced. The first is:

> The sum forfeited may, with the written consent of any judge of the court in which the action is intended to be brought, be sued for and recovered as a debt by any person who first brings his action therefor in any court of competent jurisdiction in which debts of like amount are now recovered.

That is one clause in the Act to which attention has been called by this solicitor, and he says he does not see why that should be the only method of enforcing the penalty, and suggests an alternative. The very next section has in it exactly what he is suggesting. The first method is the recovery of the penalty as a debt, the second is the recovery on summary conviction.

> Such, sum may also, with the written consent, to be obtained ex parte, of the Attorney General of the province in which the prosecution is had, or of a judge of a superior or county court, be recovered upon summary conviction before any judge of a county court, being a justice of the peace or any judge of the sessions of the peace, recorder, police magistrate, or stipendiary magistrate, or any functionary, tribunal or person invested by the proper legislative authority with power to do alone such acts as are usually required to be done by two or more justices of the peace, and when recovered, shall be paid to the Minister of Finance.

Exactly the suggestion made in this communication.

Mr. BARNARD. If the minister will look at sec. 3, he will see that for an offence a sum not exceeding $1,000 or less than $50 is to be forfeited. Section 4 says that the sum so forfeited may be, with the written consent of a judge, recovered. Section 5 says such sum, which obviously refers to the same sum as mentioned in section 4, the sum so forfeited, and the point of the letter that the minister has before him is that until a court of competent jurisdiction has declared the sum forfeited nothing can be recovered. His point is that in the first place you cannot go straight into court and sue for any amount until there has been a forfeiture. You have first to take the proceedings to declare the amount forfeited, but he says that no court has been authorized to make that forfeiture, and his contention is that section 5 is in precisely the same position, that you have got to take the two proceedings.

Mr. KING. I do not profess to have had the legal experience either of my hon. friend who has given this advice or of the hon. gentleman who has stated his opinion of the Act. All I can say is, that what both he and this writer have said is absolutely absurd in the light of convictions which have been obtained under the Act in accordance with the procedure here set forth. As I understand, the complaint is that it is impossible to obtain convictions under this Act by summary proceedings. I would like to read to my hon. friend, and perhaps he will pass on to his adviser who has given this advice, the following list of convictions obtained under the Act not by having a penalty sued for as a debt, but by summary procedure, precisely what is desired by my hon. friend's informant.

STATEMENT OF CONVICTIONS UNDER THE ALIEN LABOUR ACT.

Albert Geiser was convicted before the police magistrate at Rossland, B.C., in August, 1901, of two infringements of the Act, being fined $500 in one case and $50 in the other case. The information was laid by W. L. MacDonald, a member of the Miners' Union of Rossland, and 50 per cent of the penalties recovered was paid to Mr. MacDonald on the recommendation of the then Minister of Labour.

The secretary-treasurer of the Toronto Carpet Company, Toronto, was convicted before the police magistrate of Toronto in August, 1902, of an infringement of the Act, and was fined $50 and costs. The information in this case was laid by the Carpet Weavers' Union, Toronto.

The Frayseng Cork Company, Limited, Toronto, was convicted before the police magistrate of Toronto in February, 1904, of two separate infringements of the Act, being fined $50 and costs in each case, half the penalty recovered being, on application, paid through the Department of Labour to the informants.

J. Amberg, tailor, Dundas, Ontario, was convicted before the police magistrate of Hamilton, on August 21, 1904, of an infringement of the Act. The costs of prosecution were paid by the defendant and the penalty withheld.

The Cape Breton Electric Railway Company, Limited, was convicted in July, 1905, of two separate infringements of the Act, a penalty of $200 with costs being imposed in each case. The information was laid by one George Low, to whom, on the recommendation of the then Minister of Labour, half the amount of the penalty recovered in each case was subsequently paid. An appeal was entered in the case of one of these convictions, but did not succeed.

The Menzie Wall Paper Company of Toronto was convicted before police magistrate Ellis of Toronto on August 15, 1905, of five separate infringements of the Act. A fine of $50 was imposed in each case.

Robert Menzie, president of the Menzie Wall Paper Company, mentioned above, was convicted before police magistrate Denison of Toronto, on February 19, 1906, of a further infringement of the Act, and a penalty of $50 and costs was imposed. Half the penalty was paid over to the informant.

H. Holman Evans, manager of the Union Life Assurance Company, Toronto, was convicted before the police magistrate of Toronto in February, 1906, of an infringement of the Act, and was fined $50 and costs. Half the penalty was paid over to the informant.

An employer named Elliott was convicted before police magistrate Denison of Toronto on March 15, 1906, of an infringement of the Act and was fined $50 and costs.

The Corby Distillery Company of Belleville, Ontario, was convicted of an infringement of the Act before police magistrate Flint at Belleville, on December 22, 1906, and a fine of $50 imposed. The conviction was appealed to the Court of Appeal and sustained in a judgment given March 30, 1907.

The Spanish Mills Company of Blind River, Ontario, was convicted on June 26, of an infringement of the Act and a penalty of $50 with costs was imposed. Mr. B. H. Wiley, Echo Bay, Ontario, laid the information in this case and 50 per cent of the penalty obtained was paid to Mr. Wiley, on the recommendation of the Minister of Labour.

On September 24, 1909, the Charlton Sawmill Company at Collingwood, Ontario, was convicted before Mr. W. A. Hogg, police magistrate of Collingwood, of an infringement of the Act and a fine of $50 and costs was imposed.

On January 4, 1911, The Johnson Carey Co., Limited, was convicted before His Honour Judge C. R. Fitch, at Fort Frances, Ontario, of an infringement of the Act, and a fine of $500 imposed.

Those are only some of the convictions that have taken place under this Act before a magistrate, who has the very power that this legal adviser thinks should be given in order that this Act might be made more workable. If I may be permitted to put my own construction on this communication, I would say that some significance may be attached to this sentence:

It does seem to me that the Act is simply a piece of legislation designed for the purpose of satisfying claims that have been advanced by the Labour Unions throughout Canada, but made unworkable for some ulterior purpose.

I think that if this legal adviser, who is presumably being paid by labour men for advice, would give them advice in accordance with the law instead of volunteering opinions evidently designed to have a political bearing and purpose, he would be acting more in accord with professional duty than he is doing on this occasion, and my hon. friend could do no better service than to inform his correspondent that if he will take the trouble to look over to-day's 'Hansard' he will see there a list of convictions obtained under the Alien Labour Act; and if he will proceed in accordance with the methods laid down by the Act, and the facts are as stated by my hon. friend from his seat in the House, I have no doubt he will be successful in getting convictions of any company who violates the Act in the manner he has described.

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, all I have to say in reply is that the hon. gentleman seems to be somewhat nettled over the matter.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has already spoken, and can only speak again by the courtesy of the House.

Mr. BARNARD. The only observation I would make is that probably the minister has a guilty conscience, considering his action on the Eight Hour Bill last session.

Mr. A. C. BOYCE (West Algoma). Mr. Speaker, I am very much interested in this question. As the hon. minister knows, I brought to the attention of this House on

two or three occasions instances in which there had been wholesale infractions of the law. I have also pointed out the manifest injustice and futility of an Act the administration and enforcement of which is left to private individuals, who in the majority of cases do not care to take the trouble or the financial risk involved in working up a case against a large corporation, not to speak of the risk of an adverse verdict. As far back as July, 1908, a former Minister of Labour, the present Postmaster General, realizing the cogency of the position I then took, promised that the situation would be reviewed by the department, and that legislation would be introduced as speedily as possible to remedy the defects in the law which I then pointed out. Nothing further has been done, and the same conditions continue to obtain throughout the length and breadth of Canada. We had an instance of that only a few months ago which I brought to the attention of my hon. friend, and I think he promised an investigation into it. It was a case in which men were brought by the score almost from across the boundary at Sault Ste. Marie to displace Canadian workmen who had been there for many years, and against whose work alone no objection could be found. Those men were aliens, brought to Canada in defiance of the law, but no one cared to take the risk involved in fighting the gigantic corporation which had brought them in, and, therefore, the matter was not brought to the attention of the department. These importations could be easily prevented. Just as the Department of Immigration places officers on the frontier to watch for undesirable immigrants, why could not the Department of Labour place inspectors at different points along the frontier to make reports on these matters, and, thereby minimize if not entirely prevent the infractions of this law? If the Alien Labour Law is a serious law and the Minister of Labour is serious in his attempts to enforce it, why does he not enforce it? If he finds that private individuals do not take enough interest in the law to enforce it—and I do not blame them—why does he not himself take power, if he considers he has not sufficient already, to attend to the enforcement of his own law? The members of this government are usually not lacking in vigilance in matters of this kind except where provincial authority is concerned. We have a very cogent instance of that in the administration of the Election Law. When my hon. friend from South York (Mr. Maclean) commented on the government's inability to enforce laws which it placed on the statute-book, the answer was: The laws are there, and they should be enforced by the provinces; that is what the judicial machinery of the provinces is for. How does that apply to the enforcement of the Dominion Elections Act? The Minister of Justice told us in this House that he was perfectly justified two or three years ago in sending at the expense of this government on election day policemen on a special train in order, as he said, to prevent any violation of the Election Law at the polls. If it is competent for this government to do that in one case, why can it not do it in another case which is of manifest interest to the whole of Canada? I sincerely hope that this serious matter will be dealt with in the manner in which it should be. The minister's contention is that the remedy is entirely in the hands of the workingmen. Take the one instance of the man who had the hardihood to prosecute a large lumber corporation at Blind River for the infraction of the Act. He had to go to the expense of going to Blind River, subpoenaing witnesses and employing counsel, and when he was able to get a conviction, and the corporation was fined $50 of which $25 went to the prosecutor, all of this $25 was exhausted in the expense of prosecuting. What encouragement is that to a man getting $2 or $2.50 a day to take upon himself the whole burden of the enforcement of that law? What the department says is: Go ahead, take all the risks, employ counsel, go on with the evidence, and if you succeed we will give you one-half of the penalty that may be imposed, entirely losing sight of the fact that these men are labouring men who are absolutely unable to lose the time, and the money involved in a prosecution; and if there be not a conviction, who is to pay the man the expenses involved? This is a view of the matter upon which I have not yet heard the Minister of Labour comment—the risk imposed upon a class of men who are least able to bear it; and if the minister is sincere and honest in his desire to relieve the workingmen, to prevent injustice being done, and to secure the enforcement of a workable Act, which will be for the benefit of Canada generally, and the working classes in particular, he will adopt some method, as was promised three years ago, by which this Act will become more workable and more enforceable.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (Cape Breton, South). Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, I would like to draw the attention of the minister to two prosecutions which were instituted by private parties in 1905 against the Cape Breton Electric Company. The hon. minister will doubtless appreciate the difficulty that must exist where individuals are called upon to enforce their rights under an Act as cumbersome as that now under discussion. Leave must be obtained from a county court judge before proceed-

ings can be begun either before a magistrate or before the judge himself. That means an application to the judge in any event, and before that can be made, counsel must be employed, the order must be served on the company, and then the procedure must go on from that to the trial. This involves loss of time, and a great deal of expense, varying from $75 to $200 or $300, depending on the number of witnesses and the distances they have to travel. That is not all. The individual who brings an action against his employer need never again seek employment from that employer or even from any other in the locality. He becomes black-listed. It is only in districts where complete organizations exist for the defence of labour that prosecutions can be brought under the Act at all. It is unfair to keep on the statute-book any longer an Act so expensive to the individual that in view of the fact that it has been in operation so many years, the minister, going back ten years, can only cite the number of cases he cited this afternoon as having been carried to a successful conclusion.

Mr. KING. Some of them. I was only citing some of them that come to my attention.

Mr. MADDIN. Well, the fact of the matter is that, as this is an Act for the protection of the labourer, the protection of those who belong to the country, and who belong to the flag, it should be the duty of some person to enforce it. Collectors of customs guard the ports of entry, and we have a fishery protection service. It is not left to the fisherman to lay a charge against those who encroach on the country's fisheries. There seems to be some one appointed to administer every one of the country's laws except this Alien Labour Law. In the United States when a person lands from a boat or a train, he is almost always interrogated, especially if he has the appearance of being an artisan or labourer and he is asked as to his object in entering the country; and again and again many of them have been turned back. In this country no such safeguards are organized to protect the labourer, and the individual labourer in a country village or small manufacturing town where there are no organizations, is left the burden. It is left to him as an individual to prosecute parties, perhaps, a powerful corporation, who will take appeal after appeal, and he is a wise labourer who will look at the Act, and forget its existence, and bear the burden. It would be folly for the ordinary workingman to assume the responsibility of prosecution under such an Act as that, and hope to come out successfully. I do not urge this matter in a party spirit, but I think I am making a wholesale criticism of the administration. I hope the minister will take it seriously to heart, and if he ever gets another opportunity before this parliament, which is very doubtful, he will see to it that the Act is amended and improved.

DEFERRED ELECTIONS.

Mr. MARTIN BURRELL (Yale-Cariboo). Before you leave the Chair, I would like to refer to another matter, as it is possible there will be an early appeal to the country, of which there are very significant signs, as well as some utterances of responsible ministers. In 1909 I had the honour of bringing a resolution before this House dealing with the question of deferred elections, the effect of the motion being that it was desirable in Canada, with special reference to British Columbia, that we should have no more deferred elections, but that all should be held on the same day. That motion was defeated largely because my hon. friend the Minister of Finance preferred to treat it as a want of confidence motion. I think I may fairly claim that it was mainly defeated on that ground, and not because of the demerit of the contentions that were brought forward by me on that occasion. I do not think it is necessary to repeat the various arguments and proofs that I adduced at that time in support of the feasibility of holding the elections in Canada all on the same day. They were set forth fully at that time, and I may fairly claim that they were not answered. I pointed out then, as I will point out now, that one of the strong reasons, the irresistible reason for members of the government, notably the Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman), was that furnished by the action of the government on the occasion of the by-election in Comox-Atlin, when my hon. friend secured the seat which he is occupying at the present time. The writ for Comox-Atlin by-election was issued on January 22, 1909, and the election was fixed to be held on February 20, an interval of 29 days. For the general election, the writ was issued on September 18, the election was fixed for October 26, an interval of 38 days. Now I am sure my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue will agree that Comox-Atlin, of all the constituencies in British Columbia, is the most difficult, geographically, for holding the election on the same day as a general election. I think he has said that in so many words. I am not prepared to say that it is possible to hold the election fairly in Comox-Atlin within 29 days after the writ is issued. In fact, my hon. friend stated in his place in the debate that it was impossible. Whether it is possible to hold it in the other period, that is 38 days, which is given to all the other seats in the

country, is a matter open to question; it may be and it may not. Although it is true that the returning officers fix the date of the election, it is no less true that the member of the government representing the district affected is responsible. At all events, I claim that it is absolutely feasible and clearly possible to hold the elections on the same day in Yale-Cariboo and Kootenay. I would not like to weary the House by repeating the manifest evils of deferred elections. I am sure the Minister of Finance will agree that if it is possible to hold all the elections on the same day, there are grave evils attaching to deferred elections. It is an injustice to prevent the citizens of a constituency from exercising their franchise on the same date as the other citizens of Canada, when that is possible. When an election is held subsequent to the general election, the electors lose interest in it, because they feel that the affairs of the country are already settled, and it is not worth while for them to take the trouble of exercising their franchise. Now it is possible there will be an election soon. At the time that debate took place the Minister of Finance used this language:

> I do not for the moment say there is no room for change; I do not say that the experience of the last few years may not have shown that some of these exceptions in the Elections Act might be removed without inconvenience.

I would like also to call attention to the remarks of the Minister of Finance in connection with Yale-Cariboo:

> There are three constituencies in British Columbia in which the elections were deferred, namely, Kootenay, Yale-Cariboo and Comox-Atlin. I am bound to admit that, as regards the constituency of Kootenay, I do not see any reason why there should be a deferred election there. . . With regard to Yale-Cariboo, the representative of that constituency would be better able to advise the House as to what ought to be done.

Well, I am willing to accept the responsibility conferred on me by the Minister of Finance, and I certainly feel conscientiously able to advise the House, and the government that it is possible, and feasible to hold an election in Yale-Cariboo under present conditions on the same day as the general elections, provided there is a fair amount of time between the issue of the writ and the date of polling. Let me point out that the Act as it stands is permissive, it gives the returning officer power to defer the elections when he deems it necessary. But the closing words of section 90 which deals with this question, are:

> And the day for holding the polls shall be at as early a date thereafter as possible, but not less than seven days after nomination, and at a general election it shall, if possible, be the same day as that fixed by the Governor General for the other electoral districts, but not sooner.

So in this particular case it is clear that the law was intended to encourage the holding of all elections on the same day. I am not speaking of this matter in a controversial spirit at all. It turned out that in my constituency the fact of the election being deferred did not work to disadvantage; in fact, the feeling of the electors seemed to be that they resented the deferred election. I am not assuming for a moment that it is the intention to defer these elections. I have no reason to assume it, and I do not wish to assume it.

I would like to express the hope that the government, when these elections come on sooner or later, will see their way to intimating that it is the desire of the government that the elections in such sections shall be held on the same day. The right hon. leader of the government (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) this morning, I think it was, made a sort of announcement as to the question of the elections. He stated that the question of reciprocity was before the House, and that when we were finished with that we should take up the question of Supply, and presumably the election would follow. Of course, it is not necessary to point out to the House what every man knows perfectly well and what the right hon. leader of the government knows absolutely, that reciprocity will not be passed by this House. He has practically admitted it and I think we all accept it. We may fairly understand that the government is simply waiting the psychological moment to dissolve the House, and appeal to the country whether that psychological moment comes, in the opinion of the government, in a day, or in a week, or in two weeks, or in a month. But I would like to have pointed out to the Prime Minister if he had been in his seat, that if no better arguments are used in the House in support of the reciprocity pact than were used by members of his cabinet in the country it would, of course, be impossible to get the House to pass it. I am going to refer to this because it is almost a question of privilege, and because I see sitting opposite to me the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue (Mr. Templeman) who has been stumping British Columbia on behalf of the government, as a member of the government and on behalf of his party. He has made some very extraordinary statements. I might repeat that if arguments and statements such as were made by this cabinet minister are to form the appeal to the electors of this country it is easy to understand how absolutely hopeless the appeal is. In Victoria, the Minister of Inland Revenue held a meeting on July 3rd, and he made this statement:

One result of the agreement already has been the enhancement of the value of fruit lands in the Okanagan.

Mr. Martin Burrell, a member of the House and a fruit grower, owned a 160-acre farm, with a partially-bearing orchard, and offered it for sale about a year ago for $20,000. About two months after the agreement was announced Mr. Burrell's ranch was sold for $30,000, or $10,000 more than he offered it for before the reciprocal agreement was concluded.

I am quoting now from the Victoria 'Times,' the organ, I believe, of the hon. friend. He added:

Another instance which I am able to vouch for also, is that of the Matt Miller ranch, sold for $200 an acre on May 5 last, although a man had been given the refusal of it at $100 an acre several months before, showing that some people are not afraid of any evil effects to the fruit industry because the duty is to be taken off fruit. (Applause.)

I will just deal with the last paragraph first. The minister says: that he is able to vouch for this statement. This ranch is in Kettle River valley where I live. I know the circumstances absolutely and I am, in my place in this House, prepared to say, and to make affidavit, if necessary, that his statement that the ranch was sold for $200 an acre after reciprocity was announced and that it had been offered for $100 before, is absolutely untrue, and that the second price was simply the first price, namely, $100 an acre. I may further add that the man who made the second proposition after reciprocity was announced fell down in his deal. These are the absolute facts that the minister can find out for himself. Yet he goes on to say that he can vouch for a statement of that kind. Let me deal with the statement he made about my own affairs and I do it for the reason, that I find that up and down the country in the Liberal press, this statement of the minister has been reported without the denial which was given to it by myself. It was given prominence in paper after paper after he had held this meeting. I think it a most disgraceful thing that a minister should make an unsupported statement on false pretenses dragging in my private affairs, and then that no correction shall be given to it in the Liberal press published in Winnipeg and elsewhere. The minister made a statement along similar lines in the city of Nelson, and the paper there telegraphed me there for a statement. This is the statement I made at the time:

To the editor of the 'Daily News,' Nelson, B.C.
Sir,—The 'News' reports Hon. Wm. Templeman as saying that he has good authority for stating that since the announcement of the reciprocity pact I had sold my ranch for $10,000 more than I had offered it for before. Further, that American capital has gone into the purchase and that the deal was made as a result of the reciprocity pact. All three statements are false and absolutely misleading. Negotiations had been entered into with the parties concerned before reciprocity was announced in the House, the first figures being higher than those finally agreed upon. It is painful and amazing that a minister of the Crown can perpetrate this sort of thing. Apart from the question of taste in making statements about my private business, what must be said of the ethics of the case? If Mr. Templeman is reported correctly his gross inaccuracies in regard to my affairs will justify the public in assuming that no weight can be attached to his other utterances.

In answer to that, after I left Grand Forks, the minister saw fit not to apologize, not to correct his statement, but to write a long letter to the Nelson 'News' in the course of which he made these remarks:

Further information received by me at the time from residents of Grand Forks was to the effect that the sale was made at a price $10,000 in advance of what the property had been offered for before the reciprocity agreement had been negotiated.

I had already given this a frank denial. From my seat in the House I give it now a most unqualified denial. He goes on to say:

It was a complete answer to his jeremiads, because if wide-awake men would buy his fruit farm and other fruit farms adjacent to it, in the face of the 'smashing blow' that he said had been dealt the fruit industry, it surely was an argument in favour of my contention, and to my mind an unanswerable one.

It was unanswerable if it were true, but what becomes of the argument if the thing is entirely false? I am amazed that the minister could follow up one serious break by making another so bad as this particular letter. Then he says:

While Mr. Burrell denies the accuracy of my statements, he does not correct them.

I do not know what the minister wants in the way of correction. Does he want me to tell him the names of the parties, their birthplaces, ages, what their prospects are, and everything about them? The thing is absolutely absurd and I have to tell him that he seems to be entirely astray on this thing. For the minister's particluar benefit, let me tell him what he does not appear to know, that long before these negotiations for a part of the holdings that I have in the Kettle valley were commenced, about 80 acres were added to the property, a new water system has been supplied and a large value has been added, and that so far from his being anywhere near the truth he is absolutely wide of the mark, I repeat that I never was offered $10,000 less, but that the price before reciprocity was entered into was higher than that which the parties subsequently agreed upon. I might add, Mr. Chairman, that the deal has not been finally concluded yet. I do

not want to say anything more about my private affairs and I apologize for having brought them to the attention of the House. But, I think that it is a perfect disgrace that a member of the cabinet should go on public platforms and make statements of this kind as the basis for an argument for reciprocity when these statements are absolutely without any foundation.

With regard to the other matter I would be only too glad to get some expression of opinion from the hon. Minister of Finance, who dealt with the question in a very fair way at the time the debate occurred. I hope, in view of the subsequent facts and the present knowledge of the government there will be some reasonable chance of the elections in Kootenay and Yale-Cariboo taking place on the same day as the general election.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Chairman, with regard to the observations of my hon. friend concerning the date of holding elections, it is not a matter to which I have given particular attention. I quite join with him in the general view that what we call simultaneous polling is a good feature of our constitution.

It is certainly desirable that wherever it is reasonably possible that principle should be applied throughout the whole dominion. Whether there are exceptional circumstances or not would, I think, depend upon the information to be received. I will see that the observations of my hon. friend are brought to the notice of my colleagues, whose duty it is to give more particular attention to that branch of the public business.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). I had no intention to interfere with the private affairs of my hon. friend (Mr. Burrell) when I used as an argument the statement that he had sold his fruit ranch at an enhanced price, nor do I think that any one could construe my using this alleged fact into an interference with his private business. The report that Mr. Burrell had sold his fruit ranch at Grand Forks at a very good price to a company that were going to engage in the fruit business appeared in the British Columbia newspapers, and I wrote to ascertain the facts from a responsible gentleman in Grand Forks, and the statement I made at Nelson and Fernie that Mr. Burrell had held his ranch at a certain figure previous to the announcement of the reciprocity pact, and that he had sold it several months after the announcement of reciprocity at an advance of $10,000, was given to the public on the authority of a letter which I have still in my possession from a very prominent resident of Grand Forks who inquired into the facts. I will accept the word of the hon. member that he has not sold his fruit ranch at an enhanced price. It is none of the business of the public at what price he sold his ranch, but if it is a fact that he did sell it at an enhanced price after the announcement of reciprocity, as the general opinion is in the neighbourhood of Grand Forks, it would be fair and legitimate to mention it as an argument in favour of the benefit of reciprocity to the fruit business. The hon. gentleman had an excellent ranch and the statement is that he sold it at a very good price, and that those who bought it are going into the growing of fruit on a still larger scale than he. It is a fact that the other ranch to which I referred was negotiated for at an enhanced price, and that in the neighbourhood of Nelson a small ranch has been sold at $750 an acre, although that may be accounted for in part by the fact that it is beautifully situated on the lake and very desirable for a residence. The fact remains that the removal of duty on fruit, has not tended to depreciate the value of fruit lands in British Columbia, but on the contrary has caused the prices to go higher. The price of fruit lands immediately south of the boundary line is I believe from 50 per cent to 100 per cent higher than the price of fruit lands in relatively as good a position north of the boundary line. I used these statements on the public platform. I admit the information is second-hand, but the hon. gentleman himself knows better than I do about it, and I would suggest that he might take the public into his confidence, and tell the people the circumstances, not contenting himself with making a general denial. I do not think there is any divulging of private business about it. There is not a land transaction in British Columbia that the price is not published in the newspapers. Probably the hon. gentleman (Mr. Burrell) regrets that he has sold his fruit lands so soon. The price of fruit land, in the Boundary Creek country and the Okanagan Valley, is higher to-day than it was 5 months ago, and I am quite positive that there has been no depreciation in the price of these lands in consequence of the reciprocity agreement. I have no desire to interfere with my hon. friend's private affairs nor did I think I did so when I made use of the argument. Now, in reference to the other matter, the hon. gentleman has said that the Yale-Cariboo election might be held on the same day as the other elections throughout the Dominion, and I am inclined to agree with him. The difficulty in Comox-Atlin is that the ballots cannot be sent around that district in the week intervening between nomination day and polling day. It certainly could not be done at my by-election which was held in the winter. I question if it could be done in

an interval of two weeks. There are places up the Skeena River where the people have to travel by dog train in winter and it takes two or three weeks for them to get their mail, but of course in summer it is more easily accomplished, and, if it can be done, and if nomination and polling can be fixed on the same day as the other elections, I am absolutely in favour of it, because I do not think there is anything to be gained by deferring an election. It must be remembered that Comox-Atlin is 1,000 miles long by the route travelled from Alberni on the Southwest corner to Atlin on the Northeast, and it comprises 150,000 square miles in which there are 100 polling places, and in the case of Queen Charlotte Island a steamer has to go around delivering the ballots. If it is at all possible, I am of opinion that the election should be held on the same day as the other elections.

Mr. BURRELL. I am astonished that the Minister of Inland Revenue did not frankly tender an apology. He has not even given us the name of the responsible gentleman in Grand Forks who has given him the alleged facts that are not facts.

He has to accept my word that these statements were absolutely correct. Now, as to asking me what was the exact price I sold the land for, how would he like me to ask him the amount of the mortgage he has on the Times Building, Victoria? I do not think it concerns the House, but, at the same time, I have no worry about the matter. I may, however tell the hon. gentleman that the figures were higher before reciprocity was introduced than they were afterwards. I have told him that there was no foundation in fact for the statements he made, and he has to accept my word.

CHINESE INVESTIGATION COMMISSION.

Mr. J. D. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to invite the attention of the House to a condition of actual free trade concerning us on the Pacific—a condition established by the concurrent action of Canadian and Oriental Reformers—not limited in term, but continuing for a very long time, and seemingly difficult to annul.

The House is familiar with my subject, and the country is even more familiar with it, because I see notices in the press of the exposure of these Chinese immigration scandals, which have attracted more attention in the country than has been given to the matter by the hon. members responsible for this condition of affairs. I wish to deal, with the report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into this matter. This commission was appointed on the 12th November last, and held its first session on the 19th December. The hon. Mr. Justice Murphy was appointed commissioner. Mr. George E. McCrossan of Vancouver appeared on behalf of the Dominion government, Mr. S. S. Taylor on behalf of Yip On, one of the accused, and Mr. Gordon Grant represented the Trades and Labour Council of Vancouver. The scope of the commission was indicated by Mr. Justice Murphy at the opening session, when he said that the commission had been appointed to further investigate and report upon the frauds recently shown to have existed in connection with the unlawful landing of Chinese immigrants in Canada at British Columbia ports, and any other evasions in violation of Chapter 95 Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, 'An Act Respecting and Restricting Chinese Immigration' and 7-8 Edward VII, Chap. 14, 'An Act to Amend the Chinese Immigration Act,' and orders in council based thereon, and to investigate and report upon the results of the operation of the Opium Act, viz: 7-8 Edward VII, Chapter 50, 'An Act to Prohibit the Importation, Manufacture and Sale of Opium for other than Medical Purposes,' with special reference to any opium seizures that have taken place under said Act and disposition thereof.

Before I proceed to read the findings of the court—which I think ought to go upon record as a preliminary to any discussion upon them—I would like to exonerate the commissioner from the imputation cast upon him by statement of the right hon. gentleman, who said a few days ago that the commissioner had suggested in his report that it should be withheld from parliament. The statement surprised me at the time, but it was made quite solemnly by the right hon. the Prime Minister. The right hon. the Prime Minister had looked at the matter so casually that he had altogether failed to grasp the recommendation made by the commissioner, and his statement to the House is altogether at variance with the facts. Page 120 of the report of the commissioner contains the following:—

Recommendations re Prosecution.

First.—That the digest of facts forwarded herewith be submitted to the Department of Justice for advice as to whether they justify a criminal prosecution of Yip On and his partner Yip Sue Poey

Second.—In the event of such advice being of an affirmative nature, that this report be not made public until such prosecutions have been launched, and at least the preliminary hearings held.

The reason is that the direct evidence of Yip Dit Chor, Yong Jem Sun, and Fung Chang Ming will doubtless be necessary. If it becomes known that criminal proceedings are in contemplation, these men will probably disappear, and to locate them, as the experience

of the commission in searching for passport men shows, will be a most difficult if not impossible task.

This recommendation to lodge prosecutions was delivered by Mr. Justice Murphy to the Department of Trade and Commerce last May. The date is not stated upon the return, but it is marked 'Department of Trade and Commerce, May 1911.' I take it that the report was received at the time of the long adjournment of this House, or subsequent thereto. Mr. Justice Murphy as a well informed man knew of the intended adjournment of the House, and he was well aware that his suggestion of brief delay would not for a moment prevent the government from delivering this report to the House, as they were in duty bound to do—and indeed, as they had promised to do. Moreover, I take it that the commissioner had in his mind that the government would show diligence in this matter, that they would take warning by his suggestion to the effect that if these criminals had time to reflect, their witnesses and themselves would be spirited out of the country; and the commissioner had no reason to suppose that the government would allow this report to lie pigeonholed in one of the departments at Ottawa for two months before it received even the most cursory consideration from any minister of the crown.

Having absolved the commissioner from the imputation under which he might lie, from the right hon. the Prime Minister's statement, I would like to read the findings of the commission. At page 117 we find the following summary of conclusions:—

First.—The charges both of personal and official misconduct against the Hon. Mr. Templeman are found to be entirely without foundation.

Second.—The charges against certain members of the Liberal executive of Vancouver were shown to be untrue.

Third.—The existence was demonstrated of an intrigue on the part of Mr. T. R. E. McInnes, with whom was associated Mr. David Lew and Gordon Grant, to establish some sort of connection with the administration of the Chinese Restrictions Act at the port of Vancouver by obtaining control of the position of Chinese interpreter, and possibly in other ways. Its object was to serve some personal end.

Fourth.—Mr. Foster, government secret service officer, was utilized to advance this intrigue. To what extent he was a dupe, and to what extent a participant, is uncertain.

Fifth.—Ample opportunity has existed at the port of Vancouver for the illegal entry of Chinese into Canada in the various ways enumerated in the body of the report.

Sixth.—The administration of the Chinese Restriction Act at Victoria has been as careful, and as effective as defects in said Act would permit.

Seventh.—The port of Union Bay is practically a free port for the entrance of Chinese, and smuggling opium into Canada. The ships of two lines running direct from the Orient go there to coal before setting out on each return voyage.

Eighth.—This condition of things obtains to almost the same extent at the ports of Nanaimo, Ladysmith and Boat Harbour. No ships direct from the Orient call at these ports to coal, but tramp vessels carrying Chinese crews are numerous.

Ninth.—A system of direct fraud to secure illegal entry of Chinese into Canada as merchant exempts has flourished at the port of Vancouver, probably since 1907. It is impossible to determine how many Chinese have thus entered Canada, but it is probable that the majority admitted there under the Chinese passports secured fraudulent entry.

Tenth.—The interpreter Yip On was directly concerned, and a participant in these frauds. This is probably true also of his partner Yip Sue Poey.

Eleventh.—Numbers of Chinese have probably entered Canada as exempt sons of merchants who did not fulfil the law's requirements to entitle them to such free entry. This has been accomplished:

(a) By wholesale registration of Chinese as members of merchant firms who possibly have a small interest in such business, but who are not actively engaged in mercantile life, but are really laundrymen, labourers, clerks, &c.; and

(b) By such persons and genuine merchants as well bringing in individuals as sons who in fact were no blood relations to them.

Twelfth.—The method of identification in vogue at Vancouver until last autumn was defective, and as carried out practically valueless.

Thirteenth.—The watch kept on ships at the port of Vancouver up to the same date was farcical.

Fourteenth.—Mr. Bowell had no connection with any wrong-doing, but was negligent in the performance of his duties in so far as they appertained to the admission of Chinese into Canada. In fairness to him it must be stated that the dual position of collector of customs and of comptroller of Chinese immigration, in recent years at any rate, have made impossible demands upon his time

Fifteenth.—Some suspicions rest upon the new interpreter Poon Shun Lung in reference to the admission of his two alleged sons in January, 1910, and likewise in reference to his former connection, if his statement is to be believed, with a firm in Toronto regarded by the police of that city as principally engaged in illicit opium traffic.

Sixteenth.—Under the Act as at present framed the government is dependent in a large measure on the integrity of the interpreter, and in the matter of the admission of new merchants, wholly so.

Seventeenth.—The charge that customs officials sold opium after seizure, and appropriated the proceeds, is untrue.

Eighteenth.—The quantity of opium coming into Canada is regulated simply by the demand for the drug.

Nineteenth.—Whilst more efficient watching will prove a preventative, total exclusion of opium cannot be hoped for, and consumption

must be discouraged by drastic amendments to the Act on the lines suggested by the police officers of Vancouver and Victoria, above set out.

So that the commissioner found that, with the exception of the individuals named, the charges of maladministration made against the several departments of the government were proved up to the hilt. This commissioner was in a most delicate position during the inquiry. He was familiar with the attitude recently taken by the Minister of Justice, who has declared in this House with pride: I am a political partisan, and has disavowed that his department has any higher ideal in the conduct of its affairs than, like other departments of the government, to advance the political interests of the party in power in Canada. This judge, therefore, must have felt and realized painfully that his was a purely political appointment by a political partisan, recommended to the Minister of Justice and his colleagues by another political partisan; that his appointment to the commission was recommended by a political partisan to his colleagues at Ottawa, and that that recommendation was inspired by the Local Patronage Committee which, no doubt, in turn had dealt with his own appointment to the bench, so that which ever way he turned this judge was surrounded by political embarrassments, and when he started upon his inquiry he felt impelled to break away from the commission extended to him which I read at the opening of my remarks, and instead of dealing with the more important matters of the frauds upon the revenue, and the administration at Vancouver, he chose to take up first the purely political side of the investigation which he intended to hold. He says, at page 11 of this report:

> At an early stage the main inquiry became complicated with a subsidiary issue which was so intimately connected therewith as to imperatively demand investigation. Briefly stated, this issue as first presented was a charge that prominent members of the Liberal party had done all in their power to prevent any probing into the alleged frauds, because they were participants therein. These statements were contained in a letter, dated November 14, 1910, sent to the Minister of Customs, which appeared on the official file relating to the subject-matter of the inquiry forwarded to the commission from Ottawa. Through an oversight this letter was not made an exhibit, but its contents so far as material were set out at pages 336, 337 and 338. The original, Mr. McCrossan states, has been returned to Mr. O'Hara, the chief comptroller of Chinese immigration at Ottawa. The matter was speedily cleared up it being shown beyond peradventure that the allegations could not be supported by evidence of any kind (see Judge Grant pages 335 to 363 inclusive, and McLean, pages 1579 to 1584).

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster).

So you see the first act of this commissioner was a complete absolution of all the guilty parties without the formality of a confession from any quarter. According to the evidence nothing whatever developed as to the division of the spoils. The commissioner and the counsel appointed to prepare that case for him accepted as inevitable, so far as the Chinese were concerned, "the good old rule, the simple plan, that he may take who has the power and he may keep who can.' They have given us no other information, but that the Chinese who got all this immense revenue out of these frauds, kept the whole swag, a supposition which I am free to say is entirely at variance with popular impression at Vancouver, and should have formed, if the commissioner desired to satisfy the public of Vancouver, the subject of most diligent inquiry, examination and cross-examination which appears to have been altogether absent. The commissioner seems to have given up the problem of how to attract to the treasury the gold so freely contributed by the Chinese. He was in the position of Father Abraham when, upon an occasion historically recorded, he was called upon to provide a burnt offering and having prepared his altar and his fuel, he realized that he had no lamb for the burnt offering. It seemed to him that he had divine direction that he must sacrifice his son upon that altar.

Just as, perhaps, it seemed to Commissioner Murphy that since all the parties concerned in these frauds were of his own political faith, and simply quarrelling amongst themselves as to a division or alleged division, he must sacrifice one of the beloved sons of his party as a show of atonement for the political crimes to be expiated. Now, we are told that Abraham in his dilemma cast his eyes upon a thicket and found a ram caught by the horns, and seized the ram and laid it on the altar. In the case of Commissioner Murphy, he had the happy device of seizing in his imagination upon Yip On and Yip Sue Poy as the kids for the occasion; but unlike Abraham, he did not seize the kids themselves when they were caught by the horns in the thicket of his investigation; nor did his collaborators at Ottawa seize the kids, though Commissioner Murphy sent down to them his report that they should be seized and offered up as a burnt offering on the political altar; but, by the gross neglect of all persons concerned, these kids have been allowed to escape from the confines of Canada, and we have no burnt offering at all in response to the demand that Commissioner Murphy must offer up some one as a sacrifice to the public discontent. I will read further from the

political side of this inquiry. After the commissioner had decided that on the evidence of Judge Grant these allegations could not be supported, he continues:

The charges reappeared, however, in a somewhat modified form in the cross-examinations carried on by Mr. Gordon Grant, which were throughout very largely directed to establishing that the Honourable W. Templeman, Minister of Inland Revenue, and some members of the Liberal executive committee of Vancouver, especially Mr. Robert Kelly, had endeavoured to balk any investigation into the alleged frauds. In fact, it is clear, now that the commission is closed, from Mr. Grant's examination of the witnesses whom he requested to have subpœnaed when applying for a status as counsel, that with the single exception of Mr. Foster, the secret service officer sent out to make inquiry in the first instance, they were material only because he hoped to establish these accusations by their cross-examination. (See cross-exam. Senkler, 368 et seq; ditto Pound, 420 et seq: Kelly, 3118 et seq; Templeman, 3445 et seq.) Even in Mr. Foster's case Mr. Grant's cross-examination was largely directed to the same end. (See p. 1236 et seq.) The same purpose was indicated in his cross-examination of several witnesses called by Mr. McCrossan. (See cross-exam. Munro, 1037 et seq; McLean, 1581 et seq; Glover, 2480 et seq; Yip On, 2226 et seq.) Finally, Mr. Grant went into the box largely for the same purpose. (See his evidence, p. 1253-1276, 1315-1319, 1346-1352.) The reasons for pointing this out will be seen later.

Apparent weight attached to the charges, supported as they were by Mr. Grant's attitude, because telegrams from the accused parties to Ottawa were on the official file (Ex. 275, 393, 394, 395 and 417) not indeed requesting any hushing up of a proposed investigation, but asking the reinstatement of Yip On and of Mr. Bowell, the collector of customs and comptroller of Chinese immigration at Vancouver, after both had been suspended by the department When these telegrams were sent, as will be seen, Mr. Foster, the secret service officer, was in Vancouver, and though he had failed up to that time to get any evidence admissible in a court of law against Yip On, he had acquired a knowledge of facts and obtained possession of letters calculated to arouse grave suspicion. The parties who sent the wires knew of Mr. Foster's presence in Vancouver, and what his mission was. They did not know what evidence he had, and with the exception of the Hon. Mr. Templeman they made no effort to ascertain before forwarding the telegrams. (Kelly 3129, p. 34384-87, p. 3141, p. 34482-88.) Hon. Mr. Templeman did not see Mr. Foster, but it was charged his purpose was to stop further action on that officer's part because further activity would be injurious to the Liberal party.

These grave allegations introduced a political element into the inquiry which placed the commission in an awkward position.

So that you will see that the commissioner himself realized, and is frank enough to admit it, the embarrassment caused by his being chosen as a judge by the accused themselves As he goes on to say:

Either the widest latitude had to be given or else the commission might in turn be open to the accusation that it too was anxious to screen individuals, especially as its personnel was the nomination of the Hon. Mr. Templeman, as appeared from the official file.

The first horn of the dilemma was chosen in the belief that the traditional honour of the bar would prevent any abuse of the privileges accorded pursuant to this decision by the counsel to whom they were extended. The sequel will show that in the case of Mr. Grant this belief was ill-founded. This began to be apparent somewhat early, but the position taken was not receded from in the expectation that Mr. Grant would eventually justify his conduct by production of evidence. To place the question of opportunity beyond dispute, he was specifically asked at the last session of the commission if he had anything further to adduce (3451 at foot of page, and at page 3453, questions by commissioner).

Then the commissioner proceeds to discuss specifically the charges against the Hon. Wm. Templeman. It is not necessary for me to read all of that, because, as he has said already, these charges were found to be not sustained by the evidence. I will, however, read this portion that seems to be worth while to deal with:

Charges against the Honourable W. Templeman.

As will appear, these stand upon a different footing from those against the other parties. Accordingly they will be dealt with first.

To malign the private character of a minister of the Crown before a Royal Commission to gratify personal spleen engendered by balked intrigue is to merit the pillory of public scorn.

Then, skipping to the foot of page 15:

As to Mr. Grant, it seems clear from a perusal of the inner history leading up to his commission as hereinafter detailed, that impeaching Mr. Foster's credibility was not his object, even if that were within his province as counsel for the Trades and Labour Council, but it is believed his true motive was revenge for balked intrigue. Indeed this conclusion does not rest on deduction alone, for Mr. Grant in his evidence admits that he was piqued because he had not been appointed government counsel before the commission (see Grant, p. 1341, q. 10099-10107), the securing of which position was a minor feature of the intrigue referred to, and for this he knew Hon. Mr. Templeman was responsible (Senkler, p. 376, q. 2951 and 2952), just as it was obvious to Mr. Grant, fully conversant as he was with the inside facts, that the minister was responsible for the defeat of the whole plan. . .

And in passing it may be said that the commission, had it been seized at the outset of the facts now proven, would not have allowed Mr. Grant to act as counsel on the inquiry of issues raised by him in the investigation of which he perforce must have been a witness, as will fully appear, if absolute injustice was not to be done to several innocent people. Aware of this, and of his intention to raise such issues as he must have been, Mr.

Grant's action in accepting a retainer is regrettable and renders his abuse of the privileges accorded him as counsel the more flagrant.

. . . . . .

That the second charge against him was made with knowledge of its falsity is shown by Mr. Grant's own evidence. His version is that Mr. Foster stated the minister came to him and opened an interview relating to Mr. Foster's work by saying 'Foster, I want this investigation stopped, it is going to hurt us too much.' (Grant, p. 1257 at top), but on learning the evidence in Mr. Foster's possession, the minister directed him to go on with his work and assured him of his support (Grant, p. 1257, q. 9775 and 1258, q. 9776). Accepting this as true, it is clear that the minister's opposition only lasted so long as he had a wrong impression of the facts, and that when apprised of them, instead of trying to impede Mr. Foster's operations, he promised him every assistance. Asked to justify his course at the investigation in the face of this, Mr. Grant's only excuse was that he feared Mr. Templeman would again fall under Mr. R. Kelly's influence (Grant p. 1315, q. 10014-10026). But he had, as shown by the same reference, no reason other than alleged vague rumour for believing the minister was influenced by Mr. Kelly, and he had not even the justification of vague rumour that Hon. Mr. Templeman had in any way changed his express determination to assist Mr. Foster in every way. Moreover, as will be shown later, he had every reason to know that if Mr. Kelly had any influence it would be used—as in fact it was used—not to balk a genuine investigation, but to defeat the intrigue in which he, Grant, and others were concerned, and hereinafter fully detailed, the success of which depended upon the suppression of facts intimately connected with Chinese affairs at the port of Vancouver.

Now, as complementary to that, I want to read from the evidence of the minister himself, and I premise my reading by saying that it seems to me that the commissioner was letting politics get a pretty strong hold upon him about this time, that the view he takes is likely to prove much more charitable than the view that would be taken by any judge under ordinary circumstances where politics did not come in to bias his judgment. There was at this time an investigation going on in Vancouver by Inspector Foster of the Dominion Police. Mr. Foster had gone to Vancouver with most specific instructions from his superior officer. He was to associate himself there with David Lew; he was to follow out a plan outlined by Mr. McInnes of Ottawa; he was not to make his presence and his mission more widely known than necessary. Mr. Foster appears to have carried out his instructions in every detail, as shown by the minute reports which he sent every few days to his chief at Ottawa, Commissioner Sherwood of the Dominion Police, by whom they were forwarded to the Minister of Trade and Commerce to be placed in possession of the government. In pursuit of his investigation, Inspector Foster had caused the removal of the intepreter Yip On, who had been time and time again reported to the government by its own officials as supposed to be guilty of frauds against the revenue in connection with the bringing in of Chinese. Inspector Foster had him superseded and another interpreter put on in his place. Yip On was suspended when Mr. Templeman appeared in Vancouver. The suspension took place on the 17th of September, 1910. It was speedily rumoured about Vancouver what the significance of the suspension was and what revelations must inevitably follow from the substitution of an honest interpreter for a dishonest one. Three days later Mr. Templeman appeared upon the scene. I take his movements as detailed in the evidence. It is not necessary for me to read that part of it, which is very long. Suffice it to say that he had a dinner at the Vancouver Club, and a subsequent conclave in a room with the chiefs of the local patronage committee in Vancouver, namely, Mr. Robert Kelly, Mr. George Macdonald, Mr. J. H. Senkler and others, these persons being amongst the persons indicated as accused in the letter of Judge Grant which I have read. These were the associates of the minister in British Columbia on this momentous occasion. After they had incubated in a private room at the club for a considerable time, there was produced a telegram, drafted by whom it is not stated, signed by whom it is not stated, but signed in fact with the name of W. Templeman, said to have been affixed to this telegram by Robert Kelly's typewriter.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Of course, that is all absurd. That does not appear in the evidence. I signed that telegram myself. There is no use of misrepresenting me.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am glad to hear from the Minister of Inland Revenue. I hope I shall often hear from him. I have in my hand the telegram itself, and it is precisely what I say and precisely contrary to what the minister has said.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. As a matter of fact, I signed the telegram in lead pencil. Afterwards, after it was secured from the telegraph office, I obtained a copy of the telegram from the Trade and Commerce Department in typewriting, but I signed the original in lead pencil.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I have here the original telegram as sent with all of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company's office marks upon it—the filing marks, the number of the telegram, the red ink marks, the typewritten marks, every mark that the telegraph office puts on a telegram. This is indisputably the original

telegram which was filed in the office at Vancouver and transmitted to the Department of Trade and Commerce at Ottawa.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It cannot be the original, because I signed the original in lead pencil.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). There is an explanation. I said the original telegram sent. If a minister of a Crown goes into a private room in the Vancouver Club—

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. A dark room.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). A dark room if you like, with the leader of Tammany at Vancouver, and gives into that gentleman's possession a telegram to be taken away and copied and sent out at that gentleman's sweet will, he becomes responsible for the telegram delivered by his messenger to the telegraph office. On this occasion Robert Kelly appears to have been the chosen messenger of the Minister of Inland Revenue, and the telegram delivered at the telegraph office in pursuance of the authority given to him by the minister was this identical telegram which I have here.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There is no disputing the telegram. I am responsible for it, whether it was sent by myself or by another person. I signed the telegram. What my hon. friend has may be a copy sent by the telegraph office to the commissioner. I myself have a copy which I got from the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am glad the minister admits his responsibility for the telegram, although I do not see very well how he can evade it in view of the evidence. Just to make it perfectly plain, I will read the evidence of Mr. Robert Kelly.

I quote from page 3111 of the Evidence, question 3428:

Now there is a telegram on file, Mr. Kelly, purporting to be from Mr. Templeman to Sir Richard Cartwright, dated September 20, 1910, which I will read—do you know anything about that?

A. I guess I know something about them all, maybe. I think this telegram, the Hon. Wm. Templeman was asked to send it by Mr. Senkler, Mr. McDonald, myself and many others and was approved of by the meeting, and of course Mr. Templeman knew very little about the case although he went and inquired, and he was assured that this man was all right, and he had nothing against him from Mr. Foster.

Q. Was that sent from the meeting at the Vancouver Club, the dinner given by Mr. Glover?—A. We had dinner at the Vancouver Club with Mr. Glover and adjourned to a little room and discussed the matter.

Q. Who was at that discussion?—A. Myself, Mr. Senkler and Mr. McDonald, I think.

Q. And Mr. Sclater?—A. Yes, I believe so.

Q. Mr. Duff Stewart?—A. I think he was, but I would not say positively, as I did not pay much attention, but I remember some remarks Mr. Senkler had made in reference to David Lew, that he was anything but what was right, and he was very strongly in favour that this telegram should be sent in time.

Q. And Mr. Templeman sent that after that discussion with you others at the Vancouver Club?—A. He certainly did, I don't know if Mr. Templeman sent it, but he signed it I presume.

Mr. Justice Murphy.—I think in justice to Mr. Templeman you ought to tell us what that discussion was that led up to the sending of a telegram, why was he asked by those people to send it?—A. Mr. Templeman was aware as I understood it or had a pretty good idea that there was a certain element in Ottawa trying to get this man, David Lew, put in the position of interpreter, and in order to do so they had to get Yip On suspended or dismissed, and Mr. Templeman after he wrote that telegram and before it was sent, I think, he went and made inquiries from Mr. Munro and went over in the auto to see Mr. Foster at the boarding house where he was stopping and Mr. Foster was in bed and Mr. Templeman told me he made an appointment to meet Mr. Foster and Mr. Foster assured him there was nothing against Yip On, and it seems to me that the Minister's name should not have been dragged into this thing the way it has.

Question 34300:

It was stated by Mr. McLean, Mr. Kelly, when he was on the stand, although to some extent it was outside the inquiry, since it has come out it was only fair that you should have an opportunity to give your explanation of his statement that you control Mr. Templeman, what have you to say about that?—A. I have a good deal to say about it. It is quite in accordance with what I expect from Mr. McLean. I do not control Mr. Templeman nor do I think any other man in Canada does, and as far as Mr. McLean is concerned he is the only man I know of who ever had any desire to control.

We are getting some inside history of these gentlemen who are all part of the happy family of Liberals, and who are complimenting each other about the distribution of the spoils of office. The examination proceeds:

Last year, I was in Ottawa and Mr Norman was there so much he had worn out his chair at the Russell House attending sessions and he stayed at home and sent his brother Hugh. I was in Ottawa when Mr. McLean came down. He was staying at the Russell House, also, and he came to me and said that he wanted to get a settlement with the government for this license they cancelled on him up in Dawson, and I asked him what was the amount he thought he should receive and he said that the amount they were looking for was approximately $350,000 and he wanted me to speak to the Minister and I said, all

right, I will speak to him and see what he has to say, and I met Mr. Templeman, and told him what Mr. McLean had said and I said if the government owed the McLeans any money why don't they pay them what they owe them and get rid of them; he said if the McLeans were only asking the government for $5 I would recommend the government not to pay it, as they had nothing against the government. If the McLeans think they have any claim against the government they can sue the government; and they did sue the government and the claim was thrown out.

Question 34301:

It was not thrown out, it was withdrawn. That is the case that was reported in the 'News-Advertiser' yesterday morning?—A. Yes, I presume that is the one.

Question 34302:

Who went with you to Mr. Foster's apartments after the Vancouver Club dinner and how did you come to go to his apartments?—A. We went over in the auto.

Q. Who were with you?—A. I was trying to think who it was that came with us. I think Dr. Munro went on ahead.

Then, in cross-examination by Mr. Gordon Grant, Exhibit 395, is shown. That, I take it, is the telegram that I referred to just now. The question is asked of Mr. Kelly:

Do you know who drafted that telegram for Hon. William Templeman?—A. I don't remember who drafted it, I know I did not.

Question 34330:

Do you know of any one being with the Hon. Mr. Templeman at the time it was drafted?—A. I could not tell you who drafted it, I don't remember.

Question 34331:

Do you know where that telegram 395 was typewritten?—A. This one here?

Yes?—A. No. I do not, I could not swear where it was typewritten, I do not know.

Q. Do you think from your office?—A. In all probability I should think that was where I would likely typewrite it.

That is the way Bob Kelly was likely to typewrite a telegram from the Minister of Inland Revenue to his colleagues, drafted in the Vancouver Club over night when Bob Kelly's office was closed so that there would be no usual and ordinary traffic from the club down to the office and back again to the telegraph office in the course of sending the message.

I notice that telegram was filed at 11 o'clock in the morning at the C.P.R. Telegraph office 11K; would that assist you in recollecting if you were down at your office or if you had been any other place that morning?—A. No, but I might have written it the day before.

So Mr. Kelly writes the minister's telegrams, according to Mr. Kelly's statement.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster).

Q. But you think in your own office?—A. I think in all probability it was in my own office, but I don't remember, but I signed the telegram anyway no matter where it was typewritten.

Q. Was that telegram written for you and submitted for you to send?—A. No, it was not, I wrote that myself or had it written.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. What telegram is that?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The same telegram.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He did not send my telegram.

Mr. TAYLOR. That is what he says. I am reading from page 3121 of the evidence. I have read continuously since question 34,329:

Do you know who drafted that telegram for the Hon. Mr. Templeman?

Bob Kelly says:

I don't remember who drafted it. I know I did not.

Q. Do you know of any one being with the Hon. Mr. Templeman at the time it was drafted?—A. I could not tell you who drafted it. I don't remember.

Question 34339:

There are four telegrams here, one of which is signed by you, which is the one to the Hon. Charles Murphy, can you not recall anything more about that?—A. No, I don't remember.

Q. And you don't remember where it was typewritten? A. No.

Q. Do you remember what time of the day you signed it?—A. I do not.

Q. Do you remember if any person had anything to do with the framing of it?—A. I don't think they did, but I am not in a position to say as I don't remember.

Q. This telegram signed by Mr. Templeman which has not been marked as an Ex., yet: 'Most important that Yip On should be continued as Chinese interpreter, David Lew's claims should not be entertained.' Is that the telegram you identified as the one the Hon. Wm. Templeman sent from Vancouver Club? A. I think so.

Q. Is that it here?—A. Yes, that is it.

Q. That is the only telegram that has been produced by the Canadian Pacific Telegraph Company signed by Mr. Templeman, that is the only one you know of?—A. I think so.

Q. And you say that telegram was sent as the result of the discussion at the Club?—A. Yes.

Q. Will you explain to me, Mr. Kelly, as it is a fact, how that Templeman's telegram came to be typewritten by the same typewriter as your own?—A. As my own?

Q. Yes, it is a fact they are.—A. I don't know anything about where it was typewritten, but we discussed it and to the best of my knowledge it was written at the Vancouver Club in the strangers' room.

Q. Is it not a fact to your knowledge that the telegram bearing Mr. Templeman's signature was typewritten in your office before you

left there to go to the Vancouver Club that night?—A. It was not.

Q. It was not?—A. No.

Q. Did Mr. Templeman or any one take a draft of the telegram from the Vancouver Club to your office that night and have it typewritten, using your typewriter, or a typewriter in your office?—A. Not to my knowledge.

Q. Did any one of those gentlemen leave the Vancouver Club long enough to do that?—A. I could not tell you how long they left because they scattered around. I did not follow them. I was not in that business.

Q. How long did that discussion take at the Vancouver Club?—A. I could not tell you.

Q. How long before the telegram was sent to your recollection?—A. I could not tell you as I don't recollect.

Q. One or two hours after dinner had concluded?—A. I don't know, I suppose between one and two hours after.

Q. I understand you had dinner, starting at a quarter past seven, is that correct?—A. I don't know.

Q. That is what Mr. Glover said?—A. If he said it, it is right, I presume.

Q. Did you see that telegram after it had been completed for dispatching to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company?—A. I don't remember if I did or not.

Q. You will observe, Mr. Kelly, that Mr. Templeman has not signed that telegram?—A. This one here?

Q. Yes, that is a typewritten signature, Wm. Templeman, from the same typewriter that typewrote yours?—A. I suppose Mr. Templeman will be able to explain that when he comes. I know I did not sign Mr. Templeman's name here.

Now, I think I have read enough to——

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. member read evidence to the effect—I do not know who the witness was—that the telegram signed by me had been written by Mr. Kelly in his office, and he has now read evidence to the effect that the telegram was written in the Vancouver club. Of course I never read that evidence, but there seems to be a discrepancy which I cannot understand. I imagine there may have been two telegrams in question.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think the minister's brain must be getting befogged.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Very possibly, but 'Hansard' will show I am right.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I don't think they ever had Bob Kelly's typewriter in a room at the Vancouver Club. The original telegram procured from the Canadian Pacific Railway office was written on Bob Kelly's typewriter and Kelly himself admits it. He gives conflicting stories in his evidence as to when, how and where it was written, but cornered he admits it was written on his typewriter. The point I want to make is this—I think the minister will admit it is a good one—that it is a most careless and reckless way of doing business for a minister of the Crown to permit a telegram to be sent on such an important matter of public interest as this was by a person held up to him by public rumour as likely to be a beneficiary of the frauds that were about to be exposed.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is a very deliberate insinuation, and a very improper insinuation.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I would like to know what is improper about it?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That public opinion held Mr. Kelly up as likely to be a beneficiary of fraud. That is not true.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I cannot say with certainty as to what is held up to the Minister of Inland Revenue as I have no knowledge of his inner conscience, and private acts, but I can say from my own knowledge that Mr. Kelly is held up, if not to the minister, to all the rest of the community as the chief beneficiary of what in vulgar parlance is called the graft upon the government at Vancouver. That is a matter of public knowledge, discussed by Robert Kelly himself in his evidence, and accepted by him as being common property. It seems incredible that when all the rest of the world knows it, and when Mr. Kelly admits it, that the minister from British Columbia after all his intimate relations with Mr. Kelly should never have heard it. Here we have an interpreter suspended to make possible the discovery of the frauds; suspended on evidence so substantial that the very thing predicted turned out, and on this ship from which he was excluded they discovered over twenty bogus merchants, each of them having a letter to Yip On, the suspended interpreter, and a bag of gold to be given to him. All these were exposed as frauds by the suspension of this interpreter, and yet the minister from British Columbia, who should have been the first to put a stop to these frauds, which according to public rumour had been going on then for three years, and perhaps longer, allowed Bob Kelly to send this telegram:

> Most important that Yip On shall be continued as Chinese interpreter.

Most important to whom? Not to the public, because the public were making $500 a head, out of these twenty men coming in at that moment, and which they would not have made had it not been for the suspension of Yip On.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. My hon. friend is quoting in a very untruthful way; untruthful in respect to the impression created.

He says that certain evidence had been given incriminating Yip On, with respect to handling a certain amount of money, and I then recommended that he be reinstated. One event came after the other; my hon. friend is misconstruing it.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am sorry to have to contradict the minister so often, but he is absolutely wrong.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am absolutely right.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Absolutely wrong. His own evidence gives as a reason—I was going to say an excuse, but I do not want to use hard language as the minister does—his own evidence gives as a reason for sending this telegram, that the Foster inquiry in connection with Yip On, had at this stage been completed.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Quite true.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Four days after that date, when he had time to reflect, he wrote to his colleague the right hon. Sir Richard Cartwright, Minister of Trade and Commerce as follows:

Victoria, B.C., Sept. 24, 1910.

The Right Hon. Sir R. Cartwright, G.C.M.G.,
Minister of Trade and Commerce,
Ottawa.

My dear Sir Richard:

I notice in the press to-day that you have suspended Bowell for reinstating Yip On without instructions. Bowell, having so acted, is deserving of suspension.

I wired you from Vancouver to the effect that Yip On should be reinstated and that the acting interpreter should not be retained. I did this after being given all the information obtainable. I subsequently had a conversation with Mr. Foster and the information he gave me sustained my view that it would be in the interest of the department in getting to the bottom of the alleged irregularities if Yip On were reinstated, the investigation to be continued both here and at Hong Kong.

I am advised that the Chinese acting interpreter, while Yip On is under suspension, is one of the crookedest in Vancouver.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) W. TEMPLEMAN.

As to the question of dates and the statement of the hon. minister just now that there was no information disclosed as to Yip On's complicity when he sent these telegrams and that the disclosure came subsequent to the telegrams, I propose to read one or two telegrams which will establish the facts. I have before me exhibit No. 404, a telegram dated Ottawa, Sept. 14, 1910—six days before the minister's telegram:

Sherwood to Foster.

Ottawa, Sept. 14th., 1910.

Confidential.

Instruct Customs Officers Newbury and Bowell to relieve Mong Kow and Yip On from duty temporarily prior to arrival Empress of India pending special investigation and then proceed as suggested in your letter September seventh provided Lew will act in capacity indicated. Special care must be taken to prevent all communication with Chinese after arrival steamship at Victoria. Bowell and Newbury will be instructed by Chief Controller. Chinese to accept instructions from you.

Then on September 17th, I have a memo to the deputy minister of Trade and Commerce, reading as follows:

Following telegram was received by me at six o'clock last evening, "Yip On, Lew and I leaving to meet 'Empress'.

(Signed) A. P. Sherwood,
Commissioner of Police.

Exhibit No. 146 is a telegram dated Vancouver, September 20, 1910, which reads as follows:

To Sir Richard Cartwright, Ottawa—

Most important that Yip On should be continued as Chinese interpreter. David Lew's claim should not be entertained. Friends here strongly recommend Yip On.

W. TEMPLEMAN.

In regard to the dispute between the hon. minister and myself, I think I have proved the case absolutely. On the 20th of September we have an official report from Foster to Sherwood, his chief, that the discovery was made of Yip On's rascality at Victoria. That was no matter of secrecy. It was on the tongue of every employee in the customs service, and they were making a regular hubbub in Vancouver. Is it conceivable that these gentlemen, the heads of the patronage committee in Vancouver, should be closeted with the hon. minister on such serious business, on the night of the 20th September, and have no knowledge of a matter officially communicated from Vancouver that very day by Foster to his chief, Sherwood? I say the evidence is indisputable that these gentlemen knew all about the discovery of Yip On's complicity in this transaction before the date of this telegram. It is impossible that it should be otherwise. Of course, I cannot say that the hon. minister knew, but I go back to my former premises that it is an act of the most gross impropriety, in a matter so grave as this, for him to allow his name to be used, and telegrams to be sent in his name by any person whatever, least of all by persons bearing the character of these men with respect to these matters in Vancouver.

Apparently the patronage committee at Vancouver got very busy, as will appear from the following:

Sept. 23, 1910.

To Sir Richard Cartwright, Ottawa—

Collector Bowell should be reinstated. Our

friends unanimous for Yip On. Think dept. acting unwisely.

J. H. SENKLER.
Pres. Lib. Assn.

It is only fair to Mr. Senkler to tell the House that he says he never signed that telegram.

On September 24th we have another telegram to the Hon. Charles Murphy, Ottawa, reading as follows:

Friends here very indignant way O'Hara ignoring our recommendations. Yip On should be reinstated. If not ask our association for recommendation. Association wired Sir Wilfrid.

ROBERT KELLY.

Here is another one dated September 24th, to the Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, Ottawa:

Recommendation of our minister and Liberals for re-instatement of Yip On should be carried out. Hip On has support of Immigration and Customs officials. Complaints against Yip On not sustained. Our friends indignant at O'Hara's drastic action.

J. H. SENKLER.
For Liberal Association.

This telegram is said to be another forgery. That the telegram came from the Liberal executive at Vancouver is not disputed, but Mr. Senkler says that they had no right to sign his name to it.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Is any reason given as to why Yip On should be put back into the service?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). No reason whatever is stated as to why he should be put back. There was a reason stated why Lew should not be continued as interpreter, and that was because all these gentlemen represent him to Ottawa as being a person of bad character. In the light of the revelations respecting Yip On, it seems to me their judgment is somewhat defective. In any event the fact remains that it was most important that Yip On should be reinstated in the public service, notwithstanding the fact that he had been caught red-handed in this rascality at Victoria. It is a peculiar thing that we have the hon. minister from British Columbia (Mr. Templeman) lending himself to the suggestion.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). When was the first information that documents incriminating Yip On were in the possession of the government, before or after this?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Before this. The explosion at Victoria took place on the 18th September, when the new interpreter and inspector went on the ship and discovered these incriminating documents. On his return to Vancouver two days after the discovery he made his official report. This is where our friend Bob Kelly comes in. He engaged in the attempt to paralyse the inspector by giving him as an associate the man primarily responsible for the frauds, and who, of course, would prevent him from making any further discovery.

We had an argument in this House the other day as to whether or not the minister sent a telegram asking for the discontinuance of the investigation. The argument was invited by himself, because when he arose, it seems to me with a guilty conscience, he put these words in my mouth, when as a matter of fact I had not said anything of the kind. What I had said was that the minister sent a deterrent telegram to the department at Ottawa. He immediately rose to say it was absolutely untrue that he had sent any telegram asking for the stopping of the investigation. I ask any reasonable man whether that is not playing upon words, whether it can be dignified by any better term than quibbling, when a minister and his associates sent telegrams which in effect would stop any effective investigation although in express terms they did not say so, to make the bald denial in the House that they ever sent any telegram advising the stopping of the investigation. This would have been the wrong term to use in any event because according to the minister himself, Inspector Foster had completed his investigation; having obtained sufficient evidence to justify the further inquiry, which, at Mr. Foster's request, was held by this Royal Commission. Yet we find the minister asking to have Yip On reinstated to continue for seven years more the irregularities which he and his associates had carried on for seven years unchecked. With further reference to whether or not this had the effect of stopping the investigation I would like to read to the minister the evidence of one of his friends.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The hon. member has denied that he had suggested that I had used any influence to stop the investigation. The hon. gentleman said:

This shows how carefully the ministers of the Crown, under this government, administer their departments, when a minister will deliberately advise his colleagues to stop investigation into a fraud of this kind.

That is what I denied.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I think the minister did advise, in effect, the stopping of the investigation. I will read from his friend, Harry Senkler, to show that he, too, thought he advised his colleagues to stop the investigation and I could read other evidence to show that that belief was wide spread.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Read it all.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The evidence here would take 200 hours to read.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Then do not make insinuations.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I am not making insinuations; I am making direct statements. Mr. Senkler, at page 366 of the evidence, question 2895, said:

Q. Do you, of your own knowledge, or through your association with members of the Liberal party in this city, know or believe that there are any men profiting by graft through Chinese immigration frauds?—A. I do not believe there is any as far as the Liberal Association or its members are concerned. From what appears in the papers it may be there is money being made out of this Chinese business, but if so it has been done by people who had no connection with the Liberal Association, either personally or any other way.

Q. And it has been done in such a way that the Liberal Association has known nothing about it?—A. Then when this matter first came up the matter of the investigation there, when, I think you, Mr. Grant, and Mr. Farris acted as counsel, I was away and while I was away there was one telegram sent in my name by some individual members of the committee to Ottawa which was, I think, that this investigation should not go on.

There was the interpretation of a telegram identical in terms with that of the minister, translated by the man in whose name it was sent 'which was, I think, that this investigation should not go on.' Now, I ask the House whether I am justified in forming the impression formed by the very gentleman in whose name the deterrent telegram was sent.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What was the reason suggested why the investigation should not go on?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). There was no reason suggested, simply an urgent request that Yip On should be reinstated as interpreter.

If there is one member of this House, and I am glad there is one, who comes out of this business creditably, so far as his personal actions are concerned, that member is the first minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). He turned a deaf ear to all the remonstrances of all his influential friends on the coast. I shall read some correspondence with him.

(Private.)

Prime Minister's Office, Ottawa,
October, 3, 1910.

My Dear Senkler,—I write you with reference to the Chinese frauds, as to which you have telegraphed me. On receipt of your telegram I communicated at once with the Department of Trade and Commerce and there found that there was a very strong prima facie case against the Chinese interpreter, and that he had been properly suspended. I cannot, therefore, understand why these frauds should not be exposed. The public are so keen about this Oriental business that we will put ourselves in very serious trouble if we were to create the impression that we are not doing our full duty to have the law faithfully carried out. If you have any reason to think otherwise, please write to me and give me your full views.

Let me avail myself of this opportunity to again offer you my sincere thanks for the great assistance which you gave me and my friends in our last visit to British Columbia.

Believe me, ever,
My dear Senkler,
Yours very sincerely,
WILFRID LAURIER.

J. H. Senkler, Esq., K. C.,
Vancouver, B.C.

While the minister from British Columbia, on the ground at Vancouver, had made most diligent inquiry as he said, and had found no reason why Yip On should not be reinstated, and took the trouble to authorize that telegram, the first minister, 3,000 miles away, had found that there was a very strong prima facie case against the Chinese interpreter, and that he had been properly suspended.

The following is from Mr. Senkler:

(Personal.)

October 8, 1910.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier,
Ottawa, Ontario.

My Dear Sir Wilfrid,—I have your telegram of the 26th of September, which reads as follows:

'Sorry cannot agree with you. Have looked into matter and prima facie case against Yip On so strong as to warrant suspension, matter will be looked into again but meantime suspension must be maintained.'

That was Sir Wilfrid's attitude from the beginning:

I presume that this was in answer to a telegram which was sent to you in my name by the executive of the association on the 23rd of the same month. It also seems that a further telegram was sent by the committee in my name on the 24th of September, but whether it was sent to yourself or to Sir Richard Cartwright, I have not been able to find out. As a matter of fact, I think the committee were wrong in sending a telegram of that kind in my name in my absence. If they thought so strongly on the matter as they apparently did, they should have sent it in the name of the secretary, or vice-president, or acting chairman. However that may be, I desire to write you in connection with my ideas thereon.

I personally do not know very much about the former interpreter for the government, Yip On. He has been a witness in one or two matters that I have been connected with, but otherwise I know nothing about him. Chinese interpreters, as well as most others of the same nationality are, in my opinion, proverbially dishonest and need a great deal of watching, and if it were at all possible to obtain a Chinese interpreter who is not a Chinaman, it would be infinitely preferable to one of the Chinese race.

(Paragraph left out.)

I wish also to draw your attention to the fact that a message came to the press of this city from Ottawa, that the Liberal committee of this city Mr. Ralph Smith and Mr. Templeman were all endeavouring to stop the investigation which was started in connection with the immigration of Chinese. I, of course, cannot tell you how this dispatch ever came to be sent, but it is entirely wrong so far as our committee, at any rate, is concerned. When I returned home and found what had been done I called a further meeting of the committee, and every man of the committee agreed that a thorough investigation into this matter should be taken, and, when I was approached personally by the press in connection with it, I told them so, and had the dispatch from Ottawa flatly contradicted.

I am to-day writing you in answer to your letter of the 12th of September.

Yours very truly.

This is not signed, but it is evidently the duplicate copy of Mr. Senkler's letter. In passing I may mention that this is one of the gentlemen said to have been in the room in the Vancouver Club when the Templeman telegram was sent.

Now we will return to the commissioner. He gives a long inner history of the proceedings taken to ensure exposure of these frauds. On page 30 of his report he says:

Concurrently with these wires, however——

That is, the wires to Ottawa announcing the discoveries——

——events were happening at the coast which gave Messrs. McInnes and Lew considerable trouble and out of which grew the charges against the hon. Mr. Templeman, and the members of the Liberal executive hereinbefore outlined. Some inkling of Mr. McInnes' activities leaked out in Vancouver, and Mr. R. Kelly heard of them. His information was that Mr. McInnes was endeavouring to oust Yip On for the purpose of installing D. Lew in his place, and that the charge was desired not from any desire to improve the service, but for the personal benefit of those seeking to bring it about. (See Kelly, p. 3108, q. 34275-6, and p. 3133, q. 34427-32.) To test Mr. Kelly's candour on this matter, Mr. Grant was specifically requested by the commission to cross-examine in reference thereto. (See Kelly, p. 3144, q. 34504). The result is set out at pp. 3145, q. 34505), and shows that Mr. Kelly believed what he alleged.

It was well known in Vancouver that there was great rivalry between the Canadian Pacific railway steamship line and the Blue Funnel line to secure the Chinese passenger traffic. It was known also that Yip On's uncle was the Canadian Pacific railway agent for Chinese passenger traffic in Vancouver, and that Sam Kee, a friend of Mr. Lew, acted in a similar capacity for the Blue Funnel line. As will be seen later, the interpreter could do a great deal in the way of influencing the passenger traffic to one of the other line by making entrance of incoming Chinese difficult or easy at his pleasure. Mr. Kelly from the information he had of the activities of Mr. Lew, believed his object was to secure control of the post of interpreter for the benefit of the Blue Funnel line (see Kelly, 3134, q. 34429-31), and (p. 3145, q. 34,-507-9, and p. 3146, q. 34509-10) and from other information he had, he believed Mr. McInnes was the man behind the whole investigation from the start, and that Mr. McInnes had brought it about and was active in it, not for any improvement in the public service, but to further his personal interests (p. 3110, q. 34276, and p. 3145, q. 34508).

These two beliefs actuated Mr. Kelly in what he did. The motive he attributed to Mr. Lew was not proven before the commission, but sufficient was proven to indicate that Mr. Lew had his eye on the position of interpreter.

Good Mr. Kelly—Mr. Kelly, the saviour of his country, the leader of Tammany, so reformed that he would foil this great evil, would persuade the minister to send telegrams in his name, and would send wild expostulations in his own name, because he thought some person had some personal end to serve by his recommendations to the government! Is there anybody in Vancouver except this commissioner who would write in that way of Mr. Kelly? Can we attribute this to anything except the inherent good nature of one Irishman, Denny Murphy, dealing with another Irishman, Bob Kelly? I do not think this has been taken anywhere for anything but a joke. I think again the commissioner has been overwhelmed by the political asssociations connected with his appointment. Here is what he says of another hero:

Just at this juncture Mr. Templeman came to Vancouver, and at a dinner at the Vancouver Club, on the evening of either September 20th or September 21st, probably September 20th, 1910, met Messrs. Kelly, Senkler, McDonald and others. After dinner he went into a room with the three named. He was informed by them that Yip On had been suspended, and that Mr. Lew, who he was told was crooked, was acting in his place, and was wholly unfit for such a position of trust, because of his undesirable character. Further that the investigation was practically over, and that nothing in particular had been elicited against Yip On. (Templeman, p. 3436 and 3437). As to this last statement, whilst as will be seen, Mr. Foster had failed to get any legal evidence against Yip On, he did have in his hands moral proof, if credited, of his complicity in the frauds. The parties interviewing the minister had not approached Mr. Foster to ascertain what he had because of their belief, justified in the opinion of the commission, that he was being used to promote the McInnes' intrigue. (Kelly p. 3144, q. 34502-06). Instead they had interviewed Mr. Bowell, comptroller, and Colonel Worsnop, surveyor of the port of Vancouver, and Dr. Munro, medical inspector, who all assured them of their thorough belief in Yip On's honesty. (Kelly, p. 3130, q. 31394-7). The fact, however, that Mr. Foster had not been seen must have been told to the minister by his interviewers, for some of them as will

be seen, went with him very shortly after the interview, when he set out to ascertain what Mr. Foster really had discovered. (Glover, p. 2479 at top, and Templeman, p. 3448, q. 36,-557,-60.

I would like to contrast that with the minister's statement a little while ago that I had misplaced the date—that at that time nothing had been discovered; that he had sent his telegram first and the discovery had come afterwards. I have proved conclusively by the evidence that the minister was wrong, and I have now the same statement by Commissioner Murphy himself, that Mr. Templeman, after hearing these revelations in the private room at the club, said he had set out to ascertain what really Mr. Foster had discovered—a wise precaution, but which had no effect from the fact that before he set out to see what had leaked out he sent the message to his colleagues instructing them what must be done, what was most important in the interest of some person not yet disclosed.

Whilst there is no direct evidence that Hon. Mr. Templeman was told of the suspicions entertained against Mr. McInnes, it would seem that he was, from Mr. Kelly's evidence (page 3113, q. 34287) and from the minister's statement that the fear expressed to him as a reason for asking prompt action on his part was that Mr. Lew's permanent appointment to the interpretership was then imminent at Ottawa (Mr. Templeman, page 3437, q. 36533). Because of this fear, Hon. Mr. Templeman sent a wire (ex. 417) to Sir Richard Cartwright recommending the reinstatement of Yip On (Mr. Templeman, page 3438 at top page).

I was going to refer to some of the criticism of Mr. Foster by the commissioner, but first must read a letter from the police inspector, found on page 34 of the evidence. Mr. Foster's letter throws so much light on the inner history of the investigation that, in so far as it refers to Chinese matters, it is here set out verbatim.

Ottawa, November 10, 1910.

Dear Friend Lew,—Your letter of November 2 received to-day. I showed it to Sherwood and he had a copy made and he took it to O'Hara. I was just speaking to O'Hara for a few minutes. He was greatly pleased with our work, he told me there was going to be a Royal Commission appointed sure. I had a talk with T. McI., he states you are not the only target that they are firing at from Vancouver, for he has had to stand some pretty hot shots; he says he had the necessary papers to prove them liars, they had him before the Premier twice. Sherwood said when I was talking to him the day I got home that O'Hara wanted to have a talk with me, and he would let me know when he would see me, but so far I have heard nothing about him meeting me. They seem to be leaving everything to the commission. I was talking to Tom again to-day, and he stated that he had a talk with O'H. yesterday, but Tom is afraid Templeman will stop the Royal Commission when he returns from the west, if he can, but I think Temp. say is pretty small or in other words he is a lightweight in this case and particularly with O'Hara now since he has the record of your successor, who is Templeman's appointment. I am returning card, Sherwood said it was not necessary to have a writing expert compare the writing for O'Hara, and he also was convinced what you stated was correct. Sherwood also stated Canadian Pacific railway were going to look fully into your case. You seem to have Sherwood and O'Hara on your side now, but you know you are still in the hands of the politicians.

I was summoned from Edmonton to Chicago the first of November as fingerprint expert to give evidence at a murder trial. I was able to swear positively to the prints, I was there for two days, but I left as soon as I got off the stand and have not heard if the accused was found guilty or not.

Yours respectfully,

E. Foster.

So not only was the opinion prevalent in Vancouver that there was an attempt to stop this investigation, but in the corridors of the departmental buildings at Ottawa the same story was prevalent. Now the judge proceeds to apologize for Mr. Templeman, page 35:

Pursuant to appointment, the minister saw Mr. Foster on the morning of the 21st and heard from him what progress he had made. Mr. Foster informed Hon. Mr. Templeman that he had to get any legal evidence incriminating Yip On, but had acquired knowledge of facts that looked very suspicious. Hon. Mr. Templeman told Mr. Foster of the wire he had sent, and it was agreed the investigation should go on, Mr. Foster suggesting the advisability of sending a secret service man to China. The minister pointed out that it would be well to re-instate Yip On, thus putting him off his guard if guilty, and in the meantime carry on the proposed secret investigation. To this Mr. Foster assented, and with this end in view, the minister's wire was allowed to stand. The interview closed by the minister promising to assist Mr. Foster in every way. (Templeman, page 3439, and 3440.)

This is the judge's report on Mr. Templeman. It shows nothing short of Machiaevellian cunning on the part of the Minister of Inland Revenue, in proposing to deceive the wilely Chinaman into thinking that he really was not suspected by the subtle device of reappointing him to the office he had abused. There has been nothing furnished by the minister in this House that would have led us to suspect the possession by the minister of this marvellous cunning or ability to outwit the Chinese sharper, that has been discovered in this matter by this admiring judge. I think we should take off our hats to Mr. Commissioner Murphy. Now, the evidence at this stage deals with the appointment of counsel to assist Mr. Foster, if perchance he should be able to start prosecution against Yip On. This is important

as showing that, while Commissioner Murphy holds Gordon Grant up to public scorn as a person against whom he would, if he could, direct criminal proceedings because of his part in this investigation, as one who should not in decency accept a retainer in the matter yet we find this same young man—I have no knowledge of his qualification for the duties assigned to him, and have to take the estimate given of him by these gentlemen on one side and the other—this young man was at this very time appointed one of the government's counsel to assist Mr. Foster, a fact to which I direct the minister's attention, because if he has the character suggested by Commissioner Murphy, it is most improper that the government should so recklessly appoint him to a position of trust and responsibility in connection with the prosecution of frauds of this kind.

If he does not deserve Commissioner Murphy's condemnation, if his character is gratuitously taken away from him, what are we to think of the commissioner and of the injustice he has inflicted upon this gentleman in his desire to save the skins of other men? I would like the minister to consider that and to make some explanation to this House how he reconciles appointing Mr. Gordon Grant to a position of responsibility representing the government at Vancouver with the wholesale condemnation pronounced by this judge. I do not know whether this extraordinary occurrence is an outgrowth of the system at Vancouver, but I think we are entitled to some assurance that more attention will be paid to the recommendations of this patronage committee so that estimates so contradictory as this cannot be made within one month by the same government official. We get a sidelight on the lack of confidence that some of his colleagues had in the Minister of Inland Revenue. The report proceeds:

On September 30th, 1910, Col. Worsnop, who was to make the investigation of his own volition, he swears, (Worsnop, p. 400), and I see no reason to disbelieve him, wired asking that Mr. Senkler be appointed counsel. His reason was that he was about to preside over the official inquiry as to the status of the passport men, and had known Mr. Senkler many years, who had not only advised him in his official capacity, but was also his personal solicitor. Knowing the importance of the task he was about to undertake, he desired Mr. Senkler's assistance owing to his confidence in that gentleman as a legal adviser (Worsnop), p. 400). Mr. O'Hara replied that Mr. Senkler was on record as opposing the action of the department (Ex. 36).

Apparently, Mr. McInnes had some difficulty in having Col. Worsnop's application turned down, for on October 1, 1910, he wired Grant (Ex. 242) as follows in cipher, which I translate:

Ottawa, October 1, 1910.

Gordon Grant,
Barrister,
William Building,
Vancouver, B.C.

Private.

Worsnop asked O'Hara retain regular departmental counsel. O'Hara refused. Templeman and Murphy insisted but First Minister sustained O'Hara. Worsnop instructed prevent Chinese Consul privately interviewing Chinese. Tell 'Ceder' keep eye on this. Also continue tea trail. Hunter's authority over Worsnop confirmed this morning.

McINNES.

Here we have the minister from British Columbia endeavouring to have appointed as counsel a gentleman who had sat with him in that dark room at the club.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Whose letter is that?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). That is a telegram from Mr. McInnes.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Of course, that statement is a deliberate untruth.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I take the minister's word for it, but I think I have something under my hand dealing with it.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I never tried to get anybody appointed.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). These two gentlemen are prominent members of the Liberal party; far be it from me to judge between them. Mr. McInnes there says that Templeman tried to have this gentleman, who wished to have the thing hushed up, appointed as counsel. Templeman says that McInnes' statement is untrue. I leave it to themselves to settle. He followed this by a detailed statement by letter of his doings (Ex. 276). The document will repay perusal:

Private.

October 1, 1910.

Gordon Grant, Esq.,
Barrister, Vancouver, B.C.

Re Chinese affair.

Dear Sir,—I practically staked my reputation with the powers that be in making good provided I was given a free hand, and my suggestions followed. They have not gone back on me.

I call the minister's attention to the fact that this gentleman whom he so lightly reviled in the House just now is the personal friend and confidant of the First Minister, the private adviser of the First Minister, and the right hon. gentleman's confidence in him is shown in the correspondence a number of times. This confidant of the First Minister writes to Gordon Grant of Vancouver:

—and am confident now will back me to a finish—but the position has been fierce. This very morning the Secretary of State sent word to O'Hara to cancel the appointment of yourself and Ferris and appoint Senkler in your places. O'Hara refused and appeal was made to the Premier. I wired you the result **half an hour ago.** This is a big chance for Ferris and yourself, Gordon—a keen interest is being taken over here in the matter especially in view of the stand taken by Templeman, Ralph Smith, Senkler and the Liberal executive on behalf of the accused and against the investigators.

That is a very definite statement.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is also untrue.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). The statement is made by the confidential friend and adviser of the First Minister himself. I would like if the First Minister had been present to hear his colleague denounce his private adviser in this way. The suggestion of a royal commission came on October 12, as far as I can find out, and not from those quarters in Vancouver that professes to be so anxious to have an investigation, but from Inspector Foster himself. There seems to have been no action taken until a letter of October 24, written by Judge Grant, another good Liberal, was delivered to the government. Here is another quotation from the judge's report, showing that he had an extraordinary view of some of the circumstances to which he referred. He says on page 48:

> The whole plan having thus come to naught, Messrs. Grant and Lew, associates of Mr. McInnes, determined to make things as interesting as possible before the commission for the minister, and such members of the Liberal executive as were known to be his strong supporters, and personal friends.

The judge indulges in the extraordinary course of supplying motives for his witnesses. He does not adduce any evidence in support of it, but he supplied the evidence gratuitously out of his own consciousness, and further proceeds:

> In justice to **Mr. McInnes** it must be said that there is nothing on the record to show that he was a party to this. He, indeed, was unwilling to appear at the hearings at all and wired the commissioner that he had no direct knowledge that would throw light on the subject of the inquiry (McInnes, page 1712, q 13631, and exhibit 235). The charges were accordingly made and the telegrams quoted as proof. In the light of all the foregoing the commission finds not only that the charges were entirely without foundation, but that the sending of the telegrams were very much in the public interest.

That is a recommendation which I think must stigmatize this report as hopelessly biased. I do not care who makes the report; any commissioner who will find that the sending of a telegram for the reinstatement of Yip On as interpreter after he has been shown to have been looting the treasury for seven years—and this recommendation on the very eve of Yip On becoming a fugitive from justice, and in face of the commissioner's own well brought out statement as to on what grounds Yip On should be prosecuted—the fact that he should report that the sending of these telegrams was in the public interest, passes my comprehension.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Does he mean that Yip On ought to have been reinstated?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I do not see how it could mean anything else but that Yip On should have been restored to the public service. He says that the commission find not only that the charges were without foundation, but that the sending of the telegrams was very much in the public interest. The telegrams were that Yip On should be reinstated, that the party friends wanted this, and that the Liberals were indignant at the drastic action of O'Hara.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was there not the most positive evidence in the possession of the government at that time that Yip On was guilty of these frauds?

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). Why, yes, this very judge who says it was in the public interest to send the telegram that Yip On should be reinstated, makes this very report on Yip On. I think I am justified in reading this whole report in view of the very extraordinary finding.

> First.—Yip On and Yip Sue Poy are partners in a mercantile business at Vancouver.
>
> This fact was admitted by Yip On before the inquiry. The first question to be considered is whether evidence given by Yip On at the commission can be used against him at the trial. Immunity was offered him as to such evidence, but his counsel declined to accept it, stating that to do so would weaken his position. His counsel, however, intimated that such evidence could not be used against Yip On, even after such offer of immunity had been made was rejected.
>
> If it is concluded that such evidence cannot be used, then proof of the partnership can doubtless be obtained obiter.
>
> Second.—Yip On was the Chinese interpreter at Vancouver, from 1902 to 1910.
>
> This fact will be easily proven by the customs officials.
>
> Third.—During Yip On's term of service as interpreter, Chinese who were not merchants, were passed through the customs as merchants exempts. Their real status was known to Yip On, and he was acting as interpreter when they entered as such exempts.
>
> These facts can be proven by the evidence of Fung Chang Ning, p. 3027, et seq., and by the evidence of Yip Dit Chor, p. 2340, et seq., and of Yung Jem Sun, p. 2347, et seq. The

evidence of the two last is unsatisfactory as there was a night's interval between their evidence in chief and their cross-examination and they, to a large extent, then denied what they had stated in chief. However, doubtless leave to cross-examine them as hostile could be obtained.

It is noted that all these men entered Canada in 1907, and therefore the limitation provisions would probably apply as to any prosecution under the Act itself. Mr. McCrossan suggests such prosecution might be laid under section 573 of the Criminal Code.

Fourth.—Great numbers of Chinese entered Canada at Vancouver as merchants exempts.

This can be proven from the records.

Fifth.—A private investigation into Chinese matters was started in August, 1907, at Vancouver. Can be proved by Mr. Foster.

Sixth.—On September 3rd, 1910, a warning cable (Ex. 60) was sent from Vancouver to Hong Kong.

This can be proved by the telegraph staff.

Seventh.—Yip On admitted in the box that Ex. 63 was in his hand-writing. He also wrote several specimens by direction of counsel for the government when in the box. Messrs. Sproat and Cunningham, handwriting experts, using Ex. 60, and the specimens written in court as a basis of comparison, expressed the opinion that the sender's address on the back of Ex. 60 (which is unsigned) was that of Yip On. This signature is Yip On's firm name and address.

Eighth.—On September 6th, 1910, three warning cables, Ex. 52, 53 and 13 a, all signed Hing Sam, were sent to various parties in Hong Kong.

Can be proven by telegraph staff.

Ninth.—Hing Sam is one of three names borne by Yip On.

Can be proven by his admission in the box, if admissible. If not, possibly evidence may be obtained in Chinatown, Vancouver.

Tenth.—Handwriting experts Sproat and Cunningham, using the same basis of comparison, declared this signature to be Yip On's handwriting. If admission of Ex 60 and specimen made by Yip On are not admissible, difficulty will probably be experienced in getting many specimens of Yip On's writing to use for purposes of comparison at a criminal trial. However, two copies of his firm signature written by himself as given to a bank, can be proven by the bank manager and may serve the experts as well.

Eleventh.—Letters addressed to Yip On as Hing Sam were intercepted on a vessel, 'Empress of India,' on October 7th, 1910, which letters quoted verbatim one cable sent on September 6th, 1910, and indicated fully the nature of the fraud being perpetrated. (Ex. 93 and 94.) Translations of all cables and letters can be had by reference to the commission report.

The rest of the character of this young gentleman, who the commissioner thinks should be reinstated in accordance with the terms of the telegram, I will give after the dinner hour.

At 6 o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). When the House rose at six o'clock, I was quoting 'Murphy on Murphy' that is Commissioner Murphy's summary of the evidence adduced against Yip On and his confederates, the two men whom he now reports it would have been in the public interest to have retained in the public service as recommended by the telegrams of the hon. minister from British Columbia (Mr. Templeman), and of Mr. Robert Kelly and his associates at Vancouver.

This report was made for the information of the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Aylesworth) and was intended to help the hon. minister in arriving at a decision as to whether or not he would prosecute the parties. I will continue reading the summary:

Twelfth.—

These letters bear the signature of Yip Get Woon and the stamp of Nam Mow. agents for Yip On in China. This fact can be proven by Yip Sue Poy and by Yip On's admissions is receivable.

None of the cables of September 6th, 1910, are addressed to Nam Mow, but one is addressed to Yip Get Woon, who is reputed to be Nam Mow's manager.

This can be proven as current report by Lee Mon Kow. No more definite proof is obtainable.

Thirteenth.—

Ex. 337, from Westminster to Hong Kong, addressed "Conclusion", informing him of the fact of Yip On's suspension, and Ex. 330, detailing all steps in connection with the investigation were sent by Yip Sue Poy, Yip On's partner. This can be proven by the operator who received them.

Fourteenth.—

Several other cables, as to which see report of the Commisssion, all dealing with passports, and the investigation can be proven as probably sent by Yip Sue Poy.

(See Wilson's evidence, p. 2192). Translations of all these cables will be found in the main report.

Fifteenth.—

On the first boat intercepted (The China, September 17th, 1910) a number of suspicious letters were taken. One in particular directly implicating Yip On. (See main report).

The defence likely to be set up is also dealt with in the main report. In the opinion of the Commission if Yip On is put upon his defence he will be convicted. He certainly will be if he goes into the box and the jury does its duty.

If these facts do not justify the prosecution of Yip Sue Poy, he might possibly be convicted of perjury, if that crime can be committed before such a forum as the Commission was.

He swore positively that he did not send Ex. 337 and 330. The only corroboration of the operator's evidence that he did send these cables would be the evidence of handwriting experts using specimens written by Yip Sue Poy, whilst in the box by direction of the

Government Council that these messages are in Yip Sue Poy's handwriting.

If a prosecution is decided upon, Mr. McCrossan should be employed to conduct it as for any other counsel to familiarize himself with all the details necessary would be a herculean task.

(Signed) D. MURPHY,
Commissioner.

You will recognize that 'D. Murphy, commissioner,' thinks that if the jury did its duty Yip On would be convicted at his trial, yet this commissioner finds that it was in the public interest that the hon. minister from British Columbia (Mr. Templeman) and the patronage committee at Vancouver should send telegrams to the government recommending that this criminal should be kept in the public service, holding the responsible position of interpreter. Mr. Speaker, I take the liberty of dissenting from the finding of the commissioner, and I feel quite satisfied that no unbiased man, and no man outside the ring immediately benefiting from the proceeds of these operations will agree with the commissioner that it was in the public interest to recommend the retention of this criminal in office. This emphasizes the evil of the method of appointing this commissioner and the counsel. It seems to me simply monstrous—it is excusable, perhaps, that the hon. ministers at Ottawa should notify their colleague even though there were certain charges against him—more or less grave or more or less trifling, as you like to view it. It seems a little odd, to say the least, that they should notify him to nominate the counsel and the commissioner to try the charges; but it is simply unspeakable that having confided the nomination to him he in turn should ask for recommendations from the patronage committee at Vancouver, and bring into the affair of the nominators of the judge and jury the men accused of complicity in these odious crimes.

I have now to turn to another phase of the rascalities carried on at Vancouver. This relates to stowaways. It was found through an investigation by the Dominion Police officer that there was simply a clear avenue for the escape of stowaways from ships arriving at the harbour of Vancouver. The customs watch was of no avail whatever, and the reason it was of no avail was because the watchmen were recommended by the patronage committee, and the collector—as he said himself—had no effective control over them, he added that if he had the choice of the officers to watch the ships, he would not have any of these men in his employ.

At page 53 of the commissioner's report, I find the following:

Up to last autumn, however, that is subsequent to the reports of Mr. Foster, the government watch at Vancouver was simply farcical, and the port so far as stowaways were concerned practically free, and this to the knowledge of Mr. Bowell, the comptroller, as will be seen

In the first place, but one man was detailed to watch a vessel for the whole night through, that is from 6 p.m. to 6 a.m. (Bowell, p. 88, q. 731-2). The practice to the knowledge of the comptroller was for even this one man to leave the ship about midnight to go for lunch (see Bowell, p. 89, q. 738). The comptroller apparently believed this lunch was obtained uptown, but in reality it was taken aboard the vessel, which the one man was supposed to watch, during which time the vessel would be wholly unguarded. Moreover, the man was stationed on the wharf and was expected to watch the gang plank which apparently was in place during the whole night. The water side of the vessel was therefore wholly unguarded, and as admittedly it would be impossible for any one man, even if trustworthy to guard both this and the wharf, the watching staff of Vancouver was clearly not sufficiently numerous. The comptroller was likewise aware of this (see Bowell, p. 88, q. 737-8), and although he asked in a general way for more help he did so apparently more in connection with the general customs service than with the watching of ships. He, at any rate, never reported that ships were left wholly unguarded whilst watchmen went to lunch. (Bowell, 89, q. 740-56).

But even the sight of one watchman was useless, because the men employed were incapable and untrustworthy. Instead of being absent for lunch, they were accustomed to take supper, lunch and a third meal on board the vessels they were watching, so that at three periods between 6 p. m. and 6 a. m., the vessels so far as the government were concerned, were wholly unguarded. (See Busby's report, Sept. 28, 1910. Ex. 194.) At the date of that report, four men were employed as watchmen when their services were required, this being the whole force for day and night service. Mr. Busby reports on them as follows:

W. A. Kent, aged 48, given to drink and unreliable.

T. Physick, aged 63, physically unfit and service unsatisfactory.

H. H. Warburton; 50, cripple and unfit.

J. McPherson, given to drinking and unreliable.

That this report is correct is shown by the evidence of the secret service officer Quinn (p. 973 et seq). He worked as a Canadian Pacific railway watchman on the Vancouver wharf from August 29 to September 29. He states that the government watchmen and the ship's watchman would retire into the interior of the vessel, and frequently spend the greater part of the time there from midnight to 5 a. m. Drinking went on to a great extent. White men, Chinamen, and even on one occasion a white woman went on and off the vessel at will at all hours of the night. Members of the crew went to and fro to the city as they listed.

Here is another paragraph on frauds by entry as merchants, page 68 of the report:

Frauds by Entry as Merchants.

Exempt merchants have likewise shown a marked increase of late years, but this increase has been confined almost entirely to the port of Vancouver. From the time that the head-tax was raised to $500 in 1904 to December 31, 1910, there have been 54 Chinese entered at Victoria under this head (Ex. 412), and of these some 18 were members of a Chinese government official's suite (Newbury, p. 2812 q. 32716) and are classified as new merchants, although they had nothing to do with trade, and presumably they did not remain in Canada at all (Davey, p. 582, q. 30968-70). The true number passed as merchants exempts during these six years was 36, and of these 31 brought Chinese passports (Ex. 363, Davey, p. 2627, q. 31248-50) hereinafter discussed. These were not honoured in Victoria, but independent evidence was in every case required, as shown by the notes on the passports themselves and by the evidence (Davey, p. 2626, q. 31239). Five such passports were rejected in Victoria from the time they were first presented early in 1907 to the date of the commission sittings. Several other passports not in the Chinese language were also rejected there during the same period.

As will be seen in Vancouver, on the contrary, they were the open sesame to free entry. At that port there entered free during the same six years 389 under such passports, and seven were rejected (Ex. 13). Yet the total number of new arrivals of all classes at Victoria since the increase of the head-tax in 1904 was 5,334 (Ex. 412) in Vancouver 5,198 (Ex. 350). These figures are not strictly accurate for under the head of merchants are included merchants who had gone to China from British Columbia and overstayed their year's leave, and returning obtained exemption under the general merchant clause of the Act. There were 194 instances of this at the port of Vancouver during the six years. The commission was furnished with the number of similar cases in Victoria, but it is unlikely that it is greater than the Vancouver number, and in all probability not as great, as the latter city is the point of departure for the mainland, and the Chinese population of the mainland is probably fully as great if not greater than the Chinese population of Vancouver island, for which Victoria would be the more likely point of departure. It can, therefore, be safely concluded that the influx through the port of Victoria was at any rate as great as through the port of Vancouver. Certainly the poll tax number was much greater at Victoria, 4,340 as against 3,451 (see same exhibits). The greatly disproportionate number of exempts, both new merchants, 389 to 36, and merchant's sons, 924 to 579 (same exhibits) at Vancouver is, therefore, significant.

Before dealing with the causes of this, it is to be observed that under the Act as it stands Chinese could, without any fraud on the part of any one in the government employ, qualify and enter Canada as merchants without being at all merchants in the sense intended by parliament. All they would have to do would be to put, say $100 Mexican, or about $50 gold into some business in China, and enter the store or warehouse for a period sufficiently long—say six months—to familiarize themselves with the general method of conducting the business, and then enter Canada as merchants. No cross-examination as to knowledge of business methods would shake them, and the Act makes no provision for exclusion because of the limited amount of capital invested. It does not even require that such applicants must intend to engage in mercantile pursuits in Canada. When it is remembered that $500 in Canadian currency represents over $1,000 in Chinese currency in exchange, and very much more in purchasing power, the incentive to thus qualify is very great, and the Chinese astuteness of mind would doubtless have discovered this long ago had not an easier means by direct fraud been at hand. Vancouver was chosen as the vulnerable spot owing to the laxity of administration there.

There was another class of frauds respecting the importation of opium which is dealt with on page 112 of the report as follows:

As to opium, no evidence whatever was adduced to substantiate the charge that white officials in the service instead of destroying opium when seized, sold it and converted the proceeds to their own use. Mr. Foster investigated this, and reported on October 17, 1910, that it was without foundation (Ex. 171).

And again on page 113.

There is no doubt, however, that opium enters Canada as freely as it ever did, in fact more freely, as there is now no duty to pay (see Mulhern, police inspector, Vancouver, p. 2895, q. 35467; Langley, chief police, Victoria, p. 2895, q. 32960-63). All that has been stated in reference to opportunities for stowaways to come ashore applies, of course, with much greater force to the question of opium smuggling.

As a further commentary on the finding of Mr. Commissioner Murphy, that the minister from British Columbia and his colleagues did a virtuous act, in recommending the reinstatement of Yip On, I wish to read what the government counsel engaged to assist Inspector Foster in his examination, says:

Macdonell, Killam & Farris,
Baristers, Solicitors, &c.,
Notaries Public.
Offices: Rooms 5-9, Flack Block.
Vancouver, B.C., Oct. 15, 1910.

Mr. E. Foster,
Inspector, Vancouver, B.C.

Dear Sir,—In reply to your request for instructions as to instituting criminal proceedings against Yip On and noting that the department here advised you by wire that the decision rests with us as counsel for the department, we beg to advise as follows:

The evidence secured whilst of the strongest nature so far as it goes, would nevertheless in a court of law on a prosecution against Yip On be considered as hearsay evidence and so excluded. For this reason we think a prosecution would fail. At the same time we wish to put ourselves clearly on record as recognizing the importance of the evidence secured as demonstrating to a moral certainty that

Yip On and others have been engaged in a well arranged conspiracy which has been in operation for some time for the illegal admission of Chinese into Canada, and we believe that the only effectual way of getting at the bottom of this conspiracy and of determining who is concerned therein is to continue the investigation by Royal Commission,—the inquiry then being directed not merely against the incoming Chinamen but also against the local officials and others who may or may not be implicated. Such a course should lead to the conviction of the guilty and clear the skirts of those who may now be unjustly suspected in the public mind.

Yours faithfully,

(Sgd.) J. W. DEB. FARRIS,
GORDON GRANT,

You will notice that these gentlemen, counsel for the Dominion government, contemplated an exhaustive inquiry before a Royal Commission if one were instituted. Is it any wonder that the persons against whom the inquiry was directed, should reject the idea that these two men, with that in their minds, should be counsel before a Royal Commission and that the local committee, desirous as I have no doubt they were, to shield the guilty party should have used the minister who confided in them for that purpose, and should have prevailed on him to accept their recommendation of a gentleman to be named as commissioner and the gentleman to be named as counsel? It is natural that these persons should try to make their influence felt to throttle the inquiry from the beginning. But what have we to say of the minister who, knowing that from the beginning, sought advice from such quarters and transmitted that advice to his unsuspecting colleagues at Ottawa so that the commission when appointed might be of no good from the beginning.

I have said that this story is of long standing, that it has been reported to the government early enough, and often enough for the ministers to have thorough knowledge of it, and to realize that it was not simply hearsay, but something to be dealt with in the most serious manner. I will not burden the House or the records of the House with the particulars of the various reports received, which were set forth in the evidence, particularly the evidence of the customs inspectors, and the customs collector at Victoria, and in Mr. Justice Murphy's summary of the various reports by Mr. McInnes to various members of the cabinet at Ottawa. But I will take a letter which may well be regarded as the starting point of the official information on the subject, a letter fully borne out by the further communications to the government, and which, if paid attention to by the government, would have enabled the ministers to understand the accuracy of the reports received from time to time to the effect that a well-arranged conspiracy was in progress. This letter, marked 'private and confidential,' and written three years before this important investigation was started, is as follows:

Private and confidential.

Vancouver, B.C., July 11, 1907.

E. S. Busby,
Inspector of Customs.

Sir,—Knowing through public gossip, that there is considerable suspicion attached to the dealings with Chinese entering this port, I beg to report to you a peculiar proposition propounded to me by one Mr. Chin Chan.

Talking with this gentleman one evening, he inquisitively inquired my occupation. On replying I was a 'Tyee' customs, he became greatly interested, and asked me if I would like to make 'heap money,' in a hurry.

Of course I replied in the affirmative. He asked me if I knew Yip On, and on telling him I was very well acquainted with him, he requested me that I go to him, tell him who sent me, and enter on a deal to 'stand in' on the Chinese proposition. I questioned him closely and he informed me it was a very easy thing to work the game, that he 'savvied' all about it. After arranging with Yip On, we (Chin Chan and myself) were to go to China. I was to transact the financial end of it, while he would procure the Chinamen in Canton and Hong Kong. These Chinamen, he said, could be shipped to Vancouver in amounts of 20 to 30 each boat. Each was to pay us from 600 dollars to 700 dollars, Chinese money. A photo and description of each Chinaman was to be sent to Yip On, fictitious names to be given them, and they allowed landing as students, merchants sons, &c. I inquired how Yip On and those at this port would get their 'rake off.' To which he replied 'heap easy.' Put money in bank at Hong Kong, and send draft to Chinese firm in this city, as though it were merely some ordinary commercial transaction. In fact he had every difficulty which I suggested met in a business like way. I promised him I would see Yip On and discuss the matter with him, which of course I had no intention of doing, but he came to see me often, and insisted on my seeing him when I stood him off for several months by telling him that 'Tyees' in Ottawa were watching things closely.

After getting him to tell all he knew in making this deal, I informed him that I could not go as a partner unless I got proof that it could be worked, when he informed me he procured his knowledge from dozens of Chinamen who have arrived in Canada during the last three years. They informed him that they paid $700 or more in Chinese money to Yip Yen at Hong Kong, and not a cent to the government of Canada, when landing at Vancouver. Chin Chan tells me that as many as 25 have come over in one boat, and have told him the story of their trip as above related. He also informs me, that a Chinese firm cleaned $100,000 in one year shipping Chinamen to Canada. I was unable to make out the firm's name owing to his imperfect English.

I do not know whether this information will be of any service to you or the government, but being a government official, I consider it my duty to tender it to you, whether it be valueless or otherwise.

To me it emphazises beyond peradventure, the fact that there is a grand and lucrative scheme by which Mongolians are brought to this country, and by which the government is defrauded out of the capitation tax legally collectable on the same.

I have the honour to be,
Your obedient servant,
(Signed) W. A. BLAIR.

Then, relating to this letter by Mr. Blair, there is a covering letter from Inspector Busby, then stationed at Carcross in the Yukon Territory, transmitting the letter of Mr. Blair to his superior at Toronto. That letter is as follows:

Customs, Canada.
Carcross, Y. T., August 10, 1907.

Confidential.
S. W. McMichael, Esq., I.S.O.,
Chief Inspector of Customs,
Toronto, Ontario.

Sir,—I have the honour to herewith enclose for your consideration, a copy of a letter written me by Mr. W. A. Blair of the Customs, Vancouver, which has been forwarded to me here, respecting the alleged illegal importation of Chinese at the port of Vancouver.

The man named 'Yip On' mentioned in Mr. Blair's letter is the government interpreter at Vancouver.

The man named 'Yip Yen' is, I understand, a relative of 'Yip On's' and was formerly Chinese interpreter at Vancouver for the government, and is at present conducting a business at Hong Kong.

My reason for forwarding you the enclosed letter is, that I believe Mr. Blair to be a careful and trustworthy officer, also that you should be fully informed of any matter likely to affect the interests of the department.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
Your obedient servant,
Inspector.

(Enclosure.)

Though this copy is not signed, the address shows that the letter is from Mr. Busby, the inspector.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to say that that is all the evidence that I wish to present to the House at this moment. I have shown from these official records: That in July, 1907, official information was given to the government of plans to defraud the revenue in connection with the arrival of Chinese at Vancouver. That from time to time, subsequent to that date, reports were made to the government of the existence of fraud on a large scale, in this connection.

That these reports were verified by investigation made by Inspector Foster of the Dominion police in August and September, 1910, consequent on which information was conveyed to the government that 'certain parasites of the Liberal government' (indicating the Vancouver patronage committee) were involved in the frauds.

That upon the suspension of Interpreter Yip On, on suspicion of complicity in the frauds, the Hon. Wm. Templeman, a minister of the Crown, joined with the Vancouver patronage committee in pressing for the reinstatement of Yip On, which reinstatement would have had the effect of preventing the exposure by Inspector Foster immediately following.

That upon request by Inspector Foster and others for a Royal Commission of inquiry into the frauds, said Hon. Wm. Templeman invited the patronage committee of Vancouver to nominate the commissioner and counsel to conduct the investigation, and procured the appointment by the government, of which he is a member, of the commissioner and counsel thereupon named by the accused patronage committee.

That, contrary to the evidence, the report of said commissioner exculpates said Hon. Wm. Templeman and the Vancouver patronage committee from blame in connection with their efforts on behalf of the guilty interpreter, and makes unjust and uncalled for reflection upon the motives and character of those who procured and gave the evidence of the frauds.

In view of these facts, I move, seconded by Mr. Currie of Simcoe:

That all the words after the word 'that' be struck out, and the following be inserted in lieu thereof.

During the period of three years preceding the commencement of the investigation into the frauds connected with Chinese immigration at Vancouver, the government had been repeatedly warned of the existence of such frauds, and during such period neglected to take any steps to check or prevent them;

That very large sums of money have been lost to the public revenues of Canada by this neglect and default of the government;

That none of the persons guilty of complicity in the said frauds have been prosecuted or punished;

That the course of the government in the matters aforesaid, deserves the censure of this House.

Hon. WM. TEMPLEMAN (Minister of Inland Revenue). Mr. Speaker, I think it was last session, or probably the session before, that my hon. friend for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) rode another hobby. On three or four occasions the hon. gentleman occupied the time of the House in making speeches, asking questions, reading newspaper reports, as to the whereabouts of the famous outlaw, Bill Miner. So much had the hon. gentleman Bill Miner upon the brain that he even went so far as to charge the Justice Department, or penitentiary authority, with conspiring, or conniving, at the escape of that famous outlaw. So much did my hon. friend prosecute the Bill Miner hobby that he became known in his own home city by the sobriquet of Bill Miner. And to-day, if the men of New Westminster ask where Bill Miner is, they are more apt to

say that he is down in Ottawa than down in South Carolina. Now my hon. friend has got hold of another hobby. He has consumed the time of the House on two or three previous occasions. He has occupied, with those associated with him on this question, one day and a greater portion of another day in putting on 'Hansard' the evidence as reported in the Vancouver newspapers of the commission investigating Chinese immigration. He occupied a long time in putting upon the records a great deal of irrelevant matter taken before the commission. I am bound to say that probably one-third or one-half of the evidence taken before the Royal Commission in Vancouver was irrelevant; yet my hon. friend, for the purpose probably of occupying the time of the House, and thinking this was as good a question to kill time with as any other, has taken two or three days to put on the 'Hansard' column after column of evidence that has no particular bearing whatever with the real question of Chinese brought into the country under the Immigration Act. As a matter of fact, my hon. friend to-day has taken nearly three hours to place on 'Hansard' again evidence that he read to some extent from newspapers a day or two ago, but which he takes this time from the official report made by Mr. Commissioner Murphy. I regret very much that my hon. friend has given so much attention to the personal aspect of the evidence. I would have preferred if he had gone into the merits of the question, which, however, he has absolutely not done. I am not here to say that there has been no fraud committed under the Chinese Immigration Act. I believe that during the time we have had Chinese coming into the country, and as long particularly as there has been a $500 head tax, there have been Chinamen coming in, or attempting to come in, without paying that head tax. Smuggling in Chinamen without paying the head tax is a very profitable business indeed. I would not be surprised to learn that the practice was not uncommon, and not only common on the Pacific coast, but not uncommon on the Atlantic coast; relatively to the numbers coming into the country, just as common on the Atlantic coast as on the Pacific coast. My hon. friend has thought well to try and identify me personally in some way with an alleged conspiracy on the part of certain Liberals in Vancouver, a conspiracy between them and the Chinese interpreter to evade the head tax in some way or other, and he intimates that the Liberal party in the city of Vancouver have profited thereby. The other day, in speaking on this very question, when he was reading this voluminous evidence to the House, my hon. friend, in reply to a protest, I think, made by the hon. the Premier, said that hon. members on this side of the House were the beneficiaries of a fund of a million dollars corruptly obtained by smuggling Chinamen into this country. I think I am correctly repeating what my hon. friend said.

It will be my painful duty, he said, to remind these hon. gentlemen every time that they are benificiaries of this million dollar fund now occupying the attention of the House.

On the same day the hon. member for Vancouver referred to the million dollars that had been obtained by somebody by smuggling Chinese into Vancouver. Now, Sir, as a matter of fact, there is not a scintilla of evidence in the entire report of Commissioner Murphy upon which that statement can be based; there is not one statement of any witness whatever implicating any man in the city of Vancouver, any white man, in any respect whatever. I say it is unfair, it is deliberately unfair, it is untrue to make a statement to the House that conveys the idea that any member of the Liberal party in the city of Vancouver, or that I myself in the remotest degree, was connected with any plot or plan that would lead to these results. I say it is a monstrous thing. But it is in line with the hon. gentleman's remarks in this House, the insinuations he has conveyed, the manner in which he read the testimony, and the arguments and conclusions he deduced therefrom—just as unfair and just as untruthful as some of the evidence given before the commissioner by Mr. Joseph Martin, and by Mr. Norman McLean. These men gave their opinion of the members of the Liberal party, of the Premier and others, but they had nothing to say, and knew nothing whatever, about the alleged irregularities with respect to Chinese immigration.

Now, had the hon. gentleman not wasted so much time with the proceedings in Vancouver, I would not have wasted five minutes upon it. I went to Vancouver and gave my evidence. It is on record, but my hon. friend has not done me the justice of reading it, because I answered most of his statements in my evidence. But I feel under an obligation, in justice to myself, in view of what the hon. gentleman has read concerning myself, in view of the letters he has read from Mr. McInnes, Lew and others, I feel bound to give to the House my version of my connection with this investigation. It is not material; but it may be that some hon. members may form a wrong conclusion from what they have heard, and I think in justice to myself I ought to give parliament and the country my sworn evidence

before the Royal Commission, only a portion of it, and particularly that portion of it which will form, I think, a very effective reply to the allegations made by the hon. member for New Westminster. I will read the evidence sworn to before the commission which is on record. On this evidence the commissioner founded his conclusion in respect to my connection with the Chinese question or the alleged frauds, or the frauds, because I have not the slightest doubt that there have been frauds, to what extent nobody knows.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Was any attempt made to ascertain to what extent?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. This commission was for that purpose. The commission has gone into that very fully and nobody can give any better information than the commission does. I am not aware what steps the Trade and Commerce department have taken in that regard. I believe they have been acting upon the information they received from the evidence taken in this investigation and have been making certain changes in the immigration regulations as to interpreters and so forth, but to what extent they have gone I am not advised. Much has been said about a telegram that I sent to Ottawa. The telegram which was sent on the 20th September and was addressed to Sir Richard Cartwright, is as follows:

Most important that Yip On should be continued as Chinese interpreter. David Lew clearly should not be retained. Friends strongly recommend Yip On.

David Lew, I might explain, is a Chinaman who was at that time acting interpreter, as Yip On had been suspended during the investigation by Mr. Foster, a member of the Dominion police force and agent of the Justice department. I want this to be clearly understood by the House because the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) has been mixing up two investigations. There have been two investigations. In the first place, Mr. Foster was sent by the Department of Trade and Commerce several months before September 20 to carry on a private investigation to ascertain as a detective what he could with regard to irregularities. He had been there about two months when I arrived in Vancouver and that was the first intimation I had that an investigation was going on at all. I will read my evidence.

Q. How did you come to send that telegram?—A. I came to the city of Vancouver, after being in the province of British Columbia two or three months, and spent two or three days meeting friends here who had public business they wanted to talk about. I learned on my arrival here for the first time of the investigations going on regarding frauds in Chinese matters. I was informed then by various people that the agent of the Justice Department, a Dominion policeman, had been here for some months, I think, or some weeks, carrying on a secret investigation to find out what he could as to frauds in connection with the illegal passing of Chinamen. I was also informed that Yip On, the interpreter, had been suspended for the purpose of enabling Mr. Foster to carry on his investigation with a free hand; also that David Lew had been acting temporarily in his place. It was reported to me that the investigation was practically over, on that particular day, September 20 or 21, and that Mr. Foster was about returning to Ottawa; that nothing in particular had been elicited by him in his investigation, and that this man, David Lew, would be a very improper person to put on as permanent interpreter, and that Yip On should be reinstated, and I sent this telegram on that information.

These are the absolute facts. Mr. Foster, the agent of the department of Justice, had been carrying on an investigation which he himself informed me was at an end, he stating that he was preparing his report for Ottawa, that he expected to return in a day or two and that he had not found any evidence upon which he could base a charge against Yip On with any hope of success. He had intimated to me that he had his suspicions, that he did not think everything was all right and that the investigation should continue. I sent this telegram believing that the investigation was over, as it was over. There was no talk of a royal commission for a week afterwards. I sent that telegram to my colleague, Sir Richard Cartwright, believing that I was acting in the best interests of the department. I want it to be understood that I did not know either of these Chinamen, David Lew or Yip On, and I had never seen them. I was simply acting on information received. That information was that David Lew, who was trying to be the interpreter was a very dishonest Chinaman. I was informed by Mr. Senkler, a leading barrister in the city of Vancouver, that he had had a charge of fraud in the police court against David Lew and it would never do for the Dominion government to put him on instead of the old interpreter. So that, I was influenced by these facts.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). At what date was that conversation?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. September 20, the day that the telegram was sent. I was only in Vancouver two days altogether.

I may explain to you how it occurred. It has already been dealt with with a good deal of embellishment and a good many falsehoods, deliberate, in my honest opinion—that at a

dinner party at the Vancouver Club I sent this telegram. This is true. Mr. Glover has already dealt with the facts,—some time about ten o'clock I with a number of friends discussed this matter in the visitors' room at the Vancouver Club.

I do not think it is necessary to go into the Vancouver Club incident. I think it is a shameful piece of business in the first place for prejudiced witnesses to give that evidence before this commission and in the next place for my hon. friend to have repeated some of it in this House. The facts simply are that a friend of mine, Mr. Glover, who was not a Liberal at all, a very prominent citizen of Vancouver, invited some friends to the Vancouver Club to dinner at eight o'clock, we were there till about ten o'clock and before leaving I signed this telegram and left it there to be sent. I did not send it to the telegraph office myself. Much has been made of that meeting at the club. Evidence has been given by Mr. McInnes, David Lew, the chinaman, and Mr. Gordon Grant that they had been informed by Mr. Foster that I had called on him at midnight, that I had insisted upon this investigation being stopped and there was the insinuation that I was in a certain condition, presumably under the influence of liquor

That evidence was given before this commission by these three witnesses, and it is sufficient to say that it is not in accordance with the facts. I asked to see Mr. Foster and I proceeded from the club to Mr. Foster's residence, but I did not see Mr. Foster at all until I met him at the Hotel Vancouver next day at ten o'clock. under an engagement made with him, and we had a conversation. The whole evidence given before the commission by the witnesses I have named, with a view of discrediting myself and giving a political tinge to this matter, was absolutely untrue, absolutely unfounded, and had no basis of truth. Mr. Foster who was supposed to have been the gentleman who stated to these three witnesses that I had called after twelve o'clock at night, and that I was in an irresponsible condition, went into the witness box, and absolutely denied that he had ever said anything of the kind. Mr. Foster's evidence is on record, if the hon. member Mr. Taylor cares to read it, denying absolutely that I ever suggested in any way that he should discontinue the inquiry.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). I read Mr. Foster's evidence, and I have a very distinct recollection it wound up by saying that Mr. Templeman told him he was sorry he had sent the telgram.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. That is not quite right either. I had made the statement that Mr. David Lew was crooked, and that he should not be appointed, and here is the evidence.

Mr. TAYLOR (New Westminster). What is the hon. gentleman reading from?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am reading from a copy of the Victoria 'Times.'

An hon. MEMBER. The official evidence is here.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am reading the official evidence as taken by the official stenographer, and a copy of it was given to me personally, and was published in the Victoria 'Times' verbatim. I have not access to the official evidence just now, but I am sure that this is absolutely the same as the official evidence. I had said in my evidence that I objected to David Lew being appointed because he was crooked, and then followed this evidence:

Q. Who represented that to you?—A. Mr. Senkler particularly. He told me there was a charge against him in the police court of some kind of fraud, forgery or perjury, and statements were made that he was not a fit man to be appointed interpreter. I believed what I was told, and I warned my colleague not to put David Lew on as interpreter. The fear was he was going to be put on permanently. I sent that telegram for that reason. I was advised that the chief of police had the same opinion of David Lew, and I was told the collector of customs and the deputy collector, Col. Worsnop, were of the same opinion, and upon the information thus received I sent this telegram.

It is absolutely true that Mr. Bowell, the collector, and Colonel Worsnop, the deputy collector, were also of opinion that Yip On should be reinstated, and that David Lew should not be appointed, and I was informed of that at the time.

I thought it was due to my colleague and myself that I should ascertain from Mr. Foster all the information he could give me. I wanted to be certain that in sending the telegram I had acted properly, that it was consistent with the proper carrying on of any further investigation that was contemplated, and I suggested to the friends present that I would like to see him, and never have seen him since that occasion. I was told where he was living. Mr. Glover, I believe, had an auto waiting at the door and we started to go to see Mr. Foster. Dr. Munro was in the lobby of the Vancouver Club. I know him very well, and his standing, and I asked him what there was in this matter anyhow. He said he didn't think there was much in it. I said I wanted to see Mr. Foster and he told me where to call, and we started over to Glenwood chambers.

Dr. Munro is the medical inspector of the Immigration Department.

Dr. Munro had preceded us, and I met him at the door. He ran upstairs and returned

and said Mr. Foster had retired. I asked him to see if Mr. Foster would make an appointment to meet me at 10 o'clock next morning at the Vancouver hotel. Mr. Foster met me at the Vancouver hotel the following day, the 21st or 22nd, as the case may be, and told me what he had been doing. He said he had been here a considerable time quietly investigating, and that his work was at an end, and he was now proceeding to make out his report to send to Ottawa. He further said he had failed in obtaining information that would incriminate Yip On. At the same time he told me about an incident at Victoria when he went down to get on board an incoming steamer that had Chinamen aboard, to intercept them; that Yip On's brother, or cousin, or friend, had reached the incoming steamer and got at the Chinamen ahead of him and put them on their guard. He also said that although he had failed in securing the information he expected to get, that he felt convinced that there was something wrong. I told him about the telegram I had signed. We discussed the question of continuing the investigation and I believe we agreed that it should be continued. Something was said about accomplices in China and the advisability of sending a secret service man to Hong Kong. I thought it would be a good thing to continue the investigation at both places. There was no talk at that time of a Royal Commission. I promised to assist him in any way I could.

The departmental agent, Mr. Foster, did intimate to me that he was suspicious there was something wrong, but he had not the evidence that would incriminate Yip On. Having told Mr. Foster that I had sent the particular telegram, I discussed the matter with him, and we agreed that the advice as given Sir Richard Cartwright was not improper advice, that there was nothing at the particular moment against Yip On, that it was good advice and it should stand. I discussed with others the fact that if the information I had received was not correct, and if there was anything incriminating Yip On I would countermand the telegram. I so stated to Mr. Foster, but meanwhile I said I would allow that recommendation to stand, and I did.

Q. Had you any particular reason in wiring for the reinstatement of Yip On?—A. No; I told Mr. Foster the purport of the telegram I had sent, and when he told me he had failed in getting anything incriminating against Yip On I felt the telegram was alright. I pointed out to him that it would be good policy to reinstate Yip On and send secret service men to Hong Kong and Vancouver and carry on a secret investigation, Yip On having been reinstated would be off his guard. I believe that yet. Mr. Foster said that would probably be a good plan. I signed the telegram before I saw Mr. Foster, and I had it in my mind that if he would give me any information that would convince me that it should not have been sent that I could countermand it and give Sir Richard Cartwright other information.

Events followed this very rapidly. I went over to the city of Victoria the day afterwards, and I saw in the newspapers that Mr. Bowell, the controller of Chinese immigration, had been suspended because he had of his own motion reinstated Yip On without instructions from the department. I then wrote to my colleague, Sir Richard Cartwright, the following letter:

Victoria, B. C.,
September 24th, 1910.

The Right Honorable Sir R. Cartwright,
G. C. M. G.
Ottawa.

My dear Sir Richard,—

I notice in the press to-day that you have suspended Bowell for reinstating Yip On without instructions. Bowell, having so acted, is deserving of suspension.

I wired you from Vancouver to the effect that Yip On should be reinstated and that the acting interpreter should not be retained. I did this after being given all the information obtainable. I subsequently had a conversation with Mr. Foster and the information he gave me sustained my view that it would be in the interest of the Department in getting to the bottom of the alleged irregularities, if Yip On were reinstated, the investigation to be continued both here and at Hong Kong.

I am advised that the Chinese acting as interpreter while Yip On is under suspension is one of the crookedest in Vancouver.

Yours truly,
(Sgd.) W. TEMPLEMAN.

Continuing the citation from my evidence, I said:

In saying Lew is the crookedest man in Vancouver, I want to add that the statement is not made on any personal knowledge, but from information received from Mr. Senkler and the other gentleman I have named, and also because I was informed the chief of police in this city had no confidence in him.

Now, the difficulty in getting a Chinese interpreter at that particular moment was very great. It is not an easy thing to get a qualified Chinese interpreter, to discharge the duties, and there are very few in the country who are not Chinamen.

An hon. MEMBER. Are there no white men in the country who can speak Chinese?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There are a very few.

I received a telegram from the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce asking me to procure, if possible, an interpreter who would take the place of Yip On, who it was determined by the department would not be reinstated. The department had at the same time decided not to appoint David Lew. I sent a telegram which I think is important as showing my intention and my opinion on the question of interpreters. The telegram I refer to reads as follows:

Victoria, B. C., Sept. 30th.

Sir Richard Cartwright, Ottawa,—

Replying to O'Hara's telegram I nominate for temporary service pending the conclusion of investigation, H. Arthur, 513 Cotton Build-

ing, Vancouver. He is English. Lived all his life in Canton. Understands and speaks Canton dialects. His temporary employment will enable you to learn his qualifications. He is about 40 years of age, and impresses me favourably. I have no knowledge of him personally. You want a man who is not a Chinaman.

(Signed) W. TEMPLEMAN.

Then I continued my evidence as follows:

I recommended Mr. Arthur, who appeared to be an educated man, and I thought he would be a proper interpreter. I thought it would be improper to appoint a Chinese interpreter in Vancouver under existing circumstances. I have a copy of a telegram to Col. Worsnop from Mr. O'Hara instructing him to employ Mr. Hugh Arthur. I understand Mr. Arthur was not satisfied that he could interpret accurately all the dialects and didn't accept the position. The department then wanted another interpreter recommended, and I recommended, after being advised, Pung Chu Long. That is absolutely my whole connection in the matter. I returned to Ottawa sometime about the 1st or 2nd of October. At that time I suppose the investigation was concluded. I had no knowledge directly or indirectly of the selection of Mr. Farris and Mr. Grant to conduct deportation proceedings. I know nothing whatever about that or about the reasons given for the appointment of a Royal Commission until I arrived at Ottawa, and was consulted by Sir Richard Cartwright. That is the whole knowledge I have. It is a slanderous thing that any person, by inuendo or implication, would try to attach to me the charge that I, a minister of the Crown, would try to circumvent an investigation authorized by a colleague. It is an outrage. I have come here to go on record with regard to both charges. They are deliberate falsehoods.

I had no knowledge that a royal commission was going to be appointed. Certain evidence had been obtained in the preliminary investigation by Mr. Foster at Vancouver, and from certain deportation proceedings which had been taken, and when they concluded that they had obtained sufficient evidence to warrant the department in the appointment of a royal commission I approved of it, and after consultation with Sir Richard Cartwright, I suggested as commissioner Mr. Justice Murphy, a very prominent member of the judiciary, and a responsible, able and reliable judge of the Supreme Court.

An hon. MEMBER. He is all right politically.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. He is all right personally and every other way He is absolutely one of the best and purest minded men we have on the bench in British Columbia. Mr. McCrossan, who conducted the proceedings for the government, is also one of the leading young barristers of the city of Vancouver. There could not have been two better appointments made, as the results would show. If I had any criticism at all to make of the commission it would be that a lot of irrelevant matter was permitted to go on the record; however, that is erring on the right side. No evidence having any bearing on the question was ruled out.

I think this will dispose of the question so far as I had any personal connection with it. The attempt that has been made by my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) on this occasison and on former occasions, was with a view to connecting myself and the Liberals of the city of Vancouver with an attempt to burke the inquiry. I absolutely deny any attempt of that kind, either on my own part, or on the part of the Liberals of Vancouver. I think it is an outrageous thing, and I say to this House that there is no foundation in fact for it, nor has there been any evidence adduced which would substantiate any such charge. I do not desire to delay the proceedings, or to kill time, but there are a few points in reference to the question to which I would like to refer.

The enforcement of any law respecting the immigration of Chinamen is a very difficult proposition; it has always been so, it always will be so. There were very few difficulties, I am advised, up to the time the head tax was increased, some six years ago. Previous to that time there were certain exemptions. As the law stood, Chinamen were required to pay a tax of $100, and for a number of years before that $50, and there was very little temptation to the Chinamen to smuggle themselves into the country or enter it by false pretenses. Under the law as it exists now, there are certain exemptions. As the law stands, Chinamen are required to pay $500 head tax with exemptions of, among others, merchants, their wives and minor children, tourists and men of science. The great difficulty with the department for a number of years has been to define the term 'merchant' in such a way that ordinary Chinamen might not come in under that designation. Merchants among Chinamen are very numerous. Chinese firms are sometimes very large, there may be a dozen members of a firm; merchants may be almost anything; peddlers of green vegetables may be merchants. So the Chinaman could put the most liberal interpretation on the term 'merchant.' The frauds committed during recent years have been by the introduction of labouring men as merchants. They have received consular certificates in China, duly signed by Chinese viceroys or officials of some standing, as merchants when, as a matter of fact, they were not merchants. The certificates have been given, the department believes, by the Chinese authorities

in good faith, but they have been trafficked in on the other side. That is one explanation of the case with which Chinamen have come in as merchants when they were probably simply labouring men and should have paid the $500 head tax. The law, therefore, as it exists at present is lax, it allows the Chinamen to interpret almost for themselves the word 'merchant,' and if they are permitted to come in under the passports issued by Chinese authorities it is very difficult for the officials on this side of the Pacific to keep them out. The department was fully cognizant for years of the difficulties of administering the Act, particularly of describing merchants, and the department prepared an Act session before last, but owing to the pressure of business it was not then presented to the House. This session a Bill is on the Order Paper amending this very clause and making it more difficult for Chinamen to enter the country as merchants. The onus of proof under the Bill now before parliament and which might before this have had its second reading but for the delays caused by the long speeches of our friends opposite, provides that the burden of proof in respect to the profession of the incoming Chinaman shall be with the Chinese, and also that the burden of proof of the right of any Chinamen in Canada to be in Canada shall be with the Chinaman.

Mr. BARNARD. Did not the report of the commissioner state that there was no illicit entry in Victoria?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The report of the commissioner, I believe, is that the Act is very faithfully administered at Victoria.

Mr. BARNARD. Is the law the same?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The same law, yes,

Mr. BARNARD. Then if the officers at Vancouver had exercised the same care and supervision, there is no reason why these frauds should have been perpetrated.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I am not saying there is any reason why the frauds should have been perpetrated; the law, according to the report of Commissioner Murphy, has been very faithfully administered at Victoria, while a number of exempts have come in at Victoria, as at Vancouver——

Mr. BARNARD. There is not very much the matter with the law.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Only ten exempts in five years at Victoria.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. There must have been more than that. The exempts from the entire province have been up in the hundreds for years, and probably of these one-third have come in at Victoria. The exempts last year numbered about 800. The Bill now before parliament is an attempt to deal with this question, and to make the law more rigid, so that the definition of a merchant should be clearly understood, and it would be impossible to evade the law. The department undertook in the year 1909 to define the term 'merchant' by order in council in order that the law might be more successfully administered, but the Justice Department took the ground that it could not be amended by order in council, and so the department was defeated in its effort to perfect the Act. There is no question that a large number of Chinamen, according to the statement of Commissioner Murphy, have come into the country illegally without the payment of head tax. In the report of the commission at page 110 it is stated that in ten months ending January 31, 1911, there came into Canada through Victoria, Vancouver, Nanaimo, Montreal and other ports, 4,760 Chinamen.

At Victoria 2,512 paid the head tax and 166 were exempt; at Vancouver 1,289 paid the head tax and 545 were exempt; at Nanaimo 9 paid the head tax and 29 were exempt; at Montreal 153 paid the head tax and 25 were exempt; at other Canadian ports 30 paid the tax and 2 were exempt.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Has the minister the figures of the number of merchants who were exempt? At Victoria, I understand, according to the evidence and according to the Victoria papers, there were only 10 of that class.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. The exempts under the law are: members of the diplomatic corps and other representatives of the government of China, their suites and their servants; consuls general, consuls and consular agents, their suites and their servants; the wives and children of these persons; merchants, tourists, merchants' sons in certain cases; clergymen of the Christian religion; men of science, students and teachers; the wives and minor children of merchants, clergymen, tourists and men of science, subject to such regulations as may from time to time be made by the Governor in Council. These are all the classes who are exempt under the law. There is no distinction between them, so that it is impossible to tell how many of those 166 who came in at Victoria or of the 545 who came to Vancouver were merchants' sons, and were really labourers.

The commissioner says:

These figures include merchants, resident in Canada who have overstayed their year's leave, but a liberal allowance for this class would be 160. 4,600 Chinamen entered Canada therefore during this period of ten months, of whom 3993 paid the poll tax of $500. A

perusal of this report will show that probably more than half of the remaining 607 entered fraudulently, either as merchants or merchants' sons, and were really laborers or artisans.

As I have said, the whole purport of this report is to show that the present Act is lax in its definition of a merchant, and that is the whole weakness of the measure. There is no attempt on the part of any body—there should not be, in view of that report, at all events, and in view of our knowledge of the Chinese character—to deny the fact that Chinamen have been smuggling themselves into Canada, or have been coming in surreptitiously by entering as merchants or as merchants' sons when they should be classed as labourers; and as long as there is a $500 head tax on Chinamen we shall be subject to that sort of thing. I believe that white men would try to smuggle themselves into the country just as much as Chinamen to evade a $500 head tax. I have a complete record of the number of Chinamen who have come into Canada since the head tax was put upon them some years ago. The numbers coming in are of course very large, and I think it will be seen that the ratio of exempts to the total number coming in is no larger now than it has been in past years. During the last three months, up to June 30, 2,124 Chinamen came into Canada and paid the $500 head tax, the largest revenue ever received from that source for that length of time. In three months over $1,000,000 has been paid into the treasury for Chinamen coming into this country. During that time the exempts were 100. How many of these are really exempts or how many are fraudulent, coming in as merchants, nobody knows. The Commissioner has said in his report that he believes that a considerable number have come in. It is all a matter of estimating.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Has the minister any figures of the number that have come in by Montreal or Halifax, and does the government know that this gopher hole at Vancouver has been stopped only to be opened at some eastern ports?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. All the figures I have given are official figures from the department, and are I believe correct. If there is one man more than another responsible for the lax administration of the Chinese Immigration Act, it is Mr. John Bowell, collector of customs of the city of Vancouver. Now, I do not want to attach any stigma to Mr. Bowell. He has been exonerated by the commissioner of any personal knowledge of wrong-doing, although he is spoken of as careless. But all this immigration of Chinamen at Vancouver is under Mr. Bowell.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN.

Mr. Bowell is controller of Chinese immigration in the city of Vancouver, or had been for years until he was suspended. He had the entire management of the Chinese Immigration Act. The Chinese interpreter Yip On was under his instructions. He had to put the guards on the steamers, the whole thing was in his entire charge. Now, Mr. Bowell, as his name indicates, is not a Liberal. Mr. John Bowell is a Conservative, and there is not a Liberal in the city of Vancouver who believes that Mr. John Bowell is guilty of any wrong-doing. But, if Mr. Bowell, who had full charge of the immigration of Chinese, who has had control of the interpreter all these years, is not responsible, how in the world can my hon. friend from New Westminster attach any stigma to men like Mr. Senkler, to Mr. Kelly, one of the most prominent merchants in the Dominion of Canada? It is unfair and unjust. I do not believe it is good politics, I believe this attempt of the hon. member for New Westminster to attach a stigma to these men, to try to make it appear that they were in collusion with the Chinese interpreter in smuggling Chinamen into this country with a view of getting a rake-off—I think such a charge as that will recoil on the head of the hon. gentleman who has made it, and will do no injury whatever to the Liberals in the city of Vancouver.

Now Sir, there is no question that the Department of Trade and Commerce is fully advised of the situation. They have taken what steps they could to remedy this evil. They have put on double guards to watch the steamers, they have changed the interpreter, they have, for the moment, at all events, suspended Mr. Bowell as controller. With a view of placing all immigration matters under one head, they have transferred the administration of the Chinese Immigration Act to the Department of the Interior; the transfer will take effect on the 1st of October next. To my mind, the administration of this Act should never have been given to the Department of Trade and Commerce. The Department of Trade and Commerce have no officials to carry it on, they have been depending altogether on the officials of the Customs Department, and all the officials who have administered this Act have been customs officials. That, it seems to me, is not a good method. The Interior Department have immigration officials in the city of Vancouver, they have medical men, they have experts on Chinese immigration, and to that department the administration of the Act, I think, should have gone years ago. Therefore, probably this investigation may do good, though it has caused considerable sensation, though it has given our political

opponents an opportunity to throw a good deal of mud, and some of our own so-called political friends in the city of Vancouver have done the same thing; our political opponents have been especially anxious to take advantage of all the evidence relevant or irrelevant given before that commission and to use it politically. Still, they can use it, so far as I am concerned, as much as they please; they cannot injure me personally in the city of Vancouver or in the city of Victoria. Nobody in either city will believe that any Liberal whose name has been mentioned in this inquiry, read by the hon. member for New Westminster before the House, can suffer in any way whatever. They are too well known, they are too respectable, they are too prominent as citizens to be injured by slanders of that kind to which my hon. friend has lent the dignity of his name. Sir, I have nothing to add. I have any amount of evidence that can be read. My hon. friend read column after column of evidence that bore upon one side of the question only. I can read column after column of evidence to the contrary. I can read the evidence of Mr. Foster, of Mr. Glover, of Dr. Munro, but what is the use of doing so? We frankly admit that there has been fraud, and these frauds will be attempted as long as the head tax is imposed upon Chinese entering Canada. The only thing that can be done is to make the law more rigid and to put on more guards and reliable interpreters. I believe that it is possible the administration of the law in Vancouver can be improved. The customs collector at Victoria, Mr. Newbury, is a very efficient officer As I said a moment ago, if there was any discredit attaching to the controller of the immigration law in Vancouver, in conjunction with the officials, and the dishonesty of the interpreter whom he had under him for so many years, the responsibility might justly be placed on the right shoulders at once. The interpreter, Yip On, has been found guilty, but Mr. Bowell was his superior and should have seen that he discharged his duties. I have nothing further to add. This matter has been discussed in the British Columbia papers, the section of the country most interested, the section of country that alone knows all about it, has been fully advised as to the evidence given, and I do not think it is necessary for me to put on 'Hansard' any further statements about it. My attitude throughout the whole proceedings has been plain and straightforward, and I challenge the hon. member from New Westminster, the hon. member for Victoria, or any other person in the province, to attempt to injure me in any way whatever, by showing that I have done anything wrong, that I have known or encouraged anything wrong regarding the fraudulent immigration of Chinese into Canada.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). I do not wish to delay the House at any length at this late hour, knowing that we are all anxious to get on to the debate on reciprocity. The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Templeman), began his remarks by making, what I consider a very uncalled for, and unkind reference to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor). He said that the hon. member spent a good deal of time discussing Bill Miner, and that on the coast he was known as Bill Miner. Now, that, coming from a member of a cabinet that is so redolent of Bills as the cabinet to which the hon. Minister of Inland Revenue belongs, and also in view of the fact that the hon. member himself is known on the coast as Sleepy Bill, I think the least that he can do or say would be to consider honours even, and remain perfectly still on a personal matter of that kind. I am reminded that there is a Slippery Bill in the cabinet, you can't have two of them. I may say there is another Bill known as the Reciprocity Bill which they have on the brain, and they can't get rid of it. Then two Bills went down to Washington, and they brought back a counterfeit Bill, and it has not passed, and I am afraid it won't pass. Now, to refer to this great Tong war that has broke out in the west, and which my hon. friend has taken pains to point out, there was no onus on anybody.

He says that there was nobody to blame, but that the only thing to blame was the law. Any one who has followed the question, who has listened to the speeches in the House, who has read the newspapers, must come to the conclusion that it was not the legislation that was to blame on the coast, that it is not the present law so much as the officers who administer that law. It does not matter two pins how good a law is unless the officers of the government appointed to carry out the law do their duty honestly and fearlessly. The law, it is true, was changed for the purpose of making it easier for a Chinaman to evade it by calling himself a merchant. The result is that Chinamen have arrived in large numbers, a fact which the minister has acknowledged. Consequently, the charge made by my hon. friend from New Westminster has been fully sustained upon the admission of the hon. gentleman who has just sat down. Now, the next question is, who were guilty of not carrying out this law, and did any stigma in that regard attach to the minister? The evidence clearly shows that even a watchman appointed to guard a gang plank at

Vancouver had to receive the endorsation of that famous junta that rules the destinies of Canada on the coast—the so-called Liberal patronage committee. Mr. Bowell did not make a single appointment of this kind. The evidence showed that in many cases these men were from the riff-raff of the city, that they were bums of the worst description, and that all one had to do was to ask one of them to come on board and have a drink, or come around the bow of a vessel, at which time a whole army of Chinamen could come ashore. There is no doubt in the world that hundreds of Chinamen who did not have a passport came ashore in this way. They landed in broad daylight off the ships. Another favourite method of landing was to climb down the hawser of the ship at night when the watchman was taken away to have a drink around the corner of the custom house or some other place, land upon a pontoon or a dock, and then go off up the street. The evidence shows that there was a systematic conspiracy with the interpreters to land these Chinamen as merchants. When they arrived there, Yip On, no doubt appointed by the patronage committee on the coast, met them and saw they landed as merchants, when in reality they were nothing but common ordinary labourers. As soon as they landed in Vancouver, they took 500 or 600 shares in some Chinese business up the street, paid $5 on that and claimed that they could not be deported afterwards, because they were merchants and even had a partnership in a business in Canada. Two of the leading spirits of this great patronage committee on the coast were hogging, as they claimed, the funds. The minister says that there were was a great deal of irrelevant evidence taken. The government appointed Judge Murphy to find out what was taking place in connection with this Chinese question. Everybody knows that a commissioner is not in the same position as a judge in a court of law, that the rules of evidence do not hold in that respect and that consequently people are allowed to give evidence before a commissioner with regard to what others say to them and matters of that kind which, strictly under the rules of evidence as known in a law court, would not be admitted. As to what the feeling of this patronage committee was we have the testimony of a gentleman which I will read to the House. Page 1346:

You refer this morning, Mr. Grant, to a conversation you had with Harry Senkler.

Mr. Harry Senkler is president of the executive committee of the Liberal organization in Vancouver. He is an old St. Catharines boy, well known at Toronto University as a student and football player before he went to the coast.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

Q. Do you recall any more of the conversation than you told us this morning?—A. What about?

Q. The conversation that you referred to this morning as a conversation you previously believed that Mr. Senkler would not be safe counsel in connection with the investigation?—A. I had a somewhat longer conversation with Mr. Senkler and yourself the day that Mr. Senkler gave evidence here.

Q. How did that conversation occur, do you remember?—A. I remember this, that when we left the commission that Mr. Senkler and yourself and myself walked up the street to the corner of Seymour street, and I said to Mr. Senkler that surely he must know who sent that telegram in his name and he said he did not know, and he said I will show you everything I have got and he started to show us some correspondence; there was a great deal of correspondence and some telegrams, some of which he dropped on the sidewalk, and he showed me some memorandum of a meeting of the Liberal patronage committee regarding the appointment of the new interpreter, and regarding certain other things, in one of which a resolution, I think, was prepared by Robert Kelly and the others were signed by Robert Kelly, and I said to Mr. Senkler, that it seemed wherever we got to anything connected with Chinese immigration it was in Kelly's office, or Bob Kelly, and he said what is your theory about it, what do you say happened, and I said I do not say anything happened, but just as a line on the investigation, it seems to me that Mr. Kelly is very very active in the matter of the Chinese interpreter losing his job, and I said I thought it was very peculiar that Mr. Templeman had gone into it to stop the investigation, and I asked him if he had seen Mr. Templeman about it, and what he had done, and he said, no, that Mr. Templeman never saw him, he just came to Vancouver and saw Mr. Kelly.

Q. That is to say that Mr. Senkler, as president of the association was ignored as far as the minister was concerned?—A. Yes, and he said he had stated in the witness box that recommendations of the Liberal executive were not always followed and if I had asked him he would have stated on oath that they were followed except when Mr. Robert Kelly did not want them followed, and he went behind their backs and got Mr. Templeman to do just as he said. There was one thing in the conversation that seemed to impress me with the fact that Mr. Senkler's views on the subject of irregularities in Chinese immigration affairs was such that my advice to the government had not been apter than I thought.

Q. What did he say in reference to illegal entry of Chinese?—A. He said as far as he was concerned he did not care how many Chinese came in illegally, but what he did object to was that these fellows should hog it all.

Who are the fellows who hogged it all?

Q. Mr. McCrossan—Mr. Senkler said that.

Q. Mr. Justice Murphy.—What was that again?—A. He said that as far as he was concerned he did not care how many Chinese came in without paying the head tax, he did not care personally, but that what he did object to

was that these fellows should hog it all and that if it had gone to the Liberal executive he would not care.

We have these facts in consecutive order. It was clearly shown in the evidence that Mr. Bowell, the collector of customs at Vancouver, had nothing whatever to do with the appointment of the officials under him whether they were good, bad or indifferent. They were all appointed on instructions from Ottawa, the Minister of Customs giving authority to appoint them, and after him came Mr. Robert Kelly, and in the background of Mr. Robert Kelly was a whole army of Chinamen who came to the country without paying the poll tax. The minister says he is free from stain in that respect, but he can take what change he likes out of that evidence, and I don't think there is much coming back to him. Let us see what the friends of the minister say. Mr. T. R. E. McInnes, an official of the government who was appointed to investigate this matter, has been turned down by the government and he is angry at what Judge Murphy said about him, because, for years, he had been a respected and confidential officer of the first minister. Mr. McInnes finds insinuations in this report of Mr. Justice Murphy, which he resents and he comes back very strongly against the Minister of Inland Revenue, and in a letter published in the Ottawa 'Citizen,' of July 25th, he states the facts pretty clearly and so that we may have some intelligent idea of what took place out there, I will put this letter on 'Hansard.' It reads:

Mr. T. R. E. McInnes, whose name figured prominently in the report of Mr. Justice Murphy who investigated the Chinese immigration and opium smuggling in British Columbia, made a statement to the 'Citizen' to-day, replying in detail to the commissioner's findings. Mr. McInnes does not mince matters. He says:

'On Saturday you published the findings of Mr. Justice Murphy of Vancouver, who sat as a commissioner to inquire into Chinese immigration and opium smuggling in British Columbia. My reputation is at stake in this matter, and I now ask you to give equal prominence to what I have to say in reply to this honourable judge. I make four charges.

'1. I say that the first four statements or findings made by this commissioner in summing up his report are irrelevant, truckling, malicious and cowardly, and in so far as Officer Foster, Gordon Grant, David Lew and myself are concerned, they are absolutely false and unwarranted by the evidence.

'2. I say that the Dominion government permitted the fraudulent entry of Chinese to continue without any attempt at prevention for at least two years after the attention had been formally drawn thereto.

'3. I say that the Dominion government deliberately delayed criminal proceedings against the guilty Chinese indicated by its own commissioner, Judge Murphy, for two months in order to allow them to escape from justice.

'4. I say that if Sir Wilfrid Laurier, when replying to Mr. Borden in the House on Friday meant me when he said: 'The only person not a Chinaman who was suspected was not appointed by this government'; then Sir Wilfred Laurier deliberately misstated the fact.

'I will deal with this last charge first, and the doing so involves the whole question of my connection with the government. In August, 1907, the Indians of the Garden river reservation in Algoma were being debauched by American whisky-sellers, operating on Sugar Island in the state of Michigan just across the river from the Canadian reservation. Members of parliament, priests, and missionaries were asking the government to do something in the matter, but as the whisky-sellers were on American territory, and the Canadian Indians crossed the river to them, the situation was difficult. Neither under United States federal or state laws was it unlawful to sell liquor to a Canadian Indian on American territory; and so the offenders felt secure. My services were asked by the Indian Department. As a result inside of a month the offenders were arrested, convicted of something, and jailed in Michigan. In the following month the Chinese riot occurred in Vancouver, and Hon. Frank Oliver mindful perhaps of my Michigan success, asked me to go to Vancouver to report on the situation, and advise as to what should be done. I returned in three weeks with a report which anticipated the later findings of Mackenzie King. My report was acted upon, and copies were sent to the imperial government and to the government of India. Two months later, owing to the activities of the Asiatic Exclusion League and the fear of renewed riots Sir Wilfrid Laurier wrote a note to Mr. Oliver, giving it to me to take to him asking that I be sent again to the coast. Nominally for the Immigration Department, in reality to attempt to check a dangerous situation, and to be on hand to advise if emergencies arose. I was there all winter. The riots threatened, and actually planned in Seattle, were averted. To Mr. Gordon Grant, president at the time of the Asiatic Exclusion League, the credit for this is largely due. His sense of loyalty was awakened when he was shown what was being planned by American agitators, and what the success of their plot would mean to Canadian and imperial interests. This is the Mr. Grant upon whom Mr. Commissioner Murphy throws a slur in the third paragraph of the summary of his report.

'The next summer I acted as adviser to all the Chinese of Vancouver, in preparing their damage claims for consideration by Mr. Mackenzie King, special commissioner to assess damages in connection with the September riots. On this occasion I talked with Mr. Owyang King, then Chinese consul at San Francisco, and Mr. Tung Ching Ling, attaché of the Chinese embassy at London, as to future relations between Canada and China, and the chance of developing a large trade between the two countries, the profits of which would tend to overcome race antagonisms. At that time there was no Canadian trade commissioner in China. I had many Chinese clients and a knowledge of local Chinese customs and business methods. I sent in a report either

to the Trade and Commerce Department or the Interior Department, I forget which, but dealing with the whole question of developing Canada's trade with China, and urging the appointment of Canadian commissioners at Canton, Shanghai and Tien Tsin. I discussed the matter with Mackenzie King and he heartily approved, and promised his support if I wanted the position. Many strong recommendations were made on my behalf. The government adopted the suggestions in my report so far as to establish an office at Shanghai, but appointed the late Mr. MacLean instead of me. After Mr. MacLean's death, which occurred in the following December, Mr. O'Hara telephoned for me, and asked if I were still open for the position. I replied that I was, and would be willing to go in February, after I had finished my first draft of a new Immigration Act, which I had been retained by Mr. Oliver to prepare. A recommendation to council was prepared accordingly, and signed by Sir Richard Cartwright. The appointment, however was blocked by Mr. Templeman and that ended the matter, I never sought the position after that because Mr. Templeman had unwittingly done me a good turn; remaining in Canada proved vastly to my advantage. From time to time after that I had a retainer from the government for special services. Among them was the drawing of the new Immigration Act above referred to. This involved observation of the methods actually practised by American and Canadian officers at seaports and on the boundary.

'Now it happened that Hon. Frank Oliver in September, 1908, feared something in Alberta on the part of the Conservatives which he called 'skullduggery.' The general elections were on at the time, and he asked me to go to Calgary and vicinity on a still hunt for this 'skullduggery.'

This skullduggery must have been the gentleman who was going around the west dropping great big bunches of money into the people's bank accounts. He goes on to say:

Up to this time my services had been absolutely non-political, and Oliver knew that I had no more respect for one side than for the other. He did know, however, that I generally got results worth while in any matter which I undertook. I found to my surprise, however, that he did not propose to pay my fee from any party fund, but that I was to go on political service at government expense, to cover which I was to make a report on immigration matters.

Let me ask the House how many men to-day are in this same service of the government, in view of the election which is about to take place? We all know that in the customs service, presided over by the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Paterson) there has been a tremendous increase in the amount of wages paid, although there has not been a very large increase in the real amount of efficiency of the department. There are what are known as special officers throughout the different towns in this country drawing fat salaries, and their work is of a political character, just as is shown in this letter. McInnes goes on to say:

This was not much to my stomach, but in connection with the act upon which I was working I wanted to observe the working of the official immigration machine between Winnipeg and Vancouver, particularly along the British Columbia border and at Seattle. I did, however, throw an eye over political methods at Calgary and vicinity for about ten days, became satisfied that honest voting was the style there, and that anything in the nature of 'skullduggery' was more to be apprehended from the Liberals than from the Conservatives. This I told to the Honourable Frank and left him to go about my proper business.

'On the 10th December, 1908, I sent in a report to Mr. Oliver, covering my observations on this trip, and making certain recommendations. It was during this visit to the coast that I first paid any particular attention to the smuggling of Chinese immigrants. In drafting my Immigration Act I wished it to apply equally to Chinese, considering that there should be but one Immigration Act, designed to apply to all classes of immigrants, and administered by one department. As far as I remember, however, I made no written report then as to this smuggling, wishing to make a fuller investigation later on. But a year before that time I am told that Officer Busby of the Customs Department had noticed and reported upon these frauds, but to put it mildly, was not encouraged to disclose anything further in that line.

'Well, a year later, 10th November, 1909, I made another report to Mr. Oliver, detailing the system of fraud practised by the Chinese both as regards evading head-tax and smuggling opium. That report is completely verified in every detail by the evidence given before Commissioner Murphy two years after, and the commissioner makes that two year old report of mine the basis of the only conclusions and recommendations that are relevant or worthy of consideration in his own report now laid on the table of the House. But when I made that report in November, 1909, Mr. Oliver was afraid to act upon it. I urged him strongly one day in February, 1910, saying that not only was the continuing fraud bad alike for the reputable Chinese and the whites, but that the government was losing hundreds of thousands of dollars of revenue. Mr. Oliver, in his own frank phraseology, replied: 'To hell with the government; I'm not going to mix up in the thing and get old Cartwright jumping on me in council.'

About March, however, a copy of this last report came into the hands of Mr. O'Hara, and he began inquiries on his own account; inquiries which he pushed to a successful conclusion. In July he instructed Secret Officer Foster—a man familiar with the coast, and who had done good service there during the Asiatic troubles—to go to Vancouver, and observe the working of the Chinese Immigration Act at that port. At the same time Sir Wilfrid, then acting Minister of the Interior, issued the following order: 'That Mr. T. R. E. McInnes should again visit the western provinces with a view to his reporting along the same lines as he did in his re-

ports to the minister of the 10th December, 1908, and the 10th November, 1909, touching on immigration questions, and the administration of the Immigration Act in these provinces. Mr. McInnes will return in the month of September next, and his employment will be on the same terms as authorized before by the ministers.'

'Now Foster, although a very capable officer, would have been helpless at Vancouver in this matter without the assistance which I was able to give or procure for him, because he had no special knowledge of Chinese, and he had to encounter the strong opposition of the government officials concerned, Messrs. Bowell, Worsnop and Yip On, steamship company officials, and also political influences on both sides. The Liberal patronage committee for some reason wanted no interference with the status quo; the Conservatives as their member naively put it did not want to assist if it would hurt Jack on account of his father.' Very creditable no doubt; but the Chinese ring took advantage of the situation. Having got Foster under weigh, assisted by David Lew. I went to Calgary and gave Sir Wilfrid an interim verbal report. He approved and said to proceed, and I did so. When the time was ripe for the sudden suspension of Yip On I wired to Sir Wilfrid's secretary asking that it be done, and my suggestions were carried out to the letter. As a result the system of fraudulent entry was exposed, some of the guilty officials have been recommended for prosecution and given time to escape, and a complete change in the administration of the Chinese Act along the lines which I recommended in 1909 has taken place.

This brings me to the third charge which I make. If the government had acted immediately on the commissioner's report being received the guilty Chinese could have been arrested and tried, and at such trial much more evidence implicating others could have been brought out. I know that the recently smashed smuggling ring counted upon political protection; they thought they had secured the friendship of leading Liberal and Conservative politicians in Vancouver to such an extent as to make them immune from prosecution. Nevertheless the ring has been smashed and their revenues from smuggling of immigrants and opium have for the present been cut off. Some people are very sore over this whole affair, and these people are not all Chinese by any means, although they seem to have a very yellow streak in them. As I happen to be the main instrument of their undoing there is nothing at which they will stop to injure or vilify me. And Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Hon. Frank Oliver, instead of having sufficient manliness to at least make my position honourably clear to the public, say nothing or insinuate, as Sir Wilfrid did on Friday, that the government had nothing to do with me or my part in the affair.

Calls it a farce.

As to my first and second charges; the second was made clear in my explanation of the fourth. Now as to the first: The commissioner's mission was to inquire into the working of the Chinese Immigration Act, evasions of it, suggested improvements, and as a side issue, the question of opium smuggling. He was not commissioned to whitewash Templeman or the Liberal executive, or to vilify myself, or Gordon Grant, or David Lew, or Officer Foster, or other persons supposed to be distasteful to the ruling Liberal clique of Vancouver. He made a farce of the sessions of the commission by inviting all sorts of irrelevant evidence which might or might not effect the status of the Liberal party in Vancouver but which clearly had nothing to do with evasions of the Chinese Immigration Act. For instance, he brought in Joe Martin to say that Bob Kelly sold the political positions of Vancouver; then he brought in Bob Kelly to say Joe Martin was a liar; and so on ad nauseam. But as to the real object under investigation not one half of the time of the commission was devoted to it. Then in his findings he first whitewashes Templeman (who had not been accused) whitewashes the Liberal executive (which was not the subject of investigation) then finds me (under a special authority from the premier to investigate) guilty of an intrigue for so doing, saying that, to use his own puerile way of putting it, tried to establish some sort of connection with the administration of the Chinese Restriction Act at Vancouver by obtaining control of the Chinese interpreter and possibly in other ways. Its object was to serve some personal ends. He associates Gordon Grant and David Lew with me in this. And yet it was Gordon Grant, as counsel sanctioned by Sir Wilfrid before Templeman had him ousted in favour of one of his own pets, who secured the success of the preliminary investigation; and it was David Lew upon whom Commissioner Murphy himself had to depend to secure evidence, and reliable interpretation, to the very last session of the commission.

Then this brave commissioner attacks one the most faithful and tried police officers in the Dominion service by intimating that he was so weak or venal that I secured him and 'utilized him to advance this intrigue.' That is why I repeat that Murphy is irrelevant, truckling and cowardly. He descends to playing politics of the meanest variety; if his first findings had been drafted for him by the Liberal executive there would have been no variation in the language. His other findings are simply what I recommended or stated in my report to the government of November, 1909. I will publish that report and let the public compare it with Murphy's report, and it will then be evident where he gets whatever there is of value in it. His last finding as to opium, saying 'that its consumption must be discouraged by drastic amendments' shows that he does not even keep abreast of the Acts of parliament. I drew for Mackenzie King this session the new Opium Act, which is the most drastic and effective Act against the use of opium and cocaine to be found on the statute books of America.

I consider that statement of McInnes, if it does anything, proves conclusively that these officers who were especially instructed by the Prime Minister of this country and who were confidential officers of this government to carry on the prosecution of these Chinese and others interested in this fraud, have been discouraged and suspicions cast on their characters, their fu-

ture careers have been virtually ruined because they dared tackle this infamous Chinese ring who were robbing the country of millions.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. It is not true that Mr. McInnes went to the coast on any mission whatever, officially charged to investigate these frauds.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Does the minister desire me to read the exhibit put in by Mr. McInnes, wherein Sir Wilfrid Laurier appoints him to this commission. The exhibit is here. Here is a dispatch from Laggan, dated September 12, 1910.

Please ask Premier take communication first part tenth inclosure my report Oliver sixth instant. Featherstone will have it. Twenty-one fraudulently admitted last week, more will probably arrive on ship next Sunday. If suspension made and Foster authorized act as suggested not later than Friday, confident of capture and conclusive evidence. I will arrive Ottawa Friday morning.

T. R. E. McINNES.

He was on his way to see the Prime Minister and the minister says that none of this occurred, that the Prime Minister and officials of the government were not acting to try and find this out without consulting him. For what reason was he not taken into the confidence of the government? Why, was Mr. Foster appointed without Mr. Templeman being made aware of these facts. On the very first boat on which they captured Chinese they saved to the government something like $17,000. He did not know that these Chinamen were seized or that Yip On was suspended. The government was acting apparently behind his back. The only thing he knew was that he sent a telegram to Sir Richard Cartwright, which he afterwards denied, asking that Yip On be reinstated.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. I did not.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That is the boldest I ever heard. The minister did not recommend that Yip On be reinstated?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Not at all.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). And Yip On was not reinstated although he desired to have him reinstated. It is the same thing. He spent all the night apologizing for having sent that dispatch to Ottawa and claiming that the next day he went to see Mr. Foster about 2 o'clock in the morning, and Mr. Foster would not see him, so he sent the telegram and went to see Mr. Foster later on to see if Mr. Foster would confirm what he had done. Mr. Foster probably told him all right, but being a good officer, working for the department, he would not have any outsiders interfere with him. The whole trouble with the minister is that he was dragged into this controversy very unfairly, because the great controversy that raged on the coast was whether Mr. Templeman was drunk that night or not, and he went across the continent to deny it, and there is apparently no one who can say whether he was drunk or sober, because being a good strong man, I suppose he carries his liquor well. He went home and denied it, and I have to take his word that he was not drunk.

What is the result of this investigation? What has the member for New Westminster done for this country? He has brought before the attention of this House, one of the most rascally scandals and most desperate conspiracies ever attempted on the part of the Chinese to rob the government of many millions of dollars. This matter was brought to the attention of the House on two previous occasions and information was denied. The first minister virtually refused to bring down this evidence in order to have it come after the elections so that the public in the east would not know what was going on in the west. The member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) and I placed a résumé of the evidence on 'Hansard,' with the result that the next day the premier brought down the report. He said he did not want to bring it down because the report recommended that several parties should be prosecuted, and it was not wise that it should be made public. Everyone in the west knows that these men were out of the country weeks ago, that during four or five months they have had time to get away and during the interval the Department of Justice has not moved one iota, has not issued any instructions and to this day I challenge the minister to say that any steps have been taken to bring them to justice or any warrants issued. Why? Because the moment anyone runs up against that Chinese ring in Vancouver, there is some scullduggery as the Minister of the Interior would say, going on there, justice is demoralized and even the justice that should be presided over by the Prime Minister, and the action he should take comes out about four months late. The minister said Mr. McInnes was not appointed by the government. Here is a letter, a memorandum by Mr. McInnes to Mr. O'Hara:

Re Chinese Smuggling Cases—Vancouver, B.C.

Memorandum for Mr. O'Hara.

Following my conversation at noon to-day I inclose copy of suggestion submitted to the Premier, and which I understand he is to discuss with Sir Richard.

As to appointment of counsel the Premier intimated that he had to-day written you a letter giving you a free hand.

Please submit to Sir Richard that owing to the unusual nature of the case, and the political and official influence used to render it abortive, a slight departure from the regular legal patronage list would be justified.

Mr. Senkler has already taken a stand on behalf of the accused; and has undertaken to

criticise the action of the department without knowing the facts upon which the department's action was based. The case in his hands would be almost certainly doomed to failure.

The men suggested in place of Senkler and MacDonell are equally staunch Liberals; are specially trained in criminal law; and I will vouch for their not being led off the track by all the influence or threat the Chinese can bring to bear.

If you should wish me to to continue to act privately at the coast in completing evidence in this matter I am at your service.

T. R. E. McINNES.

September 28, 1910.

That is the letter of Mr. McInnes, and I think it dissipates the view of this matter taken by the hon. minister. Perhaps the hon. minister personally had nothing to do with this; but at the least he has been like clay in the hands of the potter as far as the operations of this ring are concerned. The evidence shows that if there was any end they wished to attain, all they had to do was to have Mr. Kelly or Mr. Macdonald outline the programme to the Minister of Inland Revenue, and he was only too glad to fall in with it, especially if a good dinner preceded it. I think this country owes a debt of gratitude to the hon. member for New Westminster for bringing such an important question before this House. I consider that he has done his duty by the country, and has promoted the ends of justice by disclosing the actions of this junta that consists of a section of the Liberal party in the west. The good Liberals of the coast do not want to have anything to do with these people; they do not want to have any 'skullduggery.' There are honest men in the party as well as unscrupulous men. The honest ones have rebelled, there is dissention in the ranks, and this question is a burning question there. The hon. minister says that no one in Vancouver thinks that anybody is guilty in this matter, but that everybody considers that the whole wrong is in the law. If the law was wrong, how is it that it was maintained at Victoria and broken flagrantly at Vancouver? The reason is that the Chinese and the officials of this government, as shown by the evidence, entered into a conspiracy whereby this government was defrauded of a large sum of money; and after the report of the commissioner, which showed that somebody had done wrong and should be punished, was in the hands of this government, no action was taken until it was possible for the guilty parties to flee the country. In this case I think full responsibility rests on the Minister of Inland Revenue. He is the man who recommended all these appointments—Yip On and all the landing waiters who let the Chinamen come into the country without passports. He is the man behind the gun in all cases. It is true, his hands were guided by the executive committee; but he cannot divest himself of the responsibilty as a member of the government and the minister from the Pacific coast.

Mr. R. L. BORDEN (Halifax). Mr. Speaker, the first paragraph of the motion which has been placed in your hands by the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Taylor) is in these words:—

During the period of three years preceding the commencement of the investigation into the frauds connected with the Chinese immigration at Vancouver, the government had been repeatedly warned of the existence of such frauds, and during such period neglected to take any effective steps to check or prevent them.

The second paragraph is as follows:—

That very large sums of money have been lost to the public revenues of Canada by this neglect and default of the government.

The third paragraph is in these words:

That none of the persons guilty of complicity in the said frauds have been prosecuted or punished.

And the conclusion based upon these alleged premises is as follows:

That the course of the government in the matters aforesaid deserves the censure of this House.

The hon. Minister of Inland Revenue has addressed himself to this question, but I did not hear one word from him denying any of the allegations made in this resolution, and he could not deny them. Let us take the first. It is a charge that the government knew all about these frauds, or at all events were warned of them repeatedly, during a period of three years before this investigation commenced. My hon. friend from New Westminster read the first of these warnings, which was not from any outside individual, but from an officer of the government, in July, 1907, who declared that these frauds were then going on according to the best of his belief, and stated the reasons on which he grounded that belief; and in his letter he named the very man, Yip On, as guilty of these frauds, who was eventually found guilty by this Commissioner. There was the first warning, more than three years before this investigation began, because it did not begin until August 1910. That warning was repeated over and over again, and during those three years this government remained absolutely supine so far as any active and effective steps to check these frauds and bring them to a conclusion were concerned. They went on during those years unchecked and unhindered, and the only minister of the Crown who has spoken on this

question to-night has taken his seat without offering one word in explanation or extenuation of that remarkable conduct of the government. It seems to me that is a painful spectacle. I am astonished that the Minister of Inland Revenue saw fit to take his seat without even apologising for that conduct of the government or giving some explanation for this inaction, neglect and default on the part of the government. So I say that the first paragraph of the resolution proposed by my hon. friend from New Westminster has been made absolutely good. The second paragraph declares that large sums of money have been lost to the public revenues of Canada by this neglect and default of the government. That is not denied either; it cannot be denied. It is true that the moneys have been lost, how much we do not know. I would have expected that the Commissioner would have been instructed to make inquiry more definitely as to the amount that has been lost. It is enough to know that hundreds of thousands of dollars have been lost by this inaction, neglect and default of the government, who were bound by their oaths of office to protect the public revenues of this country.

The third paragraph which I have quoted sets forth that none of the persons guilty of complicity in the said frauds have been prosecuted or arrested. The Minister of Inland Revenue did not controvert that, for the very good reason that he could not controvert it. These men were shown to have been guilty of fraud by evidence given before the commissioner in the earlier part of the inquiry. There was no doubt, so far as I understand the case, as to the guilt of this man Yip On. I did not understand my hon. friend the Minister of Inland Revenue in one respect, and I would like him to clear this matter up for my own information —not in respect to any of the matters to which I have been alluding, because he cannot do that, but in respect to one matter to which I can allude. I understood him to say that at the time of this conversation with Inspector Foster on the 20th September, 1910, there was no evidence in the possession of Mr. Foster against this interpreter Yip On. But I also understood my hon. friend from New Westminster to assert, and to support by evidence, that Mr. Foster had made a seizure of documents and money in possession of Yip On on the 18th of September, 1910. Am I mistaken in that?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Mr. Foster complained to me, I suppose about the 18th, that he did find some letters in the possession of incoming Chinamen about which he was suspicious. He said that some of Yip On's friends had obtained access to these documents, but Yip On had not been suspended at the time. He thought some of Yip On's friends had obtained access to incoming Chinamen and put them on their guard. But there was nothing, Mr. Foster assured me, in the way of evidence, there was suspicion that something wrong was going on.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Where were these documents and these moneys seized?

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. They were letters that the incoming Chinamen had, introducing them, I suppose, to Yip On. I don't think there was any money.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I understood these documents and certain moneys connected with them had been seized under such circumstances as directly or necessarily to implicate Yip On in these frauds.

Mr. TEMPLEMAN. Not directly. It created suspicion in the mind of the detective.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Well, I am not sufficiently familiar with the evidence itself to enable me to judge, and I will accept the minister's statement. But I think this is apparent that the investigation had not proceeded very far before it became clear to the government that Yip On was guilty of complicity in these frauds, that could not have been carried on without his connivance. That became apparent early in the course of the investigation. Notwithstanding that, the government remains absolutely inactive, not only remains inactive during the whole course of that investigation up to the time the report was received by the Department of Trade and Commerce in May last, but it has remained absolutely inactive up to the present time. So that, although it is beyond question that hundreds of these Chinamen have been smuggled into Canada without paying the duty imposed by our laws upon their entry, and although that was done by a system of bribery in which this man, Yip On, and some other Chinamen have participated to their great profit, neither of these men has been arrested or prosecuted, and both of them have been allowed to leave the country with their ill-gotten gains. That is the situation. These are absolutely undisputed facts. Therefore I say that my hon. friend the member for New Westminster has proved up to the hilt every one of the three charges which he has made against the administration in the terms of this resolution. For the same reason, I say that the conclusion of his resolution is entirely justified, where he says:

The course of the government in the matters aforesaid deserves the censure of this House.

I do not pause to deal with some of the matters with which the Minister of Inland Revenue did allude in the course of his remarks. He did not touch the real point

of the resolution, he did not make any defence of the administration censured by the resolution. The case which my hon. friend from New Westminster has made against the government is apparently undefended, it has gone by default. The Minister of Inland Revenue has made a personal explanation, has commented upon the evidence, has defended himself against certain suggestions which have been made with regard to his own course in the matter. But he has put forward nothing in defence of the government, the case, as I say, is absolutely undefended, and my hon. friend for New Westminster is entitled to judgment by default.

So far as the reinstatement of this man Yip On is concerned, that is not directly dealt with by the terms of the resolution, but I do not think the Minister of Inland Revenue made a very good case for himself in that respect. While he admits that he sent a telegram demanding or urging that this man Yip On should be reinstated under the conditions which the minister himself has described, and although the commissioner has said that the letter or recommendation of the minister was in the public interest, I am bound to say that I cannot see it in that light. This man undoubtedly was under suspicion at that time. There may have been no positive evidence against him, according to the statement of the Minister of Inland Revenue. But there was at least grave suspicion resting upon him, and the only reason suggested by the minister himself why that direct evidence had not been procured was that the friends of Yip On had gone to these Chinamen who were designing to enter Canada by means of bribes in which Yip On should participate, and had succeeded in bringing about such a condition of affairs that direct and positive evidence to sustain a prosecution could not be procured. But admitting all that, does the Minister of Inland Revenue say that he has made out a case that the reinstatement of this man Yip On at that time was in the public interest? He has made out no such case. Taking that in connection with what has been urged with force and cogency by the member for New Westminster in support of the resolution, I say that any hon. member of this House who has taken the trouble to read this resolution, and to listen to the speeches in support of it, and to the speech of the Minister of Inland Revenue who did not defend the government, would not be doing his duty unless he voted for this resolution to which absolutely no answer has been made by the Minister of Inland Revenue, the only minister of the Crown who has even attempted any defence.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).

YEAS:

Messieurs

Ames,	Macdonell,
Armstrong,	McCall,
Barnard,	McCarthy,
Best,	Maddin,
Blain,	Middlebro,
Borden (Halifax),	Nantel,
Boyce,	Owen,
Bradbury,	Paquet,
Broder,	Perley,
Burrell,	Porter,
Campbell,	Reid (Grenville),
Chisholm (Huron),	Rhodes,
Clare,	Roche,
Cowan,	Russell,
Crothers,	Schaffner,
Currie (Simcoe),	Sharpe (Lisgar),
Doherty,	Sharpe (Ontario),
Donnelly,	Sproule,
Edwards,	Staples,
Fraser,	Stewart,
Goodeve,	Taylor (Leeds),
Haggart (Winnipeg),	Taylor (New Westminster),
Herron,	Thornton,
Hughes,	Wallace,
Jameson,	Wilson (Lennox and Addington) and
Kidd,	Wright.—54.
Lancaster,	
Lennox,	

NAYS:

Messieurs

Allard,	McGiverin,
Allen,	McIntyre,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),	McKenzie,
Béland,	McLean (Huron),
Bickerdike,	McMillan,
Black,	Marcile (Bagot),
Bureau,	Martin (Montreal,
Cash,	Ste. Mary's),
Champagne,	Martin (Regina),
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Meigs,
Chisholm (Inverness),	Michaud,
Clark (Red Deer),	Miller,
Clarke (Essex),	Molloy,
Congdon,	Nesbitt,
Currie (Prince Edward),	Oliver,
Delisle,	Papineau,
Demers,	Parent,
Devlin,	Paterson,
Dubeau,	Proulx,
Emmerson,	Prowse,
Fielding,	Pugsley,
Fisher,	Rankin,
Fortier,	Reid (Restigouche),
Fowke,	Richards,
Gauvreau,	Rivet,
Girard,	Ross (Middlesex),
Hodgins,	Ross (Rimouski),
Hunt,	Roy (Dorchester),
Knowles,	Roy (Montmagny),
Kyte,	Rutan,
Lachance,	Savoie,
Lafortune,	Schell,
Lanctot (Laprairie-Napierville),	Seguin,
Lanctot (Richelieu),	Smith (Middlesex),
Lapointe,	Sperry,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),	Talbot,
LeBlanc,	Templeman,
Lemieux,	Tobin,
	Todd,
	Turcotte (Nicolet),

Loggie,	Turcotte (Quebec
Lovell,	County),
Low,	Turgeon,
Macdonald,	Turiff,
MacNutt,	Verville and
McAllister,	White (Victoria,
McCoig,	Alta.)—90.
McColl,	

PAIRS:

Messieurs

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Harris,	Beattie,
Brown,	Lortie,
Pardee,	Stanfield,
Graham,	Bristol,
McCraney,	Magrath,
King,	Northrup,
Robb,	Wilcox,
Carrier,	Arthurs,
Borden (Sir F.),	Thoburn,
Tolmie,	Elson,
Harty,	Price,
German,	Osler,
Carvell,	Henderson,
Sinclair,	Monk,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Barker,
Gordon (Kent),	Sexsmith,
Law,	Daniel,
Chisholm (Antigonish),	Crocket,
Chew,	Lalor,
Geoffrion,	Forget,
Douglas,	Lake,
Murphy,	White Renfrew),
Conmee,	Marshall,
Martin (Wellington),	Lewis,
Guthrie,	Foster,
Wilson (Laval),	Worthington,
Warburton,	Crosby,
Sealey,	Smyth,
McLean (Sunbury).	Meighen.

Amendment negatived.

PREPARATION OF VOTERS' LISTS.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). Before the motion passes I would like to refer to an inquiry I made with regard to the preparation of the voters' lists on the 20th inst. The hon. Secretary of State (Mr. Murphy) informed me on that occasion that he would have a statement prepared and brought down. A certain statement was prepared and brought down, but it does not cover all I asked for. I asked for a statement of the ridings in respect to which the voters' lists have been printed and delivered. That has been brought down. I asked also for a further statement as to when it is expected the lists will be ready for the ridings that have not been served in that way up to the present time. If the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfred Laurier) would be good enough to remind the Secretary of State, who is not in his place, I would be very glad.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax)

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE U. S.

Mr. JAMES J. DONNELLY (South Bruce). Mr. Chairman, before dealing with the principal effects of the proposed tariff changes now before the House, I wish to make a short reference to the conditions which led up to the present situation. The Payne-Aldrich Bill, which came into effect in the United States in the year 1909, provided for a maximum and a minimum tariff. The minimum tariff, which was the regular tariff, was considerably higher than the Canadian tariff, but was still 25 per cent lower than the maximum tariff. The maximum tariff was to be applied against all countries which, in the judgment of the president, discriminated in tariff legislation against the United States. The President of the United States took the ground that the terms of the French treaty, which a short time previously had been arranged between Canada and France, discriminated against the United States, and that therefore unless certain tariff concessions were made they would impose their maximum tariffs on all imports from Canada. Our government became alarmed, they sent representatives to Albany and then to Washington, and finally agreed that if the president would refrain from using his big stick, thirteen classes of articles would be placed upon a list advantageous to the United States, and assured the president that they would later on consider a broader tariff agreement with the United States. The changes in connection with the thirteen classes of articles may have been unimportant. The objectionable feature of the whole transaction was that our government assented to the principle of being dictated to from Washington in the arrangement of tariff legislation. In the fall of 1910 negotiations were again resumed, and in January of this year the Hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) and the Hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) went to Washington and arranged the present pact. There is this difference, however, in the way that the measure was submitted in the two countries. In the United States the question was submitted to the House of Representatives and to the Senate not as a party measure in the same sense that it is submitted here. It was dealt with more upon its merits. The Democratic party or the Republican party did not depend upon the result. But the situation here is very different. An agreement of great national importance is entered into by two members of the cabinet without consulting the people, without consulting the members of the House who represent the people, and we have been told by one Liberal member of the

House that it was only submitted to the members of the cabinet for their consideration for about one hour before it was brought down to this House as a government measure on the same day. Theoretically, the government supporters are free to support or oppose it, but they are aware that such opposition might lead to the defeat of the government that they were elected to support. The right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) has stated that the government will stand or fall by this agreement. The Minister of Finance stated that parliament is bound in honour to accept the agreement entered into by these two cabinet ministers. The main principle of the proposal is, that we should open our market and let in a long list of articles mentioned in the agreement, mostly natural and farm products, and that the Americans should open their market to us on similar terms. With regard to the United States lowering their rates of duty upon Canadian products, I have no objection to make. I realize that the United States tariff is a subject for the United States government to settle. If they really want to secure our products, they will grant them free entry. The indications are that in the near future the Democrats will be in control and we will then receive many concessions proposed by this agreement without sacrificing our home market. It has been stated by the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) that eighty per cent of all our agricultural products are required to supply our home market, and I am not aware that this statement has been successfully refuted; while the remaining 20 per cent find a ready market under present conditions. Why, then, should we open up our home market to the competition of half the civilized world in order that we may get into a market that already has a surplus of the principal products included in the pact? During 1908 the United States exported the following:

Wheat	151,000,000 bush.
Oats	2,333,000 "
Barley	8,262,000 "
Oil cake	$9,303,000
Flax seed	437,000 "

While there is a decrease in their exports of grain there is an increase in their exports of grain products. In 1905 they exported $42,000,000 worth of meal and flour while in 1908 they exported $66,000,000 worth of the same commodity, an increase of $24,000,000 worth, showing that they approve of the principle of sending out all their exports as far as possible in the shape of the finished product. The same condition exists in regard to live stock. While there has been a decrease in their exports of live stock there has been an increase in their exports of beef and pork. In 1905 they exported beef and pork to the value of $153,000,000. In 1908 they exported $172,000,000 worth, an increase of $19,000,000.

Now, dealing with some of the different items I propose first to take up the question of wheat. There may be local conditions at some points near the border which might occasion an apparent difference in the price of wheat in favour of the American producer; yet, I see no reason to think that this agreement would materially increase the price of wheat. In some of the Liberal papers a statement is made that the removing of the duty on wheat would increase the price of our Canadian wheat at least ten cents a bushel. In order to show the editors of these papers that their Liberal, political friends who have made a study of this question do not agree with them, I will quote the remarks of the hon. member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) as they appear in 'Hansard' at page 3730:

> I do say, this, however, that so far as I have been able to examine the matter—and I have looked into it with some care—I cannot see any reason why we should expect any very great increase in the price of wheat for transportation to the United States. There may be a reason, and there may be an increased price, but I am not able exactly to find out how it will come about.

We have heard a good deal about the benefits that would accrue to our farmers if they could get into the American market with their barley. While the price of malting barley is higher on the American side of the line than on this side, there are many factors that tend to prevent our Canadian farmers from ever going extensively into the raising of barley.

Among them is the scarcity of farm labour and the general use of the self-binder and the fact that such barley can only be produced on very fertile soil and handled only under very favourable weather conditions. Twenty-five or thirty years ago, when farm help was plentiful, the farmer could cut his barley with the self-rake reaper, leaving it lie a few days, and thus have a fair chance of harvesting it while the grain was still dry and bright. A field of barley that does not ripen evenly, if cut with a self-binder will not produce good malting barley. In fact the length of time required to dry any barley cut with a self-binder reduces the possibility of its being of a high grade. The progressive farmer who is anxious to conserve the fertility of the soil, would prefer to feed his barley at home and get his return from the sale of his live stock and dairy products. Even if our farmers desired to ship their feed barley to the United States, they could not profitably do so and compete with American corn. In support of this statement I may say that during last winter many of our stockmen in Ontario

were feeding corn to their cattle, although feed barley could be purchased at that time for about one cent a pound. With regard to hay, when making a comparison of the price of hay in the United States and Canada, it is always well to remember that on the other side the quotations are on the long ton, 2,240 pounds, while in Canada a ton requires only 2,000 pounds. I may say that so far as the people of Bruce county are concerned, they have higher ambition than to spend their time raising hay for the Americans. They raise hay, it is true, and we expect they will continue to raise hay, but they prefer to feed it to their stock and to maintain the fertility of their farms by the by-products. The people of western Ontario and particularly the people of the county of Bruce, have for many years gone extensively into the raising of horses, which has proved a very profitable occupation. While fancy or select horses have found a ready market in the United States, the opening of the three prairie provinces has supplied the best market for the great bulk of our horses. Any person familiar with the horse industry knows that no matter how carefully the sires and dams may be selected, a very small proportion of the horses raised will be what might be called fancy horses, and it is easily seen how important it is to preserve the western Canadian market for good serviceable blocks of horses. Our Liberal friends tell us that the west will soon be in a position to raise their own horses. Well, we have heard that statement for the last 15 years, but the demand has kept on increasing and in all probability will increase for many years to come, as only a small portion of the arable land of that great country has yet been brought under cultivation. I have been assured by men familiar with conditions in the west that if this agreement goes into effect our horses will be displaced in the prairie provinces by the cheaper horses from the western states. I have here document No. 849, prepared by the American Tariff Board relative to the various commodities named in the proposed reciprocity measure, and at page 109 I find the following:

> Prices of horses range from $106 to $125 per head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota, and North Dakota the range is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho, and Washington from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices of horses range from $107 to $139 per head, while in western Canada the range is from $107 to $156. In the great agricultural states of Indiana, Illinois, and Iowa, prices range from $120 to $124. In all the Canadian provinces, except Prince Edward Island, Manitoba and Nova Scotia, the prices are higher than in any of our states.

At page 110 I read that the average price of horses per head in Montana is given at $80 and in Saskatchewan the average price of horses is given at $156 per head. I wish also to call attention to the American view as put forward in the 'Saturday Evening Post' of March 25, by Senator Beveridge of the United States, who writes:

> Take horses and mules. We now ship to Canada every year thousands more of horses and mules than Canada ships to us. Canada has an under supply of horses and mules; comparatively we have an over supply. So the free interchange of horses and mules between this country and Canada means an enlarged market for horses and mules raised by our farmers. And our farmers want that enlarged market, do they not? Why, then, should we make it hard for them to enter that market with their horses and mules?

In reference to the position of the cattle and meat trade, should we enter into this proposed agreement, I find in the Toronto 'Globe' of July 24th 1911, a leading article extolling the benefits that will accrue to the United States from this pact, and there is something in that article that our farmers should reflect upon. The 'Globe' is giving a statement of the conditions in the United States, and it says:

> The meat trust has taken toll of the people without mercy, and the cost of living has been forced up so high that the town dwellers, and in some measure the farmers also, have revolted, and demanded the removal of the food taxes that were used to make great fortunes for the manipulators of the markets. On the one hand the trusts were able to depress the farmers' selling prices, and on the other to compel the consumer to pay enhanced prices for their food supplies. The secret of the meat trust's tremendous power lay in the fact that the farmer was selling cattle at prices prearranged by a little group of men who controlled practically all the packing houses in the United States, while the consumer was buying meat at retail stores similarly controlled by the trust.

That is a fair explanation of the conditions existing in the United States, and if it means anything, it means that the meat trusts had got practical control of both producers and consumers there, and the result of entering into this agreement would be simply to extend the scope of their operations. They have now their machinery in very good order to control the ninety millions of people in the United States, and it will be a very simple matter for them to extend their operations to the seven or eight million people in Canada. The last census showed that the State of Pennsylvania had a slightly larger population, and the State of New York a much larger population, than had the entire Dominion of Canada, so that for the meat trust to extend their

operations to Canada would be nothing more to them than extending their operations into another state.

In regard to the hog industry, I wish to say that our farmers have made great progress during the past ten years. Canadian bacon has gained an enviable reputation in the British market. Now, if this pact goes into effect, the result will be an interchange of hogs—whether our hogs go the United States or the United States hogs come here, the result will be that the identity of Canadian bacon will be lost, for the Americans produce sixteen hogs to one produced in Canada. Even should the agreement be revoked—as our Liberal friends seem to think, would be such an easy thing to do—it would take years to establish Canadian bacon in the position it occupies to-day.

So far as I am aware the farmers of Western Ontario have not been asking for reciprocity in hogs or hog products. The very opposite is the case, for, as a matter of fact they have been asking for increased protection in hog products. I have a copy of a petition which was sent to me during the last session of parliament, and was presented to this House early in that session. This is not in any sense a partisan document, and it was prepared at a time when there was no talk of reciprocity, but when the farmers were simply looking at it from a business standpoint of view. I will read the petition to you so that you may see what their view is:

To the Premier and members of the Dominion Parliament of Canada, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sirs,—In view of the enormous quantities of hog products being imported into Canada from the United States during the last few years, and in constantly increasing quantities which in most cases is being slaughtered on the Canadian market at a time when there is no local occasion for it, the only apparent reason being a glut in the United States market, thus enabling our Canadian packers and dealers to get supplies at a considerably reduced price, the effect of which they use to reduce the price to the producers here without, as experience shows, reducing the price to the consumer, and whereas Canada is capable of producing an abundance of pork products for the home market as well as for export and are anxious to be relieved of the great annoyance and loss of this periodical slump, therefore, we humbly petition and strongly urge your honourable body to increase the tariff on pork from two cents to four cents, and we hereby request our representative to both advocate and support such a measure at the approaching session of the House; believing that producer and consumer would be greatly benefited by a more uniformly even fair price.

And as in duty bound, your petitions will ever pray.

John McCharles	Dan. MacKay,
James H. Needham,	A. W. Hamilton,
Fred. H. Solomon,	Dan. Thompson,
R. Hamilton,	W. J. McGuire,
W. C. Smith,	K. Finlayson,
C. E. Smith,	W. R. MacDonald,
Alex. Thomson,	J. A. McKenzie,
J. A. Ruttle,	W. E. Treleaven,
Henry Campbell,	Daniel Altan,
Elisha McDonald,	Thomas Glen,
Angus McIntosh,	Godfrey Hall,
William Henderson,	Alexander McKinnon,
Angus Maityn,	Herb. Ensign,
John A. MacKay,	William J. McKenzie,
Thomas Moor,	William Davis,
Thos. McDonald,	Levi Boyle,
Dave. McDonald,	Tom. Speers,
Cornelius McGilvray,	W. S. McCrostie,
Edward MacKay,	David Falconer,
Donald McLeod,	John Fraser,
John McIver,	James Kenny,
J. L. Bowers,	Archie Harper,
D. S. McDonald,	John McDonald,
A. McLennan,	Kenneth McDonald,
John Breckenbridge,	

Electors of the South Riding of Bruce.

These electors of the south riding of Bruce are almost all farmers, and a large number of the signers of this petition are Liberals. The very first name I find on the petition, Mr. John McCharles, is a gentleman who for many years was a member of the county council of Bruce—a practical and intelligent farmer. He was a warden of the county, and is a prominent Liberal. His name was recently mentioned as a possible Liberal candidate in the county. Now, the answer the government gave to that petition is that instead of raising the tariff, they will admit American hogs into Canada free, and will greatly reduce the tariff on pork.

In order to show that the hog producers in Canada have nothing to gain by getting free entry into the United States, I would quote the live stock market reports, as they appear in the Toronto 'Globe,' of July 26. I have followed the live stock markets for some time, and I find that conditions during the last three or four months have been practically the same as set forth in this report, which I propose to give you. According to the 'Globe,' hogs in Toronto were quoted at $7.70 to $8.75. They are quoted lower f.o.b. but any one who is familiar with the live stock market will understand that this means free on board the cars at country points, and must not be taken as a fair quotation for the price of hogs in Toronto, because the freight must be added to these figures. Hogs in Buffalo, are quoted from $6.75 to $7.25. From this you will see that hogs at the present time are worth about .75 per 100 pounds more in Toronto than they are in Buffalo.

If this agreement went into force, and American hogs were allowed free entry into this country, no doubt the American surplus products would be sent here, and the price of live hogs would naturally be reduced.

In regard to lambs, I find that the highest price in Toronto is $8 per 100 pounds, whereas the highest price in Buffalo is

$6.75 per 100 pounds—$1.25 in favour of the Canadian market.

In order to show you that the Americans are sending sheep and lambs in here even under present conditions, I would like to refer to 'Hansard' of July 24, where the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) replying to an inquiry made by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) the Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson) stated that there were 12,226 sheep and lambs sent into Canada from the United States during the month of May of this year, and that the value of these lambs and sheep was $21,063. Instead of our lambs going into the United States, evidently the result would be that our home market would be swamped by American sheep and lambs. The defenders of reciprocity tell us that it will open up a market with 90,000,000 people. Take the population of Canada at about seven or eight million and the population of the United States at about ninety million, the proportion would be twelve to one.

So, for every Canadian farmer who is permitted to enter free into the United States market, twelve American farmers will be permitted to enter free into this country. By looking through the Canada Year-book for 1910, which was recently issued, I find that of what is listed as animals and animal products we imported from the United States, $11,836,464, and exported to the United States, $10,629,614, or the value of our imports from the United States for home consumption was $1,206,849 greater than the value of our exports to that country. I find that we imported in that year from the United States meats to the value of $2,216,343 and exported to the United States, $69,965. In other words, for every dollar's worth of meat that we sold to the United States we bought $30 worth from them. Of eggs, we imported from the United States during 1910, $177,577, and we exported to them in the same year, $11,551, or we bought $15 worth from them for every dollar's worth that we exported to them. Evidently if this ninety million market was such a great boon to the Canadian farmers as the advocates of reciprocity would leave us to believe, the Americans would find a market for products of this nature at home without sending them into Canada. It does not end there. For the privilege of getting into the United States market we permit 12 other nations to have free entry into our markets on the same terms which we give to the United States without getting any trade concessions from these other countries. I have here a list of the favoured countries with their areas and populations:

	Area in Square miles.	Population.
Argentine (1908)	1,117,049	6,484,023
Austria-Hungary	241,197	49,280,000
Colombia	504,773	4,142,000
Denmark (1909)	15,052	2,692,000
Japan (1908)	147,476	52,340,220
Norway	124,090	2,253,000
Russia (1909)	8,379,044	157,044,700
Spain (1909)	194,744	20,068,381
Sweden (1909)	172,875	5,476,441
Switzerland	15,417	3,555,000
Venezuela	599,358	3,647,000
Bolivia	650,000	say 2,000,000
	12,161,085	307,982,765
		say 308,000,000

So for the privilege which this pact will give us we are opening our market to over 300,000,000 people, very many of them living behind high tariff walls which will prevent us competing with them in their home markets. By the operation of the favoured nation clause the products of a protected territory three times the size of Canada, much of it highly developed, will be admitted into our home markets free. A foreign population exclusive of the United States, forty times as great as the population of Canada, will be furnished with free trade passes to the Canadian market. Including the United States, with the twelve favoured nations, it means competition between one acre in Canada and four acres outside of Canada, between one Canadian farmer and fifty foreign commercial foes. To illustrate these conditions, I wish to quote from the tariff rates of some of the different countries. Argentine will be able to send oats into Canada under this agreement free, whereas our farmers in sending oats into Argentine would pay 66 cents per 100 pounds duty. Butter would enter Canada free, while Canadian butter entering Argentine will pay 4½ cents per pound. Fresh meats would enter Canada under a duty of 1¼ cents a pound, while going from Canada into Argentine they would pay 25 per cent. Bacon would enter Canada from Argentine at a duty of 1¼ cents a pound, while Canadian bacon would pay 9 cents per pound. New Zealand mutton would enter Canada under a duty of 1¼ cents a pound, while New Zealand charges a duty of 20 per cent on our mutton. Similar conditions will apply to a great many other commodities included in this pact.

That the products of the favoured nations are similar to ours is shown by the fact that they are large producers of wheat. In 1908 the following countries, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Japan, Spain, Argentine, Austria and Russia, produced a total of 1,154,000,000 bushels. The advocates of reciprocity tell us the favoured nations will not send in anything free under this agreement, that they are not

likely to be competitors with the Canadian producers. The member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe) has placed a statement in 'Hansard' which shows that we imported goods from the favoured nations during six years to the value of $33,000,000. These people are able to send $33,000,000 worth of farm products into Canada and pay the duty under existing conditions, so what may we expect when our duty is taken off altogether? The advocates of reciprocity are not quite so confident as they were at first. Their proposition now is to give it a trial, and if it does not prove a good thing for Canada, revoke it. Do they honestly think that if they enter into this agreement and it proves a good thing for the United States that they can so easily revoke it? They have only to remember the position of President Taft a little over a year ago, the only difference would be that the size of the stick would be increased tenfold.

The Liberal organs very often refer to this agreement as a measure of tariff relief. Well, if there is going to be any tariff relief about it, I fail to see where the farmers of this country are going to share in that relief. We have a large national debt on which we are bound to pay interest. The public works which it is necessary for us to build require a very large expense of money. We have also to meet the expenses of carrying on the government of this country. We are committed to a total expense in the neighbourhood of $100,000,000 per year. Now, the Dominion government does not send around a tax collector to get that money, but collects it by customs duties; and it appears to me that if this agreement goes into effect, the farmer will pay a larger portion of his taxes in the form of customs duties than he does at the present time. Under this agreement, if a farmer requires a buggy brought in from the United States, he will still pay duty on it; if he will require to bring in any other foreign machinery, he will continue to pay duty on it. He will continue to pay duty on his cotton, his sugar, and other necessaries of life, while the miner or the lumberman who wishes to bring in supplies for his camp, feed for his horses or food for his men, will be able to bring them in duty free. The lumberman will be able to bring in his oats from the United States without contributing anything to the revenue of this country. He will be able to bring in American cattle, American hogs and American butter to supply his camp, without paying any duty upon them. The farmer will be forced to sell everything he produces in a non-protected market, while practically everything he requires to buy is protected, and he will have to pay duty on it. Now, the National Policy, as inaugurated by the government of Sir John A. Macdonald, and continued by the present government, laid the foundation for and developed a splendid home market. The purchasing power of our people is continually increasing. The census returns show that the urban population of this country is increasing at a greater rate than the rural population. Not only is it increasing in number, but its purchasing power is increasing very rapidly owing to the increased wealth of the country. Many of the people who are included in the rural population might be classed as part of our consuming population. Practically all the northern parts of Ontario, where the people are devoted to lumbering and mining, supply a good market for the farm products of the older portions of Ontario. Even the farmers of our western provinces specialize largely in wheat, and are good customers for the majority of the farm products of the older portions of Canada.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I wish to refer to the statement so often made that both political parties have been in favour of reciprocity. Conditions to-day are very different from conditions twenty years ago. The refusal of the Americans at that time to open their door to us has resulted in developing a spirit of self reliance in the Canadian people. In the face of what looked like adversity we have found other markets for our surplus products. They refused to give us assistance while we were on the up-grade. Now that we are reaching the summit, we do not require it. Let us not be deceived: the Americans to-day as in the past are legislating for what they believe to be their own best interest. Having almost exhausted many of their resources, they are entering into this agreement for the purpose of getting control of our natural resources, and in the belief that has been so freely expressed by many of their prominent men that the arrangement will ultimately lead to the annexation of Canada. While I am free to admit that in some cases this pact might result in increased prices, the discussion so far has convinced me that it is not in the best interests of Canada. I prefer to support a policy which will preserve the Canadian market for farm products for the Canadian farmer, which will encourage the transforming of Canadian resources into finished products by Canadian workmen, and reserve the right of Canadians to regulate their own tariff.

On motion of Mr. Beattie, committee rose and reported progress.

On motion of Mr. Fielding, House adjourned at 11.55 p.m.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

FRIDAY, July 28, 1911.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Eleven o'clock.

RACE TRACK GAMBLING.

Mr. MILLER moved that the evidence taken last session in connection with Bill No. 6 to 'An Act to amend the Criminal Code,' be printed as an appendix to the Journal of the House of Commons, and that rule 74 be suspended in reference thereto.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. Will the hon. member for Grey (Mr. Miller) please explain the object of his motion?

Mr. MILLER. One of the officials of the House tells me that many requests have been made to the Printing Bureau for copies of the evidence taken in regard to Bill (No. 6), known as the 'Anti-Gambling Bill.' Now, the evidence can only be printed by the carrying of this motion. The clerk of the special committee inadvertently omitted to recommend that this evidence be printed and this is the only way in which it can be printed now.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). What is Bill (No. 6)?

Mr. MILLER. It is the Bill known as the Anti-Gambling Bill or the Race Track Bill.

Mr. SPROULE. This motion speaks of the evidence taken in connection with a Bill of last session?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. The object of the motion is to have the evidence printed. This evidence should have been printed last year, but, as my hon. friend from Grey (Mr. Miller) explains, through the inadvertence of the clerk this was not done.

Motion agreed to.

IMPERIAL CONFERENCE.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. In laying upon the table of the House yesterday the report of the Imperial Conference, I stated that the rules or regulations adopted by the Committee of Defense, which were to be put in the volume, had not yet been printed, but had been received by His Excellency to be laid on the table of the House, and are upon the tables of the different parliaments interested. Yesterday we made a strong representation to the Home office that these papers should be brought down at once to the attention of the Canadian parliament and the Canadian people. His Excellency the Governor General received the following communication from the Colonial office:

'Mr. Harcourt to Lord Grey.

'London 27th July 1911.

'My telegram of to-day—on further consideration, in view of your telegram of 26th July 'Confidential,' and of 27th July 'Most urgent,'—I am prepared to acquiesce in immediate publication of both papers in Canada and I have informed Fisher that in deference to Sir Wilfrid Laurier's wishes I have felt it right to do so. Papers will be published here on Monday.

HARCOURT.

I therefore beg to lay upon the table of the House the memo. of the conference. The other paper is not copied, but it will be laid on the table during the course of the day.

I move that these papers be printed in connection with the other papers of the conference.

Motion agreed to.

RECIPROCITY PAPERS.

Mr. KING. I beg to lay on the table of the House a special report of the comparative prices in Canada and the United States from the year 1906 to 1911. This report includes prices of agriculture, fisheries, lumbering and mining products for the five years mentioned, and shows the actual market quotations.

THE CEMENT MERGER.

Mr. SPROULE. Before the orders of the day are taken up I would like to inquire what the government have done in regard to the very serious charges made by Sir Sanford Fleming concerning the Bill before the Private Bills Committee prior to the adjournment, and which was intended to be taken up after we resumed. I would like to know whether it is the intention of the government to appoint a committee of inquiry to ascertain whether the allegations made in connection with the formation of that cement company were or were not correct. The House will remember it was stated that there was over $13,000,000 of stock given in an improper way as bonus. Now, since we have resumed the committee has not been convened, and no evidence has been taken. It would seem to me in view of the very serious charges made that it would be incumbent upon the government to take some action to ascertain the correctness of the allegations. If they are correct, it reveals a very unfortunate condition of affairs. If they are not correct, they do a great injustice to certain individuals who are said to be connected with the matter.

Sir WILFRID LAURIER. We had hoped the House would deal with the matter after having taken up the Bill which is now before us, but the progress made upon the

Reciprocity Bill has been so slow that we have not much hope of this other Bill being taken into consideration until a very late period. Under the circumstances we had not thought of appointing a committee, but the suggestion of my hon. friend may be a valuable one. If we can get the House to vote upon the reciprocity agreement, then we will see what we have to do.

SALARIES AND PROMOTIONS, POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT.

Mr. HAGGART (Winnipeg). On the 16th March last this House ordered a return showing the promotions and increases of salary that had been given in the Post Office Department. Before adjournment I was informed that the matter would be taken up in a few days, but I suppose it has been overlooked. I simply mention it in order to bring it to the attention of the proper authorities.

Mr. EMMERSON. With respect to the return which was laid on the table of the House a few moments ago by the Minister of Labour, I would like to ask him if provision has been made or is being made for the printing of the return?

Mr. KING. The report is being issued as one of the reports of the Department of Labour, and will be paid for out of the appropriation for that purpose or by an order of the House.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Might I ask the Minister of Labour what means he used to gather that information or how long it has been gathering?

Mr. KING. In reply to my hon. friend I might say that this work has been in course of preparation for a considerable length of time. It is really a supplement to the volume which was brought down about a year ago, which dealt with wholesale prices, and which the hon. member for Brandon said he thought was the most valuable contribution to the economic literature of Canada.

This volume has been prepared by the same persons who had charge of the other volume and is a continuation of that work.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. The Minister of Labour sent out experts similar to the men in Washington to gather information with reference to the prices on both sides of the line?

Mr. KING. Yes, there have been special experts and officers of the department gathering that information.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Do I understand the minister to inform the House that this is a continuation of the work that Mr. Coates produced a year ago?

Mr. KING. Mr. Coates has been continuing that work since, and when the discussion came up in the House on the various articles mentioned in the reciprocity agreement it became evident that members of the House wished to get further information in the way of prices. I instructed Mr. Coates to make his further report more detailed than it otherwise would be and to carry back his investigations five years and get actual market quotations for that period of time.

Mr. MEIGHEN. This is a separate and distinct work prepared since the debate took place?

Mr. KING. It has been completed since the debate commenced, but a good deal of the information has been gathered during the last few years.

INQUIRY FOR RETURN.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would ask that a return moved for on March 20, relating to papers touching the claim of Macdonald & McLellan for the construction of a portion of the Intercolonial railway be expedited.

RULES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. EMMERSON. In view of the many references recently made to the expediting of the business of the House and the necessity of some change in the rules, I wish to ask the right hon. the leader of the House whether any steps are being taken or are proposed to be taken with regard to an amendment of the rules tending towards the expedition of public business. I wish to read an extract from a newspaper which may be of some service in consideration of the whole question:

How to Suppress Bores.

A Paris paper describes the method by which a South African tribe deals with bores.

This tribe considers long speeches injurious both to the speaker and his hearers; so, in order to protect both, there is a tribal law that every public orator must stand on one leg only while he is making a speech.

Mr. FIELDING. What if the speaker has not a leg to stand on?

Mr. EMMERSON. (Reading):

If the other leg is brought to the ground the oration must immediately end.

It is suggested that this institution would be of considerable value in other countries.—New York 'Times'.

This is an extract from the New York 'Times.' It might not meet the case now before the House as suggested by the Minister of Finance where the speakers have not a leg to stand on, but I am referring generally to the obstruction that has taken place in times past if it is not now in evidence in this House.

FARMERS' BANK.

Mr. BORDEN (Halifax). I would point out to the Minister of Finance in connection with the affairs of the Farmers' Bank of Canada that we are still without any information upon the table of the House, such as he suggested we might have. The hon. gentleman will no doubt remember that on March 15 a motion was made in this House by the hon. member for Halton (Mr. Henderson) that a royal commission should be appointed for the purpose of investigating and reporting on certain matters in connection with the affairs of that bank. The Minister of Finance, answering for the government upon that motion, referred in the first place to an answer which he had given some time previously and in which he had said that:

> The proceedings now engaging the attention of the courts of justice in Toronto, will lead to a full investigation into and disclosure of all the affairs of the bank, and that, therefore, there is no need of the appointment of a royal commission.

The minister also added that if anything should arise later to indicate that the investigation was insufficient the question would be further considered. He also said that the machinery of the courts had been involved, and the case had been occupying a great deal of attention in the courts of Ontario, and that he saw no reason to doubt that the investigation would be thorough. He, therefore, concluded that there was no need of a royal commission to investigate matters which were already being fully investigated in the courts.

The difficulty of the situation is this: If we had a royal commission, if evidence had been taken and a report laid on the table of the House, the House would be seized of the evidence and of the report itself and would be enabled to form conclusions thereon. We have not that, and further, we have not anything of the kind at all because the government has not, up to the present, laid on the table of the House the result of any investigation by the curator or by the liquidator or copies of any evidence taken in the courts. I would therefore, suggest that inasmuch as a royal commission has been denied, upon the ground that there would be an investigation by the liquidator and in the courts, it would be a proper and reasonable thing for the government to procure certified copies of all evidence taken by the curator or liquidator, if any such evidence has been taken, and of all reports made by the curator and liquidator and copies of all proceedings in the courts, which, in the judgment of the Minister of Finance, would serve the purpose that would otherwise have been served so far as the information of this House is concerned, by the appointment of a royal commission and by the investigation and report of that commission.

I would, therefore, ask whether any steps have been taken to lay that information on the table of the House. If no such steps have been taken I would ask whether the government propose to assist the House in respect to this matter by procuring official copies of all such proceedings and evidence and having them laid on the table of the House. This seems to me a reasonable request.

Mr. FIELDING. If there are any public documents whatever in relation to the Farmers' Bank which have come to the government since the last discussion—I cannot for the moment say whether there are or not—I have no objection to their being brought down in response to a request of the House. Of the general investigation I can only take the ground I did before that these matters are being investigated by the courts. We have no reason to doubt that the investigation will be in every respect thorough, and I can see no reason why there should be any departure from the usual practice in this respect. If there are any public documents in the matter which have come to the government I have no objection to bringing them down.

Mr. OSLER. My attention was called, since I returned, to a debate in parliament on the 15th of March. Before I left this country on January, I was present when we were discussing the question of the Farmers' Bank.

I then made the statement that I had spoken to the Minister of Finance in reference to the issue of a certificate to this bank. The Minister of Finance said that if I was in the House he was sure I would not make that statement. After the deposit had been made with the Receiver General and before the certificate had been issued, I met the Minister of Finance and had a talk with him about the Farmers' Bank. I told him that it was a fraud, that the people connected with it were not worthy, and that the method taken for obtaining the necessary deposit was absolutely illegal. I knew that of my own personal knowledge, because I knew where application had been made to borrow the money on these endorsed notes; I did not know at the time from whom. I saw that the Finance Minister was under a good deal of anxiety about the condition of affairs. The matter ended there so far as I was concerned until some time afterwards, when I learned that a certificate had been issued, and I again spoke to the minister, and said I was exceedingly sorry that the government had issued the certificate. The Finance Minister said that so far as he saw, the law had been complied with, and that if the government had not issued the cer-

tificate they would have been open to the charge of protecting the larger banks. Of course there is a good deal of reason in that, but I think it was a case where the closest scrutiny ought to have been observed. It was notorious that the men at the head of the bank were not worthy. The information I think was given fairly, and without any prejudice against the establishment of new banks. Further than that, I may say that I had a conversation with my hon. friend from Halton (Mr. Henderson), and he told me he had made the same representation to the Finance Minister. I only make this statement because I do not want to put in the mouth of the leader of the opposition statements which I cannot confirm.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Minister of Finance). If I had been aware that the hon. gentleman intended to bring this matter up to-day I should have read over the debate to see how far there was any conflict between the hon. gentleman's statement and my own. I am quite sure any statement the hon. gentleman makes, either at this time or at any other time, has been made in good faith. Busy men hesitate to speak with confidence concerning conversations that took place several years ago, and I feel that I should hestitate to speak definitely about a conversation on that matter of several years ago. But this I do know, that the attitude of my mind with relation to the Farmers' Bank was such that if my hon. friend or anybody else had given me any substantial reason against the issue of that certificate, I would have welcomed it, because it is notorious that I did not wish to issue the certificate to the Farmers' Bank. My hon. friend is right, I viewed it from the beginning with anxiety. I do remember I had a conversation with him about the matter, but I do not remember that he gave me any information bearing on the subject which would justify me in refusing to issue the certificate. I am sure, in a matter of such importance, my hon. friend if he had felt that he had material evidence to submit, would not have been content to trust the matter to memory, but he would have sent me a communication giving me definite information. It is, however, beyond question that anything that came to me on the subject from any quarter represented the anxiety which business men had concerning the flotation of this bank, an anxiety which I felt. But against that, I had the sworn testimony of the man who came into my office and swore that he had complied with all the provisions of the law. That sworn testimony should have outweighed probably any casual conversation I may have had from any quarter at all. I do not for a moment imagine that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr Osler) did anything in this matter except with the best intentions, and I am quite sure that neither he nor I have any desire to misrepresent one another.

WAYS AND MEANS—THE NEWMARKET à CANAL.

Mr. FIELDING moved that the House go into Committee of Ways and Means.

Mr. T. G. WALLACE (Centre York). Before you leave the Chair I wish to bring up a matter that has been discussed in this House several times already, a matter coming within the purview of the Department of Railways and Canals. I may say that my object in bringing this matter up is to place on 'Hansard' a report handed to me only on Tuesday last, which was asked for six months ago. I suppose this is the only opportunity I shall have of discussing this matter. I have always, both in this House and outside, condemned the expenditure upon the Newmarket canal as not being in the best interests of the people of this country. I believe it was an extravagant expenditure, and one that could not be justified by the Minister of Railways, or anybody else who knows the facts. The first estimate of the cost of this canal was $291,000, for a canal that was to run from Lake Simcoe to Holland Landing, and from Holland Landing to Newmarket. The next estimate was $967,000. The report shows why this expenditure had gone up from $297,000 to $967,000. This canal connects the town of Newmarket with Lake Simcoe, or is supposed to. Nevertheless, there has been no estimate made that this canal would be of any commercial value whatever, and what is more, no plan has been devised for furnishing water to this canal, and we all know that nothing is more necessary for a canal than water. There has been no report made showing where water can be got to float vessels in that canal. Therefore, I condemn this expenditure as extravagant and a wanton waste of public money. My attitude on this question may appear singular to some people, seeing that part of the expenditure is to be made in the county I represent, and no doubt many people would consider my course as bad politics. However, as I honestly believe that this expenditure is absolutely unjustified, I must, as an honest man, oppose it. Whatever benefit, temporary benefit, may come to the people of the county of York through this expenditure, will ultimately be lost to them through the failure to operate the canal. Now, I wish to place on 'Hansard' this report made by Mr. E. J. Walsh, who was the first engineer in charge of the canal. I would have preferred if the Minister of Railways and Canals was present on this occasion, but I

am not responsible for his absence. I will read the report:

Ottawa, Canada,
January 20, 1911.

Sir,—I desire to place before you, and on record in the department, (so that the same may be available for parliamentary inquiry), some observations and explanations concerning the Holland River improvements, more generally spoken of as the "Newmarket Canal," as follows:—

The policy of carrying out this work has been subjected to much adverse criticism, both in parliament and throughout the country, chiefly on account of the excessive cost.

In the debates, in the House of Commons, the Government through silence, and the Minister of Railways and Canals, by subtle suggestion and implication, has allowed, and caused the whole blame, for this unpopular expenditure, to fall upon myself.

In the reports of debates, House of Commons "Hansard," March 23rd, 1909. Supply—"The Newmarket Canal"—Mr. J. A. Currie, (North Simcoe) stated: "I do not think the Minister of Railways and Canals will rise in his place and say to this House that any single figure that has been given by Mr. Walsh to him as the responsible minister in charge of that department in connection with this work, has been within 200 per cent of what the work actually cost, or of the estimate that was made by the responsible man, Mr. Grant. . . . .

. . . . Mr. Walsh also said the original work would cost something like $300,000. His first report was made to Mr. Collingwood Schreiber, in which he placed the amount as something over $300,000. He made a subsequent report on the 17th of March, 1905, which the Minister did not quote, and the amount was $291,249.86. . . . .

. . . . . Mr. Walsh made several attempts or bluffs at an estimate on the second section but Mr. Grant, who is without doubt a very experienced engineer, made an estimate of that work which was far short of the lowest tenderer. Mr. Grant's estimate on section No. 2 was $596,826, and the lowest tender received in answer to the call founded on that estimate was $652,009.50. . . .

'Then there are the land damages and the work at Wilcox lake. No one has made an estimate on that work except our good christian friend Walsh, who says $41,000. Mr. Walsh estimated at $290,000 work which has now reached $900,000, so if he says this work will cost $41,000, we are safe in saying that it will cost not less than $150,000.'

In another portion of his speech Mr. Currie is reported thus:—

'The first mention of this canal was immediately before the election of 1904. Some time in October 1904, Mr. Walsh, an engineer of the department, was hurriedly called from Orillia to that section of country to make a survey of this particular branch.

'Mr. Walsh goes down to that country, and in a few days every loose fish in Newmarket is driving stakes and eating his dinner at the country's expense.

'By the way, it was just two or three weeks before the election, and every voter that could possibly be put to work was put to work on the job, and within a very short time they blew in $25,000 of this country's money in

making these surveys. Bear in mind immediately before the election.'

I desire, before proceeding further, to characterize the latter statement as being, absolutely, foundationless. There are only four (4) local men, and three (3) in staff from Ottawa (7 all told) employed at the time, and up to the date of the general election, which took place on November 3rd, 1904, the total amount expended, in connection with the Holland River survey, was $484.86, of which $68.79 was the actual sum paid, in wages, to the local men.

Details of this expenditure, annexed hereto, can be verified by reference to the Auditor General's report for that fiscal year. Mr. Currie's other statements, with reference to myself and my report, are quite as uncalled for, unfair and extravagant.

Doubtless, after Mr. Currie's parliamentary experience becomes more mature he may realize the propriety of asking for all papers on the particular subject, and satisfying himself that he is right in the premises, before making an attack in parliament on an official who is precluded from, being present and defending himself.

In the House of Commons debates, Hansard, March 23rd, 1909:

'Supply—The Newmarket Canal.

Hon. G. P. Graham (Minister of Railways and Canals). Mr. Speaker,.....' He gives his estimate, which, as my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) has pointed out, is too low, amounting to $354,536.

'Now let me go a little more into the history of the work as it has proceeded, giving also a digest of Mr. Grant's findings. Let us take section 2, Holland river division. On February 12, 1908, Mr. Grant, who is one of the most efficient engineers in the whole department, after giving the results of the analysis points out that the rainfall for 1907, which was a very dry year, was somewhat less than 30 inches. Mr Grant himself has gone over the figures very carefully, and, in his report of 1907, although he finds that the rainfall was less than 30 inches, and less, than Mr. Walsh found it. Mr. Walsh found by the records of the Meteorological Observatory, Toronto, that the average annual precipitation at Newmarket, for the ten years from 1896 to 1905, was 30-67 inches, and the minimum during that period was in 1896, when it amounted to only 27.67 inches, the latter is what he based his calculations (re water supply) on. Vide report, dated 29th September, 1906, E.J.W., 20, 1, 11. . . The country is committed to building the Newmarket canal. It has cost a great deal more money than was estimated. . . . I may state that the cost as estimated by Mr. Grant is, as my hon. friend has pointed out, nearly a million dollars. Mr. Butler has estimated that the reservoir will cost $80 000. . . . . The canal itself will cost in the vicinity of a million dollars.'

Mr. Samuel Sharpe (North Ontario).—As this Newmarket canal . . . . The Minister of Railways and Canals also stated that the original estimate was largely exceded, that the original estimate was something around $300,000, but that subsequent estimates which largely increased this amount were due to the increased cost of materials. I think he placed the increased cost of

materials at from 40 to 50 per cent. But he failed to inform us that the original estimate had been increased some 300 per cent.'

Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Mr. Speaker, ... We did send an engineer and he reported that the work could be done for $300,000. Well, we thought that if we could have that useful work done for the town of Newmarket and the riding of North York for an expenditure of $300,000 we ought to do it. It turns out, however, that the work is costing more than we expected. This is not unusual in works of this character. My hon. friend says it is going to cost a million dollars. But even if it should, even if there be a mistake, that is very different from a corrupt act.'

Mr. Walsh Interviews Minister.

Having been, more or less under the impression that the minister's, most extraordinary presentation and defence of the Newmarket canal policy, during the 1909 parliamentary session, might have been due to personal misconception, or misrepresentation on the part of some of his departmental officials concerning the true facts about that work, the writer called upon the Minister of Railways and Canals (a few days after prorogation) on the 28th May, 1909, and pointed out to him that the adverse criticism in parliament, directed against the former, in connection with the Newmarket canal work, was founded on false premises; that my plans and proposals in re. section No. 2, of the east branch—Holland Landing to Newmarket—had been unwarrantedly changed and the cost, unnecessarily, enormously increased; that I had recommended a standard of construction commensurate with the amount of traffic likely to be available, and that, instead of adopting this, Messrs. Butler and Grant had copied the elaborate plans of the costly Soulanges canal; overlooking the fact that the St. Lawrence canals form the links of navigable communication between the Atlantic ocean and the Great Lakes, having tributary thereto the possible carrying trade of half a continent, the magnitude of which no living person could foresee; whereas the 'Newmarket canal' is much less ambitious in its pretensions as regards prospective traffic; and further, that when an attack was made upon myself in parliament, by certain members of the opposition, the minister, instead of coming to my defense and explaining the true situation of affairs, chose to leave parliament in ignorance and contented himself with fulsome laudations of Mr. Grant's (so called) engineering skill, thus endorsing said attack by implication.

After questioning the minister, he admitted that he knew nothing about civil engineering work, and that his explanations and utterances in parliament (re Newmarket canal, and the engineers connected therewith) had been inspired and instigated by his deputy, Mr. Butler.

The writer will deal with Mr. Butler's case presently. Having impressed upon the minister the facts relative to the Newmarket Canal, and the inaccuracy and injustice of his statements and insinuations, in parliament, it was but reasonable to expect that he would seize the earliest opportunity of making suitable explanations.

That he did not do so, the following excerpt from 'Hansard,' February 4th, 1910, (this was the succeeding session), will show: 'Trent Canal construction.

Mr. WALLACE. What is the hon. gentleman appropriating for the Newmarket canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Last year we did not spend much on it. I sent for Mr. Grant, the engineer of the department, who is a first-class man, and we discussed the Newmarket canal very thoroughly. He assured me that I can state to the House on his reputation that there will be plenty of water in that canal. That is on the word of one of the best engineers we have in the service in regard to hydraulics, and a most reliable man.

Mr. GRAHAM. I have seen the work, but I did not visit it for the purpose of investigation, because any information I could give would be based absolutely on the advice of experts whom we pay for that purpose.

Trent Canal—improvements, $62,500.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. . . . . .

Mr. GRAHAM. The engineer is having his report completed on the Severn route and the Nottawasaga route. My hon. friend (Mr. J. A. Currie) can come to the department and see what he is proposing.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. Was it the same engineer who made the estimate on these who made the original estimate on the Newmarket canal?

Mr. GRAHAM. Yes, Mr. Walsh.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE. I do not wish to challenge the standing of the engineer who made the report, but, as the minister was so misled with reference to the Newmarket canal, I think it would be advisable for him to have these figures checked up by some other member of the staff.

Mr. GRAHAM. Any estimate of these routes, before anything is done, will be reviewed by Mr. Grant, the engineer of the Trent, whom I will make responsible for all the figures.

The remarks of the Minister of Railways and Canals, as quoted above, are most discourteous to myself, the inference conveyed being a reflection on my standing as an engineer. I have no objection whatever, to the minister's somewhat frenzied, commendation of Mr. Grant as an engineer, but when my name has been in the 'limelight,' and detrimental reflections by innuendo and implication are, at the same time, directed against myself, I protest most vehemently. I have known Mr. Grant for some years, he was, formerly, a flagman on my staff, subsequently he had been on the staff of the late Mr. Thos. Munro, M.I.C.E., who was the engineer in charge of the Soulanges canal construction.

NEWMARKET CANAL—HISTORIC RETROSPECT.

On September 27, 1904.—Received official letter of instructions from Department Railways and Canals, to make surveys for the improvement of the east and west branches of the Holland river, &c.

October 17, 1904.—The instrumental survey of the east branch Holland river was not commenced until this date; there being a delay, on the part of the department, in appointing an assistant engineer for the work.

January 9, 1905.—Mr. L. K. Jones (Secretary) informed me, by telephone, that Sir W. Mulock, Postmaster General, desired to see me about the Holland river surveys, and requested me to go and see the latter.

I told Mr. Jones I would see Mr. Schreiber, first.

January 10,1905.—Mr. Schreiber told me that an estimate for the Holland river (east branch) improvements was required forthwith, and directed me to see Sir W. Mulock on the subject.

Informed Mr. Schreiber that the surveys were not far enough advanced and there was not sufficient data for a reliable estimate; he said nevertheless it had to be made. I afterwards saw Sir W. Mulock, and he asked me to prepare an estimate (which he required on the following day) for a canal from the mouth of Holland river to the town-line at Newmarket; that he desired it to be designed on the most economical principals of construction to keep down the cost; that, high level, wooden bridges, with graded approaches should be adopted for highway crossings, etc.; that land required would be inexpensive, as good land, in the vicinity of Newmarket and Holland Landing, could be obtained for $50 per acre, &c., and proffered other information about the route which he said he was familiar with.

I explained to him that the estimate would not be reliable, &c.

At conclusion of interview with the Postmaster General, returned to Department Railways and Canals to again protest to the chief engineer re forced estimate. Mr. Jones took my message to Mr. Schreiber, who was with the Minister, and returned in a few minutes and stated that, both Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Schreiber desired me to prepare the best estimate possible from the data at my disposal.

January 11, 1905.—Finished the hurried preliminary estimate for proposed river improvement, and canal, from Cook's bay to Newmarket, and handed it to Mr. Schreiber at 11.20 a.m. He looked it over, and instructed me to take it to the Privy Council chamber to Mr. Emmerson, which was done, and the latter called out Sir W. Mulock, gave him the estimate and. presently, left us alone together.

I reiterated to Sir William the very meagre information upon which the estimate was founded and, furthermore, that it did not provide for storage reservoirs, &c., for a water supply for the canal, &c., &c.

The amount of this estimate was $328,825.26.

March 10, 1905.—Got letter from Mr. Schreiber asking for report and estimate of proposed Holland river improvements to Newmarket.

March 14, 1905.—Hon. H. R. Emmerson phoned at 7.45 p.m. and asked me to see Sir Wm. Mulock next day re estimate for canal on east branch of Holland river.

March 15, 1905.—Interview with Sir W. Mulock, who stated that he wanted an amended estimate of cost of improving the east branch of Holland river to Newmarket, &c. I told him the surveys were not complete and that the preparation of the estimate should be postponed.

He replied: it was imperative he should have a report before the end of the week to submit to council; that I could prepare an estimate based on such information as the surveys, so far as carried, afforded to date, and that full allowance would be made by the government for any discrepancy that might arise, &c.

March 17, 1905.—Finished this estimate.

March 18, 1905.—(Saturday)—Sent the report and estimate to Mr. Schreiber.

Mr. WALLACE.

The amount of this (amended) estimate was $291,249.86.

This was not a second distinct estimate; it was merely a correction of the estimate of January 11, 1905, which had been based on a lockage of 60 feet, but as the surveys proceeded it was found the lockage would not exceed 45 feet, hence the reduction in quantity of concrete in locks, less cost for lock gates, oak in lock sills, iron, dams, &c., accounts for the difference in the two amounts.

May 4, 1905.—Per instructions from department: handed copies of preliminary estimate, &c., to Sir W. Mulock, at House of Commons, and took occasion to, again, remind him that the estimate was prepared on inadequate data.

May 19 1905.—Received letter from Sir W. Mulock re Newmarket canal. Copy attached.

June 3, 1905.—Letter (dated May 31, 1905) from Sir W. Mulock asking if I could not reduce the schedule price for dredging Holland river, &c., also telephone message from him on same subject, and replied by letter.

Copies of both letters attached.

June 30, 1905.—The surveys for the improvements of the east branch, Holland river, were completed on this date.

July 10, 1905.—Mr. M. J. Butler replaced Mr. Schreiber as Deputy Minister and Chief Engineer of the department, but the latter continued to act for some weeks later.

July 17, 1905.—By direction prepared a report, supplementary to report of March 17, 1905, giving some additional information required by the Minister and sent copies to Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Schreiber.

January, 9, 1906.—Mr. Butler instructed me to prepare plans and specifications for section No. 1 of the Holland river—Cook's bay to Holland Landing—so that tenders might be invited without delay, &c.

I mentioned to him that some of the promoters of the work had suggested that a draught of four (4) feet of water, from Cook's bay to Newmarket, would be ample for all requirements. Mr. Butler said to adopt same dimensions as on the main Trent canal, that is a depth of 6 feet, &c.

February 17, 1906.—Completed and sent to Mr. Butler, plan, profile, typical cross sections, specifications, bill of quantities, &c., for section No. 1, of Holland river, (Cook's bay to Holland Landing).

October 1, 1906.—Completed and sent to the Department of Railways and Canals, report and detailed estimate, general plan, profile and detailed working plans (42 in all) for section No. 2, from Holland Landing to Newmarket, and for a water supply ditch from Lake Wilcocks.

November 5, 1906.—Completed specification for construction of section No. 2, and sent it to Mr. Butler.

This estimate which was for section No. 2 (Holland Landing to Newmarket only) and based on reliable information secured by instrumental survey, &c., amounted to $314,220.34 for that section of canal; and for the water supply ditch, &c., from Lake Wilcocks, the amount was $40,315.87, thus making a grand total of $354,536.21 for section No. 2 and water supply ditch.

Estimate of cost of section No. 1. Cook's bay to Holland Landing, is not included in this.

Upon the completion of the location plan, profile, &c., for section No. 1, the corrected quantities of work, to be done on this section, were taken out and showed a total of 272,060 cubic yards of dredging (consisting of peat bog, sand, silt, mud, &c.), and 15 acres of clearing.

Taking the price of these items at 16 cents per cubic yard, and $25 per acre, respectively, and adding ten per cent for contingencies, brought the estimated cost of this section to $48,295.06.

The total estimated cost, therefore, for both sections, that is from Cook's bay (Lake Simcoe) to Holland Landing and Newmarket, with water supply ditch, was $402,831.27, a sum quite ample in my opinion, to have affected the improvements if conducted in a business-like manner, and in accordance with my proposals.

The schedule prices, generally, were taken from contract rates (as given in the Auditor General's report for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1905), of Messrs. Brown & Aylmer's contract for the Simcoe and Balsam Lake Division, Trent canal.

Hansard again.

In 'Hansard,' March 23, 1909, pages 3137-38: Mr. J. A. Currie (North Simcoe) . . . This Lake Simcoe Dredging Company built a scow and placed a dredging apparatus on it. They took the contract for $46,497.10 '(Section No. 1),' and commenced work. As a result of their operations, in a very few months they discovered that their dredge would not work, and it is very amusing to read the comments of Mr. Grant on the apparatus they had there at work. . . The matter was taken hold of by Mr. Grant, and he made another estimate for a second tender. He estimated No. 1 section for the department at $131,-239. . . Tenders were called and a gentleman named Riley was one of the lowest tenderers. His figure for that work was exactly the same as the government estimate. . .

The first tender was some $41,000, and after that section had been revamped and looked over on the very same drawings, the lowest tender was $131,000.

The writer has no hesitation in stating that, if Mr. Currie's assertions are correct, there has been pitiable mismanagement, of this section No. 1 contract, on the part of the department as administered by Mr. Butler.

The sum of $131,239 as stated by Mr. Currie, to be Mr. Grant's estimate for dredging 270,062 cubic yards of peat bog, sand, silt and mud (the quantities calculated from very careful surveys and soundings, and the material classified from test borings, all of which was done under the immediate supervision of Mr. Stevens, engineer in charge of party) on section No. 1; represents a cost of about $0.48 per cubic yard.

This is an unprecedented price for dredging material of this description in a sheltered situation and to such a shallow depth below the surface of the water as six (6) feet, on Canadian public works.

The schedule price of 16 cents per cubic yard for dredging, adopted by the writer, was considered too high by Sir W. Mulock who wrote as follows:

Postmaster General,
Ottawa,
Toronto, May 31, 1905.

Dear Mr. Walsh:

With reference to your estimate for the Holland river improvements to Newmarket, it occurred to me that perhaps in view of the reduced prices for which parties are now tendering for dredging you might think it right to reduce your estimate. A short time ago Mr| Hyman informed me that he had advertised for a quantity of dredging and that the prices are very much below what have formerly been paid. If you were to see Mr. Gobeil he could doubtless let you know these modern figures, and if they cause you to revise your estimate for the Holland river improvements, I wish you would let me have your revised estimate not later than early Saturday morning of this week, as I wish on that morning to bring the matter before the government.

Yours faithfully,
W. MULOCK.

E. J. Walsh, Esq.,
Civil Engineer,
Department of Railways and Canals,
Ottawa, Ont.

The following reply was sent:

'164 Sparks St.,
'Ottawa, June 3, 1905.

'Dear Sir William,—Your letter of the 31st ultimo having reference to the estimate for the Holland river improvements to Newmarket, was received upon my return to the city to-day, and I had just read it when you called me by telephone.

'I regret it does not seem possible to safely reduce the estimate, as all items are cut pretty close, and I ascertained, during my last visit to Newmarket, that one public road crossing had been overlooked in the preparation of the estimate—this will be met by the amount for contingencies.

'I am, yours faithfully,
(Sgd.) E. J. WALSH.

"The Honourable
'Sir William Mulock, K.C.M.G.,
'Postmaster General,
'Ottawa'.

With regard to the merriment caused by the alleged hysteria-producing, comments of Mr. Grant anent the dredge used by the 'Lake Simcoe Dredging Company' on section No. 1: it may be interesting to relate that, about the time this work was let, one of the contractors, who was in Ottawa, informed me that Mr. Butler had advised him to use a hydraulic or suction dredge, and asked my opinion.

I pointed out that such a dredge could be used effectively, only, in deepening the shoals, &c., on the main river, from Cook's Bay to the 'cut off' (which was only a small portion of the work); that it would be useless for dredging the peat-bog, as the fibrous material would clog the suction and discharge pipes, &c., that they would require supplementary dredging plant, such as a bucket, and clam-shell dredge; and expressed the opinion that it would be better and less expensive to provide a combination dredge of the dipper and clam type.

Evidently they acted on the advice of Mr. Butler, with, apparently, disastrous financial results.

Not an isolated instance.

The preliminary estimate, for improving the east branch of the Holland river, made before the surveys had been carried far enough to furnish reliable data, is not an isolated instance of this kind.

The estimated cost of the great 'National Transcontinental Railway' was prepared before the survey parties had, even been placed in the field, and on such estimates the huge undertaking was launched and carried through parliament, and in reply to criticism the Prime Minister said they had:

'Mountains of information'.

Regardless of this superfluity, the discrepancy, between the estimates for this work, and the cost thereof to date, is staggering.

No scapegoat in this case.

In 'Hansard', vol. XLII., April 6, 1909, re Grand Trunk Pacific Loan; there was general criticism, by opposition members, of Mr. Schreiber's original estimates of $18,000 per mile for the prairie section being increased to $35,000 per mile; and for the mountain section from $30,000 per mile to $80,000 per mile.

Did the government attempt to saddle the blame upon Mr. Schreiber and make a scapegoat of him? Not at all, on the contrary, hon. Mr. Fielding strongly defended him. Compared with the Newmarket canal, the latter sinks into insignificance.

Mr. Butler's extravagant changes.

On December 7, 1906, Mr. Butler handed me a letter, written by Mr. A. J. Grant (in reply to a letter of the former, dated November 20, 1906), proposing certain changes in the designs and mode of construction of section No. 2 of the Holland river, and remarked that the latter had taken his ideas from the Soulanges canal work, upon which he had been employer in a subordinate capacity. The writer looked carefully into the changes suggested by Mr. Grant and endorsed by Mr. Butler, and handed in his report thereon, to the latter, on January 11, 1907.

A copy of this report is enclosed herewith.

Mr. Walsh's responsibility ceases.

Subsequent to December 7, 1906, the date on which Mr. chief engineer Butler intimated that he approved of the changes suggested by Mr. Grant (though really inspired by himself), but particularly after my report of January 11, 1907, I disclaim all and every responsibility for the huge cost of the Holland river improvements, or of any criticism attached thereto, whether as regards preliminary estimates or otherwise.

The concluding paragraph of my report (January 11, 1907) read as follows:—

'I desire to observe, in conclusion, that the suggested alterations, in the design and mode of construction, will, if indulged by the department, require a recasting of the proposals, and largely increase the cost, both, of construction and maintenance, without yielding any adequate advantage.'

Greatly increased cost.

The greatly increased cost is due, chiefly, to the following changes, viz.:—

(1) The widening of the channel.

(2) Changing a flight of two locks of 10 feet lift, each, to one lock of 20 feet lift, thereby necessitating a very large additional expenditure in providing an artificial foundation of piles, &c.

(3) The changing of the profile and general design of the work; and excavating a large section of new channel, instead of utilizing as much of the existing stream channel as possible.

(4) The substituting of culverts, in the side walls of locks, for valves near the bottom of lock gates, for filling and emptying the lock chambers.

(5) By using metal casting for the hollow quoins in locks, instead of shaping the quoin directly in the concrete.

(6) A very large increase in the expenditure on account of building all the entrance piers to locks entirely of concrete.

(7) A very large increase in the cost of the work, by the proposed use of pile and artificial foundations for structures.

(8) A large increase in excavation by proposed deepening of raceways, or channels below dams.

(9) An increase in the cost of the work, by putting stop-log openings in each dam.

(10) A substantial increase in the expenditure by changes in the down stream, face of spillways of dams.

(11) An enormous increase in the cost of the work, by substituting concrete cores, for puddle cores, in the earthen dams and embankments.

(12) Increased expense for (unnecessary) temporary bridge across the river at Bradford road and Yonge street crossings.

(13) The cost largely increased by substituting concrete for stone-filled timber cribwork, in the construction of the rest piers of swing bridges.

(14) The cast largely increased by substituting concrete for cribwork, in the foundation of the dock at Newmarket.

(15) A large increase in cost for a proposed dock at Holland Landing, not originally contemplated.

(16) Cost of proposed water-supply ditch, from Lake Wilcocks, largely increased by changing two cedar culverts to concrete culverts, &c.

(17) A very largely increased cost owing to the change of profile, &c., necessitating a great amount of stone protection of slopes of canal prism.

(18) Cost largely increased by substituting sodding for seeding of slopes of bank.

Hon. Sir A. B. Aylesworth's contribution.

While Sir William Mulock was the parent of the Newmarket canal (which he desired to have constructed on the more economical principles known to engineering science), the Hon. Sir A. B. Aylesworth, M.P., contributed his 'mite' of expense to the lusty offspring.

This took the form of a bridge across the east branch of the Holland river on the line between lots 115 and 116, in the first concession, township of East Gwillimbury.

Neither a bridge nor public highway had ever previously existed at this place, and when Mr. Butler first discussed the subject with the writer he was informed of this, and the latter also, expressed the opinion that the sagacious township authorities had, apparently,

suddenly conceived the idea that it was an opportune time to have this bridge built—through the aid of their powerful representative in parliament—at the government's expense.

On the 19th March, 1906, Mr. Butler wrote me as follows:—

The township of East Gwillimbury are desirous of building a bridge, immediately between lots 115 and 116, of the first concession, west of Yonge street, Mr. A. J. Hughes being the township clerk. As this comes across your work, I would like to go over it with you, so that we can arrange with the township authorities to have the bridge built suitable for the canal at that point. . .

A copy of this letter is attached hereto.

In the negotiations which ensued between myself (on the part of the government), and the township authorities, the latter agreed to hand over what remained of the appropriation of $3,000, part of which they were expending in grading road approaches across a marsh, and in building a wooden bridge, of 5 bents, 60 feet long, over a portion of 'Soldier's Bay,' and in driving piles on shores of the main stream. The bridge over the river, constructed by the department, is a steel swing span, 120 feet long in the clear, resting on concrete over artificial foundations, &c., its cost must have been from twenty to thirty thousand dollars. This, also, is included in the Butler-Grant revised estimate of cost of the minature Soulanges canal—yclept the Newmarket canal—but very carefully concealed from parliament. The revelations hereinbefore disclosed afford food for reflection.

Dividing the Dual Position.

Towards the end of 1904, the then Minister of Railways and Canals contemplated the abolition of the dual position of deputy minister and chief engineer, and (unsolicited) I was promised one of these positions.

The minister's plans miscarried, and a few months later Mr. M. J. Butler was appointed to both offices.

Mr. Butler's Sudden Evolution.

On the 10th July, 1905, public announcement was made in some of the newspapers of the appointment of Mr. M. J. Butler as deputy minister and chief engineer of the Department of Railways and Canals.

His appointment was heralded in the press as a national boom, he being described as a 'brilliant engineer' of eminence, 'greater than had been,' and he was duly installed in office amid the blare of trumpets and ministerial eclat.

That appointment—understood to have been arranged by certain contractors—was the subject of much comment in engineering circles, as the appointee was, generally, unknown, he having previous to his appointment on the staff of the National Transcontinental railway, in August, 1904, been employed as contractor's foreman on some railway and bridge works in Prince Edward Island, also on some locomotive works in Montreal; before that, in charge of a gang putting up water tanks, &c., for supplying water to locomotive engines on an American railway; and at a more remote period having been engaged in connection with some 'one-horse' railways over near Lake Ontario, &c.

As Chief Engineer.

His accomplishments as chief engineer of the department would scarcely gain him a niche in the 'temple of fame.' Those may be enumerated as follows:

1. His success in securing an award whereby his former employer, the contractor for the Hillsborough bridge, Prince Edward Island, was paid a large amount of money by the government for so-called 'extras,' &c., this work having already cost about three times the amount of the estimate.

2. His certificate re the substantialness, &c., of the bridge which was being constructed over the St. Lawrence river near Quebec city, upon which the government guaranteed the bonds of the Quebec Bridge Company to the extent of several millions of dollars.

The subsequent collapse of this bridge was a national disgrace, and the chief engineer of that day cannot evade his share of responsibility by putting the blame upon an invalid in New York, Mr. Cooper, whom he knew had been physically unable to visit the site of the ill-fated bridge.

3. The stupid, unbusiness-like methods pursued in connection with Intercolonial railway contracts at Moncton, New Brunswick, resulting in a verdict in the Exchequer Court for a large sum of money—over and above what the engineer considered the work was worth—for the contractor, and which the government has appealed to a higher court.

4. After the plans for the substructure of the swing bridge over the Holland river, between lots 115 and 116, east Gwillimbury township had been prepared, Mr. Butler, exercising his perogative as chief engineer, insisted on certain changes being made in those plans, regardless of the fact that it was pointed out to him that if built under his modifications the road embankments back of the abutments would, from sheer weight, shove the latter into the river. The contract was let for this bridge under the modified plans; the abutments were erected and the road approaches filled up behind those before the superstructure was put up, and it was found necessary to spend a large sum of money in driving piles through the newly made banks to prevent those from forcing out and throwing the abutments into the river.

'By their fruits (works) ye shall know them.'

So much for this engineering phenomenon. Mr. Walsh refused offer of superintending.

Engineership of Trent Canal.

In March, 1906, Mr. Butler pressed the writer on several occasions to accept the superintending-engineership of the Trent canal, but the latter declined to take the position for the salary of $3,600 a year, &c.

The refusal to accept the proffered position was followed by a species of active discourtesy which had previously been more or less thinly veiled.

Subsequently Mr. A. J. Grant was appointed, and on May 9, 1906, I was informed by official letter that Mr. Grant would take charge of the Holland river improvement work.

Had that work been left in my charge the government would have avoided much unpleasant criticism, and the country spared an absurd extra outlay of several hundred thousand dollars.

Copying Soulanges Canal Plans.

It has been already stated that Mr. Grant, with Mr. Butler's approval, copied from the Soulanges canal plans in the proposed canalizing of section No. 2 of the Holland river; and in doing so they demonstrated the fact that they were unable to differentiate between a great national water-highway route and a small local ditch.

Any engineer undertaking to carry out, almost, any class of work may find old plans or other works to copy from, but unless he discriminates between relative governing conditions he is liable to seriously blunder, just as in the case of the Newmarket canal; and in this respect it would be no more incongruous to take the statue of 'Venus of Milo' as a model for a Greek sphinx.

Hon. H. R. Emmerson Resigns Portfolio.

The Hon. H. R. Emmerson resigned the portfolio of Minister of Railways and Canals on April 2nd, 1907.

Up to this time Mr. Butler was somewhat restrained in his peculiar methods, but from thenceforth his erratic official actions indicated unbridled sway.

Exit Mr. Butler.

In the month of January, 1910, Mr. Butler severed his official connection with the Department of Railways and Canals. Judging from the newspaper reports of statements attributed to the minister, concerning the resignation of that plenipotent individual, of the irreparable loss sustained, &c., &c., the public might reasonably have inferred that he had 'shed tears of blood,' but certain parties 'in the know' only smiled. Among other remarks the minister was credited with saying that he was a: 'man of exceptionable ability and it would be very difficult to secure a successor capable of filling all these positions. I consequently have under advisement the division of the office as was the case some years ago.' Further: 'It is a case where the office should seek the man,' &c., &c.

This letter might be described as rodomontade.

It has been a favourite phrase in governmental circles of late years, and these are several, extraordinary, negative examples of its application with respect to some very important special appointments in the public service.

Seeing Red.

Like an individual, from whom the white dove of innocence had flown, protesting virtue, so the hon. minister just as frantically proclaimed and rehearsed the (mythical) stupendous and transcendental quality of the engineering exploits of Messrs. Butler and Grant, as those appeared to him. Was this an additional expedient to cover the blunderings of the department and by suggestive contrasts to attempt to discredit the writer?

A Clew.

Some important official appointments, in connection with the Department of Railways and Canals, were under consideration early in 1910, for one of which I was an applicant. Some influential (mutual) friends who had spoken to the minister on my behalf, afterwards, informed me that Mr. Graham was 'seeing red,' and had told them he believed I was a 'Conservative,' &c.

As to this: I wish to state in the most emphatic manner, that never at any time—during the period occupied by me as chief engineer of surveys of the Trent canal, main outlet routes and the various branches—did I of my own volition, either directly or indirectly, introduce politics into the question, or allow such to interfere in any way, with the work.

The only approach to politics was in connection with certain appointments to the survey parties; wherein I was, officially, instructed to apply to the persons controlling the 'patronage' for any local appointments; as for instance when the party was being organized for the survey of the Trent canal route from Rice Lake to Trenton in October, 1904, I was told to apply to Hon. Geo. P. Graham, of Brockville, (organizer of the Liberal party for eastern Ontario); and, having done so, was referred by him to Messrs B. O. Lott, of Anson, Ontario, and John Douglas, of Warkworth, Ontario, Liberal candidates for West Hastings and East Northumberland, respectively &c.

Pertinent Observations.

In view of the evidence adduced, it looks very much as if the minister had harkened to false counsel from self-seeking obsequious sycophants, and then proceeded to (figuratively) crucify the victim, without hearing what the latter had to say.

The writer would inform the minister that he, also, for several years, was at the head of a great spending department of government (both executive and administrative), in a neighbouring dependency of the empire; that he successfully conducted the work, connected therewith, on business principles, without reference to party politics; and being himself an engineer was enabled to, personally, analyse reports of engineers and other subordinate officials, and deal with the same on their merits.

The minister, however, is at a great disadvantage in this respect, having to direct public works of great magnitude, and being absolutely dependent on the honesty, or dishonesty, capability or incompetency, &c., of his immediate subordinates for any technical and concomitant advice.

My engineering record is unassailable; the works, successively carried out are an uncompromising refutation of any reflection thereon.

There are no grim spectres, of the victims of faulty structures, to haunt my conscience during the waking hours, or disturb my nightly slumbers.

It is a little over 25 years since I first joined the engineering staff of the Department of Railways and Canals and in the interim, between 1885 and the present time, I have been employed by the department for over 12 years, on very important works, and the blue-books attest the satisfactory manner in which the duties were acquitted. About the beginning of 1890, the Canadian government was requested by the government of the Leeward islands to select a Canadian engineer to take charge of important public works in the latter colony, and the position was offered to and accepted by myself, and I was occupied for a period of six years in carrying out those works.

The records there and at 'Downing Street,' London, flatteringly testify to the success of my administration. And so with railway companies, &c., &c., for which I have worked at different periods.

As an engineer, I consider myself in a superior class to those pigmies around whose heads (for, seemingly, peculiar political reasons, and to cover up blunders) the minister would encircle halos and entwine wreaths of laurel.

The actions of Mr. Butler, with respect to the Newmarket canal reports (as hereinbefore described), were not only discourteous and unbecoming the position which he held, but were, also, unprofessional. However, one could not expect much better from a parvenu whose previous authority was exercised, chiefly over navvies and shanty-men.

The minister, by dissimulation in parliament, promoted the attack on the writer, and cannot evade responsibility therefor. The whole business is reprehensible and savours very much of 'backwoods politics.'

This communication is somewhat prolonged, nevertheless it merely touches the fringe of the subject in review.

The writer has withheld, in reserve, some further interesting matter concerning the Newmarket canal.

In concluding, I recall from 'Dante's Inferno,' the portentous inscription over the portals of hell: 'All hope abandon, ye who enter in,' and consider it would be appropriate to have, suitably engraved, over the entrance to the Department of Railways and Canals (as that department is at present constituted) the significant words:

Abandon principle, and unman yourselves, all engineers who take employment here.

I have the honour to be, Sir,
&c., &c.,
(Sgd.) E J. WALSH, C.E.

I think the report of Mr. Walsh shows that the responsibility for the cost of the Newmarket canal is to be blamed on the present Minister of Railways and Canals. I do not wish to prolong the discussion and I conclude by moving the following resolution:

That all the words after the word 'that' in the proposed motion be struck out and the following be substituted in lieu thereof:

While the growth and development of Canada demand an expenditure of public money which shall at once be far-seeing, systematic and liberal, every such expenditure ought to be designed and carried out in the public interests and not for partisan purposes or for aggrandisement of party followers.

This House regrets that in many cases the government have departed from this wholesome rule and principles and have used and applied public moneys for purposes that were not in the public interest.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH (Minister of Justice). Mr. Speaker, so far as the motion which the hon. gentleman has made is supported by reference to the circumstances of the canal at Newmarket, I ought to be very grateful to him for having again brought the matter to the attention of this House and indirectly to the attention of the country, at all events to the attention of the constituency of North York, at this particular juncture. I am sure the hon. gentleman, if he should happen to have the time would find it very interesting indeed if he would make a little excursion across the boundary between his own constituency and the constituency of North York and make, in that riding, some of the remarks that usually are made when this question of the canal at Newmarket is under discussion in this House. It has been a pleasure to some hon. gentlemen opposite and to the newspapers which support them through the country to connect this work at Newmarket with my name. I have enjoyed the ingenuity and the art of the cartoonists who have amused themselves and their customers by cartoons that have appeared on the subject and I have not in the least failed to appreciate the newspaper remarks that, from time to time, have been made in reference to myself with regard to this canal. But while that is the fact and while, as I have on previous occasions said in this House, I should be very glad if I had any right to take to myself any credit in connection with the construction of the public work in question, the fact remains that I have no such right, and that the hon. gentleman, if any effort was necessary in finding a convenient subject wherewith to waste public time, might quite as well have taken up any other subject which antedated some two or three general elections. This particular question certainly arose before not merely the general elections of 1908 but before the general elections of 1904. At that time I had no idea of entering public life, I had no thought of representing or being a candidate in North York. This public work was undertaken, so far as North York is concerned, in circumstances which have already been detailed, and with which I need not occupy time that is supposed to be of some value to somebody or other, by going over again. There was absolutely nothing political about it and there was, in every sense of the word, as much agitation for the construction of this work and for the government to undertake it, by the leading men among the Conservatives of North York as there was among the Liberals of that riding, and there has from first to last in this matter been no success in the attempt which has been made at different times to give some political aspect to this undertaking. I shall not discuss at all the question of whether or not it was a judicious and advisable thing in 1904 or whenever it was that the resolution of the government to undertake this work was reached. That was long before I came into the government or into this House or had any idea of doing so and that question, I

think has been satisfactorily settled after ample debate by not merely the result of the general elections of 1904 but also by the result of those of 1908. If it pleases the hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Wallace) to seek to thresh out again this venerable and ancient dust heap or to search for the traditional grain of wheat in this pile of chaff—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Hear, hear.

Sir ALLEN AYLESWORTH—which gentlemen who cheer so enthusiastically have tried to construct about this matter, so far as I am concerned, he is entirely welcome to do so. He will be more than welcome within the boundaries of North York, he or any of his colleagues who think there is any political capital in this matter for them; I shall be only too glad to see him or any of my neighbours, if they wish to discuss that subject in North York, and I am only too grateful to the hon. gentleman for having joined that noble brigade of blockers who have impeded the business of this House. I am very glad to be able to tell these gentlemen that it will not be many days before we will bring them to the bar of public opinion for judgment.

Mr. J. A. CURRIE (North Simcoe). This question is not an amusing one, it is a very serious one, and I think it ill becomes the Minister of Justice to call this canal, which is being built in his riding, a dust heap. There is no water, but the grass is growing over the work which has been done, and it would be very absurd to call it a dust heap. I have no doubt, however, that by judicial sprinkling this scheme will germinate and result perhaps in the return of the Minister of Justice again to this House. On three occasions this public work has been used to corrupt the voters of North York, and I say it is too great an expense for this country to bear to secure the return to this House of such men as the Minister of Justice. Just to-day he has stated that hon. members on this side of the House are afraid to go to North York and use the expressions we use in this House in regard to this work. I want to tell the Minister of Justice that on an occasion not very long ago, I happened to be in North York and spoke to an audience of 4,000 people, and I took occasion to characterize this canal in its proper terms, and I can assure you, sir, that the people of North York recognized this work as a great waste of public money and a scandalous shame. Now, the Minister of Justice, after holding his seat in this House by the barefaced use of public money, goes to North York and tells the people that he is not going to be a candidate again, and with a great flourish of trumpets a young lawyer is brought from Toronto, named Robinette, and he is paraded before the electorate, and a stupendous campaign is commenced. After they had been campaigning for two or three months, they discovered that the candidate was not able to carry that riding, and they held another conclave and decided that the Minister of Justice should stand again, if there is an election within the next year, and that Mr. Robinette should retire. I want to tell this House that there is a conscience in the people of North York and the people of Ontario. They are awakening to the knowledge that they have not been getting very much in the shape of public works, or they have been accustomed to see docks built where there is no water, and canals built on top of hills where there is no need. It was a great shock to them to see this canal being built through the town of Newmarket. Why, sir, there is no beginning or end to this canal. As a matter of fact, there is not sufficient water in the neighbourhood to make the canal a success. They have built locks with concrete works and steel bridges, costing $30,000 apiece, according to the report, and what is the use of them? But the people of Ontario are beginning to see through it. The good Scotch and Irish Presbyterian vote which has enabled the prime minister to remain in office here, men of the same race and religion as my-self, these men have always believed the right hon. gentleman, and taken it for granted that he and his party are working for the benefit of the country. The trouble is that they have not hitherto been able to see with their eyes how the public money has been expended; but now they can go and see this Newmarket canal with their own eyes. Throughout the summer people go there in pilgrimages to see this great public work of Ontario; it is something like the Colossus of Rhodes or like the Suez canal, and people go to see it out of curiosity, and they get an object lesson that opens their eyes to the way this government is wasting public money. They are beginning to realize that the government is no longer worthy of their confidence, and hon. gentlemen will find out when the election comes what the voters think of it. The right hon. gentleman may rest assured that so far as the members on this side of the House are concerned, we are very glad to go before the bar of public opinion, and we know very well that the Minister of Justice will be adjudged the culprit; it is his case that is going to be tried, and I am satisfied that the verdict will be one of guilty. The Minister of Justice will find that the constituency of North York cannot be bribed in such a flagrant fashion as he is endeavouring to bribe it.

Now, let us see what there is about this canal. I think the gravest charge that has

ever been made against this government has been made by the engineer who made this report, or who has written this memorandum to the government. I have taken occasion to characterize the work of Mr. Walsh as faulty, I have called attention to the fact that Mr. Walsh did not appear to be doing his duty as a public officer. I could not understand, for instance, why a public work that was estimated to cost $290,000 should, a few months afterwards, be estimated by another engineer to cost over $900,000. I could not understand why, in view of all the traffic that could possibly pass over that canal, such a vast sum of money should be recommended by the engineers to construct it. I could not understand why the first engineer reported favourably, stating that the canal would cost about $300,000, when a few months afterwards it was discovered by another survey and by another engineer that it would cost nearly a million dollars, and when the contracts were let we found as a fact that they did amount to over a million dollars. Now, Mr Walsh has told us the story in this report, he has shown that he was virtually coerced into recommending this work, without any consideration as to whether it would be of any public utility. As far as he was concerned, all he had to do was to figure out the cost of the work. He did not take into consideration the amount of traffic that could be procured for the canal, or what use could ever be made of it. Therefore he reported that the canal would cost a little less than $300,000. But to make a canal that would ostensibly serve election purposes the cost was immediately raised by other officers in the department to nearly a million dollars by putting in the most expensive construction they could, regardless of any possible utility. Why, it is the most absurd thing in the world for any person to say that the Newmarket canal will be of any value to this country commensurate with its cost. There is only a small population, there is only a small area of six by ten miles altogether over which freight can be carried by this canal. East of it there is a heavy rise of nearly 200 feet, and no one is going to bring stuff over that height of 200 feet to get into the valley where this canal is built. On the westward there is another mountain rising 200 feet and no one would bring freight over that 200 feet in order to take it four or five miles to Lake Simcoe by canoe when there is a shorter cut down the valley which can be used. In order to serve a small valley in Ontario something like six miles wide by ten or twelve miles long, already served by two lines of railway with communication in every way and where a government road has been in existence since 1808, the government undertake an expenditure of public money to the amount of close upon $1,000,000. It ill becomes the Minister of Justice to rise in his seat and say a word about that canal. He of all people should hide his diminished head in that respect. Whenever he appears on the public platform he has not the manliness to say: Well, the thing was commenced and I have recommended its continuance in order that something may be accomplished with it. Instead of that he is always trying to crawl under the ermine of a high court judge of Ontario, trying to hide his head and get out of it by saying: I am not to blame. The expenditure which was authorized at the instance of Sir William Mulock was very small indeed, and the work could readily have been stopped if it were found not to be a public utility when Sir William Mulock left this House and remained in retirment owing to illness for some time until he went upon the bench. It is very unmanly for any one who has been befriended as the Minister of Justice has been by Sir William Mulock, the man who gave him his seat as a free gift, to turn around and endeavour to place blame upon him. Sir William Mulock has very many friends on both sides of politics in Ontario. We always considered him a kind and companionable man who was constantly thinking out good schemes for the benefit of the public at large. It is well known that his opinion on the question of public utilities drove him out of this House and out of the government, and for the man who was befriended by him, the man whom he placed in office, the man to whom he gave the riding of North York, virtually a pocket riding, to turn around in this House and cast aspersions upon him——

Mr. LANCASTER. After he had been rejected by Durham——

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). After he had been beaten in the constituency which he chose to think he could carry on his own personality——

Mr. HUGHES. He never gave them that clock either.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Then he made the people of Durham a promise that he would provide them with a public clock, but he has not carried out that promise, in that respect being unlike the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. King), who has seen to it that a clock was provided for the people of his constituency. But there is a clock going to strike in a short time, and that clock is going to ring out the old regime of which one of the most brilliant examples is the Minister of Justice. The question of the cost of this canal has been brought to our attention by the report that has been given to this House by Mr. Walsh. Mr. Walsh was very deeply touched by some remarks I made

in this House on a previous occasion. I cast aspersions upon his work as an engineer and I think I was amply justified in doing so. But, I am willing to accept Mr. Walsh's explanation. Mr. Walsh has been an engineer of standing in various parts of the world, and no doubt he is a better engineer than any of those that were over him or who have superseded him. His own report shows that. I am willing to accept that explanation, but the red line that runs all through that memorandum of his is that it is not the independent opinion of the engineer who gives his services to the Department of Public Works or the Department of Railways and Canals that is wanted. That is a disgraceful condition. What safety is there for the people of this country? We can all understand how it was that the Quebec bridge fell. He has so stated it there. The engineering was not done in accordance with the views of the engineers. The work of the engineering staff is made subservient to political purposes. What can you expect? Can you not expect that docks will go off down the river, as the dock went floating down the river at Sorel, that bridges will fall, as the Quebec bridge fell, that towers will tumble the same as the Laurier tower tumbled? What else can you expect when the men whose professional services are required are not at liberty to express their views and when all they have to do is to draw pictures on paper and endeavour to plan works in such a way as to suit the political exigencies of the occasion and in order to save the political lives of the friends of this government? Now, let us see; I pointed out on a previous occasion that this work was not finished. Mr. Walsh has some opinions on this question, and they are good as far as they go, but he is not infallible. He points out here, for instance, that the dredging that was done in Holland river was done with a suction dredge. In that he was mistaken. The kind of dredge they endeavoured to employ for that work was exactly the same kind of a dredge that he had recommended, but they have been unable to do any dredging in the Holland river, and the only motor boat that has run up and down the Holland river is now pulled up on shore, and was not painted or launched this year. There has been nothing done on the Holland river, no attempt made to deepen or straighten the channel, or do any kind of work because there will have to be an expensive dredge built there, but nobody has taken on the work, and it looks as if the government were afraid to let the contract or continue the work. An hon. minister the other night said that a chain is just as weak as its weakest link. This canal will disclose its weakness if nothing else will disclose it by its weakest link.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe).

Mr. LANCASTER. Is it long enough to hide the Niobe?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). I think that you could put all the water in that canal in the hold of one of the Dreadnoughts, and I do not think you would need to start the pumps. There will not be enough water in these ditches to enable the government to lock five motor boats through a day and still maintain the water supply. That is one of the reasons why the Minister of Justice feels so very sore about this work. Great enormous steel bridges have been built. There have been thousands of dollars' worth of work done where the grass is growing to-day, and as far as I can see the work is of no utility. I think that nearly all the farms in New York have been called upon to supply field stone for the work. I do not know how much the farmers get; I suppose they are pretty well paid for it, and they are now looking around to see if they can get some form of stone they can sow over spring or every time an election is coming on so that they can get a fresh crop of stone with which to supply that canal. There is no end to the expenditure of money and the expenditure of that money is entirely useless as far as I can see. The work so far is travelling towards the lake. It has now reached almost as far down as Holland Landing, but there are four or five miles more of work to be completed before they will get to the lake. I would be the last man in the world to say or do anything to interfere with any industry in the town of Newmarket.

No one would say there was any chance of that canal aiding or assisting any industry in Newmarket. Then again take the expenditures from year to year upon this canal by this government. I am satisfied that within the next two or three months 500 or 600 men will be placed at work on that canal in order to make the seat safe for the Minister of Justice. There is no necessity in the world for this expenditure of money, and there is no chance of the Minister of Justice being returned to this House, because the voters in North York have decided that they are not going to be held up to the scorn of the whole country for the sake of sending a Minister of Justice down here who encourages a work like that Newmarket canal.

Year before last something like $82,000 was expended on this work. There was not much done on it that year, and there is no doubt that the work will be continued as long as this government is in office; year after year and month after month, and especially in election years, great work will be done on that canal; it will be one of the most important works in this country.

Mr. LANCASTER. None after this year.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). No, because after there is a change of government the work will be finished; Laurier's work will be finished, and especially this canal. Last year $120,000 was expended by one department on this canal, but you can go along the canal for seven or eight miles and hardly see a man working on it. I do not know if men are on the pay-roll who are not working there, but I know there is a large expenditure of public moneys, and that every one in the province of Ontario treats this whole thing as a great big joke. It is believed that the government is doing work that is unnecessary, and that the efforts of every minister in this House are directed not to giving good service to the country, but to seeing that they are returned to office and they endeavour to spend as much money as they can in their own particular ridings. The minister had a dinner of some kind in North York. The member for South Essex went up there and told the assembled Grits that he had looked over that canal, and he did not like to express any opinion upon it, but he thought that any constituency that would send such an able man as the Minister of Justice to Ottawa should have a great deal of public money spent in it. That is a new code of political ethics, wider than ever; it is a case of wider open and spend all the money you can when you send a good man like the Minister of Justice to Ottawa. I should like to read the opinion expressed by the Liberal candidate in Centre York, Mr. Dewart, of the Minister of Justice, which is very amusing, but I have not the extract with me at present.

In Mr. Walsh's report, which has been placed before the House, reference is made to the close connection between the Minister of Railways and a certain gentleman named Lott.

Mr. LANCASTER. Who is Lott?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). Mr. Lott is a fugitive from justice.

An hon. MEMBER. A Grit?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). A Grit, in fact he was a Grit candidate in one of the ridings in eastern Ontario. One Saturday night he went across the river to the United States, and some time during the night smuggled across that river into Canada a number of ballot boxes with secret bottoms. In that he was aided and abetted by an official of this government who served a term for doing this work and, according to the evidence of Mr. Lott, the man he seemed to draw his light and his leading from on that occasion as well as on this occasion, referred to in the report, was the Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Graham). I am sorry that minister is not in the House, as I would like to pass up a few compliments to him and tell him what the people of Ontario think of him, how, as the chief of the Grit machine in our province, he is looked upon as one of the most dangerous men in political life in Canada, and that as the last of that old brigade they are going to see that he and his machine are crushed in this election as they were at the last local election in Ontario eight years ago, when the people showed that they had done with the Minister of Railways and his fellows, and were tired of this political scullduggery, as the Minister of the Interior would say. But they find on all hands the same thing going on as was going on previous to 1904; the same old story is told; the same old machine is at work. The expenditures of the country and the work of government are conducted more in the interest of a single party than of the public. The public are going to take their revenge, they are going to get even with the Minister of Railways for his political peccadilloes; they are going to see that the machine which he has been oiling up for the last two or three years—and his present absence from the House is probably to put some oil on the wheels—is smashed. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Railways will find that the people of Ontario will no longer put up with anything of that kind. They have tired of these political heelers, it is about time that we should have in Canada a government like the one we now have in the province of Ontario, a government that is fair and square and honest and above board, that deals with all people who come before it in one way, irrespective of whether they are Conservatives or Liberals. Let us see what the resolution says, and we will find whether the House is justified in voting for it or not. The resolution reads:

> While the growth and development of Canada demand an expenditure of public money which shall at once be far-seeing, systematic and liberal, every such expenditure ought to be designed and carried out in the public interests and not for partisan purposes or for aggrandisement of party followers.

That is a great principle for which the Conservative party will have no hesitation in voting. This government do not ask themselves: Is this going to be in the interest of Canada? The only question asked by hon. gentlemen from what I have learned, is: Is this going to help the party? The second part of the resolution reads:

> This House regrets that in many cases the government have departed from this wholesome rule and principles and have used and applied public moneys for purposes that were not in the public interest.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). What had Byron O. Lott to do with the canal?

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). The hon. member for Centre York (Mr. Wallace) read that part along with the rest of this return of correspondence of E. J. Walsh and the minister of the Department of Railways and Canals in regard to the Newmarket canal. At page 24 and 25, it says:

The only approach to politics was in connection with a certain appointment to the survey parties, wherein I was officially instructed to apply to the person controlling the 'patronage' for any local appointment; when, for instance, the party was being organized for the survey of the Trent canal route from Rice lake to Trenton, in October, 1904, I was told to apply to Hon. G. P. Graham of Brockville ('organizer of the Liberal party for eastern Ontario'); and having done so was referred by him to Messrs. D. O. Lott, of Anson, Ont., and John Douglas, of Warkworth, Ont., Liberal candidate for West Hastings and East Northumberland, respectively, &c.

Here we have the grand sultan of the party, who dispenses the patronage, the Liberal organizer for eastern Ontario, the Hon. G. P. Graham. And here is his grand vizier, Byron O. Lott, who is now a fugitive from justice for bringing into this country bogus ballot boxes and endeavouring to steal the franchise of the people. When the people, and especially the people of Ontario, vote upon the record of this government, they will have in mind this famous Newmarket canal, and will deal out to the Minister of Justice the justice to which he is entitled. And I feel confident that the verdict will be 'guilty,' and there will be no recommendation to mercy.

At one o'clock the House took recess.

The House resumed at three o'clock.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). When the House rose, I was referring to the question of the influence and the work of the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), and was giving a brief biography of his political life. It would not be fitting did I not add a gem to the collection, which has been presented to the public in the form of a letter written by Mr. H. H. Dewart, entitled "The Political Situation—A Study in Cause and Effect." This letter appeared in the 'Toronto Globe' of Wednesday, April 27, 1910. Mr. Dewart is a colleague of the honourable Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth), and he is to be a candidate,—yes, and a victim, in Central York. He was one of the disgruntled members of the Liberal party, and on this occasion he broke loose, somewhat violently, in the columns of the 'Globe,' and in the course of his letter, he paid his compliments to the Minister of Justice. I do not think I can do better than place on record what Mr. Dewart has to say of the Minister of Justice. I will not read the beginning of the article, because it has no reference to the Minister, but I will take it up where he begins to speak of my hon. friend:

Yet the Liberal party in Ontario to-day, while strong in its constructive policy, is lamentably weak in the matter of organization. Take the district of which the city of Toronto is the centre. Of sporadic and spasmodic activity at election times we have plenty; of the systematic organization that results in local educational work we have next to nothing. Victories cannot be won by shouting and bustling about for four weeks before an election. We need the organized and constant application of directed energies. Now, with regard to the men who have done their best to galvanize the Liberal workers into an organization at election times and who have accepted office in the Toronto Reform association, often against their will and at considerable personal sacrifice, I protest against their being pilloried now. They have done their best. The fault does not lie with them. They have done wonders in a centre of active Conservative organization and society influence like Toronto.

Where then must the responsibility be laid? It must surely be laid at the door of those ministers of the Crown who have failed to provide the directing power. A commander in chief, even if he be as brilliant and skilful as Sir Wilfrid Laurier undoubtedly is, cannot be expected to achieve the success that he should without able tacticians between himself and the men in the ranks. Hon. Charles Murphy and Hon. Mackenzie King have not had a chance to earn their spurs as organizers, but they will be expected to do so It is a notorious fact that in the campaign of 1908 there was not a solitary minister of the Crown in the province of Ontario west of Brockville who was of the least value to the Liberal organization as an informing, energizing or directing force. In the Toronto district our only representative in the Commons is the Minister of Justice. None of our six senators can now be reckoned on in the matter of organization.

We find a different state of affairs in the provinces to the east. Their ministers of the Crown, and even senators, not only perform their administrative and parliamentary duties as well, but also take charge of their districts, feel the pulse of the people, bring informed minds to the consideration of political issues and see that the latent forces of Liberalism are brought into a political organization that means something. Analyse the returns in the province of Quebec and you will see that behind the personality of Sir Wilfrid there is the organized effort that spells out success in close ridings.

Constituencies in western Ontario can figure out this problem for themselves and make their own application. But I know that in the city of Toronto and surrounding ridings we have suffered and are suffering as a party because the minister who is supposed to represent this district is not a political force or even a factor in organization. A district or even a constituency may be lost if featherweight advisers are the main sources

from which knowledge of political conditions is derived. The local minister should be at least the mouthpiece through which the political views or needs of the district are expressed. There are important views relating to the immigration policy, as it affects us locally, to be expressed. Large questions relating to the expenditure of moneys on public works have to be considered. Other departmental matters of importance require solution. The consideration locally that these matters have received and to which they are entitled is due in nearly every instance to the direct representations made by active Liberal workers to the minister in charge of the department interested. Surely the public at large are justified in expecting the directing force of the Minister of Justice in these matters of local policy, just as much as Liberals are in matters of political organization. If our policy is sound and our views are right, as we believe them to be, the party leader who sees to it that organized effort and wise direction are brought to bear to achieve success performs a public as well as a party service.

I am not now entering into the arena to discuss the rightness or wrongness of the attitude of the Minister of Justice regarding matters that more particularly concern his own department. No one questions his pre-eminence as leader at the bar of the province or his comprehensive knowledge of the difficult problems of law it has been his duty to consider. The Minister of Justice can maintain and justify his opinions on these matters, stubbornly if need be, and no man better than he. But in view of his recent declaration that he is a 'partisan,' by which I understand him to mean a man of party views in the best sense, every party man has the right to ask why the Minister of Justice does not give effective party service. I maintain that we have the right, both from the political and public point of view, on the ground that I have pointed out, to receive effective direction in public matters and organizing ability in party business from those who are chosen the responsible ministers of the Crown. I have hesitated for some time before expressing these views, but some one should speak out, even at the risk of incurring hostile criticism.

The history of Canada, even since confederation, is not without its political lessons. Sir John Macdonald retained weaklings in his cabinet that no party could successfullly carry after his decease. Even strong men in the province of Ontario made the fatal mistake of failing to introduce much-needed new blood in time to avert a fatal ending. Politics, after all, should be like any other business in life. It is imperative that the fittest should survive. The country is entitled to the best service of the best men, and political prescience as well as sound executive ability is needed.

That is the opinion of Mr. Dewart on the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth). I hope the hon. minister likes it.

I might say that recently the hon. minister decided to retire from public life altogether, but a change has come over the spirit of his dreams, and now he seeks to tempt the fates again, and to test the oracle in North York. I want to tell him that when he does so at the coming election, he will find the answer will be that they do not want to have any more to do with a man of his capacity, narrowness of mind and meanness of spirit.

If the Minister of Justice had had the fairness politically, and the honesty to stand up and take his share of blame for this Newmarket canal instead of seeking to pass the odium on to a man whose shoe laces he is not fit to fasten, like Sir William Mulock, I think even the best sports in North York would be willing to give him some support; but seeing that he is doing nothing but crawling on the question, and at the same time spending vast sums of money there to secure votes, the best minds in that riding are against him, and will record their verdict against him on election day. We all know that in ancient times public men sought public favour by the erection of enormous works of art and beauty with which their names would be forever associated. I would refer to the great monuments of Egypt, the public arches, and other works of art in the ancient city of Rome, and the great works in Constantinople. But I have also observed that the great men who have erected those notable public works with which their names have been associated went down into their own pockets and paid for them. Here we find a new rule on the part of the ministers of the Crown in Canada. They make the public pay for these monuments. The name of the Minister of Justice will go down to posterity associated with a great public work of no use whatever, except as a monument and which will for all time be known as the Great Aylesworth Ditch.

Mr. SAMUEL SHARPE (Ontario). I am sure we are all greatly interested in the remarks of the Minister of Justice, in whose constituency this famous canal has been constructed. It seems extraordinary that any gentleman who dares to discuss this extraordinary expenditure in the country or in the House is termed a member of the Blockers' Brigade. Blockers of what? Blockers of reciprocity? Well, while I have not much solicitude for the health of the present administration, I would suggest that if they do not shortly dissolve the House there will be less sentiment for reciprocity in the country than there is water in the Newmarket canal. The Minister of Justice stated that the opponents of the present administration were afraid to go to the constituency of North York and denounce this gigantic farce, the Newmarket canal. If he had been present at Herbert Lennox's picnic where 18,000 to 20,000 people were assembled he would have heard various speakers condemn this monumental folly of the present administration. Everybody knows

that this canal is not a commercial enterprise. It was organized purely for political purposes. The people would never have heard of the canal had it not been that Herbert Lennox defeated Hon. E. J. Davis, a member of the provincial government when Mr. Davis' normal majority was 700 or 800. When Mr. Lennox succeeded in redeeming that old reform riding of North York in the Conservative cause, then they had to devise means for spending the people's money in order to preserve the constituency to the ranks of the Liberal party. The clouds were gathering and the Liberal party workers in North York had to exercise their brains to devise means of spending the people's money in order to keep the old reform constituency of North York in the party lines. Everybody knows it was not a commercial but a political public work, and we find that notwithstanding the money that was spent in that connectioi, public opinion had become aroused over the matter, that the reform party, instead of gaining strength, is going back in that constituency not alone on account of the strong sentiment against reciprocity, but on account of this illegal, extravagant and criminal expenditure on this public work. When the Minister of Justice announced his withdrawal from public life, and said he would not likely be a candidate in the next election, the executive of North York met and selected Mr. T. C. Robinette, a defeated candidate in Toronto and an ex-candidate in Centre York, but they found the sentiment in connection with this illegal expenditure and on reciprocity so strong that they had to drop Mr. Robinette, and they had to trot out the old war horse again, and keep the Minister of Justice in harness in the vain hope, and expectation of still holding that old time constituency of North York which has a normal Liberal majority of 700 or 800. Now, we find that Mr. Robinette has been side-tracked, he is not a strong enough candidate, and I venture the opinion that even such a prominent man as the Minister of Justice in harness in the vain hope position, with all the laurels he has won in public life, according to the story of his friends, and the expenditure of a great deal of money, weighted down by the opprobium of the Newmarket canal, and the unpopularity of reciprocity, has not the slightest hope of retaining that constituency which will be redeemed in the next election by a young Conservative candidate named Armstrong. The expenditure on the Newmarket canal is condemned not alone in this House, but on every public platform in York. Does anyone imagine for a moment that the hon. member for Centre York would dare to move a resolution condemning this expenditure in his own county if it was of any use to the people? The mere fact that he brought in a resolution condemning the government in connection with this expenditure proves conclusively that the expenditure is improper, and contrary to the public interest. We have no less a person than Mr. Archie Campbell, former member for Centre York, and now senator, at a Liberal convention in 1909 condemning this expenditure in no measured terms. What did Mr. Campbell say:

> Some of the money was probably not expended in the best interests, he said, speaking generally.
>
> The Conservatives point to the canal at Newmarket and call it the 'Aylesworth ditch' and say it is monstrous.
>
> I'm free to say that if this should take place now, and with the knowledge that we have now, we probably would not have gone into it.

What kind of administration is it that will launch the country on an expenditure of from one to two million dollars, burdening this country annually with a charge of $100,000 or $150,000 without first getting an estimate as to the expenditure on a public nuisance such as this? It has been suggested by an hon. member that the Newmarket canal will be a very appropriate grave in which to bury the Minister of Justice at the next general election. This report of the meeting at which Mr. Campbell condemned the moral illegality of this expenditure continues:

> And Mr. T. C. Robinette was there, and Dr. McLean, ex-M.P., was there, and Mr. F. G. Inwood, Liberal organizer was there, and fifty other Liberals were there, and not a man said him nay, and no sound of the waters rushing through the Newmarket canal was heard in the land.

One of the most serious aspects, and features in connection with this monstrosity is seen when you consider the damages which were paid, and the expenditures from year to year. The expenditures, unlike the water in the Newmarket canal, ebb and flow, not with the tide, but with the dates of the elections.

We find in April, 1908, in which year the election was held, that the money spent amounted to $400; in May, $10,000; in June, $2,000; in July, $10,000; in August, $10,000. Then when the election approached we have in September an expenditure of $26,000, and in October, the month in which the election was held, $43,000; in November it drops to $22,000, and in December still further to $20,000. This absolutely improper undertaking cannot be characterized by any other terms than as a great breach of trust on the part of the administration. They are supposed to be administering the affairs of this country in the interest of the people, not in the in-

terest of their political followers. But we find in connection with the land damages that the greatest injustice is being done, not only to the people of this country by the excessive payments made for the land but by the political partisanship that characterized the assessment of these damages. We find the political supporters and workers of the government are receiving excessive amounts for their lands, whereas Conservatives are receiving infinitessimally small amounts. There is not the slightest doubt, in the light of the report of the engineer read by the hon. member for Centre York, that there ought to be a commission of investigation appointed to bring out the true inwardness of this whole rotten institution. I find, in speaking of the ebb and flow, not of the water in the canal but in the expenditures from year to year, that in June 12, 1908, the deputy minister of Railways and Canals, Mr. Butler, writes to A. J. Grant, superintending engineer, and wants to know if he has made any soundings to see if there is any water for the canal. Whoever heard tell of a government beginning a great public work by the construction of a canal, spending thousands and thousands and thousands of dollars before they ascertain whether there is going to be any water to supply the canal?

Dear Mr. Grant,—What gaugings have you for the water supply for the Newmarket canal? If you have not already taken a number, I would like you to run a series of them over the whole of this season to make sure of the water supply that will be available on that canal.

This was months after the work had been inaugurated and expenses incurred on this farcical undertaking. Then we have Mr. Grant's report of June 17, 1908, which is a marvel of its kind. He says:

Water measurements taken during 1907, south of Newmarket, on the east branch of the Holland river: July, 369 cubic feet per minute; August, 315; September, 654; October, 477; November, 885.

Now when you consider that the average water wagon that is driven on the streets contains about 150 gallons of water, you can imagine the terrific force of this current. So much for these reports, so much for this business administration, and so much for the quality of statesmanship that we see exhibited, the same kind as we have seen exhibited in the negotiations for reciprocity with the United States. If this is a sample of the business acumen which characterizes the present administration, no wonder the people suspect the reciprocity pact. I would respectfully suggest to the Minister of Public Works, to the Minister of Railways and Canals, to the Minister of Finance, and even to the Prime Minister himself, that it would be a splendid diversion if they would organize a picnic up there, and take the whole House of Commons up to the Newmarket canal in order to exhibit this great public work. I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the members would not require long rubber boots, nor life preservers, nor even bathing suits, because there is not sufficient water in that canal with which they may even moisten their lips. Such an excursion would relieve the weariness of our efforts here, and give us a day of needed recreation. And while the members of the House of Commons who participated in that excursion would not find any water, or any prospects of traffic, they would see stone heaps. They would see no stones on the farms adjoining this canal, because they have all been purchased within a radius of twenty-five miles, at so much per cord, and piled up along the canal, purchased during election time. It has been suggested that this bulwark of stones was placed along the canal in order to prevent it from floating away. I do not, however, attribute that motive to those who purchased the stone, but I do say that if the members of this House will take the trouble to go there they will see municipal steel bridges constructed in the different municipalities on the roads adjoining the Newmarket canal. Why the necessity for municipal bridges? Do these municipalities want public money spent to relieve them from building their own bridges? They were built in conjunction with the canal, although not necessary for the canal. These bridges were constructed for the benefit of the various municipalities, three or four beautiful bridges, beautiful in design, beautiful in structure, beautiful iron bridges, which cost upward of $30,000 each. That is the reason why this expenditure has been incurred, in order that the people residing in that constituency might be relieved of their proper and reasonable expenditure on their own public undertakings.

I said that I was going to say something about the land damages. I have a report in my hand made by a reporter of a Toronto newspaper who went up to Newmarket to investigate the conditions surrounding this canal. It is dated June 9, and he says:

When the happenings of the federal elections last October were being chronicled, North York was not given the attention that it warranted. Perhaps it was because there were over 200 others in Canada at the time that a most interesting side line of Hon. A. B. Aylesworth's campaign was overlooked. This was unfortunate, as it threw a strong light on the kindly, helpful impulses that determines the conduct of the Minister of Justice in those days of political stress.

Speaking of land damages and prices paid for holdings along the canal banks, he says:

Sometimes they were prompted to soothe the damaged feelings by recompensing the owner for his loss by allowing him as much for twenty acres as he had paid for eighty.

And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the damages were assessed by two partisan political supporters of the Minister of Justice. They went from place to place, from farm to farm awarding damages, and one of them was the defeated candidate. The defeated candidate had the cheques with him, I presume with a view to influencing the owners of property before they received their cheques. One man who had thirty acres received more than double what he paid for it, clearing $1,500.

Feelings seemed to rule, and so it is not surprising that when some Conservatives were being dealt with, try as they would, generosity could not be called so suddenly into play. They had to struggle against life long convictions, many of them longer, for they were hereditary.

Accordingly it happened that when the farms of Mr. W. C. Howard, one of the most prominent of Liberal workers, and Mr. Henry Hulse, one of the most prominent Conservative workers, stood side by side, the damages must needs be different. For 18.97 acres Mr. Howard's damages were set at $1,725; for 20.07 acres, Mr. Hulse's, at $300. Mr. Howard accepted his award, Mr. Hulse did not.

The Liberal received about six times more for his holding than the Conservative was offered for about the same area.

Herein might the moralist find a text to discourse upon the painful strength that party affiliations exert upon the conduct of human beings.

And so on. There are other examples to which I would direct the attention of the House as they are most interesting. The Toronto 'News' sent its reporter out and he made several reports. He said that the valuators were either dishonest or the assessors wrong.

Startling Difference in Official Evidence of Value of Land.

Here are some of the comparisons.

Below are given some of the assessment figures with the price paid by the government valuators:

	No. acres.	Value.
Sarah Deene—		
Assessment..	216	$7,900
Sold for right of way.	40.2	5,000
J. W. Bramner—		
Assessment..	60	2,300
Sold for right of way.	6.26	812
Mrs. E. Bramner—		
Assessment..	88	2,700
Sold for right of way.	5.92	600

The next is Mr. C. E. Lundy, and this is a most remarkable case. Mr. C. E. Lundy who was one of the assessors appointed to fix the values of land and the damages in respect to other people's property received an extraordinary price for his property and an extraordinary amount for his damages. They called in an engineer of the engineering department to fix the value of his land and estimate the damages in respect to his property. I direct your attention to the extraordinary figures:

C. E. Lundy—	No. acres.	Value.
Assessment..	34	$ 500
Sold for right of way.	26.1	3,100

Can you imagine such a state of affairs existing? Is in any wonder that this paper is characterizing the valuator's conduct as being dishonest or the municipality's assessor as being wrong in his assessment? Mr. Lundy, one of the party workers in North York and one of the assessors to assess the damages and fix the value of the land of other parties, has 34 acres upon which he is assessed $500, and he sold for the right-of-way 26 acres and received $3,100 for those 26 acres.

	No. acres.	Value.
Mary Williams and W. C. Howard—		
Assessment..	166	200
Sold for right of way.	20.2	2,400
Frank Kelly—		
Assessment..	95	3,000
Sold for right of way.	16.07	2,000
Henry Hulse—		
Assessment..	166	6,000
Sold for right of way.	20.2	2,000
John Ritchie—		
Assessment..	8	400
Sold for right of way.	6.9	1,200

This gentleman has eight acres assessed for $400 but he sells for right-of-way, and the cheques are delivered on the eve of election 6·9 acres for $1,200. Can language be found that is adequate to characterize such administration? The expenditure is monstrous and the work is a gigantic farce. I had occasion upon the date of Mr. Lennox's picnic in the constituency of North York to characterize it as a gigantic farce. It is nothing short of criminal. I could show instance after instance where you have the same kind of political partisanship characterizing the assessors in their assessment of land damages and land values. But, I think, Mr. Speaker, the last stage of public condemnation is reached when the newspaper men start to write limericks about any undertaking. Public opinion upon being aroused finds expression in various ways but the last ditch is reached—

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Mr. SHARPE (Ontario)—the last ditch is reached when the writers commence to pen limericks:

A dear little maiden named Sal
Strolled along the Newmarket canal.
She fell in with a thud,
And stuck fast in the mud,
That smothered the life out of Sal.

Mr. W. H. SHARPE (Lisgar). Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to say anything on this subject, but if the Minister of Public Works had been in his place I would like to have asked him a few questions in connection with some public works in Western Canada. In 1904 they started to build a wharf at St. Laurent in the province of Manitoba and I would like to know why this work was started. I would like to know how many people it will serve or who will be benefited by it in any way, shape or form. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in connection with this matter of the Aylesworth ditch as it has been gone into very fully, but there were a few remarks dropped by the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) in connection with the impending elections. He grew very furious, made a very vicious threat across the floor of the House, and said that in a very few days we would be face to face with the people of Canada. I suppose he meant by that that we would be brought to an account before public opinion throughout Canada. I wish to say a few words in connection with Western Canada. I do believe that if the idea of the right hon. First Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) had prevailed in the Cabinet, and that at the moment this reciprocity question was launched they had gone to the people they would have swept western Canada, but I want to tell the government to-day that after the people of western Canada have heard the other side of the question we from western Canada are ready for the fight at any time. I have no hesitation in predicting right now that in so far as western Canada, and in so far as the western members are concerned west of the lakes, we will come back with a bigger majority than we have at the present time.

Mr. FIELDING. Mr. Speaker, Canada is a big country, and when public works are being carried on in different parts of the country it is not possible that every member of parliament or every minister of the Crown can have a personal knowledge of them. So I must frankly say that I have no personal knowledge about the Newmarket canal. I do not rise for the purpose of attempting to contribute to the House any information based upon my own knowledge. I only rise for the purpose of placing on 'Hansard' one or two newspaper extracts. We have been allowing our hon. friends opposite, or they have been claiming, the privilege of occupying very many hours in delving into the newspapers in the library and perhaps, that being the case, they will not object if I should occupy about five minutes as the result of a similar study.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No objection.

Mr. FIELDING. I am obliged to my hon. friends. The complaint about the Newmarket canal is not merely that too much money has been spent, or that some one got too much money for his land, but that the canal never should have been constructed. And to use the words of one hon. gentleman opposite: it was simply a scheme of the Liberal workers of North York to keep the Liberals in power. Now, I hold in my hand an extract from the Toronto 'Globe.'

An hon. MEMBER. That's good.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, it's very good.

An hon. MEMBER. Hang on to it.

Mr. FIELDING. The 'Globe' will do some hanging for my hon. friend.

Mr. SCHAFFNER. It tried to hang the Hudson Bay railway.

Mr. FIELDING. If my hon. friend will be patient, the 'Globe' will help him through in that. This extract is from the Toronto 'Globe,' February 23, 1905. The first head line is: 'For the Waterway.' The second heading is 'North York Deputation Interview the Government,' 'Advantages of the Scheme ably Presented,' 'The bcon of Competition in Rates.'

An hon. MEMBER. Where to?

Mr. FIELDING. I will give the hon. gentleman the information later, but just now I am only reading what the 'Globe' reporter says.

Mr. LANCASTER. Did the 'Globe' editor write that at Washington?

Mr. FIELDING. That was not when the editor of the 'Globe' was doing good work in Washington, but he does good work in many places.

Mr. LANCASTER. Most of it in Washington.

Mr. FIELDING. If the hon. gentleman will not interrupt me I will continue. If we must waste time, I suppose it might as well be done by interrupting. This dispatch to the 'Globe' from Ottawa is dated 22nd February, 1905, and it says:

> The claims of the townships and municipalities of the northern portion of the county of York and of the county of Simcoe adjacent to the Holland river to have the Trent Valley canal system extended, were presented to the government this morning. The interview took place in the Railway Committee room, and was filled by the thoroughly representative deputation representing the Trent Valley Canal Extension Association. The following gentlemen composed the deputation:—H. S. Cane, President of the Association, Newmarket; F. T. Daville, Vice-President, Mayor, Aurora.

I am sure that gentleman is not one of the Liberal workers of North York. Then

there is the name of 'T. H. Brunton, secretary-treasurer, Newmarket.' The same may be said of Mr. Brunton, I am told. However, without going into the names of these gentlemen individually, I am assured that many whose names I am about to read are leading, prominent, and highly respectable Conservatives of the Constituency of North York.

Mr. LANCASTER. You've got into good company for once.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, and they will be in good company when they vote for reciprocity. Then come the names: 'W. H. Fleury, ex-mayor, Aurora; L. L. Hartman, ex-warden county of York.'

An hon. MEMBER. Another good Grit.

Mr. FIELDING. Yes, there are a lot of good Grits amongst these. If any hon. friend thinks I am representing all these as Tories, he is mistaken. We do not imagine for a moment that the people of North York are all Liberals, but in view of the statement that this canal is a rascally work and never should have been undertaken and that it was only promoted by the Grits of North York for political purposes, I want to read the names of the representative body which waited on the government to urge the construction of the work.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the report say or do you state that that deputation came to Ottawa to ask for the canal as it is built to-day?

Mr. FIELDING. What I say is that this deputation was the foundation of the proposal for the construction of the Newmarket canal. This shows how the government were induced to take up the work of constructing a canal at Newmarket.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). That report is what may be called a 'phoney' report, because it contains the name of Conservatives who were not there at all and amongst them the name of Mr. Lennox, the member for South Simcoe. That was read in the House before and it was shown that it was not correct.

Mr. FIELDING. I made no mention of the name of the hon. member for South Simcoe.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). It is there.

Mr. FIELDING. I don't think it is there.

Mr. LENNOX. I don't think it is.

Mr. FIELDING. I think the last name I read was 'L. L. Hartman, ex-warden of the county of York.'

An hon. MEMBER. He is a Grit.

Mr. FIELDING. All honour to him for his good sense. The next name is the name of a gentleman who I believe is not a Grit. He is 'T. H. Lennox, M.P.P.,' and I am told he represents the county in the Ontario legislature.

Mr. HUGHES. Having defeated several Grits.

Mr. FIELDING. I presume Mr. T. H. Lennox is the gentleman who has been honourably mentioned in this debate to-day as the gentleman who correctly represents public opinion in the North York.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the report say he was an 'M.P.P.' then?

Mr. FIELDING. It says so, whether correctly or not. Mr. Lennox appeared with this deputation.

An hon. MEMBER. What did he ask?

Mr. FIELDING. We will come to that later on. Then I find these names: 'Councillors—L. A. Wilson, Charles Webster, John Knowles, W. J. Bassitt, W. C. Towns, Messrs. W. Baldwin, D. A. Radcliffe, Aurora; Hon. E. J. Davis.' I don't think Mr. Davis is a Conservative. Mr. Davis is a Liberal, but strange to say he has been frequently cited by hon. gentlemen on the other side in recent discussion, which goes to show that they consider the opinion of Mr. E. J. Davis of exceptional value. I presume they think that Mr. Davis was a gentleman well qualified to be present with this deputation.

Mr. CURRIE (Simcoe). He is against the government now.

Mr. FIELDING. And being against the government now hon. gentlemen opposite have nothing but praise for him. There was a time when he was associated with the Liberal government of Ontario, and these gentlemen were not throwing any praise at him then.

Mr. LANCASTER. He saw the error of his ways.

Mr. FIELDING. Then follow the names of. 'Mayor Roadhouse, Councillors B. W. Hunter, T. Somerville, Newmarket, C. E. Lundy, Newmarket.'

Mr. HUGHES. They are all voting Tory now.

Mr. FIELDING. Then come the names of 'J. W. Wildman;' is he a Grit?

Mr. LANCASTER. He must be with that name.

Mr. HUGHES. A number of these gentlemen were Liberals at the time, but I am happy to say they are all voting Conservative now.

Mr. FIELDING. That only shows the generosity of the Liberal government in responding to the wishes of these gentlemen irrespective of their political leanings. Let me continue the names:

—A. W. Evans, R. H. Brimson, L. Cane, J. R. Y. Broughton, E. S. Cane, T. C. Watson, Dr. A. Webb, Robt. Schmidt, G. S. Richardson, Wm. Keith, A. E. Widdifield, W. W. Bruce, C. G. Ross, bankers; Lieut.-Col. Lloyd, Wm. Hill, T. H. Lloyd, barrister; J. E. Hughes, N. L. Rogers, Newmarket; T. H. Legge, reeve, and councillors R. W. Phillips, S. Armitage, A. McMurchy, John Wells, King township; A. McCallum, Jos. Rogers, county councillors, King township; R. Soules, reeve, Whitchurch; S. Foote, W. Leathers, Mr. Ressenell, W. Thompson, councillors, Whitchurch; L. Baker, ex-reeve, Whitchurch; councillors John Smith, F. Osley, J. Farr, W. H. Eves, East Gwillimbury; councillors M. McCardell, Sutton; reeves G. B. Thompson, Holland Landing; S. Oldham, Bradford; W. Woods, West Gwillimbury; councillor H. Stoddard, West Gwillimbury.

The Petitioners' Plans.

The deputation was introduced by Sir Wm. Mulock. The Premier was accompanied by Hon. R. W. Scott, Hon. Wm. Paterson, Hon. H. R. Emmerson, Minister of Railways and Canals, and Hon. C. S. Hyman, Minister of Public Works. Secretary T. S. Brunton presented the petitions of the municipalities of Bradford, townships of West Gwillimbury and East Gwillimbury, the town of Aurora, township of King and Whitchurch, village of Holland Landing, town of Newmarket, village of Sutton and the townships of North Gwillimbury and Georgiana. The petitions asked that the Holland river and its branches be widened and deepened so as to make commercial highways to give the towns of Aurora and Newmarket and the village of Holland Landing and Sutton the advantages of communication with the Trent valley canal system.

Many Advantages.

The various speakers impressed upon the government the advantages the improvement would bring to the large and populous district which would be given the boon of competition in rates by water carriage. The Holland river, it was pointed out, is already navigable a large portion of the distance. It was stated that manufacturers would save a large percentage of the cost of fuel, and that the saving to the farmers of the district in freight rates upon their grain alone would be $12,000 annually. As a result of the encouragement given to the cultivation of fruit by Sir William Mulock, there had been a great increase in the production of apples and the extension of the canal would furnish an outlet for the crop to the Northwest. The importance and extent of the manufacturing industries affected were also impressed upon the government.

Sir Wilfrid Impressed.

When Mr. T. H. Lennox came in such excellent company even Sir Wilfrid Laurier was impressed.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier complimented the delegation upon the able manner in which their arguments had been placed, and congratulated them that, instead of asking for a post office or cut-stone building, the first request ever made by the county of York for the expenditure of public money was for the more substantial purpose of enhancing the facilities of transportation of the people for the development of commerce. The project was one which must engage the attention of the government.

Sir Wilfrid expressed pleasure that surveys were in progress, the results of which would, he was sure, be brought before the government at the earliest possible moment, and without which the government would be unable to arrive at a determination. He assured the delegation of prompt consideration and reminded them that they had a friend at court in Sir Wm. Mulock, whose persistence in a good cause was notable.

This meeting appears to have taken place in Ottawa on the 22nd of February, 1905, and the account of it is published in the 'Globe' of February 23, 1905.

Mr. WALLACE. Does the hon. minister mean to tell us that the surveys for the Newmarket canal or deepening of the Holland river had not been made before the deputation got here?

Mr. FIELDING. I have told the House that I merely desired to read this document. I am not trying to tell the hon. gentleman (Mr. Wallace) anything. I do not pretend to have the personal knowledge of this question that he has. Now, when I read this from the 'Globe,' some unkind member said: 'oh, that is the 'Globe,' and laughed. I anticipated that, and as I always like to be obliging, and to accommodate people, I propose to read an account of this meeting from another newspaper.

Mr. STAPLES. Is that the first deputation that came to Ottawa, regarding this Newmarket canal?

Mr. FIELDING. I am not able to say with certainty. Possibly, there was a previous deputation. I should judge there may have been, but I have no personal knowledge of the matter. The 'Globe' not being accepted as reliable by some hon. gentlemen opposite, let me turn to the report in the 'Mail.' It is not so long as that of the 'Globe,' but it contains one very interesting feature. I hope that nobody is going to assail the 'Mail.' I do not mind hearing things said in criticism of the 'Globe,' because I know they are not deserved. But I should not like to find anybody expressing doubt of the absolute impartiality and fairness of the 'Mail.' Everybody knows, at any rate, that if it has a weakness it is not in the direction of misrepresenting any gentleman on the other side, for it usually gives them credit for something even better than they have been saying or doing. I am

simply standing up to defend the 'Mail,' if anybody is daring enough to attack it. Head lines and all should go in so I quote them:

ASK DEEPENING OF HOLLAND RIVER.
York County Deputation Supports Canal System.
Cheaper Freight Rates.
Sir Wilfrid Laurier Promises Surveys will be Made for the Government's Information.

Ottawa, Feb. 22.—A deputation from York county, on behalf of the Trent Valley Canal Extension Association, waited on the government to-day, asking for the widening and deepening of the Holland river.

Sir William Mulock introduced the deputation to the Premier.

In the presentation of their case, the secretary of the association read resolutions by the local municipalities in favour of the project.

Not resolutions, it will be observed, of the workers of the Grit party, but resolutions of the local municipalities:

Mr. Cane, of Newmarket, explained that they wanted the east branch of the Holland river deepened to Newmarket, and a cut made of eight miles to Aurora. The west branch of the Holland river they wanted cleaned out to Schomberg, and two miles of the Black river improved to Sutton.

Other speakers emphasized the advantage this work would be to manufacturers and to farmers in the reduction of freight rates. Mr. Henry, of Aurora, claimed that North York was entitled to some special consideration on account of its having returned to parliament for many years a gentleman in the person of Sir William Mulock, who had saved many millions of dollars upon the administrative cost of the country.

Now, the next paragraph is interesting. I have no knowledge of it personally, except it is here.

Haughton Lennox, Conservative M.P. for South Simcoe, gave his cordial endorsation to the deputation's request, and said that although opposed politically to Sir William Mulock, he was proud of him as the member for North York, and one of the Premier's ablest colleagues.

Hon. E. J. Davis, who was present with the deputation, also argued strongly in behalf of the plea they submitted.

Sir Wilfrid, in his reply, said it was unique to receive a deputation from York County. Surveys would be made, he promised, and when completed the government would look into them. The deputation knew, he added, that they had a strong friend at court, for when Sir William Mulock made up his mind on a subject he was very persistent.

As I stated, I have no comment to make. I simply wanted to read this interesting report, for what it is worth.

Mr. HAUGHTON LENNOX (South Simcoe). As my name is mentioned in this matter I would like to say a few words, although I have spoken on the subject on a previous occasion. There is no fact in the statement that Haughton Lennox, member for South Simcoe, was present and spoke either for or against the hon. Sir William Mulock. I spoke in the House about a week before the deputation referred to, and I spoke in opposition to this project. Sir William Mulock on this occasion told me that it would be well for me to reserve my opinion because a deputation was coming down, and that if I would listen to the arguments of that deputation I might change my mind. He also told me that there would be a deputation here from my own riding. I answered Sir William Mulock that I would in all probability be present when the deputation was waiting on the government. I knew the situation at that time, and on the occasion I refer to, I spoke very definitely against the scheme. I never at any time hesitated, or changed my mind, and I never had any uncertain views upon this question.

I saw some of the gentlemen who came with the deputation, and they told me that my cousin, Mr. T. Herbert Lennox was there. He is quite a politician, and a fairly good jollier, so much so that at times I have wished I could follow him in some of his ways of treating public questions, and public men. However, I wanted to speak to him, and I went down to where I presumed the deputation was to assemble, in the Langevin block. In arriving there I found a group of men talking a good deal, but not doing anything. I understood from them that Sir William Mulock was making preparations to entertain the boys right royally in the evening. It was quite a jolly party. Now, as I well knew, the whole scheme had been arranged at Newmarket long before this, at the instance of Sir William Mulock, and some Liberals, who assembled as a Liberal organization, and there was a report of it in the Newmarket 'Era.'

I spoke for a moment or two with some of the members of the deputation, but said nothing in reference to the deputation except to Mr. T. Herbert Lennox. I said to him: 'How does it come, Herb, that you are down on this thing?' He laughed and said: 'Well, Haughton, it is quite a good scheme.' I said: 'It is nothing but a scheme.' And he answered: 'Oh, it is a fine scheme.' What he meant by that, I do not know. But my opinion is that as he was a politician, and these men wanted him to come along, he decided he would come. Now, we did not discuss the matter at all, and I came away immediately after this conversation with him. I did not speak at the deputation, and was not present when it met. I do not know who introduced the deputation, nor do I even know where they met. There were no

ministers present, and no deputation proceeding while I was there.

Now, this is the second time I have been called upon to speak on this matter, and this is the second denial I have made. So far as the 'Mail and Empire' is concerned, I have no doubt the report was made in perfect good faith, but the mistake was the substituting me for Mr. T. Herbert Lennox. I presume the hon. minister knew this perfectly well, because he has gone over this programme before. We had it rehearsed here at all events, and pretty nearly every member of the House knew that there was not one syllable of justification for connecting my name with this except that on all occasions I have condemned, as I do unsparingly condemn now, this nefarious project to exploit the public money in the building of this canal.

Mr. OSLER. This matter has been so often threshed out in this House that I should not consider it my duty to speak, nor would I have spoken had not the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) quoted these extracts. The hon. minister told us that he did not know anything at all about the matter. Well, it seems to me only natural that when public money is being expended he should make some inquiry.

Of all the fool reports I have ever heard read, the report just quoted by the hon. minister from the 'Globe' is the biggest fake that was ever presented to this House. I think I can speak with some authority on this subject, because I was born up there, and as a boy I used to bathe in the Holland river at Newmarket. I can tell the hon. members of this House that very often in the month of August there is not enough water in the Holland river for the boys to bathe, unless they make a mud dam to retain it. Many times as a boy I have helped to make a mud dam so that we might get enough water to bathe in this beautiful stream. I have lived on Lake Simcoe during the summer for the last twenty-six years, and week after week I have passed that magnificent river by train, and in an automobile, and many times have I seen people take a trip up to this grand river to look at the gorgeous fake. The thing is such a circus that people talk about it, and go out to see it.

The government are trustees for the people's funds, and I say that in spending money for the Newmarket canal they are committing a breach of trust just as serious as the breach of trust committed by the directors of the Ontario and Farmers' banks. They know it is of no use. There is not enough water in the place to float a boat if there was freight for a boat to carry.

There is not one single tug boat on Lake Simcoe, there is not one single ton of freight on Lake Simcoe to be moved through that canal. When I first summered there, there were tugs going up and down Lake Simcoe hauling logs to a very extensive sawmill at Bradford and Belle Ewart. There is not a stick of timber towed on the lakes now, and there is not a mill on the lake shore. There is no business to go to Newmarket, because the cost of freight from Newmarket to Toronto by trolley would be infinitely cheaper than anything that could be charged by the canal. There was a heavy wind storm at that point four or five weeks ago, and unfortunately it blew down 40 to 60 very fine pine trees which were the beauty of the property owned by the late Sir James Edgar. I was told that these trees were sold to one of these Newmarket mill owners. They were loaded on the trolley which passes the property, and in half an hour they were in Newmarket, in a shorter time than it would have taken to ship them to the wharf and tow them over to the mouth of the canal. There is one pleasure steamboat on that lake, as old as I am I fancy, which makes excursions once or twice a week around the lake.

The government about the time they commenced to build the Newmarket canal, started to spend money on wharfs on the lake. They spent $4,000 or $5,000 building a wharf at Roches Point, where it was not wanted. A few planks had been thrown out in previous years when the season opened at a cost of $20, so the building of that wharf was just so much money wasted and thrown away. It was never used, it was an absolutely worthless expense. In the first place there is no water to supply that canal if the canal was wanted unless the water could be pumped up from the lake. We have an instance of how foolish people may be in the case of the old Sir Lister Kay farms in the northwest. It will be remembered that this gentleman established many farms for growing wheat in a district that afterwards turned out to be unsuitable for growing wheat. His foreman thought he would overcome the difficulty, and send up an enormous number of watering carts to these farms. He started to send out the water carts which he filled from a little stream there, over the 5,000 or 6,000 acres of wheat. They may fill the Newmarket canal with a watering cart, and get enough water to have a stream running down which would carry a rowboat. This work has been discussed so often, and so strongly, and there is so much money spent on it that it is the duty of the government to send some independent outside man to make a full report on it with a view to stopping this expenditure of money. I say it is a breach of the trust of public

funds, and no man of common sense, engineer, merchant or farmer, can go there and see the work, see the conditions, and not say that every dollar of that money is being wasted. Probably for some years it will entail on the country a large annual expenditure to keep it up before it is finally abandoned as an absolutely useless work.

Mr. W. D. STAPLES (Macdonald). The hon. member for Lisgar (Mr. Sharpe), referred to a public work undertaken in the constituency I have the honour to represent, the wharf at St. Laurent, and I believe it is my duty to once more explain the shameful wastefulness and extravagance of this expenditure. The Minister of Justice has referred to the Newmarket canal as a sand pile. I might refer to this as a rot heap. This government, for political purposes in 1904, in order that they might corral the whole vote in that part of my constituency, undertook to build a wharf. They got a dredge and began work with great activity. Orders went out that no person need apply who would not support the Laurier candidate, and they gathered up some 60 or 70 men. They held these men there until the day before the election, and then they went off on a jollification, winding up at the polls. Since that time not one dollar has been spent there, and there has been no effort to make any public use of the wharf. That $25,000 of public money was wasted, and stands there in a rot heap to-day. The Minister of Justice has told the House that he challenges any speaker on this side of the House to go into the constituency in which the Newmarket canal is situated, and make the speeches they have made here. I am told that they have all been there and have made much stronger speeches than they have made here. I challenge the Minister of Justice to go up into St. Laurent and undertake for a moment to justify the expenditure of some $20,000 on that wharf. I asked for a return which showed that they had expended $15,870, but that does not cover it all. They built a dredge there, and when they abandoned the work they left the dredge, and it stands there a monument of ruin beside the wharf. The Minister of Finance has tried to justify this expenditure. He is the man who has control of the public chest and who should see that the public money is expended in the interest of the people, and not wasted on such works as these. He has been in Winnipeg, and so has the Minister of Public Works. The Minister of Public Works almost promised me that he would come up and look at the wharf at St. Laurent, but I suppose when he got to Winnipeg, and some of his own political supporters told him of the shameless waste up there he was ashamed to go further. I invite the Minister of Finance to go up there as the member for West Toronto has invited him, and look at the way in which the public treasury has been robbed. When they undertook to construct this work, if they had spent $25,000 or $30,000 more, possibly it would have been of some public use to the people up there, but the government refused to expend any more, and while I was up there during the recess, I visited the wharf in company with the hon. member for Dauphin (Mr. Campbell), who will verify everything I say. There would be sufficient water to float a boat if it were dredged deep enough, but no boat has ever landed there, there has never been any traffic over this wharf which has cost some $20,000, and there it lies rotting. The hon. member for Dauphin stood there and kicked the boards into the river. I have no hesitation in believing everything that has been said regarding the Newmarket canal, and other public expenditures that have been made throughout this country by this government, when I know, and have seen right there in my constituency the condition of affairs. There is no road to the wharf, you cannot get to it without going down the beach a distance of over a mile, with sand up to the axles. I say that if the people of Canada could go up and look at this one foolish waste of money they would immediately say: We have no further use for this government, they are not responsible, they have no consideration for the interest of the public; all the consideration they have is simply to loot the public treasury.

While we have had, during the recess, members from this House going up and down the western country appealing to the people to forget all about wasteful expenditures, to forget the Newmarket canal, to forget the St. Laurent wharf, to forget the sawdust wharf, and others that it would take me an hour to mention, and to stick by the reciprocity agreement, let me tell the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff) that the people of the west are just as much interested against extravagant expenditures as they are in reciprocity, and they will be much more interested in hearing the facts than some of the clap trap that the hon. member put up at his meetings when he did more damage to his cause than he could to help it. The attention of the people where he held his meetings was directed to these public expenditures, and also to misrepresentations which the hon. gentleman made, both on the public platform and in this House, and I will refer him to one of them. He stated in this House that a man who had been down to his house, I think his name

was Moffett, claimed that he had paid $500 in cold cash to put two carloads of flax into the Duluth market. I ask if that is the case?

Mr. TURRIFF. No, Sir, it is not the case.

Mr. STAPLES. 'Hansard ' says so, and I will read it to him.

Mr. TURRIFF. I will explain it.

Mr. STAPLES. I want no explanation, we will take the hon. gentleman's words in 'Hansard.' The hon. member for Assiniboia stated throughout the country, and on the floor of this House, that it cost Mr. Moffett $500 in cold cash to put two carloads of flax on the Duluth market. What are the facts? Take the trade and navigation returns, take the questions that were asked by the hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr Rutan). He put a question on the Order Paper asking how much flax had been exported during the last three years to the United States from the respective provinces, and we found that not one bushel had gone to the United States from Saskatchewan. I give you that instance, Mr. Speaker, as a fair sample of the clap trap that the hon. member for Assiniboia indulged in. Referring again to this famous St. Laurent wharf, that I suppose the Minister of Finance will not even get up to defend, that the Minister of Public Works has endeavoured to defend, I say that if the government had any regard for decency or honesty they would get up in this House and acknowledge the wastefulness and folly of such an expenditure. Now, I do not wish to be accused of obstructing, the obstruction is due to the action of this government in going into such schemes as this Newmarket canal. I believe it was a deputation originally that came down here and asked for something else, but they did not ask for what has been undertaken, they did not ask for a canal through a sand bank where there is no water. But there is water up in St. Laurent, and if that work had been conducted on business principles, if it had been completed, it would have been of some benefit to the people in that district. But it stands there adsolutely of no use, the $20,000 has been wasted, the whole thing is rotten and is tumbling down into the creek. Sir, I have no hesitation in supporting the resolution of the hon. member for York (Mr. Wallace).

Mr. TURRIFF. Might I ask the hon. gentleman a question? Did I understand him aright to say that Trade and Navigation Returns showed that in the year 1910, there was not flax exported from Saskatchewan into the United States?

Mr. STAPLES. No.

Mr. TURRIFF. Well the statement I made——

Mr. STAPLES. The hon. member is asking me a question. I do not require to go to the Trade and Navigation Returns to justify my statement, I simply take the words of the hon. member that he spoke on the floor of the House, and the answer that was given on the floor of the House by the Minister of Customs to the hon. member for Prince Albert.

Mr. TURRIFF. As I understand the matter—the Finance Minister will set me right if I am wrong—there have been no returns brought in so far of what was exported from Canada to the United States in the fall of 1910, seven or eight months ago. The statement I made when I spoke on the question of reciprocity on the 1st day of May, was that Mr. Frank Moffett, of Weyburn, last fall shipped two carloads of flax to Duluth and that if he could have loaded those two carloads of flax on the south side of the line, and if he had not to pay the duty on that flax, he would have got $500 more for his two carloads than he did get. I stand by every word and every letter of what I said, and I stand by every word and every statement that I made at twenty-one meetings a month ago, six in Manitoba and fifteen in my own constituency. I stand prepared to back up every statement I made at those meetings. I want to tell my hon. friend from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) that not in one of those six meetings in the province of Manitoba, and my hon. friend from Lisgar attended one of my meetings, at not one of those meetings of the six in Manitoba or the fifteen in my own constituency, did any one, Liberal or Conservative, ask me a question or make a reference in any shape, form or manner to any one of those questions that the hon. gentlemen have brought up here to-day.

Mr. STAPLES. This is a personal explanation, and I want to reply.

Mr. SPEAKER. The hon. gentleman has introduced some matter not strictly relevant to the amendment. I do not know that I can allow any continued reference to this matter. The question before the House is the motion to go into Committee of Ways and Means, and an amendment with regard to certain expenditures. The discussion now must properly be limited to the terms of the amendment. In a matter of personal explanation the rule is relaxed, and if the hon. gentleman feels that he has not been fairly dealt with, I will hear a word from him, but not a continuation of the discussion.

Mr. STAPLES. I consider that I have not been fairly dealt with. Now, the hon.

member for Prince Albert (Mr. Rutan), on the 10th day of April, put the following question on the Order Paper:

What have been the exports by provinces from Canada to the United States for the years 1908, 1909, 1910, respectively, of wheat, barley, flax, oats, pease, eggs, butter, sheep, swine, potatoes, hay and fruit?

In the year 1910. Did the hon. member for Assiniboia hear that?

Mr. TURRIFF. I heard it.

Mr. STAPLES. If he will look over it he will find that there was not one bushel of ax seed shipped to the United States from Saskatchewan in 1910.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say one word.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS. Order.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I think it well to point out to the House that only one hon. member is entitled to speak at once, and that when an hon. member has risen to address the House it is very improper that there should be a debate in the form of a conversation across the floor from one hon. member to another. The hon. member for Lincoln (Mr. Lancaster) has the floor.

Mr. LANCASTER. Mr. Speaker, if I had heard nothing said here to-day with regard to this amendment which is in your hands than the—I cannot say speech—statement of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) I would be obliged, in the interest of my duty, to vote for the amendment on the statement, and the statement alone of the Minister of Finance. We have here the chairman of the Treasury Board, the censor of all the estimates, the hon. gentleman who moves the House into Committee of Supply year after year to pass those estimates, having the assurance to stand up in this House and say that he has no knowledge whatever of the Newmarket canal, that he does not attempt to make any statement of it of his own, but that because the 'Globe' newspaper made certain statements he asks his followers to vote down this amendment. Anybody on either side of this House who is anxious to honestly vote according to his conscience in regard to an amendment of this kind with no other statement than that of the Minister of Finance, it seems to me, is obliged to vote for this amendment. I have dispelled from my mind everything I have heard in this House in support of the amendment from hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, and I am going to vote for this amendment because of the very want of knowledge of the Minister of Finance in regard to the matter and because he has put these estimates before the House, has asked the House to carry them and has sanctioned the payment of these moneys year after year upon this work which he says he has absolutely no knowledge of. That is my reason for voting for this amendment, and I do not require to hear any speeches from any other hon. gentlemen to cause me to do it.

Mr. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Portage la Prairie). I was on my feet a moment ago in response to a challenge from the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Turriff). I had the privilege of following the hon. member for Assiniboia through a part of his own constituency, and I regret I cannot bring him any very good tidings as to the prospect of his own success there——

Mr. TURRIFF. Do not worry, my friend.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Among the statements which I found credited to the hon. gentleman, which, no doubt he will confirm now, were two. One was that the United States is importing 190,000,000 bushels per year.

Mr. TURRIFF. I never stated that.

Mr. MEIGHEN. The other was, and if he disputes this——

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. The point has been raised that the matter that the hon. gentleman is introducing is not relevant to the amendment. I fear I must rule, in so far as I can judge of it, that it does not appear to be relevant to the amendment that is in my hands.

Mr. MEIGHEN. I quite agree with your ruling, Mr. Speaker, and I congratulate the hon. member for Assiniboia. I happen to live within 25 or 30 miles of this famous St. Laurent wharf, and I have been more than once on the ground there, or I should say as near the ground as one can safely get with a due appreciation of the value of his life. Under the terms of the resolution, which is more or less general, as to the system or lack of system employed by the administration, this wharf properly comes into contemplation. I stand to say this, that if members of the government who had to do with the planting of $20,000 of public money there, and with the leaving of it there to rot until it now is worthless, had a due appreciation of what they owe to the people of the country they would return that money to the public treasury out of their own pockets. That wharf stands in shallow water. It cannot be reached by water because it is too shallow, and it cannot be reached by land because the land is too moist and soft. It stands out in solitary and dismal isolation, a monument

to the criminal wastefulness of the Laurier administration. Why was it built there? There is a long stretch of lake which protrudes southward into the municipality of Macdonald. There is a lagoon near that protruding lake. The government with its dredge dug a ditch between the lagoon and the lake. The lake lies on the sand, and the sand is close to the surface everywhere near the southern shore of Lake Manitoba; in fact, one can walk out sometimes half a mile into the water. The dredging was done between the lagoon and the lake to a fair depth, but it was never dredged beyond, and the consequence is that never could any vessel get to it at any time during the existence of the wharf. The wharf is built along the line of the ditch where the dredging was done, and the only way it can be reached is for one to hire a horse and plough through sand a foot to a foot and a half deep for a mile and a half, and it will take an hour and a half to do it. The wharf is used by nothing to-day except the mud hens and gulls that frequent the southern shores of the lake. It is a mockery to any administration that acknowledges it as its work. I would like to test hon. gentlemen opposite; I would like a resolution put to this House deprecating the expenditure on the St. Laurent wharf, and I wonder if the hon. member for Provencher (Mr. Molloy) would not respond to the party whip, and vote for that wise and provident expenditure.

Mr. MOLLOY. He will look after himself.

Mr. MEIGHEN. Well, if I have anything to do with it, and we are not cut too short by the administration he will have a good opportunity. As to the other expenditure on the Newmarket canal; that is still more notorious, not any more notorious in character or kind, but simply more notorious in expenditure. We have had the spectacle this afternoon of the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) attempting to justify that expenditure, just as his leader did two years ago, and just as the hon. Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) did at the same time, on the score that at a certain period in the history of Canada certain men, embracing in part Conservatives, affirmed something along this line. In the first place, because I do not want to include them in the category of the many people in this country who are prepared to advocate anything if the money is spent where they live, there is nothing clearer, even from the report read by the Minister of Finance, than that these gentlemen did not advocate what the government has done, that not one man, Liberal or Conservative, on that delegation, is committed to the wholesale fraud that the government has perpetrated. If these men actually signed a requisition asking that there be prosecuted the work that they were down here as a delegation to ask for, they would not be committed to this Newmarket canal. The widening and deepening of the Holland river, east and west, is quite a different thing from the digging of a canal down a little stream which is not the Holland river, which is miles from the Holland river, digging it uphill, digging it at many times the expenditure these men asked for, or anticipated would be entailed, and furthermore, digging it for an ostensible purpose that these men did not have in mind. But, whatever the government may have been asked for the Minister of Finance knows that if the expenditure is justified on that ground he could justify anything throughout the length and breadth of Canada.

You can find men in any locality of this country, and possibly in both parties, who will ask that large expenditures be made in their locality, because the share they will have to contribute proportionately is far more than returned to them in the direct gain accruing from spending the money around them. The Minister of Finance has acknowledged the principle upon which the government makes its expenditures. No effort is made by the government to ascertain whether an expenditure is in the public interest or not, so long as they believe it to be in the party interest. You can search these files in vain and you cannot find a statement by any person, responsible or irresponsible, to say that there would be any traffic on this Newmarket canal to render a return for an expenditure of even $290,000, as at first recommended. Up to this point, perhaps, the error in the estimate might be traceable to Mr. Walsh, but after this time the guilt is on the head of the government, because the report clearly shows that for political purposes in 1904, Mr. Walsh, was required, against his repeated protests, to put in some kind of a figure whether he had data to back it up or not. He told the government that soundings were not complete, and that any estimate he made could only be a trap, but the elections were coming on, and they pressed him, and against his many protests they forced him to put in this estimate. The consequences of that error so disastrous to Canada are from that day on the head of the government. Having had the estimate of $290,000 for a work for which there was no justification, another election was coming and they got another man to estimate the work at $900,000, and they built the canal to serve a district of six miles by nine something on the style of the Soulanges canal, whose purpose is to carry continental traffic. That is the style of a government we have.

They hope if possible to satisfy the Liberal workers in the constituency, and reward them for sending a Liberal to parliament, and possibly to conciliate a certain proportion of the Conservatives, and for this purpose they commit the country to an expenditure of $1,000,000. The defence of the Minister of Finance this afternoon is equally applicable to the numerous and heavy expenditures all over his own province of Nova Scotia. He knows that by playing the game in Nova Scotia as it was played at Newmarket, he has been enabled to gather around him a cohort of supporters from his own province. He has seen the long record of supplementary estimates which, year after year, and especially in a year preceding an election, are brought down for Nova Scotia. No wonder that the first thought that springs to his mind when justifying an expenditure, is to endeavour to show that it will meet the avaricious intentions of certain residents of the locality. Never did we hear the Minister of Finance, and never did we hear the Minister of Public Works attempt to defend an expenditure because the people of Canada got commensurate benefits from it. If the Minister of Finance had risen to defend the notorious steal on the Gaspereau river he would have used the same argument as he did this afternoon. If he attempted to defend the sawdust wharf purchase, he would have done the same thing, and no doubt that if next week mayhap he should defend the Bathurst wharf he will look in vain for any other footing on which to place himself than the voracious appetite of certain supporters. Let my last word be as to what has occurred close to my home. I ask the Minister of Finance to come to western Canada. I do not know that he has ever been there except on a rambling tariff commission, but I do know that he has never entertained friendly feelings for our great western country. I know that only twenty years ago, he stated in the legislature of Nova Scotia that the western provinces were of no use to confederation, and criticised the policy of endeavouring to add to the grandeur of confederation the provinces of the west. He has always had a jealous eye on the expenditures in that country, and western Canada has never had reason to look to him as a friend. I ask him to come to the west and to see the present condition of the St. Andrew's rapids with a landing place standing 30 feet from the ground that no one can use. Let him come a few miles further west and see the St. Laurent wharf, a resting place for gulls and mud-hens, standing out a mile and a half from human access; let him see rotting to waste the expenditure of $25,000 of the money of the people on that wharf. There may have been traffic there to justify a reasonable expenditure on that wharf, but there is nothing in the ingenuity of an honest mind to defend the spending of $20,000 of $25,000 of the people's money there and leaving it to rot in the water for seven years, until now, even suppose they continue the work, no value can be received from the expenditure already made. Will the Minister of Finance dare to say that that is not to be marked against his government with a black mark, if you could see black marks on it now? There is not a member of the Liberal party in this House —watch and see if what I say is not correct—there is not a member of the party in the House now, and they cannot gather one in from room 16 and the corridors, who will attempt to say that the people of Canada have got one dollar's worth of benefit from the $20,000 expended on the St. Laurent wharf.

That is a great state of affairs. Is that a credit to the Laurier administration? Was it the fault of the engineers? We do not need an engineer to find out that if the sand comes within a foot and a half of the surface of the water you have to dig through that sand before you can sail a schooner there. You do not need an engineer to tell you that if there is a lagoon or a marsh, you must put a road across it before you can reach the other side by walking. These abuses cannot be laid to the charge of any officials; they rest on the shoulders of the Prime Minister and the government, and they cannot get out of it simply by changing cabinet ministers.

Mr. GLEN CAMPBELL (Dauphin). I notice that on this occasion, as on most others, the ministers who should be here because of their interest in the special subject under discussion are not here. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) should be here and so should the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Graham). But they are absent—just as when reciprocity is under discussion, the gentlemen who should be here representing the government are usually away sleeping. I should like to have asked some pertinent questions of the Minister of Public Works, but, as he is absent, I suppose I shall have to leave them to some future occasion.

Now, the subject of the Newmarket canal is one which has been discussed in this House from time to time during the whole life of this parliament. The facts have been represented fairly and honestly by the members on this side, but have been misrepresented on all occasions by the speakers on the other side except to-day when this work was alluded to by the Minister of Justice (Sir Allen Aylesworth) as a dust heap. The Prime Minister has stated that the inception of this work was due to the fact that many residents of that part of the

country had come here and asked the government to make an expenditure of this kind, these people including Tories as well as Liberals. And, while that may be true in a secondary way, it is not absolutely in line with the truth as the truth should be told in this House. The facts are that a certain gentleman, Sir Wm. Mulock, who for reasons of state or political exigency was relegated by the Prime Minister to some other place than the floor of this House, had promised his constituents in North York that were he returned to power he would do what he could to make a canal from Lake Simcoe to Holland Landing. Before he was elected, engineers were over every part of that riding, practically on every farm within decent touch of Holland Landing. After he was elected, he arranged that the deputation should come up here to interview the government with regard to this canal, or rather with regard to the widening of the Holland river. He arranged that these men should come up here either at the people's expense or at his own—at least, free of expense to themselves. The sum that was in their minds when they came to ask for the deepening of the Holland river was $74,000; that was the amount they asked to be expended upon this work which is jocularly known by the people as the 'Newmarket Canal.' The estimate made afterwards by the engineer sent down by the government was $300,000. Sir Wm. Mulock, to his credit be it said, tried on all occasions to hold the expenditure down below $300,000, thinking that was all that was requisite to do the work in a way to meet the demands of the people. And to-day we find nearly a million dollars being expended for what the minister said to-day was a dust heap and what every man, regardless of political affiliation, who speaks privately on the matter, declares to be a monument of folly or worse.

Let me refer for a moment to the remark of the Minister of Justice when speaking of this matter. He was referring to what had been said in this House with regard to the Newmarket canal and the wasteful expenditure of public money by this government. And he said that the various members who made statements on the floor of the House from which they could not get away, though many of them would like to get away from their statements on public questions, would not dare to go down to North York and make the same statements there. He spoke of calling members before the bar. Why, Sir, is there not opportunity for the exercise of the power of his so-called Department of Justice? He must realize that practice makes perfection in all things, and if he desires perfection in haling criminals, perjurers, liars, thieves, or robbers before the bar there is plenty of opportunity for him to practise. Why does not he practise in many of the matters that have been brought to his attention? Why does not he take action against those guilty of robbery of the Canadian public in the matter of the immigration of the Chinese? Why not practise in the case of the thefts and steals perpetrated in connection with the Printing Bureau? Why not practise with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific frauds, with regard to the dredging frauds —which would hurt the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) so much—and so with all the rest? I do not want to be accused of being an obstructionist, but I could stand here for two hours and tell you of the things he might practise in haling people to the bar.

Now, the Newmarket canal has been pretty fully discussed and I want to say a word concerning some of the other thefts and robberies of the public by the various departments of this government that are supposed to serve and care for the public of Canada.

I will just say one word with reference to the matter so ably brought before the House by my hon. friends from Macdonald (Mr. Staples) and Portage Laprairie (Mr. Meighen)—the matter of the so-called wharf at St. Laurent. I had an opportunity of going there a few weeks ago, and looking over the works myself. And if I ever saw a monument of either senile folly or political gross carelessness it was on that occasion. This wharf was built for no purpose in the world except that mentioned by my hon. friend from Portage Laprairie (Mr. Meighen) that the wild fowl might lay their eggs and the gulls roost on it. A boat has never come in there. This wharf was built at an expense of $20,000 or $25,000 of public money, previous to the election of 1904. But the day after the election, when Mr. Riddell was defeated by my hon. friend who now represents Macdonald (Mr. Staples), the work closed down, and the wharf is now in a state of rottenness. So much so that I kicked the top logs off with the heel of my boot. That wharf is of no earthly use for anything. It is standing there in a swamp on the edge of a lake with from six to eighteen inches of water around it. If the work had been properly done, perhaps there might have been something to say in defence of it—that perhaps at some future date it could be made useful, but the work was done, as is done in the Public Works Department on every occasion, in a manner to steal the hard earned money from the people of Canada. Three or four feet from the top of the piles, scantlings were laid back to the piers, and on top of these scantlings brush was piled in. Hon. gentlemen will remember that the contractors were paid by yardage, and their yardage

counted from the bottom up to the top. A space was left, and some eight feet of brush piled in, then the sand was put on top of that. To-day if you go down there with a team of horses you will bury the team in the holes where the brush has rotted out. It was the money of the people of Canada that went to pay for that wharf, and it is the Department of Public Works which is responsible for it. I say the Department of Public Works, but, perhaps the primary responsibility must rest on the rotten administration of the Liberal government. Mr. Speaker, the day is not far away, and we will welcome it, when the people of Canada will have a chance to say that they will not stand for that sort of thing.

I had intended to speak for perhaps a couple of hours, but I understand my Liberal friends are anxious to get home to the bosoms of their wives and families, therefore, I will cut my remarks short; but at the same time let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, that I could stand here for hours, and detail the crookedness, malfeasance and incapacity of this administration in dealing with the money of the Canadian people. Let us take the case of Richibucto wharf, passed upon by Mr. Stead, the resident engineer of the Department of Public Works, as being worth $700, and inside of two or three weeks passed upon by him, when the people of Canada had to pay for it—as being worth $5,000. When he said it was worth $700 who was going to buy it? A great party heeler of the lowest description. When he valued it at $5,000, who was going to pay for it, inside of two months? The people of Canada—the suckers.

Let us look at the case of the Bathurst dredging. The contract was illegally awarded to the friends of the government—in fact one of the partnership was a person allied very closely in relationship to a member of this House. $30,000 of the people's money went into it, and that is what brings him here—his part of that $30,000.

The Guysborough Marine and Constructing Company—$34,000 of the people's money illegally given by way of a contract again. Mr. Speaker, do you think the people of Canada are going to stand for this wholesale robbery? Then, there is a little lake called Lake Maquoit. The dredging there cost about $48,000. Did it benefit the people of Canada? Not for one second. Their money was expended in digging a hole in the ground. Again $36,000 of the people's money was handed over to George McAvity as a rake-off in consideration of his political influence with his side partner the hon. Minister of Public Works. Thousands of dollars were expended to dredge for the Dalhousie Lumber Company, and no one has ever denied that the hon. Minister of Public Works, is at least, a sleeping partner in that company.

Mr. CAMPBELL.

I would like to refer to one other point, and that is the fact that a certain gentleman who three or four years ago was adjudged by the courts as unfitted to occupy a seat in this House has had more public money spent in his little constituency than we have had expended for public works altogether in the province of Manitoba during the course of the last year. If the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) were here, where he ought to be, I would have referred to another matter. However, seeing that I am on my feet I will speak of it in any event. It is a matter pertaining to the people of my constituency. I refer to the dredging of the Mossy river. For years before I had the honour of representing that constituency we had what we called the 'political dredge' at the mouth of the Mossy river. On various occasions I pointed out to the hon. Minister of Public Works that this was, in fact, a political dredge, and was of no use in the world. On every occasion I got a distinct pledge from him that he would reconsider his ways, and be wise in the expenditure of the people's money, and that he would spend the money in a proper manner. To this day there has been no money expended there. But, at the last election he found that this political dredge was no good, and for the first time in the history of the place, the Conservative candidate got a majority; therefore, he discarded the dredge and dismissed his men, as being of no use to the people of Canada, and more particularly to the Liberal party.

I wanted to ask the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Pugsley) some questions about this matter.

Unfortunately, he is not here. He should be here. Why is he not here? I wanted to ask some questions about Swan Creek dredging. The dredge worked there up to the day of the election, and no man could work on that dredge five minutes unless he promised to vote for Theodore A. Burrows. The day after the election, what happened? The dredge was put out of commission, everything was thrown aside, the people's wants were overlooked. The only object, so far as it applies to Manitoba and the Northwest as far as I have seen it, of the Public Works Department is to use that whole department and its employees as a political partisan department, and the machine for the furtherance of the crookedness of the Liberal party.

Mr. W. R. SMYTH (East Algoma). I am not at all astonished to hear members on this side of the House criticize this Government for their actions in regard to the Newmarket canal. It is only the old old story told over and over again, and it is the only old story that we have, especially

in the newer parts of this Dominion. I have the honour to represent a great deal of waterfront along the Georgian bay, the Sault Ste. Marie river and Lake Huron, and during the last election they employed dredges at different points to dredge out rivers and streams. Immediately after the elections the dredges were withdrawn.

I wish to speak in regard to a matter nearer my own home. In the town of Thessalon during the last election this government were very busy constructing a breakwater that is much needed at that point and which was very much needed at that particular time for the Liberal party. The people of Thessalon who needed that breakwater very much believed the government to be to a certain extent sincere. They went so far as to buy the timber and stone from their farms near the town, and the stone and timber are still piled near the wharf, with a man watching to see that the stones are not stolen and the timber does not rot any more than is possible during the time between the last election and now. Thus the Newmarket canal is only one of many instances. The people of the town of Thessalon are, no doubt, going to be told again that they are going to have this breakwater. I notice that they are very busy already and very anxious that the people of Thessalon shall get this breakwater. All along the shores of Lake Huron and Georgian bay you will find wharfs that are very much needed, which are getting no repairs and no attention from this government. You will find wharfs sitting out miles in the lake, that are not needed at all, but have cost the people of this country a great deal of money. Not one boat has ever reached them or ever will, they are simply monuments to the Laurier government, to the Laurier humbug, to the Laurier fraud, that is being perpetrated on the people of this Dominion.

House divided on amendment (Mr. Wallace).

YEAS:

Messieurs.

Armstrong,
Barker,
Best,
Borden (Halifax),
Boyce,
Bradbury,
Burrell,
Campbell,
Chisholm (Huron),
Clare,
Crosby,
Crocket,
Crothers,
Currie (Simcoe),
Donnelly,
Fraser,
Goodeve,
Haggart (Winnipeg),
Herron,
Hughes,
Jameson,
Kidd,
Lancaster,
Lennox,
Lewis,
Macdonell,
McCall,
Maddin,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Osler,
Porter,
Schaffner,
Sharpe (Lisgar),
Sharpe (Ontario),
Smyth,
Sproule,
Stanfield,
Staples,
Stewart,
Taylor (Leeds),
Taylor (New Westminster),
Thornton,
Wallace and
Wilson (Lennox and Addington.—45.

NAYS:

Messieurs.

Allard,
Allen,
Aylesworth (Sir Allen),
Black,
Borden (Sir Frederick)
Bureau,
Cash,
Champagne,
Chisholm (Antigonish),
Chisholm (Inverness),
Clark (Red Deer),
Clarke (Essex),
Congdon,
Conmee,
Currie (Prince Edward),
Demers,
Devlin,
Emmerson,
Ethier,
Fielding,
Fisher,
Fortier,
Fowke,
Gauvreau,
Geoffrion,
Girard,
King,
Knowles,
Kyte,
Lachance,
Lafortune,
Lanctot (Richelieu),
Lapointe,
Laurier (Sir Wilfrid),
LeBlanc,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Lovell,
Low,
MacNutt,
McAllister,
McCoig,
McColl,
McIntyre,
McKenzie,
McLean (Huron),
McMillan,
Major,
Marcile (Bagot),
Martin (Regina),
Michaud,
Miller,
Molloy,
Nesbitt,
Papineau,
Parent,
Paterson,
Pickup,
Proulx,
Prowse,
Pugsley,
Rankin,
Reid (Restigouche),
Richards,
Ross (Middlesex),
Ross Rimouski),
Roy (Montmagny),
Rutan,
Savoie,
Schell,
Smith (Middlesex),
Sperry,
Templeman,
Todd,
Turcotte (Nicolet),
Turcotte (Quebec County),
Turgeon,
Turriff and
White (Victoria, Alta).—79.

PAIRS:

Messieurs.

Ministerial.	Opposition.
Brodeur,	Haggart (Lanark),
Oliver,	Cowan,
Murphy,	White (Renfrew),
Guthrie,	Foster,
Graham,	Bristol,
Pardee,	Perley,
Rivet,	Broder,
Seguin,	Doherty,
Carvell,	Northrup,
McGivern,	Roche,
German,	Elson,
Dubeau,	Henderson,
Sinclair,	Monk,
Chew,	Reid (Grenville),
Gordon (Kent),	Blain,
Macdonald,	McCarthy,
Martin (Wellington),	Sexsmith,

Law,	Wright,
Douglas,	Lake,
Tobin,	Ames,
McLean (Sunbury),	Daniel,
Warburton,	Worthington,
Brown,	Lortie,
Beland,	Paquet,
Tolmie,	Marshall,
Bickerdike,	Forget,
Hunt,	Lalor,
Talbot,	Owen,
Harris,	Beattie,
Carrier,	Arthurs,
Neely,	Barnard,
Harty,	Price,
Stratton,	Gordon (Nipissing),
Roy (Dorchester),	Thoburn,
McCraney,	Magrath,
Martin (St. Mary's),	Nantel,
Mayrand,	Blondin,
Smith (Nanaimo),	Rhodes,
Robb,	Wilcox,
Smith (Stormont),	Edwards,
Sealey.	Russell.

Mr. LAPOINTE. The hon. member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) has not voted.

Mr. TALBOT. I am paired with the hon. member for East Northumberland (Mr. Owen). Had I voted I would have voted against the amendment. While I am on my feet I would like to draw your attention to the fact that there is not a single representative from the province of Quebec present on the opposite side of the House. I trust the Montreal 'Gazette' will take notice of it.

Amendment negatived.

Motion agreed to, and House went into Committee of Ways and Means.

WAYS AND MEANS—RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Mr. THOMAS BEATTIE (London). Mr. Speaker, the reciprocity proposal before the House to-day, I consider, is a most dangerous one for this country, and if carried out will prove disastrous to Canada. I believe it has been concocted by shrewd United States politicians, thinking and believing in the end it might lead to the annexation of this country to the United States. For the past three months I have observed the remarks of almost all the senators, as well as the papers of the United States, and I think without exception all desire closer political relation with Canada.

With respect to the commercial aspect of the question, let me here quote an item that was sent from Toronto yesterday to the Montreal 'Star':

> Nearly every day live stock from the United States is brought into Toronto, the Canadian duty paid thereon, and then sold against Canadian animals.

Yesterday 289 sheep from the States were sold on the Toronto market at 5½ cents a pound. They weighed 640 lbs. and brought $3.52 each. The duty was 88 cents. Canadian sheep brought 16 cents less.

American sheep can be brought into Toronto, pay freight, the 25 per cent duty, and compete with home animals.

With the duty off, and Reciprocity will take the duty off, the Toronto live stock market would be flooded with American sheep, and prices would drop about a dollar a head. What is true of sheep is true of hogs and cattle. It is up to the Ontario farmer to bear this in mind.

When this question of reciprocity was introduced into this House, I at once pronounced it the old policy of commercial union revived under the new name of reciprocity. At that time I stated my opinion of it to the press of the city of London. I condemned it then as severely as I could, as being injurious to Canada. And, from that time until the present day I have heard nothing from my friends but commendation of the views I then expressed. About the year 1866 the late reciprocity treaty which had been in existence for some fifteen years was repealed. In the same year there was a large convention in the city of Detroit, Michigan. The principal speaker was Senator Chandler, and what did he say? He said: 'We will starve those Canadians until they will be obliged to knock at the door for admission into our union.' That was largely applauded by all present. I believe that was the general feeling throughout the United States; and, the same feeling exists to-day.

We have been told that the President of the United States offered our Canadian delegates absolute free trade in manufactures. That, I did not consider very clever on President Taft's part. To me, Sir, it looks like the offer of a full grown man to wrestle with a Canadian lad of fourteen in short pants, because he knows he can down him. I consider the offer of free trade in manufactures to Canada, if the word is parliamentary, a very cowardly offer, knowing we could not accept, and it would seriously injure our Canadian manufactures, which are yet in their infancy. Canada is not knocking to get into the American union to-day. The United States is knocking to get into Canada. I hope they will not succeed, on their terms. If they want to get into our markets, let them take down their tariff bars, come into Canada and buy all they wish.

After forty-five years, the United States has discovered that they made a great mistake in repealing the late treaty, and are now most anxious to renew it on much broader lines. In fact they offer much more than we dare accept unless we wish to injure many of our infant industries. Let us be very careful; it is their own

welfare they are considering, not Canada's. Ever since the repeal of the late reciprocity treaty, the United States Congress has raised their tariff bars so high that very little of Canada's natural products could enter the United States, and only at great disadvantage. Canada, to-day, is quite independent of the United States or any other country, except the mother country, Great Britain, and no persons know that better than President Taft and his people. I say to the government, is it not better to leave well enough alone?

The United States' politicians are very clever and are now trying to repair the injury they did themselves by getting us back in their net again. But, to me their net is too transparent, it is like the spider's web, 'nice to look at,' but, like the fly discovered, very dangerous to be caught in.

About the time the late treaty was repealed Canada was tied up to a large extent with the United States. Much of our exports were being shipped through Boston and New York ports; not so to-day, our own ports are doing the business. But, now Mr. Speaker, we have our own splendid ships, none better sailing, from any ports. And, last Sir, but not least, the great Cunard steamship Company, having discovered the importance of the Canadian business, has decided to enter the St. Lawrence river, and that company coming after Canada's business speaks volumes for our trade. The people of the United States have not got their eyes shut, but have them wide open, and are watching Canada's great development, and I know are somewhat jealous at our success; I remember the day when they sneered at the name of Canada; now the name of Canada in the United States is respected.

Mr. Speaker, after the repeal of the old treaty Canada was in low water for some time, when Sir John A. Macdonald boldly adopted a remedy, and obtained from the people of this country a mandate to create a National Policy for Canada, which he did. Ever since that time Canada has prospered as she never did before, and will continue to prosper if that policy is let alone, and I trust it will be. I have been told some of the present cabinet, after Sir John A. Macdonald had the mandate from the people for the National Policy, said he dare not carry it into effect; he did carry it into effect, and from that date until the present time Canada had been prosperous, and if let alone will continue to prosper. There is one thing I must give the present government credit for, that is having the good judgment to let the National Policy of the late Sir John A. Macdonald remain pretty well the same as he left it. That is what they may thank for the prosperous times since they have been in office. Will any member in this House state one single act of the present party in power that has contributed to the prosperity Canada has enjoyed during the past fifteen years?

To my mind there are just two reasons why Canada has been prosperous, and has advanced in the past few years, and without those two things she would have remained where she was forty years ago. First of all, I think the National Policy commenced Canada's prosperity; I do not think any man in this House will deny that statement. The second was the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. We, Canadians, should ever feel grateful to that company of wealthy Canadian gentlemen who got together and took their commercial and financial lives in their hands and carried that great work to a satisfactory completion, after being told it would never earn money enough to oil the wheels. I consider it made the west; it largely assisted to make this country prosperous. It advertised the Dominion far and wide; it is a credit to Canada; it is a credit to the empire; every British subject should be proud of it.

I wish the Hon. E. Blake was, to-day, able to express his opinion on this question. This was the self same question that drove him from political life in Canada. The Hon. Mr. Sifton, Mr. German, Mr. Harris, are only following the lead of Hon. E. Blake, and I am told there are many others in the Liberal ranks, but have not the nerve to speak out their minds as those gentlemen have done. In 1903, I find the right hon. gentleman who leads this government expressed these sentiments during the Grand Trunk Pacific discussion:

> I have found in the short experience during which it has been my privilege and my fortune to be placed at the head of affairs, by the will of the Canadian people, that the best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them.

Evidently the hon. gentleman has changed his mind. Now, Mr. Speaker, why should the Canadian wheat crop be sent to the United States for manufacture into flour? Why should it not be ground in this country? This would be one of the prices for Canada to pay under the proposed agreement. What further price must be paid? The admission to our markets of the farmers of Argentine, Austria-Hungary, Bolivia, Colombia, Denmark, Japan, Norway, Russia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and Venezuela. Many of these countries are large exporters of animal and agricultural products which are produced in this country. Under the proposed treaty these twelve countries are entitled to receive, and will receive the same right of entry to our market which is conceded to

the farmers of the United States. But these twelve countries concede nothing to us in return. Sometime ago I saw an estimate of the enormous sum of money that has been lost to Britain by the grinding of their wheat in foreign lands. The loss in feed and grinding was estimated at £300,000,000. It was said that had there been a small tax on flour, and the grain admitted free that enormous sum would have gone into the pockets of the British workman miller instead of the foreigner, and the British people would have had their flour just as cheap; I must say it looks reasonable. Let us see what Mr. King, the great Minneapolis miller, says:

H. H. King of the Sheffield-King Milling company, Minneapolis, has written to Senators Knute Nelson and Moses E. Clapp pointing out that if, under the proposed reciprocity treaty with Canada, 30,000,000 bushels of wheat should move to Minneapolis from western Canada, it would mean a great advantage to the dairying interests of Minnesota because of the greater supply of feed that would be created, and would also mean $1,000,000 for twin city labor, exclusive of railroad labor.

Last year, Mr. King's letter points out, the Minneapolis flour mills ground 70,000,000 bushels of wheat, but they have sufficient capacity and might have ground 100,000,000 bushels had it been available.

Mr. King lays stress upon the advantages that would result in the greater feed supply that would be available. He directs attention to the fact that the German government, and also the government of France, have taken measures to favour the production of feed, and the milling of wheat in such manner that the dairy interests may not find feed prices prohibitive. Mr. King contends that the decline in wheat prices that followed the talk of Canadian reciprocity was only a sentimental decline and in no sense a true indication of what the effect would be upon values if reciprocity were a fact.

The 'Northwestern Miller' contains editorial boosting for Canadian trade treaty as follows:

'If those wise gentlemen who are so firmly set against ratifying the Canadian reciprocity treaty would look just a little further ahead than the instant and immediate effect upon the price of wheat, and squarely face the actual alternative that the defeat of the treaty would present, they might find excellent reason for changing their view.' This is the sentiment expressed in the 'Northwestern Miller' this week.

'As a choice of evils, if nothing better, reciprocity with Canada has its merits. It will do more to annihilate the colonial preference program in Great Britain than any other move that could be devised. This policy has strong support in England and the reciprocity treaty will cut out the ground from under it. If it is not applicable to Canada it will not be applicable to the other colonies, for Canada is the very keystone of the preferential idea, a scheme which, if carried into effect, practically would ruin the export trade of the United States with Great Britain.'

The editorial explains that reciprocity not only will preserve the future of the export trade of Great Britain in wheat as well as flour for both the producing countries, but it will give the millers of Canada and the United States a common ground of operation whereby they will be ale to meet the competition of British mills which now have a monopoly of the flour trade in Great Britain.

H. M. Kinney, general manager of the Winona Wagon Company, Winona, Minn., recently read a paper before the Winona Merchants' and Business Men's Association, stating his position on the question of Canadian reciprocity. After the close of Mr. Kinney's remarks, the association adopted resolutions favouring the ratification of the proposed agreement. Mr. Kinney read his paper following a banquet which was attended by more than a hundred members of the association, many of whom took part in a general discussion of the question following Mr. Kinney's statement of the proposition. His address was in part as follows:

'Let me say right here that if I thought the consummation of this agreement would be disastrous, or even at all injurious to the farmers of this country, I would not favour it for a moment. I believe, on the contrary, that it will not only do no harm to our farmers, but will eventually be of great benefit to them.

'The facts are that the Minnesota millers need some No. 1 hard Canadian wheat in order to use the softer variety grown in Minnesota. If they cannot get the Canadian, they cannot use our wheat; therefore, why not bring in the Canadian wheat free of duty to enable the millers to use more of our own?

'Another argument in favour of admitting Canadian wheat is that it will enable the large mills in Minnesota to make a flour suitable for export and thus largely increase the output of their mills. The additional offal, with such farm products as it should be mixed, will make a perfect dairy preparation for over 6,000,000 head of cattle or stock. Germany and France offer inducements to the millers for securing this offal for their dairy farms.

'The Canadian provinces are not adapted to the growing of live stock, but are distinctly a wheat country. Their packing houses now in operation at Winnipeg, Calgary and other places will be obliged to buy our live stock, thus affording the farmers a new and excellent market for it. We find by examining the proposed treaty that the duties cancelled by both countries cover 116 products, but that there is a much larger number of duties reduced.

'I met a Canadian on the train a short time ago and had quite a discussion with him about this reciprocity question. He was decidedly opposed to the treaty, saying in reply to my statement that the farmers of Canada were anxious to market their wheat in this country. "You will have to buy our wheat in a few years, anyway, and pay the duty and also our price. Your consumption is overtaking the production and it won't be so very long in getting there; then what are

you going to do?" The gentleman was right, and maybe we had better be making this bread and butter trade while we can. Let this fact be borne in mind—and I want to make it most emphatic—should that treaty prove unsatisfactory it can be terminated at any time.'

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. BEATTIE. Mr. Chairman, since the visit of the farmers' delegation this great question has been brought to the attention of the Canadian parliament and people. I refer to the reciprocity compact with the United States. Certain gentlemen in this country who are strongly opposed to protection and who apprehend danger from trusts and combines urge with great force and apparent sincerity that we can obtain relief by entering into commercial union with the United States, the most highly protected country in the world.

Common sense naturally impels one to inquire how it is possible that relief from the evils of protection can be achieved by interlocking our fiscal system with that of a country which maintains the highest tariff wall in the world.

We are said to be suffering from oppressive prices imposed under a protective tariff and we are urged to fly for relief to a country which maintains a tariff nearly twice as high. To avoid the danger of trusts and combines in Canada we are pressed to merge our fiscal system in that of a country wherein trusts and combines wield a power and influence which fortunately are unknown in Canada up to the present.

I may say that we have given the impression in the United States that we are anxious for union with that country. I received a letter to-day from the state of Virginia in which a man has the impertinence to tell me that

Annexation has already set in and nothing can stop it.

Fancy that coming from a gentleman who is the principal of a school for young men. It shows the impression that has gone abroad. I have another letter here which I received last night and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, I shall read it:

July 26, 1911.

Major Beattie,
House of Commons, Ottawa.

Hon. Sir,—I beg to advise you that while I have a very high opinion of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I am absolutely in opposition to reciprocity with the United States.

I am a farmer's son, and for some time I have been making considerable effort to unload my city holdings for a good sized farm in southwest Ontario in exchange, so that I am certainly interested.

I have a number of relatives who are actively engaged in farming; my late brother's boys are the owners of farm lands to the extent of about 1,500 acres, and I do not know of a single Grit or Tory relative engaged in farming who is in favour of this proposed measure. Of course, a Grit political follower is not so outspoken as I usually am, being an out and out independent, I am free; but I know the silent opinion of my relatives. They say that they cannot entertain for a moment any chance for the unloading of American horses and other farm products against their home productions, particularly in that territory which has cost the good people of Ontario so much to put into being, that is our great Northwest.

Of all markets, the most cherished and best is always the home market.

Now, when we had no Northwest, so to speak, and it was then a desirable proposition to have a trade arrangement with our neighbours, how were we treated?

I have not forgotten it, even if Mr. Fielding or Sir Wilfrid never knew from actual experience what it meant to us who have helped do the building and the ploughing. We were turned down hard, and why? Simply with the hope that some day we could be coerced into American bidding. Now that we have shown Uncle Samuel what a great people we could be under trial, and now that our broad acres look tempting for the purpose of feeding his hungry workmen, he would like to get access to our resources in order that he might the better compete in his manufactured products. In other words, we have our dear old uncle beaten to a finish; and in so far as I can do it there will be no chance for his proposed measure being adopted by Canada.

Mr. Taft, a business man representing a business people, now sees the great mistake they made in the past.

Let us as true Canadians hold fast to what we have so hard earned. We have no time to divide this great wealth with a people who have never done anything for us. Taft and taffee may suit the politician; but for a Canadian business man, I would if I could place an injunction on the whole plot.

That is from a very good man whom I know very well, and I thought it was worth reading.

Mr. PATERSON. A Canadian or American?

Mr. BEATTIE. A Canadian. I will let my hon. friend see the letter if he wishes; it is no secret.

Mr. PATERSON. No, no.

Mr. BEATTIE. I know the man very well. A great many people have the idea that a high tariff makes high prices. I believe that a high tariff makes low prices when it gets fairly started. No man will invest his money in any business if he is not sure that he is going to succeed. Unless you give that man some chance of making a success of his business he would be very foolish to put his money into it. A

young industry is much the same as a child; the child must be taken care of by the mother, and father until it becomes a man or woman. I would not put my own money into any business if I did not have a chance of making a successful business of it. I remember some thirty years ago meeting a gentleman in the Imperial hotel, London, England, who was engaged in the paper trade. He was almost crying as he told me this story. He said: I have to compete with the German manufacturers who sell their paper at a bare margin of five per cent. I have to pay my taxes, pay my workmen, make interest on my money and live myself. No man can compete especially in a new country and any one would be very much afraid to start an industry under those conditions. I want to show you what protection will do if it is properly looked after.

The June number of 'Industrial Canada' gives some illustrations that are worth noting. In the eighties Gresson and other French kid manufacturers were sending to the United States $5,000,000 worth of shoe leather, charging for it 60 cents per foot. A protective duty of 20 per cent was put on. Gresson leather did not go to 72 cents. It dropped to 45 cents and then to 40 cents, 35 cents and 30 cents. Thousands of men from France and elsewhere were put to work in the United States. Was protection worth while? J. G. Cleghorn, of England, manufactured linings for coats and employed in his factory 3,000 men and women. The United States put on a protective tariff, and the Cleghorn factories were shut up. Three thousand were given employment in the United States' shops, making coat linings. Mr. Cleghorn's comment of an inquirer of the United States was: 'You have the wise statesmen to keep your men employed.' Then there is the case of men's gloves. The largest English manufacturer lost 80 per cent of his business with the United States when a duty was put on this item. What was the result? Before the tariff was enacted these gloves sold for $1.25 a pair. After the tariff was put on the price was $1 for the same gloves. Pearl buttons were imported into the United States in immense quantities. A protective duty was put on, and the banks of the Mississippi hummed with the industry of many pearl button factories. The whole industry was transported to the United States, and the shells which lay for generations valueless were turned into articles of commerce. And the price dropped below what it was before the tariff was put on.'

The reduction of prices is not the only advantage gained. The chief gain is in the development of home markets. When the people employed in making kid leather, coat linings, and men's gloves for the United States were in France or England American farmers could sell them only a small proportion of the food they consumed. When the manufacturing was done in the United States the working people got nearly all their food supplies from American farmers.

C. C. James, M.A., Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, delivered a very interesting address about eight years ago before the Natural Science Association of Ontario. He showed that in a period of six years Ontario had increased its production of beef from $12,000,000 to $23,000,000; bacon and pork from $10,000,000 to $20,000,000; cheese from $9,000,000 to $15,000,000; value of farm lands from $554,000,000 to $605,000,000; value of farm buildings from $206,000,000 to $237,000,000; value of farm implements from $51,000,000 to $62,000,000; value of live stock from $94,000,000 to $141,000,000. His language is very significant when he touches the question of reciprocity. Bear in mind that his words were uttered seven or eight years before his present proposals were put forward by our government.

Denmark, some thirty years ago, began to encourage and teach her farmers to turn out the finished products of the farm. By so doing she has so stimulated the productiveness of her soil that the average crop has increased from fifty to seventy-five per cent. The superiority of Danish finished products and the reputation which they enjoy have commanded the markets of Great Britain, nearly one-third of the bacon and nearly one-quarter of the eggs, comes from this little country.

The United States can produce a food supply sufficient for at least four hundred millions, and probably sufficient for eight hundred millions of people. Mr. L. R. Waterbury, of Michigan, produced before the Legislative Committee on Agriculture a document prepared by the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States. This document showed the total per capita production for a long series of years of the following crops: Wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, potatoes, hay, tobacco, and cotton. During the past forty years the production of these ten agricultural staples in the United States has increased more rapidly than the population. The increase has been steady and consistent. The per capita production is thirty per cent greater than it was forty years ago.

I am absolutely opposed to the reciprocity compact now pending before parliament. What reasons can be urged in its favour, and what advantages can be expected from its provisions? We are told that Canada wanted it forty years ago. But we are dealing with the conditions in 1911 and not with the conditions in 1866. The denunciation of the reciprocity agree-

ment of 1854 was most fortunate for this country. It helped to bring about the federation of this Dominion, which has broadened so as to include the west. It instilled into the hearts of Canadians a courage and a faith in their country which were before unknown. It brought forth all their qualities of energy, capacity and resourcefulness. It compelled Canada to find new markets, and in the success of that endeavour, Canada found also strength and confidence.

Why is it that the free traders and advocates of reciprocity in discussing the tariff question take no account of British Columbia? They assume that the prairie provinces are naturally fitted for manufacturing industries and that consequently the sentiment of the west is certain to be in favour of free trade. They entirely ignore British Columbia. We have already shown that the free traders underrate the natural advantages of the prairie provinces. We have already pointed out that Winnipeg has factories employing about fifteen thousand hands, and that other important towns of the prairie provinces make a creditable showing in manufacturing enterprise. It is certain that Alberta, with great supplies of coal and raw materials close at hand, is certainly destined to become a great manufacturing province. But, of all the provinces of our vast Dominion, the one that seems likely to have the greatest industrial future is British Columbia.

British Columbia is not only the biggest province of the west, but it has the greatest natural advantages. It has extensive areas suitable for growing fruits, vegetables and grains; its fisheries are very valuable; its forests are unequalled; it has gold, silver, copper, lead, iron and coal in abundance, as well as numerous waterfalls, which when developed will furnish cheap electrical power; and its magnificent harbours are open throughout the year. There is also no branch of industry that could not be successfully prosecuted in that great province. British Columbia will be the most populous province of the Canadian west, perhaps of the whole Dominion, and its vote will be cast for Canadianism rather than for continentalism. There may be doubt about the sentiment of the prairie provinces on the question of reciprocity, but British Columbia is unquestionably opposed to the compact made at Washington. Strong as is the protectionist sentiment in British Columbia to-day, it will be still stronger when manufacturing industries develop throughout the country.

In the year 1887, Mr. A. Williamson challenged the Cobden Club to issue a short circular to the leading British exporters asking them whether in exporting goods to the United States the taxation was paid by the British manufacturer or the consumer in the United States. The Cobden Club did not accept the challenge, but Mr. Williamson sent a circular to a large number of representative exporters of the chief manufacturing centres, embracing cotton, woollen, carpet, iron and steel, brass, gold, silver, electro plate, hardware, guns, eyelets, engineering, glass, india rubber, leather, beer and other industries. Out of 531 replies every one but one admitted that to a greater or less extent the United States tariff taxation fell upon them instead of upon the consumers in the United States, because they had to reduce their prices to meet the prices of the protected American manufactures. The manager of the Barrow Steel Company stated in evidence before the British Royal Commission on trade depression that in one year, 1884, his company had paid £160,000 or about three-quarters of a million dollars in duties to the United States government. This is not a new condition of things. The same law of prices prevailed when the United States was a young and struggling nation. For example, two months after the adoption of the protective tariff of 1842, a large hardware importing house in New York representing British manufactures sent out a circular and price list giving in parallel columns the prices they charged for goods laid down in New York, duty paid, before and after the protective tariff was increased. Twenty staple articles, which cost £143 16s. under the old revenue tariff, were offered for £131 10s. under the new protective tariff, so that the cost in the United States after paying the duties was considerably less than before the tariff was increased. Anyone who has studied the price lists in the United States under the different tariffs since the year 1824 and compared them with the British prices for the same years will admit that in the great majority of cases the protective duty is not added to the price of the article. A few instances will suffice to show the fallacy of the free trade theory of prices. Before 1842 there was a low duty on starch, but it was not sufficiently high to cause production in the United States except on a small scale. A large factory had been started in New York, but was obliged to shut down for want of sufficient protection. As soon as the high tariff was imposed this factory was re-opened and at once placed starch on the market half a cent per pound cheaper than it could be bought for before the tariff was raised. Other factories were soon established and prices were kept down, while employment was given to a considerable number of American workmen.

The tariff of 1842 made the minimum duties on cotton fabrics six cents per square yard on plain, and nine cents per square yard on printed or coloured cottons. These duties were about equal to one hundred per cent on the importer's valuation of their goods. A few months after the adoption of that tariff, Mr. Horace Greely, editor of the New York 'Tribune,' made an inquiry as to the prices on cotton fabrics in Lowell, Mass., the principal cotton manufacturing centre of the United States at that time, and published in his paper the average prices for the three months after the new tariff was imposed. The prices were as follows:

	In May, June and July, 1842. Cents.	In Sept., Oct. and Nov., 1842. Cents.
Drillings	7¾	7
Shirtings, common...	5¼	5
Shirtings heavy.. ..	6¼	5¾
Sheetings, common ..	6⅞	6
Sheetings, wide.. ..	8½	7⅞
Flannels (cotton) ..	10	8½

Thus, though, according to free trade theory, the prices should have been doubled as a result of the high duty, they were actually reduced. Later on still further reductions were made as new factories were built in the United States, and home competiton increased. We might fill pages with similar illustrations of the fact that a protective duty is not usually added to the price except temporarily, but it will not do to weary the House with too many figures.

Those who believe that all Great Britain's progress has been due to the adoption of free trade should read the speech made by Henry Clay before the United States House of Representatives when the protective Bill of 1824 was being discussed. Mr. Clay, who has been called the father of protection in the United States, made a statistical comparison between Great Britain and other countries of Europe, showing how greatly the British people has prospered under protection.

Britain at that time had a higher protective tariff than any other country, and Mr. Clay's comparison shows that it was the most prosperous country in the world, that the earnings of the people were greater in proportion to the cost of living, and that the wealth of the country was increasing in a most extraordinary way.

In conclusion Mr. Clay said:

> The committee will observe that the measure of wealth of a nation is measured by its protection of its industry, and that the measure of the poverty of a nation is marked by that of the degree in which it neglects and abandons the care of its own industry, leaving it exposed to the action of foreign powers. Great Britain protects most her industry and the wealth of Great Britain is consequently the greatest. France is next in the degree of protection, and France is next in the order of wealth. Spain most neglects the protecting the industry of her subjects, and Spain is one of the poorest of European nations. The views of British prosperity which I have endeavoured to represent, show that her protecting policy is adapted alike to a state of war and peace. Self-poised, resting upon her own internal resources, possessing a home market, carefully cherished and guarded, she is ever prepared for any emergency. We have seen her coming out of a war of incalculable exertion, and of great duration, with her power unshaken, her means undiminished. We have seen that almost every revolving year of peace has brought along with it an increase in her manufactures, of her commerce, and consequently of her navigation. We have seen that constructing her prosperity upon the solid foundation of her own protecting policy, it is unaffected by the vicissitudes of other states. What is our own condition? Depending upon the state of foreign powers—confiding exclusively in a foreign to the culpable neglect of a domestic policy—our interests are affected by their movements. Their wars, their misfortunes are the only source of our prosperity. In their peace, and our peace we hold our condition the reverse of that of Great Britain, and all our interest stationary or declining. Peace brings to us none of the blessings of peace. Our system is anomalous; alike unfitted to tranquillity and to a state of war or peace on the part of our own country, it can succeed only in the rare occurrence of a general state of war throughout Europe.

One great mistake was made in the past by public men and newspapers of both political parties. The United States tariff was described as an 'unfriendly tariff.' Because it was very much higher than the Canadian tariff it was regarded as hostile to Canada. Now, on the other hand, when the politicians of the United States are disposed to lower their tariff on Canadian products and are even agreeable to unrestricted reciprocity their attitude is described as 'friendly,' and we are urged by the advocates of reciprocity not to reject these friendly advances.

As a matter of fact the high tariff of the United States was not adopted on account of any hostility toward Canada or any other country. It was simply designed for the purpose of protecting home industries, and it had the effect it was intended to have. The Americans are a patriotic people, and we had no right to find fault with them for protecting their own interests. Nor is their present attitude the result of any increase of friendly sentiment toward Canada. It is prompted entirely by self-interest.

The greatest compliment we can pay the Americans is to imitate their policy of adopting measures to develop their own country regardless of the policies of other nations. When the British people decided

upon a free trade policy the Americans did not consider it necessary to follow suit. They had sufficient courage and confidence to maintain their own policy. Nor is there any likelihood that they will be offended if we imitate them in this regard. The United States is a great and prosperous country. It does not need our money or our men, but Canada in this stage in its history needs every man and every dollar that can be kept in the country to aid in its development.

If, instead of adopting reciprocity, the Dominion parliament would increase the Canadian tariff against the United States and other foreign countries, American capitalists would regard it as an invitation to invest capital in Canada. They secured British capital to develop their resources by means of high protection, and they will help us in the same way that British capitalists helped them if we give equal tariff security. Within a week after the raising of the Canadian tariff a number of large American concerns would have representatives in Canada looking for sites for branch factories. A bold, independent tariff policy would excite the admiration of the American people.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, again I say had we not better leave well enough alone. Why risk a certainty for an uncertainty? Because, Mr. Speaker, I find nearly all of the United States senators in their remarks are not so much in favour of reciprocity as they are for the political union of this country with the United States, which they will never obtain.

Senator Nelson, of Minnesota, declared that his only hope of benefit from the Canadian reciprocity was it might lead to annexation of Canada; but, 'if we can accomplish the annexation of Canada we will have accomplished a great deal.'

I consider those remarks coming from Senator Nelson, to say the least, are insulting to all Canadians as well as they are to all the British Empire.

What did Senator Lodge of Massachusetts say?—'I intend to vote for reciprocity measure because I think in the long run it will draw the United States and Canada closer together.'

Before concluding, let me say a word about the British preference. I am told by our people in London that there are many agents coming in from England and selling manufactured goods the same as they make, right at their doors. That should not be. While I am in favour of the British preference, I think it should not be raised so high that it will hurt people in our own country. There is no better imperialist in this House than I am; at the same time I am for Canada first, I believe we should protect our own people first, and that we should not allow people of other countries to come in here and take away that which belongs to the workingmen in our own factories. This Dominion was created under the Union Jack. I was born under the Union Jack, and I hope to die under it; and I hope this Dominion of Canada will exist forever under the Union Jack. Mr. Speaker I wish to say right here that closer relations with the United States will never come so long as I live, with my consent.

Mr. J. W. MADDIN (South Cape Breton). Mr. Speaker, I should be derelict in my duty as a member of this House, I would not be discharging my duty to my constituents, or to the people of the province from which I come, nor in a broader sense would I be discharging my duty as a Canadian, if I were to allow this debate to come to a division without contributing my views to this very important question. Let me at first take a brief glance at the history of this country. In 1775 when the 13 British colonies that now constitute the greater part of the United States kindled the torch, and drew the sword, and cast the tea chests into Boston harbour, they probably had some justification for doing it at that time. But there were a large number of British subjects among them who thought differently, and they shook the dust of those colonies from off their feet, and came northward into the province of Ontario, and into the province of Quebec; they made their way down to the maritime provinces, and perhaps the greatest Canadian we have ever had up to the present time, the Hon. Joseph Howe, from the loins of one of those United Empire Loyalists. Now, Sir, the result of that revolution was that the people of the United States made a declaration of independence, and began to map out their own career. The other British colonies which now constitute the Dominion of Canada remained outside that union, preferring to live under the Union Jack. Our neighbours to the south, who are so friendly to-day, and who come up to the line with an olive branch in their hands seeking to make an inroad on our natural resources, in 1812 invaded this territory, and our forefathers met them at the frontier, met them on their ships, gave them battle, and fought to maintain this territory as a part of the British Empire. In 1837 when the Mackenzie-Papineau rebellion took place, it is a well known and well recognized fact that it was financed in the United States, and that a great deal of the arms and ammunition that were put into the hands of the insurrectionists came from across the 50th parallel. Now that was in 1837. The United States were not so friendly towards us then. In 1866 again the Fenian raid took place. Let me point out also that the United States had some

troubles of their own between 1861 and 1865. The people of Canada had entered into a reciprocity agreement with them in 1854, it was to continue for ten years at least, with two years notice of abrogation. That notice was given, and the treaty was abrogated in 1866. During the American civil war the British government was so indiscreet, according to the views of some of the people in the northern states, as to recognize the southern confederacy. On the other hand a large number of Canadians had gone over and fought with the northerners against the confederacy to help emancipate the slaves. A few Canadians expressed sympathy with the southern states, and some of the refugees from that country sought an asylum in Canada. This incensed the people of the northern states against the Dominion of Canada, and the people of the south were incensed against Canada as part of the British Empire, because Britain would not recognize the southern confederacy. The result was that when the war closed in 1865, the treaty was abrogated in 1866. Then the United States, that is so friendly to-day, set about, by the raising of a high tariff wall, to cut off communication between the two countries with the ultimate object of forcing Canada into annexation. That was a time calling for strong men and stern men; the occasion brought forth the men, and history repeated itself as it always does. At that time we had in Canada the late Sir John A. Macdonald, we had the late George Brown, we had the late Sir Leonard Tilley, we had Sir Charles Tupper, we had the late Sir George Cartier, we had the fathers of confederation. These men, gathered from the various provinces, set about to meet the situation which was now fraught with danger, and threatened to wipe the British colonies out of existence. What did they proceed to do? They brought these scattered provinces into a confederacy, they brought them into what is now known as the Dominion of Canada under the British North America Act, which is the constitution under which this parliament is sitting. After that was accomplished Canada raised a tariff wall against the United States. She struggled on as best she could, mapping out her own career, trying policy after policy, under the Conservatives first, under the Liberals afterwards, and in 1878 the Liberal-Conservative party adopted the National Policy. Instead of buying our manufactured goods from the United States, we made a tariff sufficiently high to protect our own manufacturers in articles that we could produce in Canada, thereby giving employment to people within our own borders, and by building railways and canals, extending interprovincial trade, and building up this country without any assistance from the United States.

This was continued down until 1896. In 1896, the present administration came into power. A great many people expected that they would at once wipe out the National Policy. As the hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Sifton) said during the course of this debate, he understood that the fiscal policy of this country had been fixed ever since the Fielding tariff of 1897, so that every man from Vancouver to Sydney, from the Great Lakes to the Arctic Ocean, knew what it was. There was no difference of opinion among statesmen or politicians in this country, with regard to the best policy for the people of this country. During all these years, from 1867, some 44 years, we mapped out our own career, we blazed the trail through the forest, we built railways and canals that have cost this country over $500,000,000. We built them east and west, we bridged a chasm of 1,200 miles of Canadian Pacific railway that does not originate one dollar's worth of freight or passenger traffic. We built these lines of canals east and west, and because geographically that was the proper route to build them by, but because we had a neighbour to the south so hostile that we were obliged to build them east and west whether we liked it or not. We have built those lines of trade and we have developed an interprovincial trade which hon. members who have preceded me have described. On the 1st day of January last every one in Canada was happy, contented and prosperous. We had developed our trade interprovincially, we had built our railways and canals as I have pointed out, and whilst we did it we lived under the Union Jack. We did not share in England's difficulties. The people of the old country had extended the British Empire until we boasted that the sun never set on it, but Great Britain never asked us for one single dollar. We went on developing our resources until it is said now that the fruit is ripe to fall from the tree. Whilst we were building our railways and canals, whilst we were extending our manufactures in the Dominion of Canada, there is not a member of this House who picked up a British or a colonial newspaper and read the head lines of threatened war between Germany and Britain, between France and Britain, who gave it a second thought. We crawled under the sheets and went to bed when we felt like it, we got up when we felt like it, and amongst the worries of the day we did not carry any national responsibility. Why? Because Britain's North Atlantic squadron patrolled our Atlantic seaboard; because 110-ton disappearing guns were mounted at York Redoubt on the shores of Halifax harbour; because masked batteries at Port Pleasant, at the eastern passage, fortified Halifax harbour and because 3,500

redcoats and 500 sappers and engineers with guns and ammunition guarded the city while we slept. At Quebec the same conditions obtained. The fortifications were there, equally fit, prepared to meet the invader and there again there were 4,000 redcoats of Great Britain manning the forts, patrolling the city whilst the people of Canada were developing its resources, extending its trade, meeting the competition of our hostile neighbours to the south. On the Pacific coast, at Esquimalt, similar fortifications, every days' pay at the port hundred redcoats were there and the South Pacific squadron of Great Britain patrolled the Pacific ocean. Every ship, every man aboard those ships, every dollar's worth of fortifications, every days' pay at the port of Halifax, Quebec and Esquimalt, was paid by the burdened taxpayers of Great Britain, who were holding the flag secure above our heads, and all that we did was, on May 24 or Dominion Day, to give ourselves a holiday, sing 'God Save the Queen,' 'Rule Britannia, Britannia Rules the Waves'—that was our contribution. On Friday, the 19th of last December, a delegation came from the west. They filled the chamber, they filled the galleries of this House, they packed the corridors around this House. They numbered some 1,600, and they came from the west which had grown up and developed after the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. They filled this House and they had the right hon. the First Minister and a few of his cabinet sitting where you, Mr. Chairman, and the Clerk of this House sit to-night. Their representatives stood up and read resolutions asking for what? Asking for this trade pact?

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MADDIN. Resolutions asking for free natural products.

Some hon. MEMBERS. No.

Mr. MADDIN. They asked for free farming implements, they asked for free leather goods, they asked for free shelf hardware. That is what the people of the west asked for, and they were told in a ten-minute speech by the Prime Minister that no material change would be made in the tariff until a commission had gone over the matter, and they would see what could be done to alleviate the circumstances that existed in the west according to the representations made by that delegation. Who doubted the First Minister when he made that announcement the day we left to spend our Christmas holidays at home? Who supposed that on the 26th day of January, at four o'clock in the afternoon, like a bolt from the blue, an announcement was to be made of a trade pact such as we have to discuss to-night? What had happened in the meantime, what had come over the political situation? I will tell you. President Taft, a Republican President, found himself surrounded by a Democratic majority. He knew the attitude of the Democratic party, he knew it was towards the lowering of the tariff of the United States. There were good reasons for that. The people of the United States, living behind their 46 per cent tariff wall, had grown in population from 11,000,000 in 1775 to 90,000,000 in 1911. They had depleted their forests, they had no wood for telephone poles, railway ties, pulp or anything else. They had depleted their fisheries and exhausted their resources to a large extent. The barbed wire fence west and north had inclosed the grazing lands and they required more meat. Prices soared so high that they were pressing very hard on the wage-earner, and the Democratic party adopted a policy that the tariff wall should be lowered. President Taft knew they would lower that tariff. They were pledged to lower the tariff, and President Taft thought he would go one better, he thought he would secure a couple of easy marks from Canada and get them down to negotiate with him in Washington, and so secure a quid pro quo, get something in exchange for what the Democrats would have given free. So an invitation was sent to Canada to send over a couple of plenipotentiaries to negotiate a treaty or pact. It is strange that this is called a pact. One might very well do as the Minister of Justice is fond of doing and propound a pun by asking: When is a treaty not a treaty, the answer being: When Fielding knocks it.

Mr. Taft sent for two representatives to go over to the United States to negotiate with him. The Democrats were sorely in need of a lower tariff. They had to get the raw material, and natural resources of some country, and Canada is only divided by an imaginary line which it would take an experienced surveyor days and days to find. Intersected by railway lines, and being adjacent, Canada was the only place that they saw to secure their raw material from. They had used theirs up—by exporting it raw, as we are invited to do, by sending it in an unmanufactured state out of the country, as we are urged to do now. No, Mr. Chairman, they took their steers, they drove them up the gang planks into the slaughter houses at Chicago, they slashed their throats, and in a few minutes cars carried away four quarters of dressed beef, the intestines were worked up into bologna sausage, the offal into fertilizer, the horns and hoofs into buttons and ladies' hat and hair pins, the hides were shorn of the hair, and this was manufactured. The hides were tanned, but they did not sell the hides; they sent

the hides to Lynn, Salem, Worcester, Woonsocket, Haverhill, and numerous other towns in the New England States, they were there manufactured into shoes and shoe strings, and they would be very glad to dispose of them in a market that would admit them free of duty. By manufacturing their resources to the very highest state they have become a wealthy nation, and now they want more raw material. They have invited us to give them that steer in order that they may work it up into its different products. Then they will send it back to us labelled 'Armour's beef,' at 25 or 30 cents a pound. We are told that it is a splendid thing to send cattle south at 6 or 7 cents a pound on the hoof, and buy the product back in tins at 25 or 30 cents a pound. If the people of the United States want our beef, give us a chilled meat industry to meet the situation, and we will manufacture it here in all its different grades and sell it to them as they sold it to us.

When the call came from Mr. Taft to send down delegates from Washington, whom did the Prime Minister or his cabinet select?—the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), and the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Paterson), two hon. gentlemen for whom I entertain the highest and profoundest regard. But, it will not be lacking in respect to say that the Minister of Customs, being out of active business, and out of active touch with the development and growth of this country, having served his country for so many years in the past, had outlived his day of usefulness for international negotiations. The Minister of Finance, it will not be disrespectful to say, was not much better fitted to carry on these negotiations. Whom were they invited to discuss this business with? We have been told on the hustings, in the Liberal press, on the floor of this House, that the day was passed when we would go begging to Washington with our hats in our hands, that Washington was coming to Canada. But, when this nefarious treaty was to be drawn up delegates went from Ottawa to Washington. Whom did they go down to meet? They went down to meet the trained tariff experts of the United States, young, strong, virile men, graduates in the class of economics and political economy of the leading universities of the United States, trained amongst the tariff experts of the country that has the highest tariff on the face of the earth, dozens of them at the beck and call of President Taft and Secretary Knox. Our two unsophisticated Canadian ministers, these guileless old gentlemen, made their way down to Washington to negotiate with an aggregation of that kind. Why, Mr. Chairman, we might as well have sent a pair of English sparrows to a convention of eagles. Canada never had a look-in from the commencement of these negotiations. Some day or two subsequent to the arrival of these gentlemen in Washington. they sent back for the commissioner of Customs, and Mr. Russell. Had not these two gentlemen gone down to fortify the ambassadors of Canada I have no doubt that such a pact would have come back signed, sealed and delivered as would have exchanged the Union Jack for the Stars and Stripes on the flag pole over this chamber before this late day.

In regard to the past political record of the hon. Minister of Customs I must confess that I am not very familiar with it, but I have pointed out what I consider to be the epoch making marks in Canada's history—confederation, the building of the Canadian Pacific railway, the National Policy, and on every one of these occasions the hon. Minister of Finance has been found on the opposite side fighting them tooth and nail, opposed to them at all times. In 1867, he was opposed to confederation, and from that on until 1878, actively, through the most powerful, at the time, Liberal organ in eastern Canada, the 'Morning Chronicle,' argued strongly against the adoption of the National Policy. In 1881, when the Canadian Pacific railway was being built, the Minister of Finance, through the columns of the 'Morning Chronicle,' fought it tooth and nail. He poured out with all the ardour and venom in his power his opposition to that enterprise, all that he could say he said and reiterated, and all he could add to that he expressed against the building of the Canadian Pacific railway. In 1882 he became a member of the Nova Scotia legislature. Within two years he was premier and provincial secretary of Nova Scotia, and on his first appeal to the people of that province after his appointment as provinical secretary and premier he appealed to the electorate asking for a repeal of the union. He addressed a memorial to the people of Nova Scotia which appeared in the 'Morning Chronicle' of May 26, 1886. In the last paragraph of this manifesto he says:

> If the people of Nova Scotia are satisfied with the fruits of Confederation, they will have the opportunity of recording the fact by depositing their ballots on the 15th June. But if, as we believe, they are deeply dissatisfied with their position in the union and determined to bring about a better state of affairs, they will doubtless feel that they can best advance the true interests of this province by sustaining the repeal policy which the local government submit for their approval.
>
> I have the honour to be, gentlemen, your most obedient servant,
>
> (Sgd.) W. S. FIELDING.
>
> Halifax, May 25, 1886.

On June 11, in support of his appeal to the people to favour repeal, he published the following in the editorial columns of the 'Morning Chronicle':

Electors of Nova Scotia.

Remember you are under Canadian corn laws, which compel you to pay 50 cents more for every barrel of flour you use than you would have to pay if the tariff permitted you to get it from the States, and besides this duty you have to pay 50 to 60 cents per barrel to bring it by railway, when you could get it from the States for ten cents freight from Boston, and fifteen cents from New York.

That was on the 11th of June, 1886, and the leading editorial on the 15th of June, the morning of the election, commenced as follows:

The first day of July, 1867, was the darkest day in this history of Nova Scotia.

On July 11th, 1886, he wrote as follows:

Farmers of Nova Scotia remember repeal means reciprocity——

He had the reciprocity bee in his bonnet as early as that:

--and reciprocity means 15 cents more for every bushel of potatoes you raise. Quebec and Ontario take no potatoes. Our market is in the States and we can get that market opened to us by repeal.

On June 8th, 1886, under the caption 'Farmers, Attention,' the editor of the 'Morning Chronicle' says:

The haying season is coming on and the paternal government at Ottawa thought it a good time to take something more from you in the way of taxes, so they have just passed an amendment to the tariff under which the duty on scythes is made $2.50 per dozen. There is a Tory manufactory of a second-class article in Ontario, and of course it must be kept up at your expense, and an inferior article forced on you by a corrupt government for the benefit of their Tory friends.

There, Mr. Chairman, was a statement to the farmers of Nova Scotia that the Tory government had raised the duty on scythes, $2.50 per doz., and the same doctrine was preached by the Liberals in the campaign of 1896, but when they came to office the first two Senators they appointed were Mr. Melvin Jones and Mr. Frost. The farmers of Canada from Vancouver to Halifax were told during the campaign of 1896 that they were being sweated by Massey-Harris and Frost & Wood, and that the Grits were going to wipe out every vestige of protection when they came to power, and the Minister of Finance, then Premier of Nova Scotia, urged upon the farmers that they were being robbed by the paternal government at Ottawa for the benefit of its Tory friends. In 1896, up to polling day, the farmers were told that they were being robbed by Frost & Wood and Massey-Harris, the two large farming implement concerns, and Mr. Jones is practically the head of the Massey-Harris concern, and Mr. Frost, the head of Frost & Wood, and these were two of the first men selected by the Liberals for seats in the Senate. And, Mr. Chairman, have not these two firms prospered well since these two senators took their seats. Is it, perhaps, because these two gigantic farming implement concerns have fortified themselves in the Red Chamber that this government, instead of giving free farming implements to the farmers of the west in answer to their prayer of Friday the 19th day of December last, preferred to take a trip to Washington to bring back something the farmers had not asked for. A great many people were surprised when in 1896 the hon. Mr. Fielding had been called to Ottawa to discharge the dignified and onerous duties of Minister of Finance. His career in his province had been watched. Just about the time the First Minister was making his speeches before the Boston Club and talking annexation, the Minister of Finance evidently took a cue from Sir Wilfrid Laurier, because when in January, 1896, the Hon. Chas. E. Tanner introduced a Bill into the legislature of Nova Scotia to make Dominion Day a public school holiday in the province, the Minister of Finance took certain action with respect to it. I quote from 'Hansard' of the legislature:

Hon. Mr. Fielding suggested to the hon. member (Mr. Tanner), that a day be named when he would move in relation to the Bill respecting Dominion Day.

Mr. Turner said he was not in a position to name a day at present.

Hon. Mr. Fielding said any day would do equally well; he merely desired that it should not be brought up without notice.

At a later date during the same session:

Mr. Tanner said he had intimated that he would to-day probably move the second reading of the Bill to declare Dominion Day a holiday in the public schools of the province. He was not prepared to move the second reading of the Bill at present but would prefer to have the matter stand over.

Hon. Mr. Fielding said he was content the motion should stand over on the understanding that a day's notice should be given.

The Bill was finally introduced on February 13th, 1896, and the late Hon. T. F. Black, then representing Cumberland county, moved in amendment:

That in view of the circumstances under which the province of Nova Scotia became a member of the union and the strong feeling manifested on the subject by a large part of the people, the unity and harmony which are so desirable to the advancement of the interests of the country would be better promoted by leaving the celebration of Domin-

ion Day in this province to the voluntary action of the people, than by the passing of an Act to compel the observance of the day, therefore, the further consideration of this Bill be deferred until this day three months.'

On a division being taken the amendment moved by the hon. member for Cumberland was put and carried, there being 21 votes for and 11 against. Names being called for there appeared before the convention, hon. Provincial Secretary:

That is our Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding), to-day. I need not read the names of the other twenty. Now, if at that time he could vote for an amendment to a Bill making Dominion day a holiday in the schools of the province of Nova Scotia simply because a number of people felt a little sore towards the union, could he not ask himself in his secret soul who had sown the seed of sedition there? Had not he been preaching it not merely for ten years since 1886, but from 1867? He advocated it so strongly that he went back from the country with a strong majority in favour of repeal. But he knew that the government of Ottawa would veto any such legislation on his part, and that the Imperial authorities would not countenance the disintegration of a confederation which had cost the people of this country so much.

Now, we have had delegation after delegation come to this parliament; in fact this has been a government of delegation; delegations have come about farming implements, about railways, about bridges, and dear knows what all. We have had petitions and representations from people all over the country. When there was a probability, or possibility, of change being made in the tariff relating to coal, Premier Murray of Nova Scotia invited the coal operators of the province to assemble, and, to a man, they gathered in the city of Halifax. Nine-tenths of the whole revenue of the province of Nova Scotia, outside of the federal subsidy, is derived from coal, and anything that would interfere with the coal trade was a matter that would affect the province of Nova Scotia. So, Premier Murray discharged his duty in calling the operators to convene and express their opinions and reasons with regard to the duty on coal. When these gentlemen had deliberated they prepared some reports which, when compiled formed a brochure which they submitted to this government, and to Mr. Fielding, personally. There were at that gathering the Dominion Coal Company, Limited; The Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, Limited; the Cumberland Railway and Coal Company, Limited; the Acadia Coal Company, Limited; the Intercolonial Coal Mining Company, Limited; the Inverness Railway and Coal Company, Limited; the Port Hood Richmond Railway Coal Company, Limited; MacKay Mining Company, Limited and the Colonial Coal Company, Limited. And they reported as follows:

The companies engaged in coal mining in the province of Nova Scotia understand that reciprocity in coal may form one of the subjects for consideration at the proposed conference between the government of Canada and that of the United States of America in reference to reciprocal trade relations between the two countries. The operators have made a careful study of the effect of any reciprocal arrangement in coal and the result of their investigations and the knowledge gained by experience in the business convinces them that reciprocity would be disastrous to the coal industry of the province.

The reasons given for this opinion and the statistics in support thereof are printed as appendices hereto and the coal operators are convinced that a study of these papers will lead to the conclusion that their opinion is right.

There is now invested in the coal mining industry of this province over $50,000,000 and more than 17,000 men and boys are directly engaged in mining alone. One-fifth of the population of Nova Scotia is dependent on this industry for a livelihood and more than one third of the total revenue of the province is from royalties on coal. The production has increased from 800,000 tons in 1879 to 6,300,000 tons in 1908. At least $10,000,000 is paid out for wages and supplies every year and about $8,500,000 of this amount is for wages. To realize the importance of the industry to Canada there must also be taken into consideration the men employed by the railways and in the fleet of ships necessary for transportation of the coal, and about its storage and handling in Montreal and other cities. The amount paid by the coal companies to the harbour commissioners of the ports of Montreal and Quebec alone amounts to over $100,000. Next to steel, coal is the best revenue producer of the Intercolonial railway.

The manufacture of steel can only be carried on successfully near an abundance of cheap coal. If production is curtailed less slack (cheap) coal will be made and the steel industry is made impossible. More than 6,000 men are employed in the steel industries of Nova Scotia and one-eighth of the total revenue of the Intercolonial railway is derived from the transportation of steel products.

It is abundantly clear from the debates in parliament and the speeches of public men both before and after the National Policy tariff of 1879 that the duty was placed on coal to offset the duty on flour; that compact was made between the public men of Canada that the maritime provinces would submit to a duty on flour to benefit the province of Ontario, and as a compensation therefor Ontario would support a duty on coal. This agreement was one of the 'give and take' arrangements so often entered into between provinces with conflicting interests and has become part of our national life and it is submitted that Nova Scotia has the right to have the compact maintained.

I pass now to some of the reasons these coal operators gave why the duty on coal should not be interfered with:

It must be remembered that most manufacturers use slack coal, upon which there is a duty of only 15 cents, or anthracite dust, which is free, and that the duty round bituminous coal does not enter into the cost of the principal lines of manufactured goods. Reference is had on this point at page 15. The maintenance of strong companies in Nova Scotia is essential to cheap coal for Ontario and Quebec, as the United States producers will maintain the price on the lakes at a point that will prevent the marketing of Nova Scotia coal. Oust Nova Scotia coal from the St. Lawrence market and the price can then be fixed as the foreign producer may dictate. . . . The operators submit that the effect of reciprocity would be to develop lines of trade north and south and render all the efforts of Canadian money and enterprise to establish these lines east and west. This would have a ruinous effect on the trade of the Intercolonial railway and the business of the ports of Montreal, Quebec, St. John and Halifax. The Transcontinental railway from Winnipeg to Moncton would be made valueless to Canada.

The operators are of the opinion that under any reciprocal arrangements as to coal:

(a) That little or no Nova Scotia coal can be profitably marketed in New England.

(b) That a large part of the St. Lawrence trade would be lost to Nova Scotia.

(c) That the effect will be most disastrous to the coal industry and will seriously imperil the growing steel industry.

(d) That it will disorganize interprovincial trade and cause serious loss of revenue to the Intercolonial railway.

(e) That it will prejudicially affect the provincial revenue.

(f) That it will impair the revenue of the Harbour Commissioners of Montreal and Quebec.

(g) That it will throw out of employment large numbers of men and take away the home market from our farmers and merchants.

(h) That coal will not be any cheaper in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario.

(i) That all the advantages would accrue to the United States operators and railway companies.

(j) That under the present tariff the coal industry has expanded enormously, enabling large steel industries to be established, and the operators say it is against the best interest of the state to alter an institution that has proven economically sound.

And this is signed by all the companies whose names I have just read. Now, in this brochure, which was submitted to the Minister of Finance, and this government, they point out that a reduction of duty would seriously imperil that industry, and also the steel industry, these two being the backbone of the province of Nova Scotia.

These coal operators were sent for. They were taken to Halifax. They were closeted together, and discussed this matter in its different phases. They drew their deductions, which were presented to this government, and especially to the honourable the Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding).

When the duty of coal was reduced from 60 cents to 53 cents, 22½ per cent of the coal supplied to the market in the St. Lawrence, at Sorel, Three Rivers, Quebec and Montreal, was supplied by the United States, whereas only 2¼ per cent was supplied when the duty was 60 cents. I have the authority of the sales agent of the Dominion Coal Company, who stated to me in 1908 that when that 7 cents was taken off coal, 12 or 15 American coal agents went to the customers of the Dominion Coal Company at the different points I have mentioned, and simply cut the price of the year before by 7 cents. The result was that the Dominion Coal Company was obliged to crawl down to that level or lose the contracts. Now, if under this pact, 7 cents more is taken off coal the result will be that American competitors will be able to come in here and tender at exactly 7 cents less, and the Dominion Coal Company and the other coal operators of the province of Nova Scotia who ship into the St. Lawrence market will be obliged to accept 7 cents per ton less for their coal.

I would like to point out something very significant in connection with this. On the files of the Labour Department will be found returns of several boards of conciliation in regard to disputes under the Industrial Act, where the employees of the Dominion Coal Company sought to have an advance of 2 cents per ton for mining coal. After a properly constituted board had heard the sworn testimony of the miners on the one hand, and of the coal operators on the other, they unanimously agreed that the company could not grant an increase of wages. I remember sitting on a board of which Dr. Shortt was chairman, and Dr. Allison of Mount Allison University represented the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company. I represented the miners. After carefully considering the whole matter we unanimously agreed that the miners were not earning a living wage. Under the provisions of the Act, we were given access to the company's private books of account, we were shown the cost of production and the price of coal. We knew the men were not receiving adequate compensation or a living wage, but at the same time we came to the conclusion that the company was not in a financial position to advance the pay of the men one cent per day. In the face of the evidence of the coal operators summoned to give their judgment in the matter, the Minister of Finance comes back from Washington with a trade pact which takes 7 cents per ton off the coal. How are the operators to compensate this? Will they go on earning less dividends by 3 cents per ton, and then make the underpaid miner assume the bal-

ance? I submit that if the hon. Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) had consulted the Minister of Labour (Mr. King), or the reports of the Labour Department, particularly the reports of the conciliation boards, he would have found that the duty on coal could not be tampered with at all. But a deaf ear was turned to this petition on behalf of the coal operators, and, seemingly, the hon. Minister of Finance paid no attention to it. During the three years I have had the honour of occupying a seat in this parliament, there have been applications and petitions made, but there never was a petition or an application presented to this House asking to have the duty on coal tampered with. Why, then, was 7 cents taken off the duty on coal as between Canada and the United States, when the miners of Nova Scotia are not earning a living wage at some of the collieries, and when the coal operators cannot receive sufficient money for their coal, with the duty at 53 cents to enable them to give a higher wage?

But, that is not all, Mr. Speaker, the steel industry which has been growing up in the City of Sydney started a department known as the rod mill, in which they successfully undertook the manufacture of wire rods. When they started this mill the government gave them a bounty of $6 per ton on wire rods. This bounty expired on the 30th June last. These wire rods were manufactured from steel which at the commencement of the manufacture of the rods was also receiving a bounty of $3 per ton. In other words, when the wire rod industry was established in the city of Sydney the company was receiving $9 per ton in the way of bounties. The bounty on the steel which entered into the rods having expired two or three years ago, and now this bounty on the rods themselves having expired, wire rods are left on the free list. The provincial government of the province of Nova Scotia still remits back 6 cents per ton of royalty on every ton of coal consumed in the manufacture of steel, and in this way has been paying to the Dominion Steel and Coal Company from $60,000 to $70,000 per annum, yet the hon. Minister of Finance comes back from Washington, and says "Not only do the steel wire rods bounties discontinue, but we are prepared to leave wire rods on the free list." Was there ever such folly? Imagine creating an industry, then withdrawing the bounties, and leaving it to compete with the United States. If that is not creating an industry to-day, and knocking it to pieces to-morrow, then I admit I may be talking the folly rather than that the hon. minister should be acting the folly.

The hon. Minister for Finance made some observations on the floor of this House on Monday the 24th inst., to which I would invite the particular attention of hon. members. He said:

> We have achieved a reciprocity in natural products, without having to make any important concessions in the matter of manufactures.
>
> This reciprocity is a good thing for the manufacturer, and I venture respectfully to repeat a word of advice which I offered them not long ago. I say unhesitatingly that from the point of view of the manufacturers of Canada this reciprocity agreement is a good arrangement, and, if it goes through, we may reasonably say to the western farmer: 'Well, you cannot have all you want in this wicked world, but this goes a long way towards meeting your demands, and we can fairly ask you to give and take, and let the eastern manufacturer have a fair show,' and we believe they will do it.

I would also like to draw the special attention of the House to the following sentence of this paragraph:

> But, if perchance the manufacturers in their great power should unite in opposing and possibly condemning, or even defeating this measure, then there will rise up in that western country a storm cloud bigger than a man's hand, and the end will be a change in the fiscal policy of the country, which the manufacturers will find much greater than anything they conceived of.

Mr. Chairman was there ever a more cowardly threat levelled at the heads of the manufacturers of Canada? And when we realize that it comes from a minister of the Crown in a British colony it seems to have all the more degrading ring about it. Could there be anything more dastardly than to practically threaten the extinction of any maunfacturer who dares to raise his voice or mark his ballot against this iniquitous pact because two old gentlemen brought it back from Washington? If the Finance Minister goes on making these threats, we will, by a process of elimination, soon discover who the contributors to the $120,000 purse were. We can fairly draw the deduction that there were not many manufacturers contributing to that purse, and if he were to denounce a few other sources, then, by a process of elimination, we could readily conclude who the contributors were. I submit that no minister of the Crown in any British colony would have the audacity, the barefacedness to express on the floors of any colonial parliament——

Mr. TALBOT. I draw your attention to this expression of my hon. friend in attributing cowardice to a minister of the Crown.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. It is not, of course, in order to attribute cowardice to

any member of this House. The hon. gentleman did not conclude his sentence, and I am not sure that he intended to attribute cowardice to any hon. member, but I would draw his attention to the fact that it is not in order to attribute cowardice to any member of the House.

Mr. TALBOT. Will he withdraw the expression.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not ruled that the hon member was out of order, as he has not concluded his sentence, but I call his attention to the fact that to attribute cowardice to a member would be out of order. I do not think he intended to do so although his sentence contained the words.

Mr. MADDIN. Positively not. I think the member for Bellechasse (Mr. Talbot) must have a pain.

Mr. TALBOT. I wish to know if the hon. member will withdraw this expression. I may have a pain and I may tell my hon. friend what my pain is.

Mr. MADDIN. I submit that the act of threatening the manufacturers of this country or any manufacturer is a cowardly act.

Mr. TALBOT. Will the hon. gentleman be allowed to go on with his speech without withdrawing?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER. I have not ruled any expression of the hon. gentleman out of order, so there is not any withdrawal required.

Mr. MADDIN. If the hon. the Finance Minister were to single out a few other sources from which such a contribution could come, we must draw a reasonable inference as to the source of that fund.

On the same day, July 24, the hon. member for Westmoreland (Mr. Emmerson), speaking in this House, made the following statement to which I wish to take exception:

> My hon. friend has said that because this member or that member has not spoken there is some doubt as to his convictions. I would be very sorry to be judged from that standpoint. My hon. friend from Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) did not speak, it is true, in this House on the question of reciprocity. I did not speak, but I would not wish my views to be judged from that fact. I do know that the hon. member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) during the month of June spent practically all his time campaigning, not only in Pictou, but in every county of the province of Nova Scotia. Doing what? Advocating reciprocity.

I know positively that he did not speak in any one of the counties of Cape Breton, Colchester, Digby, Cumberland or Halifax. He did speak in his native county of Pictou, which he represents. He did speak in the town of Westville, where in 1904, the member for Pictou was some 400 votes behind Mr. Charles E. Tanner, whom he defeated on that occasion and in this election Mr. Robertson, a Liberal-Conservative candidate led the poll with over 600 majority. But, Mr. Chairman, we have been told over and over again that reciprocity was not an issue in the provincial elections in Nova Scotia. So far as I can make it an issue in participating in that campaign I made it an issue. It may have been an issue down in Yarmouth county, and that may be one of the counties that the hon. member for Pictou campaigned in, but in the county of Yarmouth, which for many years had sent Liberals to support the government of Nova Scotia, one of the provincial ministers of the Crown was defeated by a Liberal-Conservative candidate. He may have spoken in some of the counties of Nova Scotia, but methinks that he was not overly anxious to discuss reciprocity in that province. Reciprocity was not an issue there. I have before me a copy of the Sydney 'Record' of June 13, and it outlines what, in the opinion of the Liberal party there, was the issue in the province of Nova Scotia at that time. They say:

> The opposition have forced federal issues into the present contest. They are asking the electors to vote on reciprocity, coal tariff, and steel bounties, questions over which the local legislature has no control. The result, then, in Cape Breton will be regarded in the nature of a verdict on federal policy. The navy is the big federal issue in Sydney. It cannot now be shirked. A vote against Premier Murray will be equivalent to a vote of want of confidence in Fielding and Laurier. It will be regarded at Ottawa as a pronouncement not only against reciprocity but against the navy. Therefore, vote for Kendall and Carroll if you are in favour of the navy and shipbuilding at Sydney. An adverse vote will encourage the opposition at Ottawa to block the navy contracts.

That was the issue held out to the electors in Cape Breton. But they knew what the issue was, they knew that the steel bounties and the duty on coal were being struck at by this pact, and that the Nova Scotia government had put the brand of approval on it before they went to the country. There were good reasons why the member for Pictou (Mr. Macdonald) would not care to discuss reciprocity at any great length in Nova Scotia, because he had gone out with the Prime Minister on his tour through the west. He had left behind him the cool and turbulent waters of the Atlantic, and he went out over the prairies on a railway that would never have been built had the two very gentlemen who were going out there had their own way about it.

They crossed the prairies from Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains, they

penetrated the passes of the Rocky Mountains, and made their way to the limpid waters of the gentle Pacific, having followed their sinuous course across the continent. The hon. member for Pictou had been living for weeks in the hallowed presence, he had followed the white plume across the continent, and had learned words of wisdom there. He was in the confidence of the Premier of Canada. He came home with a message to the people of Nova Scotia, and he received a welcome at New Glasgow in proportion to the welcome that the Premier himself received in the city of Montreal. So important was the return of this gifted son of Pictou to his native heath, that the Liberal population of that county urged that the merchants in the town of New Glasgow should leave their electric lights burning in the windows in order to illuminate the streets down to the park where the address was to be made to the returning hero who was coming back from the feet of the man he worships as a political god. After the address had been presented, the hon. member for Pictou spoke in reply. I read this from a report of his speech sent in a dispatch of September 12, 1910, to the 'Morning Chronicle,' a paper of Halifax, and published on September 13, 1910.

An hon. MEMBER. Is it a Liberal paper?

Mr. MADDIN. There is a strong suspicion in Nova Scotia that it is a Liberal paper, and I think the suspicion is well founded.

Above all else he prized the confidence of the Pictou county Liberals greater than anything else, and he always wanted to be known as Ned Macdonald, son of the plain people.

. . . . . .

Mr. Macdonald enunciated the policy of the Liberal party as affecting the tariff question. They had the same policy in the west as in the east The people of the west did not want free trade any more than those in the east, and they ascertained that the only shouting for free trade in the west came from the Tory camp. He believed that the future of Nova Scotia was wrapped up in its manufactures, and there would be no tariff changes to disturb them.

The motto of our neighbours to the south had been to look out for number one, and previous to fourteen years ago it had been almost the annual custom of the Conservatives to send delegates on tariff missions to Washington. Now the order was changed and the missions were from Washington to Ottawa, and Canada through Sir Wilfrid intended to look out for number one. Some rough spots on the tariff would be smoothed out, but no change will be made that would interfere with British preference or with the vested interests of men who had put their money in the east. The policy he declared, was that the tariff will be maintained as it is, only remedying where it unduly presses.

Mr. MADDIN.

Now, here was the appeal of a gentleman who had spent some considerable time in the company of the Prime Minister, and was no doubt with the Prime Minister when he was making just such a speech in the city of Montreal. It sounds very much like that which the Prime Minister delivered in reply to the farmers of the west last December in this chamber. I am not surprised that he did not care to discuss reciprocity to any extent in the county of Pictou, or in any other part of the province of Nova Scotia. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have pointed out that the Minister of Finance received that brochure from the coal operators of Nova Scotia; he absolutely disregarded it, and I cannot understand how, since he has disregarded it, that in the last local election in Nova Scotia, so many of the coal operators' bosses should be active partisans, and been busy brow beating and intimidating the workingmen of the Dominion Coal Company in order to get them to the polls to vote for the Murray candidates. The Finance Minister absolutely disregarded that petition. The same seems to have been true of every other petition that has come from the county of Cape Breton. I can remember when there was a Liberal sitting for the county of Cape Breton. It is only a few years ago when a delegation left the city of Sydney headed by the warden, Mr. Levatte, and some two or three of the municipal councillors, with Mayor Richardson, of Sydney, Mayor Macdonald, of Sydney Mines, and two or three councillors from Glace Bay and Dominion, people who had been appointed at a public meeting in the courthouse in the summer of 1908, to come up here and strengthen the hands of Mr. Johnston, who then occupied a seat on the floor of this House supporting this government, in an endeavour to obtain a railway from St. Peter's canal down the shores of Bras d'Or lake into the city of Sydney. That is government by delegation. But that railway has not been built, although such a strong Liberal aggregation came up here to assist a Liberal member occupying the seat which I occupy to-day. It was only a year or two before that when D. K. McIntyre, of Sydney, at the expense of the parishioners of East Bay, came up to Ottawa to strengthen the hands of Mr. Johnston to get a subsidy towards that railway. Why, Sir, when the people of the town of Glace Bay wanted four drop letter boxes in their town, they did not get them until Peter E. Ogilvie, one of the town councillors of Glace Bay, came as a delegate to Ottawa to strengthen Mr. Johnston's hands. Always Mr. Johnston had to be fortified, always Mr. Johnston's petitions and delegations were turned down. In 1910 the coal operators of the province had their petitions and their requests turned down. I submit it is time that the people of the

county of Cape Breton, above all other counties should cease sending delegations to this government in the hope of obtaining fair and equitable treatment.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is another matter I would like to point out. I have endeavoured, from a historical point of view, to trace the growth and development of this country, the difficulties which have been overcome. We are merely passers by. We are inheritors by the law of descent of one of the finest countries under the sun. Commencing at the Atlantic seaboard, the province of Nova Scotia, for its square mileage, cannot be surpassed in its mineral resources, its fisheries and its forests. There is no better farming, lumbering and fishing province than the province of New Brunswick. The province of Quebec has its manifold advantages in farming and mineral resources, and its great commercial enterprises. The province of Ontario has long been described, and properly so, as the banner province of the Dominion of Canada. When we pass by Lake Superior to the provinces of Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan, we have a country of rolling prairies, of fields of wheat, capable of producing sufficient to feed the whole of the British Empire, and almost the whole of the English speaking people. Then, after crossing the Rocky Mountains to the province of British Columbia, we reach perhaps the richest of them all in natural resources. These provinces, under a confederation such as we have, are not ours to dangle in the market, they are not ours to dispose of by a deed in fee simple. They are ours merely for the purpose of a life estate, we are merely the trustees for our descendants who are to come after us. We have committed to our charge a great responsibility in looking after the interests of this great country, for which we shall be held responsible by our children and our children's children.

We cannot deal quietly with a situation of this kind. We have a certain amount of trade with Great Britain. She carries our grain back to the old country when she brings some of her manufactures out to this. Divert our trade north and south and what will be the result? If our wheat is to find its way to Minneapolis, to the Atlantic seaboard, through the United States, or through the rolling mills of the United States, there to be rolled and shipped to England in its manufactured form, England must suffer to some extent, and we must suffer even to a greater extent. In 1886 the Minister of Finance was persuading the people of Nova Scotia to look for cheaper flour—always in the United States. At the very moment almost when the Canadian Pacific railway was opened up, in 1886, he was telling the people of Nova Scotia: Secede, secede from confederation, let us have free trade with the United States, let us have reciprocity—his very words. The reciprocity bee has been in his bonnet now for more than a generation. He never conceived the idea that the wheat for the Nova Scotian's flour could be raised in the Dominion of Canada, but a great statesman had conceived the idea. Sir Charles Tupper had said that when the road was built traffic would be carried eastward and westward, and they would open up a country capable of raising 200,000,000 bushels of wheat. Hon. gentlemen at that time in the House, talking about it in the corridors, said he was crazy. On the floors of the House they were more respectful, but they were none the less severe. They said that the railway would not pay for its axle grease, that there were nothing but buffaloes and Indians in the west and that it was folly to have built the road. Sir Charles Tupper is living to-day to see his prognostications verified and the Minister of Finance and his friends who had fought for reciprocity and who had tried to turn the hearts and minds of the people of Nova Scotia towards Boston for their flour and other supplies hoped that some day they would occupy the treasury benches where they would reap that which Sir Charles Tupper had sown.

I do not intend to occupy the attention of the House much longer. I can only say that while we have been developing our country to the extent of 8,000,000 people while we have built up our manufactures to aggregate over a million dollars a year, while we have money stacked in the bank to the extent of $990,000,000 while we have prospered to the extent we have, while we have been doing that, as I pointed out to-day, we did it without having to assume any national obligations. But, we went through the fire of test which tried our manhood, which tried the stuff that was in us. We have developed this country, and it is our duty to maintain it and discharge our obligation towards the mother country. Those people who manned those vessels, who manned those fortifications, who built those fortifications, who built those warships, who made British traffic on the high seas safe, who made the British household safe, have been borne down by taxes until to-day Great Britain is face to face with the two greatest problems which confront the white race. One is the question of the unemployed. Travel across this continent from Vancouver to Sydney and you would not find a door at which you could knock and ask for a meal and be turned away. We have no poor or impoverished people in this country. It may be that in Montreal or Toronto an

occasional family are in want, but it is a matter of pride more than anything else. They could easily be relieved. Some of our people are poor, some of them have not much money, some of them have no ships, or lands or automobiles, but they all make an honest living, they can all find plenty to eat and plenty to wear. This is not true of the other side.

They have the great burden of taxation which was borne upon the shoulders of the mother country. In guarding us while we were in our swaddling clothes there has grown up a condition the result of which is that there are hundreds of thousands of people born in empty doorways, or dry-goods boxes, under wharfs, in cellars, in out of the way corners; there are hundreds of thousands of these to be found in London, Liverpool, Birmingham, Nottingham, Manchester, Dublin and Glasgow, who never had a roof over their heads but the sky, hundreds of thousands who never use a knife or fork or eat off a table. Great Britain is face to face with the task of coping with the unemployed, aged and impoverished. There are hundreds of thousands of them in Great Britain, and Uncle Sam comes up to his tariff wall with the olive branch and beckons to us and asks us to tear down the wall to let them obtain access to our natural resources. We give them 160 acres of the best land on the face of the earth, give them admission to this country, we let them come in and compete on even terms with our farmers, we let the farmers from Dakota, Montana and Minnesota cross the parallel, come into our western country, take up Canadian farms, become, perhaps, Canadian citizens in name at least, raise identically the same crops that they were raising in those same states and then send them back and trade with the same old customers that they traded with before they came to this country. That is what the United States asks us to do. Shall we do it? Have we come to the parting of the ways? We have developed the resources of our country under the conditions which I have outlined here to-night. Surely there is sufficient of manhood in us that we shall meet our obligations in a manly way instead of lowing our tariff wall, instead of negotiating with this people, who fought us, let us maintain the advantage which we now have. The first printing press that was ever set up in Ontario was set up for the purpose of publishing sedition and treason in order to influence the Canadian mind, set up by Americans and paid for with American money. Shall we lower our tariff wall and allow free access to the people of the United States to take up our square mileage, raise the same crops and send them back to the same customers? Shall we permit them to take our raw materials, manufacture them and sell them to Britain or sell them to us? Or shall we assist Great Britain in such a way as to relieve the pressure that now bears heavily upon the shoulders of the mother country? Had we not better open up the developed country of the west, enable her to solve the unemployed problem and so contribute some little at least to the discharge of this great national obligation which we can never fully repay.

Mr. EDWARD KIDD (Carleton, Ont.). Mr. Chairman, since I have been a member of this House I have not taken up very much time, but this reciprocity agreement is such a very important measure that I feel it my duty to say a few words in opposition to it. I think that the people of Canada regard this as one of the most drastic measures that was ever brought into this House or placed before the country. From what we have heard from the other side of the House we never thought for a moment that this measure or anything leading up to it would be brought before the House, or that we would be called upon to sanction it. We have a very good reason for that belief in the following expression by the right hon. Prime Minister (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in 1901:

I remember, and you remember also, that since the abolition of the reciprocity treaty in 1866, we have sent delegation after delegation to Washington to obtain reciprocity. We are not sending any more delegations. But I rather expect, and I would not be surprised, if the thing were to take place in a few years —I say—I rather expect that there will be delegations coming from Washington to Ottawa for reciprocity. Having learned from our friends in the south how to receive such a delegation, we shall receive them in the proper manner—with every possible politeness.

In 1903, in proposing the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway legislation, the Prime Minister was uncompromising:

I have found in the short experience during which it has been my privilege and fortune to be placed at the head of affairs, by the will of the Canadian people, that the best and most effective way to maintain friendship with our American neighbours is to be absolutely independent of them.

Then at the Imperial Conference in 1907, he said:

If we were to follow the laws of nature and geography between Canada and the United States, the whole trade would flow from south to north, and from north to south. We have done everything possible by building canals and subsidizing railways to bring the trade from west to east and east to west so as to bring trade into Brtiish channels. All this we have done, recognizing the principle of the great advantage of forcing trade within the British empire. . . There is no boundary line except a purely conventional one over the whole territory of North America. Their habits are the same as ours, and,

therefore, we are induced to trade and cannot help it by the force of nature. But so far as legislation can influence trade, we have done everything possible to push our trade towards the British people as against the American people. . . .

There was a time when we wanted reciprocity with the United States, but our efforts and our offers were put aside. We have said good bye to that trade, and we now put all our hopes upon the British trade.

Everybody can see from this language that the Prime Minister never thought then of submitting a reciprocity proposition to parliament. At the last three general elections there was nothing about reciprocity, and the Liberal rally was 'let Laurier finish his work.' I wonder what work he had to finish; whether it was the Quebec bridge that fell down or the Laurier tower that tumbled over in a like manner. We need not wonder at our American friends being very much in favour of this pact. It is worth while to note what was said by Mr. Champ Clarke, the leader of the Democratic party which now controls the House of Representatives. He said:

Therefore, I am in favour of the reciprocity treaty, because I hope to see the day when the American flag will float over every square foot of the British North American possessions clear to the north pole. They are people of our blood. They speak our language. Their institutions are much like ours. They are trained in the difficult art of self-government. My judgment is that if the treaty of 1854 had never been abrogated the chances of a consolidation of these two countries would have been much greater than they are now. I do not doubt whatever that the day is not far distant when Great Britain will joyfully see all of her North American possessions become part of this republic. That is the way things are tending now. I do not confine my support of reciprocity Bills to this one. I am in favour of reciprocity treaties with the Central and South American republics, including Mexico. The quicker we get them the better off we will be. Of course, as between the two, if we had to have reciprocity with Canada and not with these countries to the south, or with the countries to the south and not with Canada, I would take reciprocity with Canada.

We know that the reciprocity treaty which was in force between 1854 and 1866, was very favourable to the Americans, because in these years, during which they had their own civil war, they wanted our products, and so they lowered the tariff on them. At the present time, to show a comparison of prices for agricultural products between Ogdensburg in the United States, and Prescott, on the other side of the St. Lawrence, I take the following from the report of the tariff board appointed by the United States:

Commodity.	Price.	Ogdensburgh, N.Y., and Prescott, Canada.			
		Producer's price.		Wholesale.	
		Highest.	Lowest.	High.	Low.
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Beef cows	A.	$5 00	$3 00	$5 60	$3 50
	C.	4 50	3 00	5 00	3 50
Calves	A.	14 50		5 00–5 10	
	C.	5 00	3 50	5 60	4 10
		Per head.	Per head.	Per head.	Per head.
Milkers and springers	A.	$60 00	$28 00	$75 00	$35 00
	C.	65 00	25 00	75 00	30 00
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Lambs	A.	$5 60	$5 00	$6 20	$5 50
	C.	6 60	5 50	7 25	6 00
Sheep	A.	4 00	3 75	4 50	4 00
	C.	4 25	3 75	4 60	4 25
Hogs	A.	8 00	5 90	9 00	6 50
	C.	8 50	7 00	9 20	7 60

Poultry dressed	A.	21 cents to 29 cents.
	C.	24 cents to 29 cents.
Eggs	A.	28 cents to 35 cents.
	C.	30 cents to 36 cents.

The comparison between the prices of the Buffalo market, and the Toronto market is as follows:

Commodity.	Price.	Buffalo, N.Y., and Toronto, Canada.			
		Producer's price.		Wholesale price.	
		Highest.	Lowest.	Highest.	Lowest.
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Beef steers and heifers	A.	$6 20	$4 00	$6 75	$6 25
	C.	5 65	4 00	6 25	4 50
Beef cows	A.	4 80	3 55	5 35	4 00
	C.	4 75	2 60	5 25	3 00
Stockers and feeders	A.	4 75	3 30	5 25	3 75
	C.	5 00	3 75	5 50	4 25
Calves	A.	6 55	5 35	7 25	6 00
	C.	7 80	2 50	8 50	3 00
		Per head.	Per head.	Per head.	Per head.
Milkers and springers	A.	$61 00	$18 00	$70 00	$20 00
	C.	71 00	26 00	80 00	30 00
		Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.	Per 100 lbs.
Lambs	A.	5 90	$4 15	$6 50	$4 75
	C.	5 70	5 20	6 25	5 75
Sheep	A.	4 00	2 25	4 50	2 70
	C.	4 15	2 55	4 65	3 00
Hogs	A.	7 75	5 40	8 50	6 00
	C.	9 30	6 50	10 00	7 15

You will notice from this comparison of prices, that there was nothing in favour of the American side, but it all goes to show that the Canadian markets are better for the Canadian farmers. It is I believe a fact that although the consumer is paying more for his stuff on the American side, that is due to the manner in which the trusts control the situation in the United States, and the actual fact is that the producer gets a lower price in the United States than in Canada.

I quote the following with reference to dairy cattle:

Prices of dairy cows range from $33 to $39 a head in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York. In Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota the range is practically the same. In the western border states of Montana, Idaho and Washington the range is from $41.80 to $46.50. In eastern Canada, prices of dairy cows range from $32 to $48, and in western Canada, from $39 to $41. The highest Canadian price quoted is $48 in Ontario as against $46.50 in Montana, the highest American price.

Now, I have some facts here which show that we have a market in which we can command sales at good prices. We need not go begging to any American city or to the United States government for the prices I am going to give you.

Dispersion sales of pure-bred cattle held in Canada during 1910 brought some record prices, and the following figures prove conclusively that our Canadian breeders are under no obligation to the Americans in order to get a remunerative market for their surplus stock. The first sale I wish to refer to was held by James Benning of Williamstown, Ontario, on April 20, 1910. His 81 head of cattle brought $11,916, an average of $147, each. Forty-two aged cows brought $207. Other prices were as follows:

Herd bull sold for $400.
12 yearling bulls averaged $85.50.
13 bulls averaged $108.
10 1909 heifers averaged $114.
16 1910 calves averaged $42.25.
The highest prices paid for cow $590.
Highest price paid for two year old heifer $425.
Highest price paid for 1909 calf $200.
Highest price paid for 1910 calf $95.
Highest price paid for 1909 bull $125.

Mr. John Campbell's sale held near Dalmeny on April 19, realized some good figures. Eight Holsteins brought $1,475, an average of $184 each; one cow brought $290; twenty-one aged Ayrshire cows brought $1,676.

William Higginson's sale of registered Holstein cattle held at Inkerman, Ontario, Tuesday, November 1, brought the following figures:

Ninety head realized $12,457, herd bull sold for $850, highest price paid for cow $300, twenty-one males brought $2,220, average price of males $105.35, 69 females brought $10,235, average price of females $148.

Still more gratifying were the prices realized at the sale of Holsteins held by Brown Brothers, on December 28, among which were the following:

48 head brought $11,355, an average price of $236.50.

13 females brought $2,185, an average price of $252.

[illegible]es brought $2,185, an average price of $168.

15 1910 calves brought $1,575, an average of $105.

3 yearling heifers brought $595, an average of $198,33.

9 two year old heifers brought $2,645, an average price of $294.

9 three year old heifers brought $2,230, an average price of $239.

33 head, calved previous to 1910, brought $8,700, an average price of $280.60.

Highest price realized for female $1,000.

Highest price realized for male $800.

Highest price realized for yearling, $220.

Highest price realized for two year old heifer, $700, and another one sold for $620.

Highest price realized for three year old heifer $460, and two others sold for $450 and $385 each.

Highest price realized for 1910 calf $240, and another sold for $200.

Highest price realized for 1910 heifer calf $135.

Distributed, the cattle went as follows: Leeds county 34, Dundas 5, Carleton 2, Prescott 1, Grenville 1, Western Ontario 2, United States 3. At Benning's more than 75 per cent of the animals were sold to Ontario breeders. Higginson's cattle were distributed as follows: Western Ontario 3, New Brunswick 3, Dundas 27, Leeds and Grenville 27, Carleton 7, Glengarry 5, Russell 2, Stormont 2, New York state 8, New Hampshire state 6.

Now, I desire to give an account of another sale, this one being held in Maxville. The total sum realized was $40,715 for 119 animals. The highest priced animal went for $2,600. An account of the sale was given in the press, and that account reads, in part, as follows:

According to the statement of the secretary of the Canadian Ayrshire Breeders' Association the sale of animals of that breed held at the farm of Robert Hunter and Sons at Maxville on Wednesday, was the greatest on record on this continent. About six hundred buyers or intending buyers were present from as far east as New York city and as far west as Ballard, Washington. One hundred and nineteen animals were auctioned off under the direction of Mr. Andrew Philips, who conducted the sale. The highest price realized for any one animal was $2,600. This price was paid for the stock bull Bargenock Victor Hugo, by Mr. D. Ryan, of Brewster, N.Y. The highest price paid for a female was by Mrs. Earhart, West Berlin, New Hampshire. The total sum realized was $40,715, and the average price per head was $342.15.

Now, let me give a few figures showing the character of our sheep trade. The following figures show our exports of sheep to the United States:

1907,	63,034	head, value	$195,655
1908,	53,583	head, value	206,089
1909,	43,803	head, value	158,660

And our total imports of sheep to Canada from the United States have been as follows:

1907,	135,344	head, value.. ..	$750,242
1908,	101,589	head, value	589,285
1909,	67,656	head, value	365,155

Now why should we look to a country that has more sheep than we have, as a market for sheep? The United States export far more sheep than we do, and yet we are supposed to look to the United States for a market.

There has been a great deal of comment and discussion made by the members of the government in regard to this pact, concerning hay. I am sure no farmer should think of looking for a market for his hay —at least only for a very small quantity of it. For any farmer who will raise hay to sell year after year will soon have very little to sell. The same thing applies to potatoes. We do not pretend to raise many potatoes to ship, and none of our farmers should build on the potatoe market. Potatoes are a perishable article, and we should not take any credit for creating a market for them. If the Americans want any of our products they know what to do in order to get them. I know in former years when they wanted anything from this country they simply let down the bars. In 1902 or 1903 when they wanted our young cattle they reduced the tariff on cattle, and after they had brought in what they wanted, they put the tariff up again.

The following statement will show the exports of cheese from the United States to Canada for the years mentioned and the total exports of cheese from the United States:

	Lbs.	Value.
1907..	1,540,552	$ 166,510
1908..	452,361	56,704
1909..	120,844	14,952

Total Exports from United States:

	Lbs.	Value.
1907..	17,285,230	$2,012,626
1908..	8,439,051	1,092,053
1909..	6,822,842	857,091

The Total Exports of Milk from the United States were as follows:

	Value.
1907..	$2,191,111
1908..	2,455,186
1909..	1,375,104

The Total Exports of Cheese from Canada were:

1909..	$22,106,108
1910..	180,859,866 = 21,607,692

There has been a great deal of stress put on the fact that we will have a market for our cheese. That is not the case. Cheese was high in the United States last fall, but we all know how that came about.

They sold themselves short in the early part of the season, and later on a few men cornered the cheese market and raised the price to about 14 cents. If those who are endeavouring to secure reciprocity are looking for a market for $21,000,000 worth of cheese, when the Americans themselves are exporting cheese to the extent of over $2,000,000 in 1907, and over $857,000 in 1909, how can they expect a market from these people? We make a very superior cheese in Canada to-day. The Ontario government is spending on an average over $65,000 a year for instruction in what we call the outside service—that is outside of the agricultural centres. They are spending this large amount of money educating the farmers of the whole country to make a fine cheese, which they are doing. Everybody knows that the United States is making a very inferior article, and that they would be only too glad to mix their cheese with Canadian cheese and so lower our price or raise theirs. I am sure if this reciprocity pact passes it will be a great injury to our cheese trade. We have taken a great deal of pains and been to large expenses to make a good article, and put it on the market in good shape. I know from the conditions existing across the line that reciprocity would be a great injury to our cheese trade.

In 1910, we exported 4,615,380 pounds of butter valued at $1,010,274. We must admit that our butter exports are decreasing. At the same time we take a great deal of care to put what we have to sell on the market in proper shape, and we would derive no advantage from shipping our butter to the United States. In 1907, we shipped 12,544,777 pounds valued at $2,429,489. In 1908, we shipped 6,463,061 pounds valued at $1,407,962. In 1909, we shipped 5,981,265 pounds valued at $1,268,210.

Dairying has expanded in other countries just as it has in ours, as will appear from the following paragraph:

DAIRYING EXPANDS.

South Australia shows Strong Forward Movement.

Adelaide, South Australia, July 20.—South Australian produce always finds a ready market in the United Kingdom, and since the establishment of the government produce department and the appointment of a trades commissioner, an appreciable increase in the output of perishable produce has taken place. Producers now know that should the local market fail they can profitably export through the department; consequently they have not hesitated to extend their operations.

The dairying industry especially has expanded, and the exportation of butter this season shows a marked improvement compared with previous years. In 1908-09 a total of 456 tons was shipped from Port Adelaide, in 1909-10, 822 tons, while the aggregate shipments to date for the 1910-11 season total 1,747 tons. The quantity of butter now made in the state exceeds eight and a half million pounds annually.

Most of the separating is done by farmers on their own farms, and the cream is then forwarded to the various butter factories, which give employment to a large number of people. The opening up of new lands, the extended practice of irrigation in the Murray valley and at other places under government supervision, has given a great impetus to the industry, and these totals will probably be exceeded in the near future.

This shows that if this pact goes through our markets will be flooded with produce of all kinds from these favoured nation countries. Denmark for instance has been shipping very large quantities of dairy produce to Great Britain where it competes with our produce. What would the result be if Canada were to enter into an arrangement for free entry of butter from Denmark under this pact? What would the results be if Canada should enter into free trade in butter under the proposed reciprocity agreement?

Our farmers would be confronted with the competition on our own markets of such producing countries as Denmark, Russia, Australia, New Zealand, Argentine Republic, Sweden and Norway, as well as the United States.

Would this competition amount to anything?

At present the import demand from Great Britain is the controlling factor in the Canadian butter market, and it is interesting to note that the average prices realized in Great Britain during the year 1909 for butter imported from Russia, Australia, New Zealand, United States and Argentine Republic were lower than those obtained for Canadian butter. In the matter of prices, then, these countries would be prepared to undersell Canada on her own market, as they do now on the British market.

Denmark, which is the largest exporter of butter to Britain, gets much more for her products than does Canada. This is because of the quality of the Danish butter, which is said to be superior to any other make in the world. The fine flavour of Denmark's dairy product would thus ensure a successful competition on the Canadian market even in the face of lower prices. Just as the English consumer is willing to pay more for Danish butter, so would the Canadian consumer do the same.

Great Britain in 1909 imported 455,034,944 pounds of butter worth $109,134,815, from the following countries:

Denmark	$51,671,648
Russia	14,325,256
France	11,292,185
Australia	9,770,695
Sweden	7,170,746
New Zealand	7,164,799
Netherlands	3,879,999

Argentine Republic..	1,907,801
Norway..	797,481
Canada..	585,913
Other countries..	568,292

So you see that if the produce of these other favoured nation countries were admitted to enter Canada and compete with our produce this country would be very greatly affected.

The following comparison of tariffs on butter, if reciprocity becomes law, shows that Canada gives free entrance to all her competitors, but must pay duty to all of them, except the United States, if she wishes to send butter back to them:

Canada—Free from Favoured Nations and British Possessions, including Denmark, Russia, Australia, Sweden, New Zealand, Argentine Republic, Norway and United States; otherwise 4 cents per lb.
Australia—6 cents per lb.
New Zealand—General Tariff, 30% ad valorem British Preferential Tariff, 20% ad valorem (Canada is entitled to the B.P. Tariff.)
Denmark—In hermetically sealed vessels, 4½c. per lb.; otherwise free.
Argentine Republic—4 2-5c. per lb.
United States—From Canada, free; otherwise 6c. per b.
Sweden—2 2-5c. per lb.
Norway—Minimum Tariff, 1 4-5 c. per lb. Maximum Tariff, 3c. per lb.
Russia—1 7-100c. per lb.

Canada's export trade in butter is not so great at the present time that her farmers can afford to imperil their dairy industry by a tariff scheme that would, in all probability, make the country's imports in this article greater than her exports. In the year ending 1910 Canada shipped only 4,615,380 pounds of butter, worth $1,010,274. Canada's imports of butter on the other hand amounted to 687,454 pounds, worth $104,301.

I wish to place on record a comparative statement of the exports of eggs from the United States and Canada. These figures are as follows:

Export of Eggs from United States.

	Dozens.	Value.
1907..	6,968,985	$1,542,789
1908..	7,590,977	1,540,014
1909..	5,207,151	1,199,522

Exports of Eggs from Canada to United States.

	Dozens.	Value.
1908..	32,991	$9,846 00
1909..	59,483	14,952 00
1910..	39,917	13,896 00

When the United States export these large quantities of eggs why should we expect to have any market for eggs there? It is a well known fact that last year eggs were higher in Canada than in the United States, and at the present time I understand a very large firm in Toronto has a contract for eggs with a firm at Buffalo at 15 cents, and where our farmers are getting a much higher price than that right at home.

Serious difficulty may be experienced in Canada owing to the importation of oleomargarine, an imitation of butter, into our market. The manufacture or sale of oleomargarine is absolutely prohibited in Canada. The United States are to-day exporting large quantities of this imitation butter, the figures being as follows:

Exports of Oleomargarine from United States to Other Countries.

	Pounds.	Value.
1907..	5,397,609	$520,406
1908..	2,988,175	299,746
1909..	2,899,058	293,635

The export of horses into Canada from the United States and vice versa have been as follows:

Year.	United States into Canada.		Canada into United States.	
	Number.	Value.	Number.	Value.
		$		$
1907	26,361	3,536,353	33,882	4,359,957
1908	15,324	1,962,438	19,000	2,612,587
1909	17,376	2,221,562	21,616	3,486,617

The prices of horses range from $106 to $125 in Maine, New Hampshire, Vermont and New York; in Michigan, Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota the average is from $111 to $126, and in Montana, Idaho and Washington from $80 to $108. In eastern Canada prices range from $107 to $139. You will see that our prices range far higher than those in the United States. In western Canada the prices range from $107 to $156. In Indiana, Illinois and Iowa the prices range from $120 to $124.

In all the Canadian provinces the prices are higher than in the United States. If this pact goes through, which I hope it will not, our market will be injured very much for Canadian horses. I remember, when I was a very small kid, that our horses were always supposed to be very much better than American horses. We had many of our southern neighbours up here buying our horses a few years ago for street car purposes and it was claimed that three of our horses would outlast four or five American horses owing, no doubt, to our horses being raised in a colder climate and therefore being hardier and more valuable horses than the American horses. There is no doubt that our farmers will be greatly injured if this pact goes through because it will be taking from them their western market which is the best market in the world to-day for eastern horses.

Now, let me call your attention to the bacon and ham trade. The following is a statement of the exports of bacon and ham from Canada to Great Britain.

Year.	
1906	$12,119,804
1907	9,196,305
1908	11,153,749
1909	8,625,005
1910	6,836,392

You will see that in the last couple of years there is a decrease in our exports. Where does the rest go? The answer is that we are using the rest. We are using far more bacon and hams than we did some years ago.

EXPORTS OF CANNED MEATS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Year.	Quantity. Lbs.	Value.
1907	2,710,369	$287,460
1908	4,957,022	532,442
1909	5,759,930	620,193

EXPORTS OF BACON FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Year.	Quantity. Lbs.	Value.
1907	250,418,699	$26,470,972
1908	241,189,929	25,481,246
1909	244,578,674	25,920,490

EXPORTS OF HAMS AND SHOULDERS FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Year.	Quantity. Lbs.	Value.
1907	209,481,496	$23,698,207
1908	221,769,634	25,167,059
1909	212,170,224	23,526,397

I will give a short comparison between Chicago market prices and our Ingersoll market prices for the years 1901 to 1910:

EXPORTS OF BACON FROM THE UNITED STATES.

Year.	Price at Chicago.	Price at Ingersoll.
1901	$5 71	$6 70
1902	6 76½	6 68
1903	5 88	6 07
1904	5 04	5 32
1905	5 18	6 41
1906	6 23	7 17
1907	6 09½	6 85
1908	5 36½	6 87
1909	7 53½	8 04
1910	8 59¾	9 11

The Ingersoll prices averaged 58 cents per hundred weight higher than the Chicago market prices.

Now I will read a paragraph from the report of the committee appointed by the Senate committee to make inquiry into the comparative prices in Canada and the United States:

Why is it that an American board of investigators thus finds itself confronted with these superior conditions in Canada? Simply because of the better product cultivated by the Canadian farmer. With regard to this point of quality in our hogs——

This is taken from Senate Document 849. This is where some of the figures I have quoted are taken from and they are figures that this tariff board spent a great deal of time in Canada and the United States in procuring in order to make a comparison of prices.

The lack of corn, the existence of a well-established dairy production and the advisability of suitable forage, has led to the introduction of another agricultural speciality in which Ontario excels, to wit, the breeding and rearing of bacon pigs, as contrasted with the heavy corn fed lard hog of our middle west.

We all know that just as soon as this pact goes through we will be confronted with the American fat hog, which will reduce the value of our pork to a large extent. There is no doubt that we raise a far superior quality of hog to that of the Americans. For 15 or 20 years we have been breeding a superior quality of hog, we kill him at the right time, and put him on the market at the proper time. Our consumers consume far more bacon and pork than they did a few years ago. For years we made our hogs very heavy for the shanty trade, and the Americans followed in the same direction. But we have ceased sending large fat hogs to market now. This market will all be upset if this pact goes through. Now, Sir, I wish to draw your attention to the amount of spring wheat that is grown in the United States compared with what we have in Canada, and the average grown per acre. The United States, in 1910, raised 231,390,000 bushels of spring wheat, average per acre 11·7, value per bushel 98·8 cents; of winter wheat they raised 464,044,000, average per acre, 16·8 bushels, value per bushel, 89·1. In the United States the total amount grown of winter wheat was 695,443,000 bushels; in Canada, of spring wheat there were grown 133,379,600 bushels; average per acre, 15·53 bushels; value per bushel, 73·8 cents.

Of winter wheat there was grown 16,610,000 bushels; average per acre 23·49 bushels; value per bushel, 87 cents. The total wheat grown in Canada in 1910, 249,989,600 bushels. Now we can easily see that the Americans raised a very large amount of wheat, and still our people are anxious to get their market.

Now let us look at the exports of Canadian wheat for the last five years to Great Britain and to the United States:

	Exports to Great Britain.	Exports to United States.
1906..	$30,622,824	$298,160
1907..	20,710,973	630,349
1908..	42,911,610	102,849
1909..	51,350,211	602,661
1910..	58,538,772	1,883,637

Wheat imported into Canada from the United States:

	Bush.
1906..	578,622
1907..	1,167,402
1908..	5,138,455
1909..	9,431,346
1910..	12,070,811

Now with this large amount of wheat, I do not see why we should be looking to the United States for a market. Here is a table showing wheat exports from the United States:

	Bushels.	Value.
1907..	76,569,423	$60,214,388
1908..	100,371,057	99,736,767
1909..	66,923,244	68,094,447

Now why should we be looking for a market from which is exported so large a quantity of wheat? I do not see any advantage that we could have. I can see quite well the advantage the Americans would have in this trade. It is a well-known fact that our wheat is a great deal better, of a superior quality to that of the Americans. We often hear it said that unless their wheat is mixed with some of our Canadian wheat it will make nothing but dough. They want our wheat to mix with their own, and that is one reason why they are so anxious to have this reciprocity treaty concluded. Let me here read you a short paragraph from a speech of President Taft at Indianapolis, in favour of reciprocity, made on the 4th of July last:

> President Taft put the parting touch on his part in the celebration of the city's 'safe and sane' Fourth in a speech on Canadian reciprocity at the Marion Club banquet to-night. The President made his answer to the argument of other Republicans that reciprocity, as he has proposed it, is not good Republican doctrine, but Democratic doctrine.
>
> Replying to the contention that reciprocity would be made wholly at the expense of the farmer and in the interest of the wage-earner of the large cities, Mr. Taft said that in his judgment 'the reciprocity agreement will not greatly reduce the cost of living, if at all.'
>
> 'It will,' the President continued, 'steady prices by enlarging the reserves of supplies for those things that are raised in both countries, and it will make more remote the possibility of cornering commodities and extorting excessive prices for them from the public.'
>
> The complaint that the farmers would suffer by the agreement, the President said, when analysed would be found to be an argument that the admission of Canadian wheat free of duty would lower the price of wheat raised in the United States ten cents a bushel.
>
> 'The answer to this argument,' he said, 'is that this cannot be, for the reason that the price of wheat in the United States and Canada both is ultimately fixed by the price of wheat in the world, and that the world's prices are adjusted and made at Liverpool by the relation of the supply of the exported wheat to the demand for it by countries which do not raise enough to supply their people.

Is not that a strong admission of President Taft that reciprocity will not raise the price of wheat. I read this from the Toronto 'Globe,' July 24, 1911:

> In the United States we have seen the same sequence of events in our own time. A people formerly agricultural have become city dwellers. Their exports, which were mainly natural products a generation ago—wheat, corn, cattle, cotton and similar articles—are now in ever-increasing degree manufactured goods. Under the protective system in its application to foodstuffs the duties on wheat, barley, oats, beans, cattle, fish and meats have been prohibitive since the passage of the McKinley tariff twenty years ago. The inevitable result has been the frequent cornering of the wheat market, and the increase of the price of wheat and flour far above that prevailing in the world's open marts. The meat trust has taken toll of the people without mercy, and the cost of living has been forced up so high that the town dwellers, and in some measure the farmers also, have revolted, and demanded the removal of the food taxes that were used to make great fortunes for the manipulators of the markets. On the one hand, the trusts were able to depress the farmers' selling prices, and on the other to compel the consumers to pay enhanced prices for their food supplies. The secret of the meat trust's tremendous power lay in the fact that the farmer was selling cattle at prices pre-arranged by a little group of men who controlled practically all the packing houses in the United States, while the consumer was buying meat at retail stores similarly controlled by the trust.

You can see, Mr. Chairman, from this that the trusts control nearly all the articles consumed in the United States, and there is no doubt that under reciprocity they will extend their influence to Canada without the least trouble in the world. It is a well known fact that the local butchers right aross the line cannot buy cattle direct from the farmers as the Canadian butchers do, because the trusts crowd them out of the

market. A farmer that lives three or four hundred miles from Chicago will have to sell his meat to the trust, and the consumer has to pay the railway frieght on the live stock cargo, and the freight on the dead meat from Chicago to New York, thus paying a double rate. They pay on the live cattle going into Chicago and on the dead meat going out, and in the meantime there are two or three middlemen to make money. There is no better managed market the world over than in the Dominion of Canada; nearly everything the producer raises goes direct to the consumer, and the producer gets more for what he produces than does the American producer, while the American consumer has to pay more for his food, the reason being that the trusts intervene between the producer and the consumer in the United States. This proves that we should continue to do business in the future, as we have done in the past. President Taft at New York plainly indicated the intention of the United States to prevent by this agreement the possibiilty of a commercial union of Canada with the empire. He said, speaking to his own people:

I have said that this was a critical time in the solution of the question of reciprocity. It is critical because unless it is now decided favourably to reciprocity it is exceedingly probable that no such opportunity will ever again come to the United States. The forces which are at work in England and in Canada to separate her by a Chinese wall from the United States, and to make her part of an imperial commercial band reaching from England around the world to England again by a system of preferential tariffs, will derive an impetus from the rejection of this treaty, and if we would have reciprocity, with all the advantages that I have described, and that I earnestly and sincerely believe will follow its adoption, we must take it now or give it up forever.

In the same speech Mr. Taft disclaimed any desire on the part of the United States for the annexation of Canada. He cannot speak for the United States on this subject—but assuming that he is right with regard to annexation, he certainly is right with regard to Canada's future with the empire if reciprocity takes effect, and again we ask: 'Why take the risk?'

It is not much wonder they should talk this way, because they know right away that if they talked commercial union or annexation it would kill the Bill in Canada, and so, they ask for reciprocity in order to help Canada. Did you ever know of the Americans doing anything before to help Canada? Never. I quote the following remarks of Senator Works:

Washington, July 19.—Senator Works, of California, insurgent Republican, urged the passage of the Canadian reciprocity Bill in a vigorous speech in the Senate to-day. He expressed the belief that reciprocity would not injure the farming interests of the nation,

except to cause some temporary disturbances in border states, which would soon adjust themselves.

Senator Works said he did not believe President Taft had used undue influence to secure the passage of the reciprocity Bill through congress, and that Mr. Taft was 'too good a lawyer to overstep well recognized bounds.'

Attempts to amend the Bill were obvious attempts to defeat reciprocity as a whole, said Mr. Works, who defended the Bill as fair and just and of lasting benefit to the country.'

No wonder, Mr. Chairman, that all these politicians of the United States are in favour of reciprocity with the United States.

The New York 'Journal' is very confident about the future:

Intelligent Americans will favour this treaty; intelligent Congressmen will vote for it. Eventually, beyond question the whole North American continent will be one nation.

The Oriental 'Review' of New York regards the trick as already done:

This great republic has morally added to its union one more state without fighting for it, and without any future need of 'knocking it' into proper shape.

When the International boundary between Lake Superior and the Pacific was being delimited, the United States desired it to be at latitude 54.40, instead of at parallel 49, where it now is. Ardent spirits wished to settle the question by the sword. The difference between 49 and 54.40 is that 54.40 is north of the Saskatchewan, and that if the boundary had been fixed there no part of the Canadian west that is growing wheat for export would have belonged to Canada. The St. Paul 'Dispatch' is reminiscent:

The arrangement is just as good for the United States, so far as it goes, as the policy of '54-40 or fight' would have been had it succeeded.

The unique position and possibilities of Canada in world politics are keenly realized by many business men and publicists in the United States. They see that Canada's political strength within the British empire will be increased as her trade with the empire increases.

Control of trade and trade routes is the most powerful incentive to political aggrandizement. They openly profess that the agreement is a blow to Great Britain and to the empire. Whatever is a blow to Great Britain and the empire is a blow to Canada.

Mr. Knox, the United States Secretary of State—chief member of President Taft's cabinet—speaking at a reciprocity dinner in Chicago, which, to quote the official report of the Chicago Association of Commerce, was representative of 'cities as far

north as Duluth, and as far south as Nashville; as far east as Cleveland, and as far west as Omaha,' said:

In providing for free wheat we also take into account the facilities which the United States possesses for handling a part of the surplus Canadian crop, and thus preventing the demoralization of prices which results through the dumping of large quantities upon the European markets, where the world's price is fixed. The free admission of grain from Canada thus meets the present situation and provides against contingencies when the Canadian surplus becomes greater by placing the control in the hands of our own grain-growers.

It has been the object of Canadian statesmanship to build up Canadian ports, because control of maritime trade is of the essence of building and preserving a nation with seacoasts. Governor Foss, of Massachusetts, is wholeheartedly for the reciprocity agreement because it will draw all kinds of trade away from Canadian ports.

And Mr. James J. Hill, chairman of the board of directors of the Great Northern railway, said:

It is not what we have gained by the reciprocity treaty that is most important, but what we have prevented. In the comment on the treaty when it was pending nearly every argument for it spoke of the good it would bring and it will bring good. My views in favour of reciprocity are so well known that I need not repeat them, now that the Senate has acted favourably. But the good that it will bring is only the smaller consideration of the question. What would have happened if we had not passed the treaty? That is the big question. There would have been a revival of a move for imperial federation, and if we had refused to trade with our good neighbour, our second best customer, and, for our manufacturers the best customer we have, we should have been sorry for it in years to come, for the opportunity was before us to make a favourable agreement with Canada and it would not have been before us again for many years if we had refused it this time.

That is why I say that while the treaty will mean much good for both the United States and Canada—and I believe that it will stimulate trade on both sides and that it will not be long before everyone will see its benefit and see that the wise thing to do was to act favourably upon it—yet, after all, that is the secondary part. There is not the slightest doubt that the situation was such that had the vote in the senate been against it, the report would have gone over the world and would have stimulated activities elsewhere for obtaining trade that we are in the best geographical position to handle, and in England it would have meant the beginning of action for such imperial trade federation as would have shut us out.

Will it hurt Canada? Not a bit of it. It will be of great benefit to Canada. It ought to help Minneapolis and St. Paul, and Winnipeg, and all our country and Western Canada. There never was any more reason why there should be a line of custom houses along the northern Minnesota-Montana border or the border of eastern Canada, than there should be between Minneapolis and Wisconsin or New York or Pennsylvania. What has made the commerce of the United States so great? That provision in our constitution that said that trade shall lie free and untrammelled between the states. Although there were those who doubted the wisdom of free commerce between all the states when our country was in the formative period, it has been the greatest thing in our history. It will be the same between the United States and Canada.

You see, Mr. Chairman, all these prominent men in the United States are in favour of this pact. But even so lately as a year ago had they any favours to offer Canada? No; they wanted the highest tax they could put on—25 cents a bushel on wheat, 6 cents a pound on butter, and so all along the line. They never were anxious to give Canada any favours but sought to do everything they could to hurt her trade. Mr. Chairman, it is growing late, and I will now move the adjournment of the debate.

Progress reported.

RECIPROCITY DOCUMENTS.

Mr. KING moved that the report of comparative prices in Canada and the United States, 1906-1911, be printed, and that rule 74 of the House be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

Mr. FISHER. I beg to lay on the table complete information in reply to a question asked by Mr. Sharpe (Ontario), dated March 16th.

I would also lay on the table for the information of the House some comparative figures which have been prepared by the department in regard to agricultural products affected by the pact with the United States.

At the request of the right hon. the Prime Minister, I lay on the table the report of the committee of the Imperial Conference convened to discuss defence at the War Office, June 14-17, 1911.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Does the hon. minister (Mr. Fisher) propose to have this report printed forthwith.

Mr. FISHER. That is the intention.

Mr. BRODEUR. I beg leave to lay on the table the interim report of the Fishery Commission of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. TAYLOR (Leeds). Might I ask what business will be proceeded with on Monday?

Mr. FISHER. Reciprocity will be interesting, I think.

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

Parliament was dissolved on Saturday, July 29, 1911, by proclamation of His Excellency the Governor General.

INDEX

THIRD SESSION—ELEVENTH PARLIAMENT, 1910-1911.

Abbreviations of well known words and Parliamentary expressions are used in the following :—1°, 2° 3°, First Reading, Second Reading, Third Reading ; 3 m. h., 6 m. h., 6 w. h., Three Months' Hoist, Six Months' Hoist, Six Weeks' Hoist ; *, without remarks or debate ; Accts., Accounts ; Adjn., Adjourn; Adjd., Adjourned ; Amt., Amendment ; Amts., Amendments ; Amalg., Amalgamation ; Ans., Answer ; Ass.; Assurance ; B., Bill ; B.C., British Columbia ; Can., Canada or Canadian ; C.P.R., Canadian Pacific Railway ; Com., Committee ; Co., Company ; Conc., Concur, Concurred, Concurrence ; Consd., Consider, Consdn., Consideration ; Cor., Correspondence ; Deb., Debate ; Dept., Department ; Depts., Departments Div., Division ; Dom., Dominion ; Govt., Government ; His Ex., His Excellency the Governor General ; Hse., House ; H. of C., House of Commons ; Incorp., Incorporation ; Ins., Insurance ; I.C.R., Intercolonial Railway ; Man., Manitoba ; Mess., Message ; M., Motion ; m., moved ; Neg., Negatived ; N.B., New Brunswick ; N.W.T., Northwest Territories ; N.S., Nova Scotia ; O.C., Order in Council ; Ont., Ontario ; P.E.I., Prince Edward Island ; P.O., Post Office ; Par., Paragraph ; Prop., Proposed ; Q., Quebec ; Ques., Question ; Recom., Recommit ; Ref., Refer, Referred, Reference ; Rep., Report, Reported ; Reps., Reports ; Res., Resolution ; Ret., Return ; Ry., Railway ; Rys., Railways ; Sel., Select ; Sen., Senate ; Sp., Special ; Stmnt., Statement ; Sup., Supply ; Suppl., Supplement, Supplementary ; Wthdn., Withdrawn ; Wthdrl., Withdrawal ; Y.N., Yeas and Nays ; Names in Italics and parentheses are those of the mover.

ALLEN, Mr. H. E., *Shefford.*

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9619 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7661 (iv).

AMES, Mr. H. B., *Montreal, St. Antoine.*

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ques.) 5632 (iii).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re* (Ques.) 2666 (ii).

Australian and Can. Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900 (M. for stmt.*) 1501 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 2440 (ii).

Charing Cross Bank, and Atlantic Quebec and Western Ry. Co. (M. for cor with Govt) 1726 (i).

Chemin Gouin, Postmastership, Name of, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).

——— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Superannuation, &c. (Ques.) 7210 (iv).

Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ques.) 1280 (i).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i)

G.T.P. Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalty *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).

See 'N. T. Ry.'

Half Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes (M. for copy*) 1912 (i).

Harbours and Rivers Expenditures by Public Works (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).

N. T. Ry., Changes in Original Specifications, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*

N. T. Ry., Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000 (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff who have resigned, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1499 (i).

——— Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re* (Ques.) 1491 (i).

——— Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

——— Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery (Ques.) 1569 (i).

——— Shops, Specification *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ques.) 2157 (ii).

——— Total Expenditure to 31st Dec., 1910, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ques.) 1497 (i).

——— (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).

——— Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re* (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).

North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Elections (Ques.) 1082 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

Preferential Tariff, Concessions granted to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).

AMES, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations (M. for cor.*) 7039 (iv.)
——— Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ques.) 6757 (iv).
——— Payment of $100,000 to Phœnix Bridge Co. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4083 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6786 (iv).
See 'Australia.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5051 (iii).
St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Six Nation Indian Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1500 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Montreal, P.O., alterations) 1862; (Montreal postal station) 1861 (i).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c. (Ques.) 814 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E., *East Lambton.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6293 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1947 (i).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of (M. for cor.*) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Banking and Commerce Com., Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364 (ii).
'Canada Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing (Ques.) 2885 (ii).
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of (Ques.) 5638, (iii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
——— Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v)
Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ques.) 8994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9046 (v).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6206 (iv).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii); in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
——— (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908, 8924 (v).
Copyright Act B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8899 (v).
Coronation Stamps, Inquiry *re*, 9247 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of location (Ques.) 4669 (iii).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ques.) 662 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice Breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6475 (iv).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ques.) 799 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number established in the past year (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Number operated, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5453 (iii).
——— Investigation *re* (remarks) 7560 (iv).
Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (remarks) 5292 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4367 (iii).
Franking System, for Private Business (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7828; in Com., 7848 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm (Ques.) 804, 1349 (i).
Live Stock Industry, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1200 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2894 (ii).
Mail Delayed and Mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ques.) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ques.) 802 (i).
——— remarks, 1356 (i).
See 'Sheldon, C. D.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
Montreal Govt. Weir, Inquiry for Ret., 2065 (ii).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Naval Service, Number of Battle Ships withdrawn from Canada by G.B., during the past five years (Ques.) 1092 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8963 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post Service between Canada and G.B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re* (Ques.) 805 (i).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Coronation.'
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Short-Date Newspapers, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c. (Ques.) 5934 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).
Post Office, Deptl. Money Orders, Printing of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection to Passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Public Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 5541 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3072 (ii).
——— Supervision, Expenditure (remarks) 6672 (iv).
Railway Mail Clerks, Increases to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Names of those compensated for Accidents (Ques.) 9537 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3737 (ii).
Reciprocity—British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Mins., 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. for Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— Dairymen's Association of Western Ont., Denial of Stmnt. of Min. of Customs, 4570 (iii).
——— Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).
——— Res. of Toronto Anti-Reciprocity League *re* Annexation (read) 4141 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6802 (iv).
'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage (Ques.) 2371 (ii).
Richelieu and Ontario Nav. Co.'s B. 192 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufactured, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery Routes, Number in Operation, &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

ARMSTRONG, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10365 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1364 (i).
——— Action of Government *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
See 'Mails:.
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm (read) in Com. of Sup., 5965 (iv).
Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 806 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5964; (dairying) 6249 (iv); (exhibitions) 9079 (v).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1051; Mines (salaries) 1480; Post Office (contingencies) 6068 (iv); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subsidies (Canada and Australia) 8765; (Canada and Cuba) 8778; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8786; (Canada and G.B.) 8775; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).
Post Office (Curren ,R. C., gratuity) 4283; (mail clerks) 4281 (iii), 6082 (iv); Outside Service (magazines) 6080; (mails) 6077 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ontario (Brantford drill hall) 2098 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2362 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8877 (v); Ontario (Peterborough) 2608 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—Intercolonial Railway (freight service) 5988 (iv); (Halifax) 5924 (iii); Miscellaneous (official cars) 6447 (iv).
United States Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations re (Ques.) 984 (i).
See 'Review.'
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
——— (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E., *Parry Sound.*
Callender Lighthouse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6498 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Explosives Importation, Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8457 (v).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5155 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's. incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
North Bay, Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c., (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).
Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

ARTHURS, Mr. J. E.—*Con.*
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9695 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Reciprocity with United States, Resolutions *re*, M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 9646 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Mines (salaries) 1479 (i).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses &c.) 6455, 6497; (Midland and Tiffin) 6502 iv).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B., K. C. M. G. (Minister of Justice) *North York, Ont.*
Address, The, 664 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2168 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., ref. to Justice Department. (Ans.) 926 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7578 (iv).
C. P. R. Land Tax, Decision of Privy Council (remarks) 2992 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Investigation Commission, on Inquiry for Judge's Rep., 9594 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4582 (iii).
Clarry, L. F., Payments to by Govt. (Ans.) 813 (i).
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard, Travelling Expenses &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Convicts liberated from Kingston Penitentiary without Clothing or Means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2067 (ii).
——— (statement) 1986 (ii).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10352 (v).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary (Ans.) 8582 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5498 (iii).
Fedorenko, Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8971 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4593, 4603 (iii).
——— (explanation) *re*, on M. (Mr. Jameson) 4683 (iii).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
Hague Arbitration, Counsel, Names, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 797 (i).
——— Fisheries Regulations with U. S., Conference *re* (Stmnt) 1988 (ii).
See 'North Atlantic,' 'Supply—Justice.'
Hudson's Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9158 (v).
See 'Waterways.'
Judges appointed since 1896, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 8095 (v).
Judges in Yukon Ter., Annuities (M.) for Com. on Res., 8790 (v).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel in outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 1014 (i).
Justice, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 469 (i).
Juvenile Deliquents, Act 1908, (B. 189) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Legal Agents appointed for Govt., Precautions *re* acting for private Parties (Ans.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2902 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3256 (ii).
See 'Waterways.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4209 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Marriage Laws in prov. of Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ans) 7208 (iv).
Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s intention (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury (Ans.) 7207 (iv).
Ministers, Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
N. T. Ry. Land Damages, Fiats *re* Land Damages, Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriages.'
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10489 (v).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor, 2186 (ii).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Arbitration at The Hague, on Address, 664 (i).

AYLESWORTH, Hon. Sir Allen B.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor, 4337 (iii).
—— Distribution of copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation (Ans.) 3064 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8331 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) on M. for 3°, 2740 (ii).
Pecuniary Claims *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7899 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 963 (i).
Reciprocity and North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7223 (iv).
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ans.) 5406 (iii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 111 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 3184 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada (remarks) 6200 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Justice (contingencies) 1020; (salaries) 1014 (i).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (contingencies) 6160; (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
The Hague: *See* 'North Atlantic.-
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition (Ans.) 708 (i).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9906 (v).
—— on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10144 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 908 (i), 9158 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S., *East Hamilton.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7471 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. as Immigration agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5192 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9610 (v).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6631 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10272 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9519 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5795 (iii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude May, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8974 (v).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society (B. 172) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
I.C.R. Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c. with Aud. Gen., Stmnts, &c. (M. for ret.*) 784 (i).
Military Adviser to Imperial Conference, Apptmt of Mr. S. Hughes (remarks) 9072 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8521 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6147 (iv).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8593 (v).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons imported (Ques.) 1721 (i).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8070 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railway Act (telegraph, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6860 (iv).
—— Ques. *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8578, 8967, 9575 (v).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3349 (ii).

BARKER, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6061 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3812 (ii); Ont. (inspectors) 6631 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5192 (iii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161; Exchequer Court (printing reports) 6161; Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6166 (iv).
Legislation—House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8528 (v).
Post Office—Outside Office (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10101 (v).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H., *Victoria, B.C.*
Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts Works (remarks) 10367 (v).
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10433 (v).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities (M. for reps.*) 785 (i).
Customs Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co. (M. for copies) 931 (i).
See 'Vancouver.'
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ques.) 3220 (ii).
Exchequer Court Act (compensation for injuries) Amt. (B. 25) 1° m., 663 (i).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) 9005 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8458 (v).
Fisheries Act (salmon licenses) Amt. (B. 58) 1° m., 1343 (i).
Fish Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re* (remarks) 2080 (ii).
——— Par. in Victoria 'Daily Colonist' (remarks). 1458 (i).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8631 (v).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2879, (ii).

BARNARD, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7863 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9470 (v).
Jardine, Mr. John, Payments to by Govt. (Ques.) 4670 (iii).
——— Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt. (Ques.) 3847 (ii).
——— Payment by Govt. in excess of Work (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading, &c. (remarks) 7257 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7251 (iv).
See 'Indian Act.'
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6491; (buoy steamers) 6550; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (pensions to pilots) 6534 (iv).
U.S.. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington (remarks) 9247 (v).
Vancouver Customs Entries, by Robt. Kelly, &c. (M. for copies) 713 (i)
See 'Customs.'
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).

BEATTIE, Mr. T., *London.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. res. (Mr. Meighen) 1946 (i).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8936 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1312 (i).
Coronation Day in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c. (Ques.) 9989 (v).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (remarks) 10351 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) (personal explanation) 5316 (iii).
Flags, Regulations by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags (prop. res.) 4347, 4379 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1438 (i).
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 57) 1°*, 1277 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s (B. 75) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389 (ii).
Newspaper Trains, Cost of Operation *re* Special Trains (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9925 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5258 (iii).

BEATTIE, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt, (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5119 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10535 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10042 (v).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4311 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629 (iv); Post Office (mail clerks) 4281, 4284 (iii).

BEAUPARLANT, Mr. A. M., *St. Hyacinthe.*
Census Taking System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
Civil Service Act (garnishee) Amt. (B. 12) 1° m., 195 (i).
——— Garnishee of Salaries, on M. for Sup., 4571 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ques.) 658 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7450 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i).

BELAND, Mr. H. S., *Beauce.*
Address, The, 172 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 172 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Statements in 'Le Devoir,' 146 (i).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7427 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3389 (ii).

BEST, Mr. J., *Dufferin.*
Aud. General, Cor. *re* over-payments by Govt. (remarks) 1010 (i).
Census Enumerators, Pets, in Favour of Reciprocity, Circulation of (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Eucharistic Congress, Number of Buildings decorated by Govt. (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
——— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c., (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Stock *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Mica Exports, 1900 to 1910 (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Privilege, Ques. of, Members paying for Speeches, &c., 1355 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Res., 9885, 9891 (v).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8367 (v).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6828 (iv).

BEST, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).
Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3795 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6069 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Combines Investigation Act) 4280 (iii).
Legislation—Senate (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Post Office (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).

BICKERDIKE, Mr. R., *Montreal, St. Lawrence.*
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt (B. 39) 1° m., 924 (i).
——— Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
La Banque du Canada incorp. (B. 123) 1°*, 4109; on M. for Com., 5631; in Com., 5776 (iii), 6120 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 3180 (ii), 7720, on M. for 3°, 7717 (iv).
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 61) 1°*, 1453 (i).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s (B. 192) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s (B. 214) 1°*, 8955; in Com., 9167 (v).

BLACK, Mr. J. B., *Hants.*
Canada Medical Act Amt. (B. 15) 1°m., 309 (i); 2° m., Ref. to Special Com., 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8048 (v).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8048 (v).
Fruit Duties *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 3377 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1134 (i).
Medical Council Bill, Par. in "Globe," Correction *re*, 2991 (ii).
See "Can. Medical."
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2533 (ii).
Reciprocity Treaty, Dufferin Res. *re* (remarks) 5547 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756 (v); Post Office —Outside Service (magazines) 6080 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Pollution of the City Water, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).

BLACK, Mr. J. B.—*Con.*
Typhoid in Ottawa, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
—— (explanation) 4720 (iii).
Ventilation of the House of Commons (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R., *Peel.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 355 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
See "I.C.R."
Agricultural Expenditures in Ontario, for 1910 (Ques.) 6668 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6311 (iv).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (i).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3600 (ii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8828 (v).
Casualty Co. of Can. incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Cattle Exports to the U.S., bonded to G.B. (remarks) 7426 (iv).
—— Reshipped to G.B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
—— Apptmt. of (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).
—— Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9053 (v).
—— Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt. &c. (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Census Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9725 (v).
Census, System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4341 (iii).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2508 (ii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8717 (v).
Civil Service Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1912 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 2555, 3059 (ii).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4659 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3504 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8121 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8996 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5431 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6617 (iv).
Freeman, Cecil Ernest Relief (B. 143) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10252 (v).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5127 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ques.) 817 (i).
G.T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5796 (iii).
—— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
—— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073, 1507 (i).
—— Settlement *re* (remarks) 9692 (v).
—— Status of men Reinstated (remarks) 3377 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409, 1545, 1729, 1746 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2962 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8744 (v).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
—— Working Operations (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5986 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1295 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister, acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Labour Strikes, Conflict *re* (remarks) 6366 (iv).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. res. (Mr. Sproule) 1239 (i).
Lunenburg Tower Clock, Specification *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2023 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ontario, Accommodation *re* Rys. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) on M. for 3°, 8965 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6133 (iv).
—— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Opium Importation of, Prohibition of Sale B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 468 (i), in Com., 2539 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re* (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2271, Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
Peel County Mail Service (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
See 'Postal.'
Pork Packing Industry Delegation, Inquiry for Rep. 3530 (ii).
Port Credit Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
Port Credit Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10 (Ques.) 5638 (iii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of certain Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Postal Service in Peel County, Rural Mail Delvery (remarks) 10355 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Buildings, Advertisements for Tenders, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).
Printing Bureau Irregularities, Money Loss *re* (Ques.) 794 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep., 831 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt), to sit during Sittings of the House, 10190 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Railway Freight Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4167 (iii).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7550 (iv); Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7618 (iv); Original Resolution (remarks) 7668 (iv).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8369 (v).
—— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5728 (iii).
—— Letter from the 'Globe' Reporter on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).
—— Negotiations, Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* visit to Washington (remarks) 4299 (iii).
—— Oleomargarine, Admission of (Ques.), 6668 (iv); (remarks) 6504 (iv).
—— Protests *re*, Inquiry for, 3951 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of, (remarks) 5951 (iv).
—— Special Interests in Can., (remarks) 3058 (ii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6812, 6892 (iv).
—— Statistics, Accepting as read and Printing in 'Hansard)' (remarks) 6859 (iv).
—— Statistics, Reply of Trade and Commerce Dept. *re* Return (remarks) 6514 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members *re* Bringing Down (remarks) 5938 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal,' &c.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2662, 3844 (ii).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6191 (iv).
South Grey Govt. Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 3344 (ii).
See 'Civil Service.'
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Springhill Mine, N. S., Strike, (remarks) *re* Militia, 2641 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c., (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c., (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (dairying) 6243 (iv); (exhibitions) 3776 (ii); 9078 (v); (seeds) 6221 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5960 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv); St. Peter's (improvements) 6419 (iv); Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392 (iv); Welland (Jane St. bridge) 6425 (iv); Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475 (i); Customs (salaries) 5992 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1018 (i); Labour (salaries) 1484 (i); Militia (salaries) 1029 (i); Mines (salaries) 1476, 1478 (i); Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6617 (iv); (legal expenses) 6661 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5168 (iii).

Indians—Man. (annuities) 8886 (v).

Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).

Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3801 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6549; (maritime road) 6543 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8770 (v).

Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6570 (iv).

Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3211; (fire escapes) 3160 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3157; (sundries) 3161 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i); (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1620; (Hillsborough) 1622; (Moncton armoury) 1623 (i).

Public Works—Buildings— N.S. (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1629; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tilbury) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2633; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (furniture, &c.) 3164; (heating, &c.) 2590, 3162; (H. of C. improvements) 2592; (lighting) 3202 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv); (pavements) 2594 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Aylmer) 1673; (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i); (Montreal barracks) 2575 (ii); (Napierville) 1866; (Quebec immigrant) 1887; (Rigaud) 1888; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Three Rivers) 1902 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9556 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9502 (v); Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R (air brakes) 5913; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (rolling stock) 5927 (iii); (working expenses) 6340 (iv)

Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry, Commissioners) 6428 (iv)

Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6559; (meteorological service) 6563 (iv)

Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9706 (v).

BLAIN, Mr. R.—*Con.*

Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3188 (ii).

See 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'

Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904 (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

BLONDIN, Mr. P. E., *Champlain.*

Address, The, 169 (i).

Arthabaska and Drummond Election, *re* Disloyal Speeches (remarks) on Address, 169 (i).

—— Statements in 'Le Devoir,' Denial, &c., 145 (i).

—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).

Lanctot: *See* 'Richelieu.'

Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).

Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), on M. (Mr. German), to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8027 (v).

Richelieu, Member of, Charges *re* Emplymt. of Govt. Work men from Sorel Ship yards, Ques. of Priv., 4645 (iii), (M.) for Com., 4654 (iii).

St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).

Sorel Naval Shipyards, Investigation, Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).

Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir FREDERICK, K.C.M.G., (Minister of Militia), *Kings, N.S.*

Alberta Rangers, Macleod, Squadron, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection therewith (Ans.) 7341 (iv).

Annual Drill, Number of Men, Officers, &c. (Ans.) 8700, 9353 (v).

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Baby Farm, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ans.) 2155 (ii).

Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 3606 (ii).

Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. F., Emplymt. by Govt. &c (Ans.) 8100 (v)

Canadian Veterans at Coronation (Ans.) 3608 (ii).

Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4660 (iii).

—— Canadian Cadets, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).

—— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7106 (iv).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (Ans.) 3277 (ii).
—— Regulations *re* Selection (Ans.) 3220 (ii), 4464 (iii).
—— Selection of Officers (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Esquimalt Guns, Removal of (Ans.) 3220 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress and Guards of Honour (Ans.) 704 (i).
—— Militia Officers at Reception, Uniform, &c. (Ans.) 707 (i).
—— Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ans.) 3219 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Compensation to (Ans.) 658, 1089 (i).
—— Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
See "Veterans."
Flags Flying on Military Buildings (remarks) 4725 (iii).
Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* Purchase by Man. Govt. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6055 (iv).
French, Gen.'s, Report (presented) 76 (i).
—— on Inquiry for Rep., 10 (i).
Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9371 (v).
Militia, Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ans.) 8700 (v).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parliament (Ans.) 1003, 1090 (i).
—— Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
—— Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ans.) 7595 (iv).
—— Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1003 (i).
—— Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
—— Surveys, Expenditure in last five years (Ans.) 1102 (i).
—— Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Montreal and Mar. Prov. Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N.B. Artillery Regiment, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8529 (v).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7340 (iv).
Petawawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 9984 (v).

BORDEN, Hon. Sir Frederick—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Boston Speech (remarks) 5751 (iii).
—— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5548, 5750 (iii).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Regiment while in England (Ans.) 1088 (i).
—— Number issued to Queen's Own (Ans.) 9781 (v)
Ross Rifles loaned by Canada to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ans.) 1087 (i).
—— Recommendation to British Govt. (remarks) 7553 (iv).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price paid, &c. (Ans.) 8583, 10335 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia—(salaries) 1021 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8758 (v).
Militia (allowance) 8514, 8528 (v); (customs duties) 6054; (R.M.C. maintenance) 6054; (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 3156; Que. (Montreal barracks) 3145 (ii).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of (remarks) 7558 (iv).
—— Purchase of Site (Ans.) 2154 (i).
Veterans, Grants to by Govt. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
See 'Fenian.'
Veterans of 1866, Compensation *re* (remarks) 9999 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L., *Halifax, N.S.*
Address, The, 22 (i).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 218, (amt.) 228 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order, Member asked to apologize for using word "liar," 463 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2173, 2183 (ii).
Agricultural Implements, Valuations for Duties, Manipulation of, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published by "Le Canada" in 1904 (remarks) on Address, 223 (i).
See 'Drummond.'
Atlantic Mail Contract, Question *re* (remarks) 2373 (ii).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, rumours *re* (remarks) 9373 (v).
Bank Act, Consideration by Govt. (remarks) 6674 (iv).
Bank Curators Reports (remarks) 4569 (iii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
Budget, The, (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, Inquiry, 4117 (iii).
—— Adjournment for Coronation (remarks) 9310 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* G.B. and Can. (Ques.) 1905 (i).
See 'Telegraph.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8813, 8841; in Com., 9256 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* Mr. Oliver on Proposed Motion (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver.'
C. P. Ry. Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) in Com., 1848 (i).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7219 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Apptmt. of Enumerators (M. for copy*) 9994 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9056 (v).
Census, Inquiry for Information, 9694 (v).
—— Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v).
Census Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9717 (v).
—— Further information *re*, 9897 (v).
Census, Systems of Collecting (M. for papers, &c.) 4337 (iii).
—— Inquiry for (remarks) 6669, 7556 (iv).
China-Japan SS Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10401, 10450 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9838-9 (v).
—— Discussion *re* Rep., 9929 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8723 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com on Res., 8906 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re* (M. for cor.) 2218 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 7553 (iv).
—— (notice of motion) 1912 (i).
Coal Strikes, Settlement of (remarks) 6914 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7808 (iv); in Com., 8896 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8711 (v).
—— Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
See 'Business,' 'Imperial Conference.'
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910 (Ques.) 801 (i).
See 'Duties.'
Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections (M. for O. Cs. &c.) 2218 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7017 (iv).
Deptl. Expenditures of Public Moneys, Investigations *re* (remarks) on Address, 37 (i).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) in Com., 8044 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, O. Cs. in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 476 (i).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of articles in Schedules of Customs Act (M. for ret.) 1105 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3480 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re (remarks) 8111 (v).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mails.'
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Fanny Louise Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2251 (ii).
—— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5387 (iii).
—— Proceedings *re* Commission, Inquiry for, 10471 (v).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1598 (i).
—— (remarks) *re* Printing of Speeches, &c., 1454 (i).
—— Stmt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Grain Growers' Guide (remarks) 1575 (i).
Fedorenko, S., Extradition of (remarks) 10 (i).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9627 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P.M.G. at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044 (v).
Fisheries, Newfoundland: *See* 'Hague.'
Fishery Officers in Victoria Co., on Inquiry for Ret., 6672 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4208 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8501 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4352 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8086, 9346 (v).
French, Gen., Rep., Inquiry for, 9 (i).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
—— Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Grain Act Amt. B., 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9514 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5705 (iii).
G.T.R. Trainmens Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1071 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B., 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8978 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Agreement *re* (remarks) 1725 (i).
—— Bay of Fundy, on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4614, 4701 (iii).
—— (remarks) in Speech on Address, 24 (i).
—— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1804 (i).
—— Stmt. *re* (remarks) 1913 (i).
See 'North Atlantic.'
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaints *re* Treatment *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com., 8723 (v).
Halifax Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of (remarks) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ques.), 653 (i).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., on M. (Mr. Taylor) for Ret., 2861 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411, 1536, 1739, 1765 (i).
House of Commons Appointments (remarks) on M., 5288 (iii).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1564 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Position of the Opposition, Compromise, &c. (remarks) 8033 (iv).
—— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt, &c. (remarks) 10340 (v).
—— Precis *re* Proceedings (remarks) 9693 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
—— Printing and Distribution in Canada (remarks) 9691 (v).
—— Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10114 (v).
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020; on M. for 2°, 7825, 7832; in Com., 7852 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2956 (ii).
I.C.R., Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs, &c. *re* Claims of Contractors (M. for copies*) 5640 (iii).
—— inquiry for ret., 10470 (v).
—— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1179 (i).
—— Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings, (remarks) 3000 (ii).
—— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ques.) 653 (i).
—— Halifax Terminals, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham 2647 (ii).
—— Terminals, at Halifax, Dock Accommodation (remarks) 2376 (i), 9531 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1301 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 971; in Com., 976, 1295: in Order for Com., 1407 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 871 (i); on M. for 2°, 9132; in Com., 9157 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 224 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9452; on M. for 3°, 9533 (v).
See 'China and Japan.'
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations, &c., 8 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Speech at Montreal. *See* 'Fiscal.'
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop, Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1199 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
—— Cor. between Govt, and British Ambassador, Inquiry for 3530 (ii)
—— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c., (remarks) 1651 (i).
See 'International Waterways Bill,' 'St. Lawrence.'
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c., (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9543 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Mail Service to Maritime Provinces, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax (remarks) 2376 (ii).
——— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1358 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6202 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus Manufacture, Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1576 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2800 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
See 'Business,' &c., 'Govt. Business.'
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9498 (v).
N. T. Ry., Eastern Div., Total Cost up to 31st Dec., 1910 (Ques.) 2434, 3064 (ii).
——— Land Damages, Delay *re* Fiats for Compensation (remarks) 3949 (iii).
——— Payments *re*, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div, Completion of (Ques.) 1711 (i).
Naval Defence, Government Proposals (remarks) on Address, 34 (i).
Naval Policy of the Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 218 (amt.) 228; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5947 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 782 (i).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press (remarks) 8791 (v).
——— Power, Regulations, &c., (remarks) 8893 (v).
See 'International.'
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration at The Hague, (M. for cor.) 4337 (iii.)
——— Hague Award (remarks) 689 (i).
——— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8093 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 8309; (amt.) 8314, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347 (v).
——— Inquiry for Meeting of Com., 9899 (v).
See 'Can. Northern,' &c.

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2831 (ii).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2534 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2344 (ii)
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 725 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks) 9917 (v).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8591 (v).
Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Riordan Paper Co., (remarks) 10201 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9579 (v).
Prime Minister's Tour Through the West, (remarks) on Address, 25 (i).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancy, Apptmt. of, Delay, &c. (remarks) 6928, 7428, 7803 (iv); 8255 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission 7698, 7794 (iv).
——— Investigation Rep., on M. (Mr. Murphy) to print (remarks) 8 (i).
Privileges and Election Com., Charges *re* (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep., 7884 (v).
Priv., Ques. of (Mr. Lake) on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5746 (iii).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen's. Rep., 860 (i).
——— (remarks) 309 (i).
Public Buildings, Erection, &c. (M.) to discharge Order, 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii)
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ques.) 2667 (ii).
——— Information *re*, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 966 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9331, 9391 (v).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 5044 (iii).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2497 (ii), 4830; (amt.) 4844; Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. of Res., 3294 (ii); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4058 (iii).
Reciprocity, British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c. (remarks) 7210 (iv).
——— Articles *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10004 (v).
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Presd't Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Res., 5293 (iii).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2990 (ii).
——— Fruit Duties in B.C. (remarks) 3771 (ii).
——— Importations into Canada from Favoured Nation countries, Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets, 4134 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Papers, 2555 (ii).
——— Manufactured Products and Agricultural Products (stmnt) *re* Mr. Clark's Speech *re*, 4196 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Best) to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations with U.S. and Can. (remarks) on Address, 32 (i).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (Mr. Fielding) on M. to adjn. debate, 9886 (v).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Currie) 4125 (iii).
——— on Question of Order referring to previous debate, 8256 (v)
——— (remarks) *re* Better Order, 3705 (ii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (i).
——— Statistics of comparative prices, 6807 (iv).
——— Statistical Tables, Inquiry for 2985, 3059 (ii).
——— Statistics from U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
——— on handing in Statements (remarks) 6955 (iv).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7672 (iv).
——— letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
R.N.W.M. Police, Death of Inspectors on Northern Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at public function (remarks) 938 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. John Valley Ry: *See* 'Grand Falls,' &c.
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault (M. for cor. pets, &c.) 3228 (ii).
——— on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Further Information *re* (remarks) 3058 (ii).
See 'Long Sault.'
St. Peter's Canal Construction, Answer to Question (remarks) 8355 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv).
Senate, Cost of, amended Motion (Mr. Foster) 1453 (i).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7825 (iv).
Springhill Coal Strike, Information *re* Present Situation (remarks) 6362 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Correction in Translation (remarks) 8088 (v).
Supply for Public Works, Objection *re* Vote in full, 9554 (v).
Supply, Schedule of Votes, Proportion, &c. (remarks) 9567 (v).
Supply B. 225 on M. for 3°, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9080 (v).
Interior (boundary surveys) 9546; (Dom. Lands surveys) 9547; (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9551 (v).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8753; (Baddeck and Iona) 8763; (Bonaventure River and N.B.) 8764; (Canada and Mexico) 8781 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1595 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8872 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers, N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501, 9507 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Tariff Negotiations, &c., Prime Minister's remarks in the West (remarks) on Address, 26 (i).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Taylor, Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 6 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

BORDEN, Mr. R. L.—*Con.*
Trade, Imports and Exports, between B.N.A. Possessions and U.S. (M. for ret.°) 4383 (iii).
U.S. Warships in Great Lakes, Armament of, &c (Ques.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).
—— Information from Official Sources, Delays, (remarks) 6611 (iv).
—— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canadian Canals, 6116 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State (remarks) 10455 (v).
—— Inquiry for Stmnt., 10096 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. B. 212 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 9348 (v).
Water Carriage of Goods, on M. (Mr. Brodeur) to refer Complaint to Com. on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5627 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6387 (iv).
Whips, Chief, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor (remarks) 6 (i)
Waterways Treaty Bill: See 'International.'

BOYCE, Mr. A. C., *Algoma West.*
Algoma, Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
—— Emplmnt. of Foreigners on Public Contracts (remarks) 10372 (v).
See 'Sault Ste. Marie.'
Electricians Protest *re* Dismissals at Sault Ste. Marie, Alien Labour Law Administration, on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigatin *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5322, 5508 (iii).
Farm and Garden Products, Imports at Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 7034 (iv).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9621 (v).
Fishery Inspectors, Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6646 (iv).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10350 (v).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N.S. Steel and Coal Co. (Ques) 2670 (ii).

BOYCE, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 2747; Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).
—— Ques. of Order, 2768, 2814 (ii).
—— (explanation) 2438 (ii).
—— Notice of Discussion, 2150, 2254 (ii).
Obabikong and Sabiskong Indian Reserves, Tenders *re* Burned Timber (Ques.) 1344 (i).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6121 (iv).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011, 10026 (v).
Reciprocity Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6782, 6900 (iv).
—— Trade and Commerce, Reply to Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6511 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike, Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Cor., 6365 (iv).
See 'Alien.'
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1349 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1400 (i).
Steel Wire, &c., Bounties, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (mooring posts) 6397; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6646 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 3001 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5214 (iii).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date (remarks) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 880 (i).

BOYER, Mr. G., *Vaudreuil.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6329 (iv).
Carillon Canal, Water Powers, Names of Lessees, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4578 (iii).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c. (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ques.) 2852 (ii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H., *Selkirk.*
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Product (Ques.) 6756 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9286 (v).
C.P.R. Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, 2992 (ii).
Census Enumerators for Man. and N.W. on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9029 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8928 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3506 (ii).
Fish Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 1459 (i).
Fishery Regulations, Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
See 'Lake Winnipeg'; 'Manitoba,' &c.
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4372 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9530 (v).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c. (Ques.) 1722 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545 (i).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G.B. from Man. (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7833 (iv); in Com., 8404 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 796 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re* Res. from Board of Trade (read) 4217 (iii).
Light-House Keepers Salaries, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 773 (i).
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
New Westminster Employees, Increase of Salaries, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2185 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8596 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5068 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 6680 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Pets, &c., 3057 (ii).
—— Letter from Market Gardeners (read) 4130 (iii).

BRADBURY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to, Ques. of Priv. 4227 (iii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. *re*, 1650 (i).
—— Fish Ladder &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
—— Sums for Completion (remarks) 1508 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5837, Ques. of Order, 5865 (iii).
—— Amounts received from Sales, Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 787 (i).
—— Chief Justice Howell's Commission (M. for copy of evidence*) 7039 (iv).
—— Investigation by Rev. Dr. John McDougall (Ques.) 787; (M. for copies) 1292 (i).
—— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints &c. (Ques.) 1974 (ii).
—— Original Documents &c. (remarks) 8192, Cor. *re* Original Documents &c. (read) 8109; on Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8478 (v).
—— Rep, in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3841 (ii).
—— Request by Commission for Official Documents (remarks) 9899 (v).
Selkirk Postoffice Box (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3789 (ii).
Civil Govt.—Post Office (contingencies) 6059 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5175 (iii); (agencies) 6047 (iv).
Indians, N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036, 6039 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9549 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (pavements) 2593 (ii); (Sussex Street Block) 3172; (water supply) 2586 (ii); Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).
R.N.W.M. Police (subsistence) 8600 (v)
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., Inquiry for Ret. 3955 (iii).

BRODER, Mr. A., *Dundas.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6292 (iv).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).

BRODER, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re* &c. (Ques.) 2671 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2390 (ii).
Elevator Terminals &c., Investigation *re* (Ques.) 1497 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240 (v).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1559 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1221 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2894 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2816 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6739 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 6414 (iv).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of men *re* ice blockades (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413; (iv) Williamsburg (electric power) 6396; (iv); Public Works—Buildings, N.B., (Fredericton pavement) 1613 (i).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P., (Minister of Marine and Fisheries), *Rouville.*
Address, The, 135, 152 (i).
Aids to Navigation *re* St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c., (Ans.) 800 (i).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c., (Ans.) 1909 (i).
'Arctic' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Barrington Passage Bait Freezer, on Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage Work (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
—— Salary, &c., (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
B. C. Fisheries Regulations (M. for Com. on Res.) 4201 (iii).
See 'Fisheries Act,' 'Govt. Steamers.'

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 3859 (ii).
Canadian Naval Service, Boot Contract, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1723 (i), 2675 (ii).
—— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c. (Ans.) 1279 (i).
—— Building of Cruisers, &c. 197 (i).
—— Cruisers, Article in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping (remarks) 931 (i).
—— Coal Consumption by Niobe, (Ans.) 7209 (iv).
—— Cruisers manned by Canadians, Names, &c., (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt., in the 'Navy' (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' (Ans.) 1091 (i).
—— Fisheries Protection Service, Seizure by 'Rainbow,' (remarks) 4117, 4208 (iii).
—— Loan of Cruisers by Imp. Govt., (Ans.) 983 (i).
—— Names of Employees, Duties, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmnt., 935 (i).
—— Naval Expenditures Return (remarks) 4659 (iii).
—— Navy Regulations, Printing, &c., (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Approximate Cost, &c., (Ans.) 7210 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Contracts *re* Provisions (Ans.) 794 (i).
—— 'Niobe,' Date of laying keel, Repairs in England, &c., (Ans.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Speed, Result of Official Trials (Ans.) 7209 (iv.)
—— 'Niobe,' Wages of Seamen, Discontent, &c., (remarks) 531 (i); (stmnt. read) 664 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c., (Ans.) 792 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c., (Ans.) 788 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' listed as ineffective (remarks) 1071 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' struck off Effective List, (Ans.) 1081 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Total Cost to date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Recruiting by Postmasters (remarks) 7262 (iv).
—— Recruiting Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration, &c., (Ans.) 7804 (iv).
—— Roper; *See* 'Roper.'
—— Ships ordered by Govt., Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press' (remarks) 867 (i).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Canadian Naval Service, Tenders for Cruisers, &c., (Ans.) 8700 (v).
—— Total Cost of Cruisers (Ans.) 791 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since October 31, 1910 (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. (B. 155) 1° m., 6112, 2° m., and (M.) to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4581 (iii).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5039 (iii).
Coronation, Naval Cadets, Methods of Selection (Ans.) 9986 (v).
'Crissie Toomey,' Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (Ans.) 9374 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dog Fish Industry, (remarks) 8044 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Speeches *re* Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 135, 152; Cartoons displayed to House (remarks) 146 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Str.. Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
—— Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6464 (iv).
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ans.) 1080, 1092 (i).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada (Ans.) 799 (i).
Falconer System of Bookkeeping, Adoption of by Depts. (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt (B. 185) in Com. on Res., 8043; in Com., 8419 (v).
Fisheries Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret 5836 (iii).
Fisheries of Can., Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilcox) to Com. of Sup., 5224 (iii).
Fisheries Officers in Ontario, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Fisheries Protection Service, Number of Vessels (Ans.) 805 (i).
—— Control by Dom. Govt. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup. (Mr. Taylor) 8484 (v).
—— on Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).
—— Date of Operations *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Fisheries Treaty, Penalties *re* Violation of, on Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (i).
—— Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
—— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).
—— Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fishery Regulations, Violation of by C. K. Golden, &c. (remarks) 2368 (ii).
Fisheries Treaty, 1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S. (remarks) 6531 (iv).
Fishery Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep. laid on Table, 10590 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6613 (iv).
Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Applications *re* Fish Fry (Ans.) 1494 (i).
Fish Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).
Fishing Bounties in Kings Co., P.E.I., Names of persons receiving Pay (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Fish Poachers on Pacific and Lake Superior Coasts (remarks) 1460 (i), 2085 (ii).
Fishing by Steam Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c. (Ans.) 6271 (iv).
—— Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) 6506 (iv).
Fish Transhipment from Mar. Provs. (remarks) 6092, 6102, 7106 (iv).
—— Statement (read) 7259 (iv).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations Bill, on Request (Mr. Jameson) to place on Govt. Orders, 3374 (ii).
Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B., on Inquiry for Ret., 5629, 5732 (iii), 6672 (iv).
Fishways on Pembina River (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
—— Placing of Ladder (Ans.) 1090 (i).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Amounts paid from 1906-10 (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
—— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Govt. Goods purchased from U.S., Amounts paid, &c. (Ans.) 817 (i).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Weir Licenses &c. (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ans.) 1976 (ii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries, Regulations, Papers laid on Table, 2365 (ii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Hague Tribunal, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Sup., 4593, 4678 (iii).
Herring Traps, Close Season (remarks) 2086 (ii).
Immigration Officers of U.S. residing in Canada (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Imperial Defence Conference Rep., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2216 (ii).
—— Premier's Reception from Conference, Amount expended (Ans.) 9781 (v).
See 'Laurier.'
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
International Fisheries Commission, Regulation *re* (remarks) 7260 (iv).
—— Regulations, Mess. from Washington (remarks) 6504 (iv).
See 'Fisheries.'
'Iroquois' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).
James Bay Fishing Lease to Ach. McNee, Duration of (Ans.) 4830 (iii).
'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ans.) 2368 (ii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ans.) 1907 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries, Investigating Fisheries, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 797 (i).
Lake Winnipeg Icebreaker (remarks) 4223 (iii)
Lanctot Charges: *See* 'Privileges,' &c.
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ans.) 9982 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
'LeDevoir,' Quotations from *re* Drummond Election, Ques. of Priv., 469 (i).
Life Saving Awards, Names of Recipients (Ans.) 3849 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Date of Appmt. &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 772 (i).
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table, 529 (i).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitoba Fisheries Commission, on Inquiry for Rep., 4207, 5035 (iii).
See 'Fisheries.'
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re* (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
—— Investigations, Prosecutions, &c. (remarks) 10243 (v).
—— Purchase of Ships (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6473 (iv).
BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6763 (iv).
—— (remarks) on Inquiry for Ret., 6120 (iv).
Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c. (Ans.) 2376 (ii), 5637 (iii).
Menzie, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 4929 (iii).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ans.) 817 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1724 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners (B. 48) 1° m., 1070 (i); in Com., 8451 (v); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ans.) 984 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7718; in Com., 7723 (iv).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Navigation Licenses, on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington (Ans.) 2376 (ii).
Navy of Canada: *See* 'Can. Naval Service.'
Negroes in Govt. Employ: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Northwest Fishing Co., on Inquiry for Ret. 5630 (iii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ans.) 5832 (iii).
—— Pet. *re* (Ans.) 3465 (ii).
Oyster Culture, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. 760 (i).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3908 (ii).
—— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7979 (v).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ans.) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Members *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Reciprocity, Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5737 (iii).

BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).
Revised Statutes—Chapter 142, French Version, Correction (B. 136) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 799 (i).
—— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval by Govt. (Ans.) 1289 (i).
—— (remarks) 935 (i).
—— Meaning of Word 'Faction,' Incomplete Answer (remarks) 1353 (i).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth of Water at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ans.) 1718 (i).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name (Ans.) 1491 (i).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* (remarks) 7258 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Funds, Amount in Trust, Investment &c. (Ans.) 9993 (v).
—— Law *re* Payment of Dues (Ans.) 1904 (i).
Smelt Fishing in Nova Scotia, Pet. *re* Change of Open Season (Ans.) 9984 (v).
Sorel Marine Shops, Complaints *re* Thefts (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Sorel Shipyards, Official Inquiry, Rep. *re* (remarks) 6758 (iv), 9995, 10096 (v).
—— Charges *re* stealing Buoys (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 7217 (iv).
—— Dismissal of A. Senecal (remarks) 5732 (iii).
—— Instructions to Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 7039 (iv).
See 'Privileges.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawler, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3118 (ii).
Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Canada (Ans.) 4046 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1463 (i).
Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; (fish transportation) 6092, 6102; (fishways) 6659; (legal expenses) 6661; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160; (Ont. inspectors) 6613 (iv); (overseers) 3809 (ii); (oyster culture) 6661 (iv); (protection service) 3807 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6105, 6159 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service, (Agencies, rents, &c.) 6454; (aids to navigation) 6455; (Barret, M., payments to) 6091;
BRODEUR, Hon. L. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
(buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458; (Eureka) 6503; (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092; (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091; (lighthouses, repairs) 6455; (lightkeepers salaries) 6454; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6542; (pensions) 6091; (pensions to pilots) 6533, (signal service) 6502; (steamers) 6546; (telephones, life stations) 6539; (Thunder Bay) 6500; (wharfs) 6538; (wireless stations) 6457 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (shipwrecked seamen) 6572; (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6554 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv); (cattle inspection) 5828; (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5811; (masters and mates) 5821; (life saving awards) 5822 (iii); (life saving stations) 6090; (Moodie, Maj. J. D., compensation) 6090 (iv); (obstructions in navigable waters) 5826; (patrol boats in North) 5829; (registration of shipping) 5826; (schools of navigation) 5823; (winter mail service) 5828; (wrecking plant subsidy) 5829 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks 3152 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6557; (meteorological service) 6561, 6564 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).
Telegraph Act (wireless) Amt. (B. 116) 1° m., 3453 (ii).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal (Ans.) 2367 (ii).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling'.
Treaty of 1871, *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (correction) 7023 (iv).
Vessels Registered in Canada, List (presented) 9690 (v).
Vessels transferred between Canada and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ans.) 3464 (ii).
'Wanda' Yacht, Change from American to Canadian Register, &c. (Ans.) 4301 (iii).
—— Motive Power, &c. (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6905 (iv).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).
Westport Signal Stations when and where Erected, &c. (Ans.) 1092 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
See 'Telegraph Act.'
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ans.) 3225 (ii).

BROWN, Mr. J. P., *Chateauguay.*
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6818 (iv).

BUREAU, Hon. J. (Solicitor General) *Three Rivers and St. Maurice.*
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9525 (v).
Immigration Act Amt B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2008 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1512 (i).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9219 (v).
Miner, Bill, Capture of (remarks) 4384 (iii).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 1800 (i).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1382 (i).

BURRELL, Mr. M., *Yale-Cariboo.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 303, 311 (i).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7255 (iv).
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 63) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7872 (iv).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1315 (i).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10376 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 8999 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8105, 9251 (v).
Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen,' 3283 (ii).
Fruit Duty, Res. from B.C. Inland Board of Trade (read) 3377 (ii).
Fruit Growers from B.C., Report, Inquiry for, 6120 (iv).
See 'Reciprocity'.
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1418, 1793 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1555 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7855 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9433 (v).
Kettle Valley Ry. Co.'s (B. 82) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2456; in Com. on Res., 3579, 3611 (ii).
—— Editorial in 'Summerland Review,' and Res., from Fruit Growers in Okanagan Valley (read) 4126, 5549 (iii).

BURRELL, Mr. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., Negotiations, Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in 'Citizen' (remarks) 4566 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949 (iv).
—— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
—— Tel. from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B.C. (read) 3770 (ii).
—— *See* 'Fruits.'
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., Quarantine (animals health) 5968 (iv).
Immigration (agents, &c.) 5206 (iii).
Postoffice (postmasters salaries) 4289 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Grand Forks) 3015 (ii); (Greenwood) 3015 (ii); (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6563 (iv).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 886 (i).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L., *Dauphin.*
Address, The, 640 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083 (iii).
Aylwin Irrigation Co.'s Grant, Inquiry for Papers, 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
See 'Percy.'
Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule (remarks) 1461 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re* (Mr. Oliver) Personal Explanation, 8188 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., and N. W., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9032 (v).
Clock in Tower of Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3510 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8126 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors, Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6642 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey, Inquiry for Ret., 5954 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9529 (iv).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Homestead Entries, Irregularities *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5587 (iii).
Homestead Infractions, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 'Liar,' asked to withdraw, 5561-2 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7852 (iv).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet., *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6002 (iv).
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou, Denial of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res., (Mr. Sproule) 1270 (i).
Man. Swamp Lands, Concession to Province, (remarks) 6759 (iv).
Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c., (Ques.) 4664 (iii).
——— O. Cs., &c., (M. for papers) 4382 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 5630, 5954 (iv).
——— (remarks) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).
Militia Dept., Showing of Passes by Members of Parlt., (Ques.) 1090 (i).
Mossy River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10528 (v).
Northwest Fishing Co., Inquiry for Ret., 5630 (iii).
Oliver Charges: *See* 'Can. Northern Land Grant.'
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c., (remarks), 9924 (v).
Percy Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs. &c., (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Railway Rates in Man. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6435 (iv).
See 'Parcel Post.'
Railway Shelters for Workmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6438 (iv).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6916 (iv).
——— Assurance of member for North Oxford *re* Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5541 (iii).
Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5952 (iv).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3044 (ii).
Saskatchewan Capital City, on Ques., of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5561, 5622 (iii).

CAMPBELL, Mr. G. L.—*Con.*
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1403 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6241 (iv); (exhibitions) 3785 (ii), 9077 (v); Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (iron mooring posts) 6426; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (contingencies) 4725; Interior (salaries) 4727 (iii).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (legal expenses) 6661; (Ont., inspectors) 6642 (iv).
Indians—N.W.T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6040 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5556, 5582 (iii).
Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3802 (ii).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (engineers) 3212; Ont., (Mitchell) 2147; (Peterborough) 2608; Sask. (Battleford) 2971, 3006; (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6563 (iv).
Swan Creek Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B., *Carleton, N.B.*
Address, The, 512 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5571 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9271 (v).
Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Com. of Sup., 4588 (iii).
Civil Service Act, (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8937 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5481 (iii).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 9371 (v).
See 'St. John Valley.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1528 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. (B. 9) 1° m., 150; 2° m., 1300; in Com., 1526 (i); on Senate Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1147 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 969; in Com., 979, 1515 (i).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9482 (v).
Naval Policy, on The Address, 512 (i).

CARVELL, Mr. F. B.—*Con.*
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8961 (v).
Ontario Northern and Timagami Ry. Co.'s (B. 119) 1°*, 4109 (iii).
Potato Barrels; *See* 'Inspection,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7783 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s (B. 120) 1° m., 4110 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 964 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9329, 9391 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4486 (iii).
—— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5547 (iii).
—— Treaty Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6805 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
Saskatoon & Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 111) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow Relief (B. 181) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2658 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3447 (ii); Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Hartland) 1618 (i).

CASH, Mr. E. L., *Mackenzie.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines incorp. (B. 81) 1°*, 1640 (i); on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3494 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9525 (v).
Manitoba and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 19) 1°*, 376 (i).
Reciprocity wih U. S., in Com. on Res., 6952 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. A. W., *Inverness.*
Otter, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiation *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T., *Huron East.*
Address, The, 246 (i).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c., (remarks) 1363 (i).

CHISHOLM, Mr. T.—*Con.*
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3514 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c., (Ques.) 2151 (ii).
Food Supplies and Cold Storage B. 112 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 2985 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S, in Com. on Res., 7517 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10131 (v).
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons, (remarks) 7259 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6107 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic, and Prorogation &c. (Ques.) 4676 (iii).
Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 6664 (iv).

CHISHOLM, Mr. W., *Antigonish.*
Conciliation Board *re* Strikes, Remarks of Judge McGillivray (remarks) in Com of Sup., 4272 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps. 3904 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6904 (iv).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3089 (ii).

CLARE, Mr. G. A., *Waterloo South.*
Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ques.) 8934 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H., *Essex South*
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 187) 1°*, 8187; in Com., 8969 (v).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7563 (iv).
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) 1°*, 8582; in Com., 8971 (v).
Conduits Co. Limited Patent Relief (B. 43) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6616 (iv).
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) in Com., 5127 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Co. of Canada (B. 55) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s. (B. 223) correction of clerical error (M.) 9305 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8547 (v).

CLARKE, Mr. A. H.—*Con.*
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1513 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5911 (iii).
Oliver, Hon. Frank, Charges *re*, Meeting of Com. (remarks) 9900 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6144 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 829 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9403 (v).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7148 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6616 (iv).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co. Patent Relief (B. 188) 1°*, 8308; in Com., 8970 (v).

CLARK, Mr. M., *Red Deer.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 297 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3496 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4376 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1754 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1561 (i).
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. in Com. on Res., 4143 (iii).
Reciprocity, *re* Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) on U.S. Manufactures &c., 4197 (iii).

CONGDON, Mr. F. T. *Yukon Territory.*
Beatty, Mary Jane Relief (B. 163) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 64) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2318 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Crothers) for Royal Commission, 7765 (iv).
Reciprocity Treaty, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7624 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2731 (ii).

CONMEE, Mr. J., *Thunder Bay and Rainy River.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2174 (ii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2223 (ii).
Dom. Elections Act (ry. trainmen) Amt. (B. 38) 1° m., 924 (i).
Electricity, &c., Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) 1° m., 2254 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2415 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s (B. 109) 1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184 (ii); in Com., 6121, 6124 (iv).
——— M. to introduce, 2828 (ii).
——— Documents *re*, placing on Hansard, 2829 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com of Sup., 2275 (ii).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 84) 1°*, 1640 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2621; Ottawa (water supply) 2589 (ii).

COWAN, Mr. G. H., *Vancouver.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9864 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9456 (v).
Post Office Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9574, 9576 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9388 (v).
Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6795 (iv).
———Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10063; Ques. of Order, 10008 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3201 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S., *York, N.B.*
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging Total Quantity and Cost (Ques.) 803, 1285 (i).
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extensions (M. for cor.*) 6158 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8805 (v).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B., (Ques.) 8704 (v).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re* (remarks) 9247, 9374 (v).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ques.) 814 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting Contracts to (Ques.) 813 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Grand Falls Ry: *See* 'St. John Valley Ry.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1777 (i).
I.C.R., Moncton Extensions, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., (Ques.) 6157 (iv).
See 'Builders.'
—— Moncton Station, Site purchased, &c., (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2026 (ii).
Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official, Dalhousie, N.B., Member of Town Council, (Ques.) 4044 (iii).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contract, Specifications, Cor. &c., (M. for copy*) 1340 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Standard, Estimated Total Cost (Ques.) 4047 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c., (Ques.) 1287 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of, &c., (Ques.) 2852 (ii).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. Ry., Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ques.) 6156 (iv.)
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910 (Ques.) 6267 (iv).
Quebec and New Brunswick Ry. Co.'s B. 120 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4523 (iii).
—— Boston Speech of Minister of Militia (remarks) 5751 (iii).
—— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10010 (v).
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of Public Works, Proposal *re* (Ques.) 1348 (i).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c., (Ques.) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c., (Ques.) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry., B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5644 (iii); in Com., 8413 (v).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111 (ii); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv.); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).

CROCKET, Mr. O. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers —N. S., (Argyle Sound) 9505 (v); (Cribbons Point) 6029 (iv); (L'Ardoise) 6029 (iv); (Margaree) 6029 (iv); (Upper Prospect) 6030 (iv); (West Dublin Bay) 6030 (iv); (Yarmouth) 6031 (iv).
Public Works —Harbours and Rivers — Ont., (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R., (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
Victoria Electoral Division, Convictions, Fines, &c., (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 869 (i).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B., *Halifax.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8843 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9066 (v).
China-Japan S.S. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2517 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8729 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8947 (v).
Coasting Trode Act, Changes *re* (Ques.) 4675 (iii).
'Crissy Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8044 (v).
East Chezzetcook Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
English Mail Service to Mar. Provs. (remarks) 8793 (v).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie), 4373 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 5833 (iii).
Grand Trunk Strike, Payment to Judge Barron (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conference re (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1439, 1772 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Repeal of (remarks) 6934 (iv).
I.C.R., Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ques.) 5832 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated (Ques.) 3666 (ii).
—— Eastern N.S. Extension, on Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1170 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2058 (ii).
Militia Supplies, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 4667 (iii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse. (remarks) 2261, 2265 (ii).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Names of Officers (remarks) 9090 (v).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper (Ques.) 5832 (iii).
—— Pet, *re* Light (Ques.) 3465 (ii).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp vending machines) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 8068 (v).
Railways-Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5091 (iii).
Reciprocity—Kentville Res. *re* (read) 5548 (iii).
Springhill Mines Strikers, and Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks in Com. of Sup.) 4236 (iii).
Steam Trawling, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3108 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1052; Public Works (salaries) 1045 (i).
Fisheries (fishways) 6660; (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4236 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6548; (maritime road) 6544; (pilots) 6538; (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Anapolis and London) 8754; (Baddeck and Iona) 8764; (Canada and Cuba) 8777 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Ocean and River Service—('Earl Grey') 6481 (iv); (life saving awards) 5822; (maintenance, &c.) 5812; (masters and mates) 5821; (obstructions in navigable waters) 5827; (schools of navigation) 5823 (iii).
Post Office (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii).
Public Works--Building--Alberta (Macleod) 3003, 3005; Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Chesley) 2104; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2134; Ottawa (telephones) 3170; (Woods Building lighting contract) 3175 (ii); Que (Montreal barracks) 1864; (St. Lambert) 1901 (i); Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers--N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv); I.C.R. (Halifax) 5920 (iii).

CROSBY, Mr. A. B.—*Con.*
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c. (Ques.) 3464 (ii).
West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arrangements *re* Contract (Ques.) 4674, 4925 (iii).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3192 (ii).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res. 1981 (i).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W., *Elgin West.*
Address, The, 462, (M.) to adjn. debate, 468, rsmd., 491 (i).
Alberta Railway and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) in Com., 3024, 3181, 3391 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Canadian Railways, Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3940 (ii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9050 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8737 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8944 (v).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission re Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5377 (iii).
—— Treasury Board, Rer., Ques. of Priv., 5552 (iii).
—— Mr. Calvert's Connection *re*, Ques. of Priv., 5730 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1766 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com. 1516 (i).
Lethbridge Speech of Member for Pictou (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on the Address, 492 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Royal Commission, 7751 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7943 (iv).
Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7077 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5873 (iii).
South Grey Appointment, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6493 (iv).

CROTHERS, Mr. T. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Fredericton pavement) 1614 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office). 1588 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2098; (Chesley) 2104; (Dresden) 2108; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2131, 3156; (Midland) 2145; (Tilbury) 2627 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3162; (pavements) 2602; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1674; (Napierville) 1866, 1873 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2974 (ii).
Public Works—Miscellaneous (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

CURRIE, Mr. J. A., *Simcoe, North.*
Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090, 9311 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3460 (ii).
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1360 (i).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1342 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2430 (ii).
Business of Private Members, Thursdays Routine (remarks) 1550 (i).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co..'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3458 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9223, 9279 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1838 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2513 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10438 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9840 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8941 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Regulations *re* Selection (Ques.) 4464 (iii).
—— Selection of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt., (remarks) 1580 (i).
See 'Adjournment.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8467 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel.'
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt, (Mr. Crocket) 10229 (v).
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.'s (B. 72) 1°*, 1488 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff). in Com., 3024 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1545, 1731 (i).
Hydro Electric Power Connection across McGann Property, Decision of Minister (remarks) 1598 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amt., 3460 (ii).
I. C. R. Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ques.) 5129 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 876 (i): on M. for 2°, 9093 (v); in Com., 9157, 9172 (v).
'Labour Gazette' Names on Mailing List, (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence, on M. for Sup., 2893, 2916 (ii).
See 'International.'
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c (Ques.) 5637 (iii).
Newmarket Canal Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10491 (v).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916, 9930 (v).
Penny Bank Act Amt. B. 221 (Mr. Fielding) in Com. on Res., 9221 (v).
Pollution of Navigable Waters (B. 178) 1°*, 7339 (iv).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10341 (v).
Potatoes: *See* 'Inspection.'
Printing Bureau Investigation, Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 1364 (i).
—— Printing of (remarks) 1351 (i).
Pure Foods (B. 35) 1° m., 865 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9314, 9317 (v).
Ry. Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'

CURRIE, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*
Railway Rates, &c., Treaty *re* Control of (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2461 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4771 (iii); remarks *re* Pulp in Com. on Res., 3322 (ii).
——— Discussion by reading Extracts, Ques. of Order, 4124 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Order, 4055 (iii).
——— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
——— Submission to House for Ratification (remarks) 1805 (i).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt, (remarks) 7612 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9165, 9167 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167, 9168 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1475; Militia (salaries) 1022 (i).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8835 (v).
Public Works—N.B. (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Hartland) 1617; Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1582; (Lunenburg) 1595; (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (pavings) 8883; (Rideau Hall) 8876 (v).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).
Vessels transferred between Can. and Newfoundland (remarks) 3464 (ii).
Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5215 (iii).
Waterways Treaty, Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).
See 'International,' 'Long Sault.'

CURRIE, Mr. M., *Prince Edward.*
Bay of Quinte Ry. Co.'s (B. 88) 1*, 1710 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W., *St. John City.*
Absence, Emoluments for (Ques.) 1089 (i).
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s 'Arctic,' Rep. of Mr. Vanasse (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6542 (iv).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to (Ques.) 5290 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).
Census System of Taking, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4340 (ii).
Chatham Public Building, Purchase of Site, Name of Owners (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8911 (v).
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2229 (ii).
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S. (remarks) 4470 (iii).
See 'Negroes.'
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues (remarks) 9374 (v).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4354 (iii).
——— (remarks) 4724 (iii).
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S., Conferences *re* (remarks) 2002 (ii).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage, &c. (Ques.) 7807 (iv).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2019 (ii).
Immigration into Eastern Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).
I. C. R., Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Bill, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9583 (i).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock, &c. (Ques.) 3668 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 868 (i).
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders re (Ques.) 5132 (iii).
Match Factories, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Match Factories, using Phosphorus, Number, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 1717 (i).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2061 (ii).
N. T. Ry., N. B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
Naval Boots for Marine Dept., Specifications, Tenders, &c., (Ques.) 1723 (i).
N. B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5945 (iv).
"Negroes": *See* "Coloured Aliens"; "Civil Service".
Ottawa City Health Conditions, on Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6370 (iv).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1101 (i).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contract, Contract *re* Lowest Tender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Post Office Estimates, Objection *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5054 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., (remarks) 4501 (iii).
——— Dufferin Board of Trade Res. (read) 5547 (iii).
St. Andrews Rapids Fish Ladders &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3033 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5695 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5974 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville) 6357 (iv); Lachine (tugs) 6388 (iv).
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coins) 6062 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Indians (salaries) 4725 (iii); Interior (salaries) 4726 (iii).
Dom. Lands—Miscellaneous (parks) 6049 (iv); (Banff water works) 6052; (Buffalo) 6049 (iv); (Forestry Convention) 6052 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6092 (iv); fishways) 6660 (iv); (inspectors) 6658 (iv); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6109 (iv).
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); (committees) 6471 (iv); (electric attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173 (iv); (sessional clerks) 6168 (iv); (stationery) 6176 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5169 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6162 (iv).
Labor Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6496 (iv); (buoys in Bay of Fundy) 6458 (iv); (buoy steamers) 6549 (iv); (Eureka) 6503 (iv); (Harling, Mr. Thos., compensation) 6092 (iv); (Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, compassionate allowance) 6091 (iv); (Lime Kiln Crossing 6546 (iv); (maritime road) 6542 (iv); (pensions, pilots) 6533 (iv); (shipbuilding) 6488 (iv); (telephones) 6542 (iv); (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv); (wharfs) 6538 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv) 8775; (Canada and Newfoundland 8783 (v).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6555 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517, 8528 (v); R.M.C. (maintenance) 6054 (iv); (Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).

DANIEL, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Ocean and River Service (Moodie, Maj. J. E., compensation) 6090 (iv).
Post Office (clerks) 4292 (iii); (railway mail clerks) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii); (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Vancouver) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax post office) 1590 (i); (Lunenburg) 1597 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3173 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford 2980 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9506 (v); (Yarmouth) 6032 (iv).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5995 (iv).
Public Works—Telegraph Lines (B.C. (Okanagan Valley) 6033 (iv); Sask. and Alberta (Maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Senate (casket for address) 6167 (iv).
Scientific Institution (magnetic observatory) 6557 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6659 (iv).
Water Supply for Parliament Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 3224 (ii).

DEMERS, Mr. M. J., *St. John and Iberville.*
Bank Act Amt. (B. 5) 1° m., 148 (i).
Ques. of Priv., Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' *re* Apptmt. to Bench, 271 (i).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B., *Wright.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6302 (iv).
E. B. Eddy Co.'s (B. 54) 1° *, 1277 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5149 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1433, 1749 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2011 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Rep. *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10109 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com., on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep., Ques. of Order 7977 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7064 (iv); on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4082 (iii).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).

DEVLIN, Mr. E. B.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co. Ltd. incorp. (B. 158) 1° m., 6439; 2° m., 7147, 7590 (iv). in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, &c. (remarks) 1367 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Aylmer) 1672 (i).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J., *Montreal (St. Anne).*
Bank Act Amt B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8856 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8738 (v).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7820 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act. O. Cs., in Com., 8087 (v).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir, 475 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8452 (v).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8421 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8660 (v).
Guarantee Accident and Guarantee Co.'s incorp. (B. 115) 1°*, 3453 (ii).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2007 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7859 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8403 (v).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 921 (i); on M. for 2°, 9127; in Com., 9193 (v).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2920 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3259 (ii).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B. (remarks) 9375 (v).
Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2055 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8451; on Senate Amts, 9535 (v).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2530; on M. for 3°, 2742 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. and Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7912 (v).

DOHERTY, Mr. C. J.—*Con.*
Railway Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9385 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Investigation on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5891 (iii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1380 (i).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8687 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1864 (i); 2568, 3144 (ii); (Maisonneuve) 1686 (i).

DONNELLY, Mr. J. J., *Bruce South.*
Farmer's Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5461 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1409 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c., (Ques.) 3278 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., on M. for Com. on Res. (Mr. Fielding) 10456 (v).
Supply—
Public Works—Buildings— Ont. (Chesley) 2103 (ii).
Walkerton & Lucknow Ry. Co.'s (B. 34) 1°*, 817 (i).

DOUGLAS, Mr. J. M., *Strathcona.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.'s (B. 91) 1°*, 1710 (i)
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c., (seeds) 6230 (iv); Public Works — Buildings — Alta., (Strathcona) 3011 (ii).
Western Alberta Ry Co.'s (B.135) 1°*, 4740 (iii).

DUBEAU, Mr. J. A., *Joliette.*
Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.'s (B.186) 1°*, 8187 (v).

ECREMENT, Mr. A., *Berthier.*
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c., (Ques.) 659 (i).
Commercial Relations, &c., Translations of Documents (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed (Ques.) 660 (i).
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ques.) 3463 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389 (ii); 3° m. 7560, 7717 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c. (Ques.) 3065 (ii)

EDWARDS, Mr. J. W., *Frontenac.*
Agriculture, Govt., Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6282 (iv)
Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce, Quantity and Value imported from U. S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).
Armouries, &c., in Canada, Inquiry for Ret. 1460 (i).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. (B. 24) 1° m., 530 (i).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).
Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaint *re* (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8938 (v).
Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston, without clothing or means (remarks) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii)
Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S., 9361 (v).
Drill Halls, Generally, Construction &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ques.) 8993 (v).
Elevators, Terminal &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3511 (ii).
Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 9369 (v).
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5412 (iii).
Farm Products imported from U. S. into Kingston Quantities &c. (Ques.) 3668 (ii).
Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U. S. (Ques.) 1496 (i).
Fish Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, (Ques.) 1494 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4359 (iii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value &c. (Ques.) 8984 (v).
Horses admitted into Canada with U. S. Settlers &c. (Ques.) 8937 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1403, 1546, (i); on M. for 3°, 3527 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).
I. C. R., Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, from whom purchased (Ques.) 7033 (iv).
Kingston Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c. (Ques.) 2886 (ii).
Mica Imports, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).
Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-1911, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 7038 (iv).
Milk and Cream, Value of Export to U. S. for March and April, 1911 (Ques.) 8790
Postal Service, Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) 10356 (v).
Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i)
Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ques.) 10335 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7774 (iv).
Public Buildings, Cost of for several Years (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7393 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10065, 10090 (v).
———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, (remarks) 6902 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).
Revenue and Expenditure, Total from 1890 to 1911 (Ques.) 9992 (v).
Rideau Canal, Lockmen, Pets. *re* increased pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
——— Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery: *See* 'Postal.'
Sand supplied Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair (Ques.) 5406 (iii).
Sharbot Lake Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
Sheep and Lambs imported in Canada from U. S. &c. (Ques.) 8987 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6258; (farm bulletins) 6186; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6413; Miscellaneous (lockmen) 6453; Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1050; Militia (salaries) 1020 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6627 (iv).
House of Commons (stationery) 6177 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (pilots) 6537 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8756; (Canada and Australia) 8766, 8772; (Canada and Cuba) 8776; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784 (v).

EDWARDS. Mr. J. W.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8692 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (quarantine stations) 6027 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N. S. (Halifax postoffice) 1589 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093; (Brantford) 2098; (Dresden) 2105; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2131; (Mount Forest) 2150 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1698 (i).
Public Works—Telegrapn Lines—Sask., &c. (maintenance) 6034 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (rolling stock) 8514 (v).
U. S. Warships through Canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571 (i).
Veterans, Grants to, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1103 (i).
Wolfe Island, Customs Official, Apptmt. of &c. (Ques.) 8099 (v).
——— Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
——— Protection to Road (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

ELSON, Mr. P., *Middlesex East.*
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Government. Remedy, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).
Reciprocity—Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List (Ques.) 6264 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R., *Westmoreland.*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1362 (i).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220) 1° m., 9224; on M., (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup, 1859 (i).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9724 (v).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8118 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10220 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s B. 223, in Com., 9510 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1764 (i).
I.C.R., Branch Lines (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9584 (v).
———Acquisition of (remarks) 6768 (iv).

EMMERSON, Hon. H. R.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1151 (i).
International Waters Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9095 (v).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., English Mails, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8792, 9541 (v).
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1009 (i).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 1070 (i); on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8888 (v).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 999 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9244 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8960 (v).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10343 (v).
Post Office Promotions and Salaries (remarks) 10469 (v).
Railway Act (express companies) Amt. B. 8 (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9395 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023, 10033 (v).
Rules of the House, Amendment of (remarks) 10470 (v).

ETHIER, Mr. J. A. C., *Two Mountains.*
Divorce Bills, Ques. of Priv., *re* Remarks of Senator Kirchhoffer, 4201 (iii).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govt. Action *re* (remarks) 4300 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S., (*Minister of Finance*) *Shelburne & Queen's (N. S.).*
Accounts outstanding, (Ans.) 5403 (iii).
See "Government Loans."
Adjournment for Coronation, (M.) 9580 (v).
——— Extension of Time (remarks) 9090, 9566 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Alberta Ry and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3392 (ii).
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiry of &c. (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Quantity exported from Canada into United States (Ans.), 6270 (iv).
See 'Gold'.

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6758, 6907 (iv).
—— Inquiry for Copy (remarks) 7256 (iv).
—— Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
See 'Japanese'.
Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Banking Act Amt. (B. 50) 1° m., 1340 (i)
Bank Act Amt. (B. 213) 1° m., 8887 (v); 2° m. and in Com., 9221; 3° m., 9334 (v).
See 'Penny Banks,' 'Quebec Savings Banks.'
Bank Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 6675, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
—— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6443 (iv).
Bankers' Associations, &c., on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 4116 (iii).
—— Agreement *re* Competition (Ans) 3466 (ii).
Bank Failures, Reps. of Curators by Govt. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
—— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re*, (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
—— Curators Reports, on Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).
—— Statement by Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ans.) 2671 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 8956, 9373 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec, B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7475 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ans.) 4825 (iii).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The (financial statement) 6577 (iv).
—— (remarks) 6439 (iv).
Business of the House, (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House, Adjournment of House for Coronation (statmt.) 9309 (v).
See 'Coronation,' 'Adjournment.'
—— Morning Sittings (M.) 8887 (v).
Canadian Currency refused on Pullman Cars, Letter from Vice-President of Co. (read) 8191 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming (remarks) 9372 (v).
Canada Medical Act, Order called for Com. on B. 15, 6067 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836; in Com., 9260 (v).
Cattle exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B. (remarks) 7427 (iv).
—— Re-shipped to G. B. (remarks) 7558 (iv).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Cement Merger: *See* 'Can. Cement.'
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9059 (v).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
—— Jacques Cartier Division, Names of officers, &c. (Ans.) 9372 (v).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington (remarks) 9512 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s of Canada incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v).
Customs Duties, 1906-1910: Ques. of Priv. *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster , 7021 (iv).
Debates, Official, 1st Rep. of Com., on M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Estimates (1911) Suppl. (presented) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).
—— (1912) Suppl. (presented) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates, Special Items, reported as passed, &c. (remarks) 9076 (v).
Estimates *to* be voted re Interim Supply Bill (remarks) 9223 (v).
See 'Supply Bills.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5306 (iii).
—— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation re Double Liability, &c., (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
—— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8209 (v).
—— Proceedings *re* Commission, on Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 10472 (v).
—— Stmnt. of Warning by Mr. Osler, M.P. (remarks) 5389 (iii); 10473 (v).
—— Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii).
—— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificates (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
—— Warning to Govt. (remarks) on Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2679 (ii).
See 'Bank Curators.'
Financial Statement—Budget, The, 6577 (iv).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4357 (iii).
Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).
Germany, Trade Relations with, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8535 (v).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ans.) 9985 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
See 'American Silver.'
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3775 (ii).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c., (Ans.) 3281 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9524 (v).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9308; in Com. 9510 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Water Power Lease, Tenders *re* (remarks) *re* Question, 9352 (v).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
——— Total Amount paid since 1896 (Ans.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Steel.'
Imperial Conference, Military Arviser to, &c., 9182 (v).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9182 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations (B. 224) in Com. on Res., 9432, 9445; in Com., 9494; 3° m., 9533 (v).
Japanese Treaty, Action *re* (remarks) 9076 (v).
See 'Anglo.'
——— Canada-Japan Treaty, Expiration of (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
La Banque International du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) on M. for Com., 5631 (iii); in Com., 6120 (iv).
Loans: *See* 'Govt. Loans.'
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2765 (ii).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecremont) in Com., 7722 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings 9500 (v).
N.T.Ry., Total Cost to Dec. 31st, 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10509 (v).
Niobe and Rainbow, Names of Officers ((remarks) 9090 (v).
Ottawa Improvement Commission, on Inquiry for, 3672 (ii).
Penny Bank Act Amt. (B. 221) M. for Com. on Res., 8104; in Com. on Res., 9220 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Porcupine Disaster by Fire, Govt. Aid to (remarks) 9636, 9696 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances (Ans.) 7246 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Financial Loan, Interest *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest (Ans.) 2851 (ii).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. (B. 219) 1° m., 9089; 2° m., 9343 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., Statement, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 2440; Schedules laid on Table, 2465 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4845 (iii).
——— in Com. on Res., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 3289 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4073
——— Free Trade Offer by U.S., Speech of Mr. Taft (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5294 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper (Ans.) 4468 (iii).
——— British Ambassador's Warning to Mins. (remarks) 6200 (iv).
——— Britain's Demand from U.S. *re* Tariff Concessions (remarks) 6574 (iv).
——— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 5620 (iii), 7214 (iv).
——— British Tariff Commission, Rep *re* (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
——— Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609; on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).
——— Conference at Washington, Length of Session, &c. (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 3068 (ii).
——— Cor. marked 'Private,' 2987 (ii).
——— Cor. Giving Names of Writers of Letters, &c. (remarks) 7265 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10007 (v); (remarks) on M. to adjn. debate, 9885 (v).
——— Debate, Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).
——— Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054 (iii).
——— Farm products imported from other Countries (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Representations, French Edition, on Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v)
——— Importations from Favoured Nation countries (Ans.) 4111 (iii).
——— Importations from Favoured Nations (remarks) *re* Answer, 4114 (iii).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Importations from Favoured Nations Countries into Canada, Answer to Questions, 4134 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Pets, &c. (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
—— Lord Strathcona's Telegram, Mess. from Associated Press (read) 5292 (iii); on Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) *re* Lord Strathcona's Telegram, 5211 (iii); Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, on Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
—— Names of Favoured Nation Countries (Ans.) 4665 (iii).
See 'Importations.'
—— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7222 (iv).
—— Perley, Mr., Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. (remarks) 10198 (v).
—— Protests *re* (remarks) 3951 (iii).
—— Pulp and Paper Duties, Further Information *re* (remarks) 2646 (ii).
—— Resolutions against (remarks) 4121 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 4931 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Can., 6780 (iv).
—— Statistics, Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).
—— Statistics, Mess. to Pres'dt Taft *re* (remarks) 4472 (iii).
—— Statistical Tables, on Inquiry for, 2985, 3059 (ii).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations (Ans.) 7037 (iv).
—— Statistics from U. S. (remarks) 2737 (ii).
—— Statistics, U. S. Govt. Publication *re* (remarks) 6674 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ans.) 10194 (v).
—— Suppl. Ret. Laid on Table, 4383 (iii).
—— Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ans.) 3667 (ii).
—— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
—— Wool in the Fleece, omitted from Free List (Ans.) 6264 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).
Revenue and Expenditure Total for 1890-1911 (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).; in Com., 8966, 9165 (v); (M.) to ref. to Banking Com. 7590 (iv).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3021, 3454, 3845 (ii).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9078 (v).
Sessional Employees, House of Commons, on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 3471 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3347 (ii).
Speeches by Prime Minister, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9072 (v).
Stamp Contract: *See* "American Bank Note."
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections, &c. (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3107 (ii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Steel Wire Bounties *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
See "Iron," "Budget, The"
Sterling Trust Co.: *See* "Security."
Supply Bill (No. 128) in Com. 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 4210 (iii).
—— (B. 160), 1°, 6439-40 (iv).
—— B. 225, 1°*, 2°*, 3°*, 9580 (v).
SUPPLY—
Schedules of proportion of Votes (presented) 9566 (v).
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coins) 6060 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3834 (ii).
Indians—Man. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6497 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784 (v).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8685 (v); (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting) 3202 (ii); (pavements) 8884 (v); (Rideau Hall) 8875 (v).
Trade and Commerce (commercial agents) 6059 (iv).
Unprovided items (generally) 6160 (iv).
Testimonials to Ministers. *See* "Ministers."
Treasury Board Minutes, *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
U.S.—Japanese Treaty, on Inquiry for Copy, (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S.—Warships on Great Lakes, Information *re* (remarks) 6613 (iv).
Vancouver, Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ans.) 3066 (ii).
Victoria Museum, Cracking of Walls (remarks) 9152 (v).

FIELDING, Hon. W. S.—*Con.*
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. (Mr. Foster) to Com. of Sup., 6382 (iv).

FISHER, Hon. S. A., (Minister of Agriculture) *Brome.*
Address, The, 626 (i).
Agriculture and Experimental Farms Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Agriculture, Expenditure from Confederation (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
——— Expenditure in Ontario for 1910 (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
——— Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6308 (iv).
Agricultural Imports into Canada, Value &c. (remarks) *re* Question, 5402 (iii).
Agriculture and Militia Expenditures from 1867 to 1910 (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity (Ans.) 6757 (iv).
"Alva" Str., Price paid to Philip & Son. (Ans.) 2438 (ii).
Animal Industry in Can., Reps. Data, &c., on M. (Mr. Magrath) for Copies, 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U. S., Disregard of Rules (remarks) 311 (i).
Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c., (Ans.) 2156 (ii).
Archives Historical Work, Names of Staff (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re* (remarks) 10350 (v).
Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 655 (i).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co's. Patent Relief B. 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Cement Production, Total annually since 1900 (Ans.) 10196 (v).
Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 2155 (ii).
Census Commissioner for York County, N. B. (Ans.) 8704 (v).
Census Enumerators, Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations (remarks) 7021 (iv).
Census Enumerators for Hochelaga, Names, &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmts. (remarks) 8889 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9016 (v).
Census Enumerators Names, Number, &c. (Ans.) 4465 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Peel County, Names, Apptmt. &c. (Ans.) 10335 (v).
Census Officials, Policy of Appointments (remarks) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

FISHER, Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure &c. (Ans.) 9432 (v).
Census, Omissions by Enumerators, (Stmt.) 9898 (v).
——— Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).
——— Omissions in Enumerations, on M. (Mr. Perley) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9714 (v).
——— Omissions in Enumerations in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Census, Progress *re* (remarks) 9594 (v)
Census Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c. (Ans.) 659 (i).
Census Returns, Method of, on Inquiry for Ret., 6669 (iv), 8193 (v).
Census, Stmnt. *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
Census, System of Collecting, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4338 (iii).
Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6204 (iv).
Cheese Curing Cool Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 5407 (iii).
Cholera Precautions, &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Servants, Appointments from South Grey, on Inquiry for Ret., 2555 (ii).
Cold Storage, Aid to by Govt. (Ans.) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amount paid from 1907-10 (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
See 'Live Stock.'
Coloured Persons appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conservation Commissioners' Report, Printed Copies, &c. (Ans.) 660 (i).
——— (presented) 698 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. (B. 184), in Com. on Res., 7807 (iv); 2°* and in Com., 8895 (v).
Copyright Act, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re* (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Method of Collecting, &c. (Ans.) 5937 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7018 (iv).
Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
Embargo on British Cattle, (remarks) 10344 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid *re* (Ans.) 2437 (ii).
Experimental Farms, Fruit and Vegetable Farms (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9001 (v).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year (Ans.) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dominion, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 1102 (i).
——— Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 662 (i).
——— Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ans.) 1286 (i).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets for 1910-1911 (Ans.) 8096 (v).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8107 (v).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3226 (ii).
Fruit Growers, Duty *re* (remarks) 3284 (ii).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appointmt, Qualification, &c. (Ans.) 8701 (v).
Horses diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada (remarks) 7428 (iv).
Immigration—Farmers sent to G. B. from Man. (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (bushel and bags) Amt. (B. 153) 1°*, 6035 (iv); in Com., 8078 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9476 (v).
Jacques Cartier, Census Enumerators &c. (Ans.) 9431 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1197 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2809 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 203 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5946 (iv).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ans.) 8992 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies, Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4409 (iii).
——— Papers Laid on Table, 10590 (v).
——— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6811 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7669 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
——— Delays in Preparing (remarks) 7554 (iv).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation *re* (remarks) 10095 (v).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. (B. 157) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv); in Com., 8077 (v).

FISHER. Hon. S. A.—*Con.*
Seed Grain Distribution, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8042 (v).
Selkirk Exhibition, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 9077 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (archives) 6184 (iv); (dairy and fruit inspection) 6234 (iv); (exhibitions) 3775 (ii), 9077 (v); (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); (Patent Record) 6184 (iv); (seeds) 6213 (iv); (tobacco production) 6262 (iv); (year book) 6184 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5954 (iv); (salaries) 1474 (i); Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486 (i); Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
House of Commons (sessional clerks) 6170 (iv); (stationery) 6177 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157 (ii); N.B. (Tracadie) 1625 (i); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8879 (v); Que. (Grosse Isle) 1675 (i).
Quarantine (animals' health) 5955 (iv); (public health) 5979 (iv); (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).
Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv); (salaries) 6166 (iv).
Trussed Concrete Steel Co.'s Patent Relief B. 188 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8970 (v).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market (Ans.) 6267 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E., *Toronto North.*
Address, The, 60, 531 (i).
——— Correction of Figures by Mr. Guthrie (remarks) 229 (i).
See "Customs Duties" "Govt. Sinking Funds."
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of (remarks) 6673 (iv).
——— Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
——— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2161 (ii).
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8955 (v).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 8887 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Delay in Discussing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6444 (iv).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govtl. Action *re* (Ques.) 5632 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators by Govt. (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
——— (M. for copies*) 3142 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Bank Failures, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).
See 'Farmers Bank.'
Bankers' Association, Bylaws, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 4116 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2364, 2429 (ii).
Bark Lake Post Office, Cleaning and Opening, &c. (Ques.) 6270 (iv).
Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co.'s Patent Relief B 187 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 8969 (v).
British Preference (remarks) 5620 (iii).
Budget, The, Reply to Financial Statement, 6588 (iv).
——— Delay, &c. (remarks) 6441 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7575 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8836 (v).
Can. Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6115 (iv).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
Canadian West Loan Corporation Incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8563 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8568 (v).
Census Appointments for East Elgin (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
Census Enumerators, Commencement and Completion of (remarks) 7218 (iv).
Census Taking, System, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4339 (iii).
China-Japan, SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii). in Com., 8677 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8906 (v).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Canada Incorp. B. 196 (Mr. Molloy) in Com., 8968 (v.)
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1322 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7819 (iv); in Com., 8898 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v). *See* "Supply—Miscellaneous."
Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910 of Units (M. for ret.) 2162 (ii).
Customs Duties 1906-1910, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) 7022 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Customs Duties, (correction) 7104 (iv).
See 'Address' &c.
Dog Fish Industry (remarks) in Com. on Bill, 8045 (v).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1985 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons, Telegram, &c. (remarks) 147-156 (i).
———, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations, &c. from "Le Devoir" 472 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur and Fort William, Investigation *re* Management; on prop. Res. (Mr. W M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8115 (v).
Farmer's Bank Failure, Application *re* Charter, Date and Names (Ques.) 1970 (ii).
———, Incorporation, and Dom. Govt. (M. for cor.°) 1726 (i); 2230 (ii).
———, Inquiry for, 4468 (iii).
———, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8214 (v).
———, Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
———, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5329 (iii).
———, Treasury Board Minutes (remarks) 4741 (iii), *see* "Treasury Board".
——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fisheries Act, (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8045, 8420 (v).
Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum, (M. for copy*) 980 (i).
———, Inquiry for Sir John Thompson' Memorandum, 2004 (ii).
———, Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8495 (v).
———, Printing of Documents (remarks) 4207 (iii).
———, Trap Nets (remarks) 2070 (ii).
Fish Transhipments from Mar. Provs., Ret. (remarks) 7106, 7259 (iv).
Fish Transportation, Amounts paid out of Aiding Fund. Further Information *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Expenditure annually, Value, &c., (Ques.) 6271 (iv).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).
Govt Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required Bounties paid, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).
—— ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6, Ques. of Priv. 3772 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Germany, Trade Relations with Negotiations *re* (remarks) 8403, 8534 (v).
Grain Grower's Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8536 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of Men (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Bay of Fundy) on M. (Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup. 4683 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U. S. Conference *re*, on Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1998 (ii).
—— Distribution of Copies (remarks) 8094 (v).
—— Printing of Papers (remarks) 230 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3. (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1529, 1747 (i).
House of Commons, Translation Staff, Promotions, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).
House of Commons and Senate, Inquiry for Ret., 2556 (ii).
Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award (remarks) 673 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold, re Construction Fund (Ques.) 796 (l).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr Oliver) in Com., 2005 (ii).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7352 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copies, 2217 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7837 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8104, 8403 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
I.C.R. Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).
I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3665 (ii).
—— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4205 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9092 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).
Justice, Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1017 (i).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3061 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1199 (i).
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Land Grant, Inquiry for O.C. of May 6th, 1907, 6915 (iv).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2817 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7447 (iv).
Milk and St. Mary's River Water Rights (remarks) in Com. on Waterways Bill, 9109 (v).
Mint Operations Implementing Information (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3065 (ii).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief B. 203 (Mr. Rivet) in Com., 8970 (v).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 546 (i).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N.W. (remarks) 5912 (iii).
—— Restrictions re (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Niagara River Water Powers Regulations *re* (remarks) 8892 (v).
N.W. Mounted Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson-Yukon Patrol (remarks) 7254 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8317 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6123 (iv).
—— on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2830 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Apology for using word 'liar' insisted on, 463 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2274 (ii).
Parliament, Opening and Closing, Date of from 1896 to 1910 (M. for ret.*) 786 (i).
——Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G. B. and U. S., Protection (remarks) 3671 (ii).
Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 2736 (ii).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7697 (iv).
Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking in Public Accounts Com., 998 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4337 (iii).
Questions, Incomplete Answers (remarks) 1013 (i).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, &c., Quotations &c. (remarks) on Address, 531 (i).
Railways and Canals Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8410 (v).
Ry. Commission &c., Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S. and Can. (remarks) 3056 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5045 (iii).
'Rainbow' and 'Niobe' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs, and Maintenance &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3327, 3530 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4852 (iii).
——— on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com, on Ways and Means, 2446 (ii).
——— (remarks) on Address, 72 (i).
Reciprocity, Assurances *re* Farmer's Interests (remarks)) 5543 (iii).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., Pets. Memorials, &c. (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1652 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 2439 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Commercial Statistics, 2070, 2555, 2646, 2737, (ii).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics (remarks) 4471 (iii).
Reciprocity on Inquiry for Pets., &c., (Mr. Bradbury) 3057 (ii).
——— Trade and Commerce Dept., Reply *re* Ret. for Statistics (remarks) 6510 (iv).
Reciprocity Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5949; Rule (read) 5953 (iv).
——— Procedure in the House, *re* Resolutions, &c. (remarks) 5752 (iii).
Reciprocity, Tabulated Statements, &c. (remarks) 2986 (ii).
——— Tel. from Min. of Fin. to High Commissioner, Inquiry for, 3274 (ii).
——— Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2644 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 8093 (v).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Revillon Freres Trading Co., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 8966 (v).
Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 8969 (v).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function (remarks) 940 (i).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5643, (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5871, 5900 (iii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Secretariat in London, Inquiry for Papers, 1506 (i); 5836 (iii).
See Imp. Conference.
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649, 3845 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2722 (ii).
Senate, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911 (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4316 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plan (remarks) 2077 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture &c. (exhibitions) 3776 (ii), (seeds) 6213 (iv); Quarantine (animals health) 5962 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (machinery) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Agriculture (salaries) 1474; Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1486; Depts. Generally (cleaning, &c.) 1486; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486; Justice (salaries) 1017; (contingencies) 1020, Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464; Militia (salaries) 1025; Mines (salaries) 1476; Privy Council (salaries) 1013; Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473; Secretary of State—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Trade and Commerce (salaries) 1485 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6625 (iv).
Militia (allowance) 8517 (v).
Miscellaneous (Coronation Members and Senators) 8685; Imperial Conference (Ministers expenses) 8679; (pelagic sealing conference) 8679 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax Citadel) 1581 (i); Ont. (Athens) 2089; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2572 (ii).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov.-Gen's cars) 6447 (iv).
Tariff Negotiations, &c. (remarks) on Address, 65 (i).

FOSTER, Hon. G. E.—*Con.*
Tatamagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway, &c. (Ques.) 7806 (iv).
Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting (remarks) 5136 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4659 (iii).
See 'Bank,' Farmers Bank.'
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters (remarks) 7022 (iv).
U.S. Consuls, Names, Fees, &c. (M. for ret.) 1727 (i).
U.S. Immigration Agents, and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).
U.S., Japanese Treaty, Inquiry for Copy, 7256 (iv).
U.S. Warships on Great Lakes, passing through Canadian Canals (remarks) 6118, 7253 (iv).
U.S. Warships passing through canals, Inquiry for Ret., 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with (Ques.) 3066 (ii).
West Indies Trade with Canada, on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion, 6274 (iv).
Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

FOWKE Mr. F. L., *South Ontario.*
Address, The, 254, 271, (i).
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Quebec (B. 152) 1°*, 6439; in Com., 7470 (iv).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 68) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. (B. 161) 1°*, 6756 ; in Com., 7560, 7568 (iv).
G.B. and U.S. Arbitration Treaty, Information *re* (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Naval Policy *re* Govt. Policy, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 271 (i).
Quebec, Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 126) 1°*, 4384 (iii).
Reciprocity, Manufactured Articles, (remarks) 5746 (iii).
—— Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'n, Res. (read) 5747 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6824 (iv).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Supply., 6425 (iv).
Whitby Postoffice Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1868 (i).

FRASER, Mr. A. L., *King's (P.E.I.)*
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building, &c. (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8932 (v).

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion, &c. (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8047 (v).
Fishing Bounty in King's Co., P.E.I., Names of Persons receiving (Ques.) 7246 (iv).
Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Appotmt., Qualification, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)
Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c. (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Govt. Railways Constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 4829 (iii).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U. S. (remarks) 2003 (ii).
Hillsborough Bridge, P.E.I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. (B. 153) in Com., 8743 (v).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7805 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meeting of (remarks) 4048 (iii).
New Harmony Postoffice (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6084 (iv).
Oyster Industry, &c., on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor., 757 (i).
P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
—— Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks), 6923 (iv).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3883 (ii).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., *re* Surveys, on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2178 (ii).
—— Winter Service, Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf, Expenditure *re* Repairs (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P.E.I., Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3105 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Lighthouse and Coast Service—Marine (ice breakers) 6489; Postoffice—Outside Service (mail clerks) 6084 (iv); (postmas-

FRASER, Mr. A. L.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
ters) 4295 (iii); Public Works—Buildings — P.E.I. (Summerside Armoury) 1602 (i), (Tignish) 1603 (i), Railways—P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Supreme Court Judgeship in P.E.I. Vacancy, Complaints *re* (remarks) 2072 (ii), 7553 (iv).

GAUVREAU, Mr. C. A., *Temiscouata.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6295 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) 5777 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers, from Quebec to Gulf of St. Lawrence, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret. 774 (i).
Order, Ques. of, Apologies for using word "liar", 467 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5184 (iii); Railways—I.C.R. (highways protection) 5918 (iii).

GEOFFRION, Mr. V., *Chambly and Vercheres.*
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s (B. 44) 1°*, 1069 (i); in Com., 2594-5, 3021 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s (B. 60) 1°*, 1453 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182 (ii).
La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Co.'s (B. 193) 1°*, 8308 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7938 (v).
Restigouche Riparian Association incorp., (B. 176) 1°*, 7019; in Com., 7589 (iv).
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Que (Montreal barracks) 3147 (ii); (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895 (i).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M. *Welland.*
Georgian Bay Canal, Par. in 'Globe' *re* commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
International Ry. Co. and International Traction Co, &c., (B. 74) 1°*, 1488 (i).
Mather Bridge and Power Co.'s (B. 20) 1°*, 377 (i).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry Co.'s (B. 99) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Privileges and Election Com., 3rd Rep. of Com. *re* Lanctot Charges, (presented) 6756 (iv); (M.) to conc, 7873, Agreed to (Y. 98, N. 56) 8030 (v).

GERMAN, Mr. W. M.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4482 (iii).
——— Vote re Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden). Personal Explanation, 4929 (iii).

GERVAIS, Mr. H., *Montreal, St. James.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8739 (v).
Debates, Official Rep. of Com. (M.) to conc., 6438 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8236 (v).
Montreal, Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904 (M. for ret.*) 3225 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ques.) 1104 (i).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 1°, 6439; on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

GILBERT, Mr. ARTHUR, *Drummond and Arthabaska.*
Address, The, 624 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).
——— (notice of motion) 5938 (iv).
——— Total Expenditure from Confederation (Ques.) 4302 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 6158 (iv).
Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of, re Telegram delayed, &c., 1456 (i).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation (Ques.) 3467 (ii).

GIRARD, Mr. J., *Chicoutimi and Saguenay.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor., &c. (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3117 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6239; (seeds) 6232 (iv).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S., *Kootenay.*
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers, 9248 (v).
Canadian Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 134) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W.T., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9063 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8943 (v).

GOODEVE, Mr. A. S.—*Con.*
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6912 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8459 (v).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8054 (v).
Flag Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4366 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8618, 8650 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1427, 1732, 1756 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9204 (iv).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9472 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt: (Mr. Blair) to Com. of Sup., 2322 (ii).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4969 (iii).
——— Hamilton Cotton Co., Statement of Employees (read) 5747 (iii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram (explanation) 5210 (iii).
——— Obstruction *re* Debate (remarks) 10043 (v).
——— Res. from Creston Fruit and Produce Association (read) 4119 (iii).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7628 (iv).
Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement for Installation of, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).
Fisheries (inspectors) 6637; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6108 (iv).
Labour Dept. ('Labour Gazette') 4226 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C., (Cranbrook) 3013; (Revelstoke) 3017; Dominion (rents) 3212; Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3186; Yukon (Dawson) 3215 (ii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
Woods Building, Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3186 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. D. A., *Kent East.*
Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s (B. 206) in Com., 8970 (v).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties, &c. (Ques.) 4041 (iii).
Supply—Fisheries (overseers) 3821 (ii).

GORDON, Mr. G., *Nipissing.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8824 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service (remarks) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6632 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8615 (v).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7841; in Com., 7861 (iv).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before (Ques.) 1568 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 1495 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 170) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956 (v).
North Bay Wharfs, Information *re*, 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of, Govt. Assistance *re* (remarks) 6766 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid to (remarks) 9694 (v).
Reciprocity Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9564 (v); Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6632 (iv); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3406; Public Works — Buildings—Ont. (Sudbury) 2627 (ii); (Tillsonburg) 2628 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P. (Minister of Railways and Canals), *Brockville.*
Accidents, &c. on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3927 (ii). *See* "Ry. Accidents".
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv). *See* "I.C.R.".
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com. 5079, 5253, 5630 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3027 (ii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4240 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co. &c. (Ans.) 3853 (ii).
———, (explanation) 4048 (iii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii)
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1713 (i).
———,Privileges, Advertisement *re* Tenders (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Grantees, Improvements, &c. (Ans.) 1712 (i).
———, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
———, Total Cost, Revenues from Grantees. Arrears, &c. (Ans.) 1713 (i).
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
British Columbia Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by Govt., &c. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (B. 211) Guarantee Bonds (M.) for Com. on Res., 8704 (v); in Com. on Res. 8801; in Com., 9222, 9255 (v).
Canadian Northern Branch Lines Co.'s (B. 81) on Senate Amts., 6468 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com. 3454, 3456 (ii).
C.P.Ry., Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction of, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
———, Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1828 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Canal Statistics (presented) 7019 (iv).
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ans.) 2669 (ii), 8700 (v).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Clarry, L. F., Expenditure *re* Trent Canal Floods (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
Electric Railway Charters since 1896, Extensions *re* Constructions, &c. (Ans.) 4043 (iii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractor, Completion &c. (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts (remarks) 2996 (ii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ans.) 10196 (v).
See 'Parcel Post'.
Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4825 (iii).
Fish Preservation in Trent River, (remarks) 1504 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, Commencement *re* (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii)
Govt. Railways, constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s inc. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8922 (v).
Grand Falls Ry.: *See* "St. John".
G.T.Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1079 (i).
G.T.P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3022 (ii).
G.T.P.Ry. Classification, Arbitrators' Report (Ans.) 696 (i).
———, Eastern Division, Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ans.) 1571 (i).
——— Labourers working at Lafond, Amounts due, &c. (Ans.) 3670 (ii).
——— Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1493 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ans.) 1493 (i).
———Pension Fund, Rules and Regulations (Ans.) 2153 (ii).
See 'Nat. Transcl. Ry.'
Halifax and St. John, Wharfage, &c. (Ans.) 7807 (iv).
Hillsborough Bridge, Material furnished, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7593 (iv).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6422 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425, 1794 (1).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, &c. (Ans.) 661 (i).
Hydro-Electric Co.'s Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ans.) 9430 (v).
I.C.R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6678 (iv).
——— Accidents, Passes, &c., on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Advertising in Conservative Papers (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
See "Advertising."

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Bell, Mr. G. W., Pass Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Branch Lines Leasing (prop. res.) 9244; in Com. on Res., 9581, 9588 (v).
——— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
——— Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction (Ans.) 5833 (iii).
——— Dismissals, from Nov., 1908, Number reinstated (Ans.) 3666 (ii).
——— Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1174 (i).
——— Excursion Rates *re* Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, &c. (Ans.) 1347 (i); (remarks) 2997 (ii).
See 'Rates.'
——— Freight Rates on Coal, Iron, &c., Classification, &c. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent at Moncton (Ans.) 654 (i).
——— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c. (Ans.) 6664, 7601 (iv).
——— Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton, &c. (Ans.) 5130 (iii).
——— Halifax Terminals (stmnt.) 2647 (ii). 9561 (v).
——— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds (Ans.) 6665 (iv).
——— Hay transported free from Quebec to Mar. Provs. (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
——— Ice Contract at Riviere du Loup (Ans.) 2438, 3853 (ii).
——— I.C.R. and G. T. Ry. Arbitration, Points to be determined, Cost, &c. (Ans.) 3665 (ii); (remarks) *re* Answer, 4206 (iii).
——— Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c. (Ans.) 7033 (iv).
——— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
——— Mileage, Value of Rolling Stock (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
——— Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders' Woodworking Co. (Ans.) 6157 (iv).
——— Moncton Station, Site purchased (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets (Ans.) 7032 (iv).
——— Petit Rocher Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 6156 (iv).
——— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees (Ans.) 2152 (ii).
——— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6340 (iv).
——— and P.E.I. Ry. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
I.C.R., Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe' (corrected statement) 2886 (ii).
See "Advertising."
——— Rates, for Political Picnics at Truro (explanation) 3343 (ii).
See "Excursion."
———Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
International Ry Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ans.) 4466 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9190 (v).
See 'Long Sault.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2912 (ii).
See 'International Waterways,' 'St. Lawrence.'
McClary Maufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).
N.T.Ry., Classification Arbitration, Rep. *re* (Ans.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ans.) 1099; Correction in Figures, 1293 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division (Ans.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Estimated Quantities, &c. (Ans.) 1491 (i).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ans.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Div., Total Cost (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Total Cost up to Dec. 1910 (Ans.) 3064 (i); Corrected Answer (read) 3144 (ii).
——— Eastern Div., Question, Overbreak *re* (remarks) 2434 (ii).
——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ans.) 1094 (i).
——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delays, &c. (Ans.) 6668 (iv).
——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret., (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Pusher Grade (remarks) 4051 (iii).
——— N.B. Section, Standard, Total Estimated Cost (Ans.) 4047 (iii).
——— Over Classification, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6273 (iv), 9899 (v).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
N.T.Ry., Over Classification, on Inquiry for Information *re*, 9995 (v).
——— Payments, on Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
——— Provisions in Contract *re* taking over completed sections (Ans.) 1093 (i).
——— Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Ry. Commission Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
——— St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Dat of Completion (Ans.) 1711 (i).
——— Section Houses (Ans.) 1099 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Machinery &c. (Ans.) 1569 (i).
——— Shops, Specifications *re* Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press (Ans.) 2157 (ii).
——— Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry Co., Agreement *re* Running Rights, &c (Ans.) 2435 (ii).
——— Total Cost of Construction (Ans.) 5135 (iii), 7591 (iv).
——— Total Cost up to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section (Ans.) 1497 (i).
——— on M. (Mr. Ames) for Ret., 1727 (i). *See* 'G.T.P.Ry.'
Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c. (Ans.) 5831 (iii).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv)
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) on M. for Com., 8094 in Com., 8234, 8525, 8916 (v).
Parcel Posts System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v). *See* 'Express.'
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, &c., on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies, 713; 1497 (i), 3069 (ii).
——— American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ans.) 697 (i).
——— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 9981 (iv).
——— Caisson, Damage to (Ans.) 4045 (iii).
——— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 1714 (i).
———Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Graham) 4324 (iii).
——— Contract, Advertisement *re*, on M (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 713, 1497 (i).
——— Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman (remarks) 4205 (iii).
——— Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (ii).
——— Contract for Reconstruction (remarks) 4740 (iii).
——— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c. (Ans.) 2667 (ii).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Quebec Bridge, Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c. (Ans.) 3279 (ii), 6268 (iv).
——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c (Ans.) 8102 (v).
——— Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests &c. (Ans.) 658 (i).
——— Members of Board of Construction (Ans.) 9981 (v).
——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).
——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
——— Superstructure, Contract let (announcement) 6669 (iv).
——— Supervision, Amount expended (remarks) 6671 (iv).
——— Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6450 (iv).
——— Tenders *re*, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for copies of Advertisements, &c., 3069 (ii).
——— Tenders *re* Carriage Way &c. (Ans.) 9980 (v).
Railway Act (accidents) Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959, 1798 (i).
Ry. Act. (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonnell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Ry. Act (express co.'s) Amt. B. 8, (Mr. S. Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1299 (i).
Railways and Canals Dept. Act (equipment renewal) Amt. (B. 156) 1° m., 6188 (iv). 2° m., 8409; in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Ant. (B. 197) 1° m., 8399 (v); in Com., 9312, 9377 (v).
Railway Accidents on running Trains, Construction Work, &c., on M. (Mr. R. Smith) for Ret. 714 (i). *See* "Accidents.'
Railways and Canals, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).
Railway Commissioners' Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between Can. and U. S. (remarks) 3055 (ii).
Railway Commission Vacancy, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ans.) 1291 (i).
——— Apptmt. of French Canadian (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commissioners (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Railway Express Rates: *See* "Express," "Parcel," &c.
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U.S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6432 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Railway Rates to Clergymen, Reduction of (Ans.) 2434 (ii).
Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Railway Subsidies, Total Amount paid since Confederation (Ans.) 3467 (ii).
——— Corrected Stmnt., 6196 (iv).
Railway Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provincial and Ry. Commissioners (Ans.) 697 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem in Canada, Stmnt. on M. for Com. of Sup., 5039 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) *re* handing in Statements, 6955 (iv).
Revillon Frères Trading Co., Limited incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).
Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6414 (iv).
Rideau River, Removal of Stumps (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt. or N. T. Ry. (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. Branch Line Lease (B. 150) M. for Com. on Res., 4200 ; in Com. on Res., 5641 (iii); 2° m., 8410; in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light, Power, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Damming, Protest *re* Bill now before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4217 (iii).
See "Long Sault."
St. Peter's Canal, N.B., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 8103 (v).
——— Answer to Question (remarks) 8356 (v).
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
Selkirk Route *re* Canal (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Soulanges Canal, Claims for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration (remarks) 6273 (iv).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay Dyke) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Cardinal (dock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge); 6356; (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office); 6409; (lock 17) 6409; (lock 19) 6409; (removing high spots) 6409; (Robertson's Culvert) 6409 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Canals—Farran's Point (lower entrance) 6409 (iv).
Canals—Galops (upper lock) 6410 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358, 6410 tugs) 6359, 6388; (wharf's and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).
Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, &c.) 6452; (working expenses) 6452 (iv).
Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410; (scow) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).
Canals—Rapide Plat (dredging) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Rideau (bridges) 6413 (iv).
Canals—Sault Ste Marie (concrete walls) 6358; (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (mooring pier) 6397; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395 (iv).
Canals—St. Peter's (improvements) 6418 (iv).
Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6390; (machinery) 6389; (mooring posts) 6389; (protection works) 6390 (iv).
Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6453; (improvements) 6419; (lift lock) 6398 (iv).
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6404; (Jane St. bridge) 6425; (Port Colborne) 6397; (stone protection) 6425 (iv); (survey) 9563 (v); (widening) 6408 (iv).
Canals—Williamsburg (electric power) 6396 (entrance pier) 6426; (iron mooring posts) 6426; (lockmaster's house) 6408; (machinery) 6426 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Railways and Canals (salaries) 1473 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6655 (iv).
Railways—G. T. P. (govt. director) 6449 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (air brakes) 5913, 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5914, 5983; (Chatham) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (facilities and accommodation) 5929; (fire extinguishers) 5927 ; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5918 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v); (highways protection) 5917 (iii) ; 9560 (v) ; (Moncton car shops) 5926 (iii); (operation) 5983; (Pullman berths) 5991 (iv); (rolling stock) 5927 (iii), 8913 (v); (Str. 'Scotia') 5928; (surveys, &c.) 5928; (Sydney Mines) 5929 (iii); (Windsor branch) 6352; (working expenses) 6338 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446; (inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv); (level crossings) 9509 (v); (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (Ry. Commissioners) 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).
Ry's. P.E.I., (Harmany-Elmira branch) 6352 (iv).
Transcontinental Ry. Eastern Div. Expenditure *re* Construction (Ans.) 9431 (v).
See 'G. T. P.' &c.
Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re* (remarks) 7210 (iv).

GRAHAM, Hon. G. P.—*Con.*
Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s B. 135 (Mr. Douglas) in Com., 6951 (iv).

GUTHRIE, Mr. H., *South Wellington.*
Address, The, 77 (i).
——— Correction of figures in Hansard, 228 (i).
See 'Govt. Loans.'
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181 (ii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 220), (M.) to place on Govt. Bills, 9350 (v).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3456 (ii).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3774 (ii).
See 'Address.'
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com. 3182 (ii).
Railway Sel. Com. (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3629 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4868 (iii).

HAGGART, Mr. A., *Winnipeg.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8572 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8925 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday, (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8608, 8666 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10251, 10290 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9515 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8549 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1792 (i).
Immigrants, Money Qualification, *re* Operation of Act (remarks) 150 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7853 (iv).

HAGGART, Mr. A.—*Con.*
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re* (remarks) 4469 (ii), 6054 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6762 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (iv).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c. (M. for papers, &c*.) 7039 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 8072 (v).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ques.) 1282 (i).
Priv. and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot) Charges *re*, on M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7888 (iv).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9332 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8389 (v).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10140 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 3021, 3180, 3454, 3842 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3793 (ii); Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5173 (iii).
Indians—Man, &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Militia (Winnipeg drill hall) 6054 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004; Man. (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii); Ottawa (pavements) 8884 (v).
Winnipeg River Water Power Rights, Grants, Leases, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G., *North Lanark.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5086 (iii).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Rentals from, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2196 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8804, 8818; in Com., 9222, 9259 (v).
C.P.Ry. Reducton of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1836 (i).
Copyright Act, B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8899 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1319 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2388 (ii).
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2190 (ii).
——— Cancellation of (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8559 (v).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1075 (i).
Imperial Conference, Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10120 (v).
I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument Nationale, Montreal, Demonstration (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9099; in Com., 9156, 9216 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2896 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3238 (ii).
Niagara River Water Powers, Regulations *re* (remarks) 8893 (v).
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries Arbitration (remarks) 672 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Genl.'s Report, 834 (i).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, 3069 (ii).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Information *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4334 (iii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 961 (i).
Railways and Canals, Deptl. B. 156 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8409 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9379 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup. (reply) 5103 (ii).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 8411 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1378 (i).

HAGGART, Hon. J. G.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6216; Civil Govt.—Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1467(i); Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2093 (ii).
Sussex Street, Deptl. Buildings, Alteration in Plans (remarks) 2079 (ii), 4824 (iii).
Yukon, Beer Import Tax Repeal, in Com. on Res., (Mr. Oliver) 1977 (ii).

HARRIS, Mr. Llyod, *Brantford.*
Globe Printing Co.'s (B. 121) 1°*, 4040 (iii).
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.'s (B. 149) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 106) 1°*, 2828 (ii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland Relief (B. 182) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4877 (iii).
Reciprocity, Berlin Board of Trade Res., on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5730 (iii).

HARTY, Mr. W., *Kingston.*
SUPPLY.
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2138 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D., *Halton.*
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9222; on M. for 3°, 9334 (v).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2431 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3183-3454 (ii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2227 (ii).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Dom. Lands Act (O. Cs.) in Com., 8086 (v).
Elora Postoffice, Site, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Express Rates, *See* 'Parcel.'
Sheldon, C. D. Illegal Use of Mails (re-M. (Mr. Foster) for copy, 2242 (ii).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability, &c. (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
—— Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8224 (v).
—— Royal Commission of Investigation (amt.) to Com. on M. for Ways and Means, 5295, Neg. (Y. 62, N. 97) 5523 (iii).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6629 (iv).
Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. 8084 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1419 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Milton Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1871 (i).
Ministerial Association, Attack *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 3184 (ii).
Parcel Post, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9936 (v).
Postoffice Act, (stamp vending machine) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2° 8069; in Com., 8070 (v).
Public Buildings in former Estimates, given Precedence over new Ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2114 (ii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8401; in Com., 9321 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5063 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7633 (iv).
—— Res. from Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, (read) 4122 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6517, 6816 (iv).
—— Statistics, &c., Ques. *re* Vote of member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

HENDERSON, Mr. D.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7625 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579, 9166 (v).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2598 (ii).
Seed Control Act (seeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6189 (iv) ; in Com., 8078 (v).
Supply Bill, Interim (B. 160) on M. for 1°, 6440 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6235 ; (Patent Record) 6184 ; (seeds) 6217 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv)
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1049 ; Mines (salaries) 1477 ; Public Works (salaries) 1033 (i).
Dom. Lands—Parks (buffalo) 6051 (iv).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6629; (modus vivendi licenses) 6160 (iv) ; (overseers) 3809 ; (protection service) 3807 (ii).
House of Commons (committees) 6170 ; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175 ; (sessional clerks) 6170 ; (stationery) 6178 ; (telephones) 6171 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5195 (iii).
Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6043 ; Que. (medical attendance) 6035 (iv).
Justice—Dom. Police (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4233 (iii) ; (technical education commission) 3804 (ii).
Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9566 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—N. B. (Campbellton) 1609 ; (Hampton) 1615 (i) ; Ont. (Dresden) 2108 ; (Fergus) 2111 ; (Essex) 2110 (ii).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5996 (iv).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5987 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558 ; (meteorological service) 6566 (iv).
Senate (stationery) 6337 (iv).
Unprovided Items (generally) 6160 (iv).

HERRON, Mr. J., *Macleod.*
Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date (remarks) 9090 (v).
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1966 (i).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3181, 3392 ; (amt.) 3024 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5087 (iii).
Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re* (remarks) 1079 (i).
Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3062 (ii).
Census Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9719 (v).

HERRON, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept. (remarks) 6197, 6363, (iv) 9070 (v).
Coal Strikes in West, Information *re* (remarks) 6908 (iv).
——— Present condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 2271 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3508 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607, 8674 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8083 (v).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c., of Alberta, Provl. Control of (M. for cor. *) 1500 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1240 (i).
McLeod Postoffice, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9315, 9416 (v).
Seed Grain, Distribution of, Complaints *re* Quality and Price (remarks) 8041 (v).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6062; Dom. Lands—Parks—(buffalo) 6050; Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv); Postoffice (postmasters' salaries) 4292 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3004 (ii).

HODGINS, Mr. G. F., *Pontiac.*
Emo, Matilda Relief (B. 130) 1° *, 4298 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3529 (ii).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 198) 1° *, 8476 (v).
Welland Canal Enlargement, Memorials, Pets, &c. (M. for copies *) 1500 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S., *Victoria and Haliburton.*
Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Naval Policy, 281 (i).
Advertising Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6394 (iv).
Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection therewith (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Ancona Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3601 (ii)..
Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation to Canada (remarks) 5216 (iii).
Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c. (M. for ret. *) 1340 (i).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils (Ques.) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong *re* (remarks) 4931 (iii).
Canal Reciprocity for American Boats (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
Clifford W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9997 (v).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Coronation Ceremonies, and Cadets from Canada (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re* (remarks) 6506 (iv).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c. (remarks) 7105 (iv).
Debates Committee, Status of (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, *re* Speeches (remarks) 153 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Attendance of Militia, Authority for (Ques.) 3219 (ii).
——— Govt. Authority re Decoration of Govt. Buildings (Ques). 925 (i); (remarks) 3369 (ii).
——— Guards of Honour, &c. (remarks) on Address, 289 (i).
——— Mess of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt. (Ques.) 706 (i).
——— Militia Officers attending Reception, in Uniform (Ques.) 707 (i).
——— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials (Ques.) 925 (i).
See 'Precedence.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5496 (iii).
Fenelon Falls Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day (remarks) 3671 (ii).
——— Neglect on St. George's Day (remarks) 7553 (iv).
——— Orders *re* (remarks) 2648 (ii).
See 'St. George's.'
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 1641 (i).
G. T. R. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of Dismissed Employees (remarks) 1073 (i).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* Eucharistic..
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1411 (i).
House of Commons Ventilation, (remarks) 4209 (iii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 7020 (iv).
'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wrecking (remarks) 7104 (iv).
Labour Strikes, Militia Interference (remarks) 10349 (v).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3060 (ii).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3241 (ii).
See '*St.* Lawrence.'
Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
Masonic Property stolen, Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* (Ques.) 7207 (iv).
——— (remarks) *re* Counsel's Action, 7552 (iv).
——— Apology to Counsel, Ques. of Priv. 7873 (v).
Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Militia Regulations governing admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1008 (i).
Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).
Order Ques. of *re* Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5562 (iii).
Oshawa Customs Collector, Mr. G. F. Blamey, Retirement of (Ques.) 3225 (ii).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 6768, 7023 (iv).
——— Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 7345 (iv).
Peat Gas Producer, Progress *re* Electric Power (Ques.) 708, 985 (i).
Pelagic Sealing Treaty between U.S. and G. B., Protection *re* (Ans.) 3671 (ii).
Postal Regulations, Distribution of Newspapers (remarks) 10342 (v).
Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 955 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
Questions and Answers written, Copies given to Press (remarks) 990 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7126 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10009, 10059 (v).
——— Debate, Ques. of Order *re* Talking' between Ministers, 7292 (iv).
——— Farmers's Interests, &c. (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Reciprocity, Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe', at Washington (remarks) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity ,Editorial in 'Globe' (remarks) 2743 (ii).
——— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa (personal explanation) 3352 (ii).
Reciprocity, Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3608 (ii).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c. (remarks) 6782 (iv).
——— Accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6840 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7670 (iv).
——— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7676 (iv).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt. (Ques.) 1288 (i).
——— Meaning of Word 'faction', Preparation of Answer (remarks) 1351 (i).
——— (remarks) 942 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own Rifles while in England (Ques.) 1087 (i).
Ross Rifles loaned by Can. to G.B., Use at Bisley, &c. (Ques.) 1085 (i).
——— (remarks) 7552 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Lawrence River Damming, Diversion of the Channel (remarks) 3058 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U. S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
See 'Long Sault.'
Scugog River Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'House.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).
Speaker's Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ques.) 926 (i).
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen, &c. (remarks) 269 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (archives) 6184; (year book) 6184 (iv).
Canals—Chambly (Iberville bridge) 6357; (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358; (wharfs and basins) 6359 (iv).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).
Canals—Trent (machinery) 6357 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1021 (i).
House of Commons (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6173; (sessional clerks) 6167; (stationery) 6175; (telephones) 6172 (iv).

HUGHES, Mr. S.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5557 (iii).
Justice—Dom (gratuities) 6161 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8679 (v).
Post Office—Outside Service (mail service) 6179 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lavatories) 2583; (water supply) 2583; Que. (Montreal barracks) 2569, 3148 (ii)
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (working expenses) 6[illegible]
P.E.I. (Harmony-Elmira branch) 6353 (iv).
U.S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, &c., Subjects of Extradition, &c. (Ques.) 707 (i).
Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Foundation, Inquiry for, 7666 (iv).

HUNT, Mr. A. B., *Compton.*
Orford Mountain Ry. (B. 100) 1°*, 2254 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7006 (iv).

JAMESON, Mr. C., *Digby.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3943 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction (M. for papers*) 3947 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5039, 5293 (ii), 8791 (v).
Bay of Fundy Fishing Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ques.) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 3606 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Papers, in Com. of Sup., 6057 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* New House (Ques.) 4929 (iii).
—— Lightkeeper, Salary, &c. (Ques.) 4929 (iii).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 8983 (v).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 28 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
Customs Act Amt. (B. 28) 1° m., 699 (i).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re* (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 5293 (iii).
Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8440 (v).
Fisheries Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6093 (iv).
Fish landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c. (M. for ret.*) 1501 (i).
Fisheries Protection Service, Seizures by 'Rainbow' (remarks) 4116, 4208 (iii).
Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden, for Violation of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington (remarks) 2088 (ii).
—— Changes at Washington (remarks) on motion for Sup., 8502 (v).
Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty (Ques.) 2886 (ii).
Fishing Vessel Licenses (B. 27) 1° m., 698 (i).
Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders, 3373 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock (Ques.) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c., (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Hague Arbitration, Bay of Fundy, 4683 (iii).
Hague Arbitration, North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Production of Papers, on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between, &c., (Ques.) 8991 (v).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9218 (v).
'John B. Young', Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re* (Ques.) 2368 (ii).
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re* (Ques.) 2157 (ii).
Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition Ques.) 4043 (iii).
Meteghan Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).
Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 4929 (iii).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Payments, Inquiry for Ret., 1572 (i).
New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 1283 (i).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County (Ques.) 657 (i).
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (v).
Postmasters Association, Pets *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3947 (ii).
Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re* (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6966 (iv).
—— Fishing Bounties, Payments *re* (remarks) 6670 (iv).
Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land Purchase, &c. (Ques.) 8994 (v).
—— (M. for cor.*) 8994 (v).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c. (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
Seed Inspection and Sale Act B. 167 (Mr. Fsher) in Com., 8078 (v).
Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c. (Ques.) 9993 (v).
Smelt Fishing in N. S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season (Ques.) 9984 (v).
Statutes, French Translation, Corrections (remarks) 8090 (v).
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty (Ques.) 4046 (iii).
—— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3129 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9088 (v); (tobacco production) 6264; (Year Book) 6184 (v)
Charges of Management—(foreign and uncurrent coin) 6061 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054 (i); Postoffice (clerical assistance) 6063; (contingencies) 6070 (iv).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6093; (fishways) 6659; (inspectors) 6658; (oyster culture) 6661 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (maritime road) 6543; (shipbuilding) 6488, 6498; (telephones, life stations) 6539 (iv).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Govt. steamers maintenance, &c.) 5815; (life saving awards) 5822; (patrol boats) 5829; (P. E.I. winter mail service) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Chatham) 1610 (i).

JAMESON, Mr. C.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Continued.*
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax, Dom.) 1592; (Halifax post office) 1587; (Weymouth) 1601 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. |Peterborough) 2616; Ottawa (lighting) 3173; (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 1863; (Napierville) 1865 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Argyle Sound) 9504 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Pullman berths) 5990; (surveys) 5929 (iii).
Scientific Institutions (meteorological service) 6565 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (life belts &c.) 6572; (magnetic observatry) 6563 (iv).
Trawling: *See* 'Steam Trawling.'
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa (remarks) 4723 (iii).
Wesport Signal Stations, When erected, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1091 (i).

KIDD, Mr. E., *Carleton, O.*
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6209 (iv).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8953 (v).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com,. 8746 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 10572 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6234; (seeds) 6224 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G., (Minister of Labour) *Waterloo North.*
Accidents on Canadian Railways, Investigation *re* , on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to (Ans.) 5632 (iii).
Alien Labour Law on Public Contracts, in B.C. (remarks) 10369 (v).
—— Administration at Sault Ste. Marie, on M. for Sup., 5530 (iii).
B.C. Coal Strikes, (remarks) 6363 (iv).
—— Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6366 (iv).
See 'Coal Strike.'
British Patriotic Songs and American Scholars in Western Schools (Ans.) 657 (i).
Cement Merger: *See* "Industrial Mergers."
Coal Strike in B. C. and Alberta, Conciliation *re* (remarks) 6197 (iv).
—— Further Information (read) 6908 (iv).
—— Present Condition (remarks) 7105 (iv).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Coal Strike in B. C. &c., Remarks of Mr. Taylor, M.P., 9721 (v).
See 'Labour.'
Cocaine, Prohibition of Sale (prop. res.) 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2063 (ii).
See 'Opium.'
Combines Investigation Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 663 (i).
——— Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).
See 'Cement.'
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1318 (i).
Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of (Ans.) 8993 (v).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) 9001 (v).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of (remarks) 2080 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (Ans.) 2158 (ii).
——— Arrangement re Reinstatement (Ans.) 654, 809, 811 (i).
——— (remarks) 1072, 1507 (i).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3393 (ii).
——— Inaction of Labour Dept., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5776 (iii).
——— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to (remarks) 1805 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4261 (iii).
——— Minister's Efforts a Success (Ans.) 811 (i).
——— Resolution from Order of Conductors (Ans.) 9988 (v).
——— Settlement of (remarks) 9692 (v).
——— Statements by Leaders of Ry. Organization (read) in Com. of Sup., 4246-7 (iii).
——— Status of Men reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
——— Tel. from Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Great Northwestern Telegraphers Co., Request *re* Board of Conciliation (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1534, 1737 (i); on M. for 3°, 2870, (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works *re* Com., Printing of Proceedings (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
——— Representations re I.C.R. Workingmen (correction) 4116 (iii).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. re (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal (Mr. Rhodes) (remarks) 6931 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2940 (ii).
See 'U. S. Trusts.'
Industrial Training, Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
I. C. R. Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Granting (Ans.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9176 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9463 (v).
Labour Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Labour Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, on Ques. of Priv., 9721, 9786 (v).
——— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., re Militia (read) 10344 (v).
Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number of Employees, &c. (Ans.) 1717, 1977 (i).
Matches, Manufacture, Prohibition of Phosphorus B. 10 (prop. res.) 1802; 1° m., 104; 2° m., 1576 (i).
——— (B. 96) in Com. on Res., 2021 (ii).
N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).
North Atlantic Collieries, Protest re Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).
Opium Prohibition (B. 97) Prop. Res., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 1°*, 2062; 2° m., 2518, in Com., 2532; 3° m., 2740 (ii); on Senate Amts, 8090 (v);
——— (B .22) 1° m., 468 (i).
See 'Cocaine.'
Petawawa Military Camp, Damages by Fire (remarks) 9250 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Fair Wage Clause for Bridge Workers (Ans.) 5835 (iii), 6757 (iv).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3946 (ii).
Reciprocity, Res. of Berlin Board of Trade, Ques. of Priv., 5726 (iii).
——— Speech of Member for N. Oxford (remarks) 5545 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6817 (iv).
——— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices, laid on Table, 10468 (v).
——— (M.) to print, 10590 (v).
——— (remarks) 10469 (v).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land Purchase (Ans.) 8994 (v).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 4237 (iii).

KING, Hon. W. L. M., C.M.G.—*Con.*
Springhill Mines Strike, Information *re* Condition (remarks) 2641, 2740 (ii), 6363 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (combines investigation Act) 4280 (iii); (conciliation board) 3384, 3393 (ii); (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii), 6057 (iv); (salaries) 1484 (i): technical education commission) 3801 (ii).
Technical Education Commission, Progress *re*, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1721 (i).
—— Completion of Work (remarks) 1661 (i).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt. (Ans.) 8993 (v).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
—— Investigation *re* Combines Act (remarks) 4300 (iii).
—— Board of Investigation (remarks) 5954 (iv).
U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations, &c, U.S. Courts, on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4345 (iii).
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Settlement of, Rep. of Conciliation Board, on M. (Mr. Goodeve) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9699 (v).
—— Conciliation Board (remarks) 9070 (v).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of living (Ans.) 3065 (ii).

KNOWLES, Mr. W. E., *Moosejaw.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1934 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N.W. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9014 (v).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9034 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co., incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8918 (v).
Healey, Fanny Mary Relief (B. 199) 1°*, 8476 (v).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 56) 1°*, 1277 (i); in Com. 3994 (iii); on Senate Amts, 6952 (iv).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6151 (iv).
Postmasters Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6064 (iv).
Post Office Act (stamp vending) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. 8071 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) on Res., 6921 (iv).
—— Res. from Swift Current Board of Trade (read) 4119 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6064 (iv).
Tariff Resolution, Par. in Moosejaw 'News,' Ques. of Priv., 2639 (ii).

KYTE, Mr. G. W., *Richmond (N.S.)*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 369 (i).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1140 (i).
Lymburner Contracts with Public Works Dept. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Privileges and Elections (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7958 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 3956 (iii).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7632 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Mail Subsidies and SS.Subventions (Baddeck and Iona) 8764 (v).

LACHANCE, Mr. A., *Quebec Centre.*
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amount realized, &c. (Ques.), 1289 (i).
Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c. (Ques.) 1289 (i).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees, since 1st Jan. 1905, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2376 (ii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet (Ques.) 1718 (i).

LAFORTUNE, Mr. D. A., *Montcalm.*
Address, The, 615 (i).
Canadian Northern Quebec Ry. Co.'s (B. 89) 1°*, 1710 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8007 (v).
Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6833 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).

LAKE, Mr. R. S., *Qu'Appelle.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1958 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c. (Ques.) 7344 (iv).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work remarks) 7219 (iv).
Census Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of, on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9024 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8726 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4661 (iii).
Dom. Lands. Sask., Gross Receipts, Cost of Administration, &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Dom. Lands, S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Application *re* Entry, &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Drummond, &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3491 (ii).
Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11 (Ques.) 8096 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2268 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9532 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Cancellation of Mr. John Bradley's Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23 (Ques.) 4112 (iii).
See 'Pre-emptions.'
Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination (Ques.) 814 (i).
Immigration into Western Can., Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (M.) to adjn., 1551 (i).
——— Notice of Discussion, 1503 (i).
James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c. (Ques.) 1082 (i).
Lajord Post Office, Change as Accounting Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
Natural Resources, &c. in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c. (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Report, Inquiry for, 2004, 3672 (ii).
Pasqua Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
Post Office Estimates, on objections to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c. (Ques.) 812 (i).
Reciprocity—Opposition to, Ques. of Priv., 5739 (iii).
——— Speech of Min. of Agr. in Montreal, Ques. of Priv., 6199 (iv).
——— Statistics asked from Trade and Commerce Dept.; Reply of Dep. Min. (remarks) 6510 (iv).

LAKE, Mr. R. S.—*Con.*
Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ques.) 6505 (iv).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ques.) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c. (Ques.) 1908, (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Post Office (postal guide) 4280 (iii).
Immigration (seed grain) 3837 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5583 (iii).
Labour (Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8691 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Macleod) 3003; Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
R. N. W. M. Police—(pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Ottawa, Alterations in Plans (remarks) 2075 (ii).
University of Sask., Land Endowment, Res. *re* (Ques.) 4111 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R., *Haldimand.*
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com. 9265 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8719 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913 (v).
Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c. (Ques.) 3470 (ii).
Dunnville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission of Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5314, 5459 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1531 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (i).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9916 (v).
Public Buildings, Erection and Construction (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9290 (v).
Railway Mail Service, Names and Dates of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations (Ques.) 3855 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5058 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Res. from Winnipeg Board of Trade (read) 4121 (iii).

LALOR, Mr. F. R.—*Con.*
Reciprocity, Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) *re* Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, 4223 (iii).
Speeches of Ministers distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3786 (ii); (seeds) 6229; (Quarantine, animals) 5963 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1666; (Napierville) 1866 (i).
Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise (Ques.) 7601 (iv).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A., *Lincoln and Niagara.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6298 (iv).
Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c. (Ques.) 4825 (iii).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.'s (B. 80) 1°*, 1640 (i).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7567 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s (B. 201) on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9257 (v).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1832 (i).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ques.) 4672
Census, Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) 9714 (v).
Coroners' Inquests: *See* 'Ry. B. 2.'
Elevators Terminal at Port Arthur, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2425 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5399 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8216 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9613 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Croket) 10261 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8237, 8542, 8918 (v).
Grand Trunk Ry. Co.'s (B. 223) in Com., 9510 (v).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8977 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1434, 1527, 1738, 1750 (i); on M. for 3°, Ques. of Order, 2874 (ii).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
Imperial Conference Rep., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10112 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7840 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B., 9 (Mr. Carvell) in Com., 1527 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 977, 1511 (i).
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3268 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10523 (v).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8234, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916; (amt.) 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8340 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2849 (ii).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1604 (i).
Public Works—Generally, Objection to Votes in full, 9552 (v).
Public Works Promised during Western Tour (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re* (remarks) 1639 (i).
Ry. Act (accidents, coroners, &c.) Amt. (B. 2) 1° m., 8; 2° m., 956; on M. for 2°, 1407; Debate rsmd. on M. for 2°, 1797 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9377, (amt.) 9378 (v).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Fielding) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7281 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016, 10036 (v).
——— Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
——— North York, Challenge *re* Contest (remarks) 7224 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6781 (iv).
St. Catharines Drill Hall, Site *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Abolition of (prop. res.) 2680 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1374 (i).
Supply—Schedule of Proportion of Votes (remarks) 9567 (v).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (survey) 9563 (v).

LANCASTER, Mr. E. A.—*Con.*
SUPPLY—*Con.*
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3440 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fairville) 1611; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1615; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (Tracadie) 1624 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1582; (Parrsboro) 1630 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2604; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2590; (pavements) 2593; (water supply) 2589 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1602 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Lévis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1865; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawinigan) 1890 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Argyle Sound) 9501; Ont. (repairs, &c.) 9552 (v).
Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9562; (highway protection) 9561; (level crossings) 9509 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. A., *Richelieu.*
Independence of Parlt., Charges *re* Govt. Employees, painting Private Dwelling, &c., on M. (Mr. Blondin) for Special Com., 4655 (iii).
——— Charges *re* obtaining lumber, &c., from Govt. Store (Ques. of Priv.), 8695 (v).

LANCTOT, Mr. R., *Laprairie-Napierville.*
Agriculture. Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6285 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1879 (i).

LAPOINTE, Mr. E., *Kamouraska.*
Address. The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech (seconded) 16 (i).
Quebec Members, Absence of *re* Extra Session (remarks) 10098 (v).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W., P.C., G.C.M.G., (Prime Minister), *Quebec East.*
Address, The, 44; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 441 (i).
——— Precedence *re* (M.) 5 (i).
——— (M.) to present. 694 (i).
——— Reply from His Ex., (read) 1487 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).
Adjournment of House (M.) 866 (i).
See 'Coronation,' &c.
Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence in Eng., Emoluments *re* (Ans.) 1089 (i).
Agricultural Implements, resuming adjnd. debate (remarks) 2253 (ii).
Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report (presented) 3952 (iii).
Aliens, Naturalization of, Legislation *re* (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6907 (iv).
——— Termination of (remarks) 2004 (iv).
——— (remarks) 2271 (ii).
Arbitration Treaty between G.B. and U.S., Information *re* (Ans.) 5834 (iii).
——— (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment (M.) 4115 (iii).
Atlantic, Que. and Western Ry.: *See* 'Charing Cross.'
Aylmer Post Office, Revenues for 1908-9, &c. (Ans.) 984 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1340 (i).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2131 (ii).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. for Decision (Ans.) 1091 (i).
Bellevue Mining Disaster (remarks) 1080 (i).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
Birthday of Prime Minister, Congratulations from Leader of the Opposition (remarks) 9 (i).
Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. (remarks) 1575 (i).
British National Songs in N.W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5619 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity,' &c.
Business of the House (remarks) 4117 (iii).
Business of the House for Thursdays (remarks) 1550 (i), 2065 (ii).
Canadian Commisioner to France, Apptmt. of (Ans.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency of, Charge *re* Frauds (Ans.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Company, Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*, on Personal Explanation (Mr Oliver) 8189 (v).
—— Proposed Motion, 8191 (v).
See 'Oliver, Hon. Mr.'
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 661 (i).
Canada and South America SS Service, Subsidies to (Ans.) 5290 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies SS Subsidy, Contract, &c. (Ans.) 5936 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr W. M. Martin) in Com., 8570 (v).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity (remarks) 6508 (iv).
Charing Cross Bank, Cor. with Dom. Govt. on M. for Copy, 1726 (i).
China-Japan SS Subsidy (B. 103) prop. Res. 1802 (i); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii); in Com., 8675 (v).
Chinese Immigration, Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion &c. (remarks) 2738 (ii).
—— Total Number, Capita Tax, &c. (Ans.) 788 (i).
Chinese Investigation, Rep. of Judge Murphy, Laid on Table, 9897 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9836 (v).
—— Discussion *re* Judge Murphy's Report, 9928 (v).
Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ans.) 1103 (i).
Christmas Adjournment: (M.) 1453 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Officers (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor. 2220 (ii).
—— on Notice of M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1912 (i).
Cobalt Mail Service, Inefficient Service (remarks) 1663 (i).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
See 'Imperial.'
Commercial Relations, &c., Translation of Papers (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Committees, Sel. Standing (M.) 5 (i).
—— Lists (presented) 262 (i).
—— (M.) to add Name, 377 (i).
Companies Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. Miller) on M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).
Consuls General, Status at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1304 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8709 (v).
See 'Imperial Conference.'
—— Invitation to Members of Parlt (remarks) 1580 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Indian Contingent, (remarks) 6507 (iv).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday (remarks) 5836 (iii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplmt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Official, Halifax, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Office, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2220 (ii).
Dairy Industry, Nature of Memorials *re*, &c. (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
Debates Committee, Status *re* Duties (remarks) 7015 (iv).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
Deputy Governor, Tel. of Mr. Justice Girouard to Cardinal Vannutelli (Ans.) 702 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 54 (1).
—— Quotations from Notary Begin, Ques. of Order, 57 (i).
—— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* quotations from 'Le Devoir', Ques. of Order, 472 (i).
Easter Adjournement (M.) 6758 (iv).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8120 (v).
Estimates, 1912 (presented) 695 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials in Procession (Ans.) 925 (i).
—— Mess. of Homage by Administrator (Ans.) 702, 707 (i).
—— Reception by Federal Govt., &c. (Ans.) 5935 (iv).
—— Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, (remarks), 6522 (iv).
See 'Speaker'.
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ans.) 5933 (iv).
See 'Can. Commissioner.'
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5395 (iii).
—— (remarks) 1510 (i), 7560 (iv).
—— Application *re* Charter, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1970 (ii).
—— Assets, Keeley Mine, Value, &c. (Ans.) 2152 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Farmers' Bank, Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2247 (ii).
—— Endorsation of Premier, Letters read, 2264 (ii).
—— Question *re* Incorp. (remarks) 1904 (i).
—— Representations to Fin. Dept. *re* Stability, &c. (Ans.) 2151 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmt., 1574 (i).
—— Speeches, &c. (M.) to print, 3054 (ii).
—— Distribution of Copies of Report (remarks) 6908 (iv).
See 'Western'.
Favoured Nation Treaties, Par. in Toronto 'Globe' *re* Abrogation (remarks) 5292 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity, &c.'
Fenian Raid Veterans' Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) to Com. on Ways and Means, 9605 (v).
See 'Veterans.'
Festival of the Empire, Chateauguay Battle, Abandonment of (remarks) 8108 (v).
Fish Hatchery at Snake Island, Winnipegosis Lake, Apptmt. of Keeper (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re* (stmt.) 1725 (i).
—— Modification of (remarks) 1804 (i).
—— Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8512 (v).
See 'Hague.'
Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds, &c. (Ans.) 1567 (i).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers, Report of Proceedings (M.) to print, 3952 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk), Objection to motion, 5161 (iii).
—— Estimates *re* (remarks) 2095 (ii).
—— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement (remarks) 2261 (ii).
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings (M.) 10095 (v).
—— Precedence on Mondays (M.) 4114 (iii).
—— Precedence on Wednesdays (M.) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Gov. General, Apptmt. of Duke of Connaught (remarks) 1726 (i).
Grain in Fort William and Port Arthur Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3605 (ii).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8536 (v).
Hague Tribunal, Fisheries Regulations with U.S. (remarks) 1725 (i).
—— Fisheries Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 1805 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
—— *See* 'Fisheries,' 'North Atlantic'.
Halifax Post Office, Completion of Repairs, &c. (Ans.) 653 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ans.) 5103 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1532, 1743, 1754 (i).
House of Commons, Appointments (M.) 5288; (M.) to conc., 5400 (iii).
—— Galleries of H. of C., Applause in (remarks) 4469 (iii).
—— Number of Persons residing in (Ans.) 3848 (ii).
—— Restaurant, Joint Com. (M.) 469 (i).
—— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ans.) 1085 (i).
—— Sessional Clerks, Application *re* Increase of Salary (Ans.) 5404 (iii).
—— Translation Staff Promotions (M.) 527 (i); (M.) *re* Apptmt., 7015 (iv).
—— Water Supply for Parlt. Biuldings *re* Typhoid Epidemic (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Hydro-Electric Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' Conditions *re*, (remarks) on M. (Mr. Lake) 1566 (i).
Imperial Conference, Attendance *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8034-7 (v).
See 'Coronation.'
—— Questions to be submitted by Canada (remarks) 4299 (iii).
—— Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7372 (iv).
See 'Secretariat.'
Imperial Conference, Precis Rep. and Verbatim Rep. (remarks) 9693, 9783 (v).
—— Complete Report presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10111 (v).
—— Cor. with Mr. Harcourt (read) 10338 (v); (M.) to print, 10340 (v).
—— Defence Papers laid on Table, 10467 (v).
Imperial Defence Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for copies, 2217 (ii).
Imperial Defence Committee Report, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Copy, 948 (i).
Indian Act, (Treaty) Amt. (B. 177) 1° m., 7019; on M. for 2°, 7830 (iv); on M. for 3°, 8105 (v).
I.C.R. Terminals at Halifax, Accommodation *re* (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1524 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Internal Economy Commission, Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).
International Waterways Commission (prop. res.) 695 (i).
—— Names of Members, Amounts paid to (Ans.) 3861 (ii).
—— Apptmt. of Chairman (remarks) 4741 (iii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 3 (M. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i).
See 'Long Sault.'
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid (Ans.) 6158 (iv).
Jackson, Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ans.) 656 (i).
Japanese Treaty: *See* 'Anglo-Japanese.'
Jardine, John, Claims *re* Govt., Par. in 'Daily Times,' (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Apptmt. *re* (remarks) 7553 (iv).
See 'P. E. I.'
Juvenile Delinquents Act. Discussion *re* (remarks) 4383 (iii).
Kelly, Robt., Employmt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B. C., (Ans.) 2665 (ii).
Langdon Subdivisions of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ans.) 1347 (i).
Lemieux, Hon. Mr., Mission to Rome, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 2607 (ii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramways (Ans.) 1104 (i).
—— Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ans.) 1488 (i).
Library of Parlt., Joint Com., (M.) 309 (i).
—— Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere (M.) 8789 (v).
Lt.-Governor, N. S., Cor. *re* Continuance as Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co. (Ans.) 2670 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River, on M. (Mr. Borden) to Com. of Sup., 2892 (ii).
—— Cor. between Govt. and Brit' bassador (remarks) 3530 (ii).
—— Rep. of American Commissioners, &c., (remarks) 1652 (i).
See 'International Waterways,' 'S Lawrence.'
Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions *re* (Ans.) 1285 (i).
See 'Rural.'
Mails, Illegal Use of for Fraudulent Schemes (Ans.) 802 (i).
—— Illegal Use of by C. D. Sheldon, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Speaker) 1358 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals, on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Man. Boundaries, Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg *re*, Cor. &c. (Ans.) 710 (i).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c., (remarks) 6764, 6915 (iv).
Matches, White Phosphorus, Manufacture Prohibition B. 10 (Mr. King) on M. for 2°, 1577 (i).
——B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2052 (ii).
Mess. from His Ex., Estimates (1912) Presented, 695 (i).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2791 (ii).
—— on Explanation (Mr. Boyce) 2439 (ii).
—— Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7444 (iv).
Minister of Militia. Absence from Hse., *re* N.S. Elections (remarks) 2265 (ii).
Minority Representation, Intention *re* Redistribution Bill (Ans.) 9998 (v).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ans.) 5136 (iii).
Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent (remarks) 5836 (iii).
—— Death of Inspectors, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 7254 (iv); 8598 (v).
—— Pay and Allowance, &c., (Ans.) 8101 (v).
N. T. Ry., Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of (Ans.) 1972 (ii).
Natural Resources in Alberta and Sas., Prov. Control, Cor. *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
Naval Conference, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Protocol. 3074 (ii).
Naval Construction, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8355 (v).
Naval Defence, Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 54 (i).
—— Direct Contribution in Resolution (remarks) 548 (i).
Naval Service, 'Rainbow', Type of Guns, (Ans.) 1490 (i).
Netherlands Land Mortgage Co., Investments in Canada, Cor. with W. T. R. Preston (Ans.) 789 (i).
—— Further Cor., Reps., &c. (Ans.) 5639 (iii).
—— on Inquiry for Cor., 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on M. for Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, 778; Letter of Chief Justice Sir Charles Fitzpatrick (read) 779 (i).
—— on prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) for Com., 781 (i).
—— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification (Ans.) 2669 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
North Atlantic Coast Fisheries, Hague Award, Distribution of (remarks) 8094 (v).
See 'Hague.'
North Shore Taxpayers and Voting at Federal Election (Ans.) 1082 (i).
Oaths of Office (B. 1) 1°*, 1 (i).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy (M.) for Com. of Investigation, 8309 (v).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8315 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv., 8032 (v).
——— (M.) for Com., *re* Investigation, 8791 (v).
——— Information *re* Committee (remarks) 9900 (v).
See 'Can. Northern.'
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6134 (iv).
——— on M. to introduce, 2829 (ii).
Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of, on using word 'liar', apology insisted on (remarks) 463 (i).
Ottawa Improvement Commission's Rep., on Inquiry for, 2004 (ii).
Parcel Post Service, Loss *re* (Ans.) 806 (i).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S., re Protection (remarks) 3670, 3769 (ii).
See 'Seal.'
Pork Packing Industry, Inquiry for Rep. of (remarks) 3530 (ii).
Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re* (Ans.) 1104 (i).
Post Office Revenue for Tilbury, &c., for 1904-10 (Ans.) 807 (i).
Post Office Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c. (Ans.) 1568 (i).
Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Bi-Weekly (Ans.) 982 (i).
Post Office Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of (Ans.) 1282 (i).
Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 952 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
P.E.I., Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6927, 7430, 7803 (iv), 8355 (v).
See 'Judicial,' 'Senate,' &c.
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7688, 7798 (iv).
Printing, Joint Com. (M.) 309 (i).
Private Bills (M.) to extend time, 1454 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com. (A. Lanctôt) 3rd Rep. (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) and Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 823 (amt. to amt.) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Public Accounts Com., Meetings, and Aud. Gen.'s Rep. (remarks) 310 (i).
Questions answered Orally (remarks) 700, 990, 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers, &c. (remarks) 1013 (i).
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 967 (i).
——— B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3946; in Com., 3946 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5235 (iii).
Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10193 (v).
Railways, Telegraph Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8357 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4741 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4873 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4057 (iii).
——— Assurance *re* Farmers' Interest (remarks) 5542 (iii).
——— Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Information from Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6509 (iv).
——— Debate (remarks) 3143 (ii).
——— Debates, Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 10001 (v).
——— Debate, Resuming of (remarks) 5939 (iv).
——— Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt (remarks) 4663 (iii).
——— Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Rep. *re* Delegation (remarks) 3529 (ii).
——— Incomplete Ret. (remarks) 1654 (i).
——— On Inquiry for Protocols, 2555 (ii).
——— On Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2439 (ii).
——— Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview (read) 5126 (iii).
——— Negotiations between Can. and U.S. (remarks) on Address, 48 (i).
——— Negotiations with U.S., Information *re* (remarks) 1506 (i).
——— Negotiations at Washington (remarks) 2070, 2271 (ii).
——— Negotiations, Mr. J. A. Macdonald's Connection *re* (remarks) 4299 (iii).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Submission to Hse. before Signed (remarks) 1805.
——— Procedure *re* Resolutions, &c., (remarks) 5753 (iii).
——— Protests *re* (remarks) 3952 (iii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties *re* (remarks) 2639 (ii).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8255 (v).
——— *re* Question (Mr. Monk) 4114 (iii).
——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).
——— Statistics, Accepting as Read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).
——— Trade Statistics with U.S. (remarks) 6675 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7671 (iv).
——— letter from 'Globe' reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7678 (iv).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5736 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for (Mr. Campbell), 5954 (iv).
Returns, Notice to Members of bringing down (remarks) 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8579 (v).
Rivière des Prairies Dredging Rep., on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2163 (ii).
Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Defense at Public Functions (remarks) 941 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service on C.N.R., Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Manufacture of Stamps and Postcards &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
——— Number &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rural Mail Routes operating in Man. (Ans.) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c. (Ans.) 983 (i).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service (remarks) 9995 (v).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).
St. Johns, P.Q., Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir' (Ans.) 1090 (i).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3229 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 3058 (ii).
——— Legislation *re* at Washington (remarks) 3283 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix (remarks) 3840 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Mr. Allison's letter, 3769 (ii).
See "Long Sault".

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re* (Ans.) 3462 (ii).
See 'Natural Resources.'
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10197 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table, 10337 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'
Secretariat at London, on Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Papers, 5836 (iii).
——— on Inquiry for Papers, 1507 (i).
See 'Imperial Conference,' &c.
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2663 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2709 (ii).
——— (remarks) *re* Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate, Reform of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4314 (iii).
Senate Vacancy in P. E. I. (remarks) 2074 (ii).
See "Judicial."
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).
See "Mails."
Small Pox Epidemic, Condition of House of Commons (remarks) 7252 (iv).
See 'Typhoid.'
Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7248 (iv).
South African Parlt., Report of P. M. G. (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3346 (ii).
Speaker of the House, Wearing of Official Robes, &c. (Ans.) 706 (i).
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola (Ans.) 926 (i).
——— Purchase of Birds (Ans.) 928 (i).
——— Purchase of Glassware (Ans.) 929 (i).
——— Purchase of Gramophone Records (Ans.) 927 (i).
——— Rental of Piano, &c. (Ans.) 927 (i).
Stamp Cancelling Machine, Cost, Rentals, &c. (Ans.) 806 (i).
Supply, (M.) for Com., 695 (i).
Supply, for Public Works (remarks) 10354 (v).

SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485; Gov. Gen. Sec.'s Office (salaries) 1013; High Commissioner (salaries) 1486 (i); Privy Council (clerkships) 8750 (v); (salaries) 1013 (i).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Baddock and Iona) 8763 (iv); (Bonaventure River

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

and N. B.) 8764 (iv); (Canada and Australia) 8764 (v); (Canada and Cuba) 6058 (iv), 8775; Canada and G. B.) 8773; (Canada and Mexico) 8781; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspé and Dalhousie) 8785; (Port Mulgrave, &c.,) 8786; (P. E. I. and G. B.) 8788; (Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C.) 8787; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Miscellaneous—(Coronation, members and senators) 8680 (Imperial Conference ministers expenses) 8679; (Paris agency) 8694; (Pelagic sealing conference) 8678 (v).

Mounted Police (Coronation contingent) 8752 (pay of force) 8598);(subsistence) 8599 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax citadel) 1581 (i).

Trade and Commerce (Chinese Immigration Act) 6058; (commercial agents) 6059; (inspectors) 6059 (iv).

Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip (remarks) 5 (i).

Trade Commissioners, Names of Countries, &c. (Ans.) 2156 (ii).

Trade Relations with Germany (remarks) 8403 (v).

Typhoid Epidemic, Prorogation of House (Ans.) 4676 (iii).

See 'Smallpox.'

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers (remarks) 6119 (iv).

—— Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re* (Ans.) 984 (i).

—— Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c., on M. (Mr. Meighen) for Ret., 4346 (iii).

U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of (Ans.) 7026; (remarks) 6362 (iv).

—— Passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt. (Ans.) 10335 (v); (remarks) 6118, 7254 (iv).

University of Sask., Land Endowment *re*, (Ans.) 4111 (iii) .

Unorganized Districts, Deferred Elections (remarks) 10100 (v).

See 'Voters.'

Veterans, Grants to (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

See 'Fenians.'

Voters Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation by Customs (remarks) 5628 (iii).

Water Powers, Conservation of (remarks) 7261 (iv).

Water Powers owned by Dom., Legislation *re* Regulating (Ans.) 7804 (iv).

LAURIER, Rt. Hon. Sir W.—*Con.*

See 'Long Sault,' &c.

Ways and Means (M.) for Com., 695 (i).

Wentworth, Number of Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret., 2557 (ii).

Westbrook Mail Service, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1103 (i).

Western Farmers' Delegation, Control of Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).

See 'Farmers.'

Western Tour, and Tariff Promises (remarks) on Address, 45 (i).

W. Indies SS. Service, Specification *re* Contract (Ans.) 4466, 4674, 4925 (iii).

Whips, &c.: *See* 'Taylor.'

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ans.) 708 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

Yukon Beer Import Tax Repeal B. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1979 (ii).

LAW, Mr. B. B., *Yarmouth.*

Reciprocity with U. S., Res. from Yarmouth Farmers' Association (read) 4122 (iii).

—— Yarmouth Board of Trade, Res. *re* (read) 5550 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R. (Postmaster General), *Gaspé.*

Arrow Lake Postal Clerk (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of (remarks) *re* Question, 2373 (ii).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening (Ans.) 6279 (iv).

Barrington Passage Bait Freezers Ret. (stmnt) 8889 (v).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals paid, Sums expended by Govt., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2197 (ii).

Birch Grove Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6076 (iv).

Cable, G.B. and Canada State-owned, Proposal *re* by G.B. and Can. (Ans.) 1905 (i).

See 'Telegraphs.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8815 (v).

Canso and Guyborough Mail Service, Contracts *re* (Ans.) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmastership. Name, Salary, &c. (Ans.) 7038 (iv).

—— Postmaster A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c. (Ans.) 7210 (iv).

China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2506 (ii).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. (B. 217) in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924 (v).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Cobalt Mail Service to Cochrane (remarks) 1804 (i).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Coronation Contingent, Apptmt. of Col. Landry (remarks) 8093 (v).
Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location (Ans.) 4670 (iii).
Don. Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor (Ans.) 9987 (v).
Dunnville Postal and Customs Collections (Ans.) 3470 (ii).
Elora Post Office, Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).
English Mails to Mar. Provs.: *See* 'Mail Service.'
Escott Postmastership, Apptmt of, Charges against late Postmaster (Ans.) 4926 (iii).
——— Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6181 (iv).
——— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase (Ans.) 7602 (iv).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Decoration of Govt. Buildings (remarks) 3369 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, Speech of P. M. G. at Montreal (remarks) 2680, 2268 (ii).
Franking for Fraudulent Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
See 'Mails.'
Fraser River Mail Service, Application *re* (Ans.) 3463 (ii).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re* (Ans.) 3854 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders (Ans.) 7038 (iv).
Hall's Prairie Post Office, Pet. *re* Location, &c. (Ans.) 3468 (ii).
Haskett, Havelock, and New Tuskett Post offices, Distances between &c. (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Herron Post Office, Progress *re* (remarks) 9588 (v).
I. C. R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to ride in Mail Cars (Ans.) 8584 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9457 (v).
Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail (Ans.) 9782 (v).
Letter Carriers, New Westminster, Free Transportation *re* Tramways, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2194 (ii).
Mails Delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c. (Ans.) 2372 (ii), 4668 (iii).
Mail Delivery, Free, Conditions *re* (Ans.) 4925 (iii).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ans.) 9538-9 (v).
Mail Service Estimates, Objections *re* passing (remarks) 4297 (iii).
Mail Service in Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails (remarks) on M. for Sup., 9544 (v).
——— (remarks) 8794 (v).
Maritime Mail Service, Delay *re*, Representations by Board of Trade, Halifax (remarks) 2376 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs. Mail, Forwarding of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6071 (iv).
Meteghan Centre Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4296 (iii).
Ministers Speeches, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).
Ministers Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7441 (iv).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).
Montreal Harbour Commissioners' Act Amt. B. 48 (Mr. Brodeur) on Senate Amts., 9534 (v).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Addition to (remarks) 2647 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec (B. 222) 1° m., 9228; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers, &c. (Ans.) 9375 (v).
Naval Service, Medical Examiners for Recruits (Ans.) 8991 (v).
Nelson Postal Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Newspapers, Postal Regulations *re* Distribution of (remarks) 10341 (v).
Newspaper Trains, Special, Cost of Operation (Ans.) 9983 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re* (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
Parcel Post, Express Rates (remarks) 9915, 9937 (v).
Peel County Mail Service (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
——— Rural Mail Delivery, Generally (remarks) 10361 (v).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design (remarks) 7108 (iv).
——— Refusal of Imperial Design (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Postage Stamps, New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ans.) 9990 (v).
——— Prizes, Inspection *re* (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Postmasters' Salaries, Increases to, Classification *re* Offices, &c. (Ans.) 5934 (iv).
——— Pets. *re* Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

LEMIEUX, Hon. R.—*Con.*

Post Office Act (stamp box) Amt. (B. 104) 1° m., 2736 (ii); 2° m., 8065 (v).

Post Office Act (ry. mail clerks) Amt. (B. 216) M. for Com. on Res., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906; in Com., 9567-8, 9577 (v).

Post Office Collections, Revenue in Cities (Ans.) 3862 (ii).

Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ans.) 6667 (iv).

Post Office Matters, Generally (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

Post Office Revenue and Expenditure, Inquiry *re* (Ans.) 10335 (v).

Post Office and Customs, Revenues for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw (Ans.) 4673 (iii).

Pratt's Siding Post Office, Request *re* Establishment (Ans.) 3067 (ii).

Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Sale of (remarks) 7109 (iv).

Railway Mail Clerks, Injuries, &c., Grants *re* (Ans.) 3860 (ii), 9537 (v)

——— Minimum and Maximum Salary, Claims *re* Increase (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

——— Names of Persons not passing Qualifying Examination, Date of Apptmts., &c. (Ans.) 3855 (ii).

See 'Post Office, B. 216, 'Supply.'

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 4005 (iii).

——— Mr. Bryce's Instructions *re* (remarks) 4141 (iii).

——— Denial *re* Annexationist (remarks) 4054 (iii).

'Review of Reviews' Collection of Extra Postage (Ans.) 2371 (ii).

Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

See 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.

Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c. (Ans.) 6505 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Sheldon, C. D., Return to Canada (remarks) 6201 (iv).

Sorel Shipyard, Inquiry for Official Rep., 10203 (v).

Stamp Vending Machine: *See* 'P. O. B., 104.'

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Post Office (clerical assistance) 6063 (iv); (salaries) 4280 (iii).

Immigration (agents) 5185 (iii).

Post Office (Curren, R.C., gratuity) 4283; (letter carriers' boots) 4283 (iii); (mails) 6076; (mail service) 6179; (miscellaneous) 6182 (iv); (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (ry. mail clerks) 4281, 4286 (iii), 6082, 6179; (ry. mail clerks, compensation) 6088 (iv); (rural postmasters) 4281 (iii); (salaries) 6178 (iv); (stamps) 4280; (superannuation) 4285 (iii).

Public Works—Building—Ont. (Athens) 2092 (ii).

Tadousac Postmaster, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ans.) 5133 (iii).

Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9641 (v).

——— *See* 'Cable.'

Thibodeau, Mr. Frank, Salary as Postmaster, &c. (Ans.) 8100 (v).

Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause (Ans.) 3466 (ii).

Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance *re* (Ans.) 3861 (ii).

U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping (remarks) 9248 (v).

Water Carriage of Goods Act Amt. (B. 212) 1°*, 8887; in Com., 9348 (v).

Windsor Letter Carrier, Salary (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H., *Simcoe South.*

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225, (i).

Aliens outside of Canada, Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).

Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9221 (v).

Bank Act, Legislation this Session (remarks) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).

Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3602 (ii).

Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept. (Ques.) 8583 (v).

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ques.) 4304-5 (iii).

——— Place of Residence (Ques.) 5288 (iii).

See 'Christian.'

Big Bay Point Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup, 6005 (iv).

Bookkeeping of Depts., Names of Employees in Departments, &c. (Ques.) 1718 (i).

——— *See* 'Falconer.'

Bradford Channel (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8822; in Com., 9258 (v).

C.P.Ry.. Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1834 (i).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s B. 70 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3063 (ii).

Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8569 (v).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9722 (v).
Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question (remarks) 4567 (iii).
——— *See* 'Beausoleil.'
Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Service from 1896 to the present (M. for ret.*) 1727 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy re, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2224 (ii).
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services (Ques.) 813 (i).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7811 (iv).
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re* (remarks) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Declaration of London. Consideration by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 5935 (iv).
Elevators, Terminals, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3499 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2381 (ii).
Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of (Ques.) 1904 (i).
——— *See* 'Book-keeping.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., Protection (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compention, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9617 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6639 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8655 (v).
Govt. Business, Precedence on Wednesdays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) Ques. of Order, 9523 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G.T.Ry. Pension Fund, Rules, Regulations, &c. (Ques) 2153 (ii).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Agreement *re* reinstatement, &c. (Ques.) 811 (i).
——— Minister's efforts a Success, &c. (Ques.) 810 (i).
——— Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3398 (ii).
——— Status of Men Reinstated (remarks) 3375 (ii).
G.T.P. Ry., Development Co. (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 2666 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*
G. T. P. Ry., Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* (Ques.) 1570 (i).
——— Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost *re* (Ques.) 1493 (i).
——— *See* 'Natl. Transcl. Ry.'
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9305 (v).
Holland Peat Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 4303 (iii).
Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada, Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted, 4298 (iii).
——— Secretariat, &c., on M for Com. on Ways and Means, 7378 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 905 (i).
Judges appointed since 1896, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 8095 (v).
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt., Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties (Ques.) 813 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2899 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3249 (ii).
Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet (Ques.) 4305 (iii).
Ministers, Speeches of, distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9254 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2777 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9241; in Com., 9496 (v).
N.T.Ry., Classification, &c., Arbitration Rep., *re* Investigation (Ques.) 1490 (i).
——— Completion of Eastern Division (Ques.) 1099 (i).
——— Construction Work, Estimated, Quantity, Cost, Bridges, &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).
——— Contracts for Eastern Division, &c., (Ques.) 1095 (i).
——— Contracts Security Deposit, Amount of (Ques.) 1971 (ii).
——— Customs Duties on Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).
——— Defaulting Contractors, Penalties, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
——— Eastern Division, Expenditure *re* 21 Contracts (M. for ret.) 5136 (iii).
——— Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates (Ques.) 2434 (ii).
——— Eastern Division, Section Houses &c (Ques.) 1099 (i).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

N.T.Ry., Eastern Division, Total Cost, to 31st Dec., 1910 inclusive of Quebec Bridge (Ques.) 5130 (iii).

——— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction &c. (Ques.) 9430 (v).

——— Estimated Cost and Mileage of Fencing, &c. (Ques.) 1094 (i).

——— Execution of Work under Contract, Delay *re* (Ques.) 6668 (iv).

——— Expenditure, Difference in Amount in Ret. &c. (Ques.) 4827 (iii).

——— Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg (M. for copy*) 785 (i).

——— Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies (remarks) 8596 (v).

——— Over-Classification, Investigation, Reps. (M. for copy*) 4677 (iii).

——— Over-Classifications, Reduction *re* (remarks) 6272 (iv); 9899, 9995 (v).

——— Provision in Contract *re* G.T.P. taking over completed Sections (Ques.) 1093 (i).

——— Total Cost to complete Construction (Ques.) 5135 (iii).

——— Western Div., Total Cost *re* Construction (Ques.) 7591 (iv).

See "G.T.P. Ry."

Newmarket Canal &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10515 (v).

New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co's B. 170, on M. for Com., 8094 (v).

Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ques.) 5132 (iii).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8348, (amt.) 8350; Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).

P.E.I. Judicial Vacancy, Delay in Apptmt. (remarks) 7431 (iv).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2182 (ii).

Privilege, Ques. of, *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com., 990 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 527, 818 (amt.) 823 (i).

——— Proposed Amendment (notice) 696 (i).

Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c. (M. for ret.°) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii), 7347 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract (M. for copies) 713, 1497 (i), 3068 (ii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys. (Ques.) 697 (i).

——— Amount expended *re* Supervision (remarks) 6671 (iv).

——— Construction, Information *re* (prop. res.) 4319 (iii).

——— Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th, 1903, Transfer of Same to Govt. &c. (M. for ret.*) 785 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret., 4567 (iii).

——— Employment of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection (Ques.) 6663 (iv).

——— Expenditure *re* Investigations, &c. (Ques.) 8102 (v).

——— Financial Loan, Interest, &c. (Ques.) 4665 (iii).

——— Investigation *re* Tunnel Construction (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Plans, Contract, &c. (remarks) 6273 (iv).

——— Plans and Specifications, Approval by Chief Engineer of G.T.Ry. Co. (Ques.) 4826 (iii).

——— Plans and Specifications, Instructions *re* (M. for papers*) 4677 (iii).

——— Remuneration, Supervision, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv). 6670 (iv).

——— Superstructure Contract (remarks) 6670 (iv).

Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8400; in Com., 9314, 9379 (v).

Ry. Act Amt. (1903) c. 31, Proclamation *re* (M. for copy*) 786 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Comission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

Ry. Shelter for Sectionmen (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Provinces and Ry. Commissioners (Ques.) 696 (i).

Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5053 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3681 (ii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Ques. of Order, 7550 (iv).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Globe's Report *re* (remarks) 7602, 7671 (iv).

——— British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* (Ques.) 6268 (iv).

——— Correction *re* Figures in Speech in Hansard, 3770 (ii).

——— Cor. *re*, Inquiry for, 2988 (ii).

——— Denial of Stmnt. *re* Member for East Hastings (Mr. Northrup) 5029 (iii).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

Reciprocity with U.S., Farmers' and Manufacturers' Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt, 4663 (iii).

——— French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty &c. (Ques.) 8097 (v).

——— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9887 (v).

——— Ques. of Order, 5030 (iii).

——— on Ques. of Order *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).

——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5953 (iv).

——— Statistics, Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (remarks) 6858 (iv).

——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order, 6892 (iv).

——— Statistics, Question *re* Vote of Member for Labelle, 6839 (iv).

——— U. S., Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics (remarks) 6673 (iv).

Returns, Delays in Preparation (remarks) 7555 (iv).

——— Inquiry for, 7256 (iv).

——— Notice to Members (remarks) 5939 (iv).

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. ing, &c., (Ques.) 4672 (iii).

Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2650 (ii).

Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decoratting, &c. (Ques.) 1100 (i).

Senate, Reform of, on prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4312 (iii).

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3347 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6223; Quarantine (animals' health) 5976 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Chambly (macadamizing) 6408 (iv).

Canals—Cornwall (enlarging office) 6409 (iv).

Canals—Galops (upper entrance) 6410 (iv).

Canals—Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358; (tugs) 6359 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (arbitrations, &c.) 6427; (surveys, inspections, &c.) 6452 (iv).

Canals—Murray (dredging) 6410 (iv).

Canals—Que. (dredging) 6411 (iv).

Canals—Sault Ste. Marie (lock gates, &c.) 6417; (upper entrance) 6416 (iv).

Canals—Trent (flood damages) 6454; (improvements) 6420 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6399; (stone protection) 6425 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (entrance pier) 6426; (machinery) 6427 (iv).

Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6639; (legal expenses) 6661; (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6197 (iv).

LENNOX, Mr. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3383, 3410; Ques. of Order, 3450 (ii).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752 (v).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8681 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Lunenburg) 1595 (i); Ottawa (McGillivray's contract) 5994 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v).

Railways—G.T.P. (govt. director) 6448 (iv).

Railways—I.C.R. (Fredericton) 5916 (iii); (freight cars) 5985 (iv); (Halifax) 5919; (highways protection) 5917; (Str. Scotia) 5928 (iii); (working expenses) 6341 (iv).

Railways—Miscellaneous (inspections) 6452; (McGill University) 6445; (official cars) 6447; (ry. commissioners) 6427; (remunerations) 6449 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7351 (iv).

Water Carried Freight, Value, &c. (remarks) 6671 (iv).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N., *Huron, West.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 417 (i).

Baggage Smashing Prevention (B. 129) 1° m., 4198 (iii).

Bank Act Amts. (B. 297) 1° m., 8695 (v).

Business of the House, Public Bills for Thursdays (remarks) 2064 (ii).

Canada Shipping Act (registration) Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Brodeur) on M. for 1°, 6116 (iv).

Commercial Agent at Washington (remarks) 9511 (v).

Criminal Code (homicide by hunters) Amt. (B. 40) 1° m., 987 (i).

Daylight Saving (B. 26) 1°*, 663 (i).

Food Supplies in Cold Storage (B. 112) 1° m., 2983 (ii).

Foreign Consuls, Official Status (remarks) 9511 (v).

Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt. (remarks) 1725 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (marking) Amt. (B. 154) 1° m., 6034 (iv).

Load Lines on Ships (B. 98) 1° m., 2063 (ii).

Militia Regulations governing Admission to Militia Dept. (remarks) 1001 (i).

Offensive Weapons (B. 86) 1° m., 1642 (i).

——— Pets. *re* Legislation (Ques.) 3064 (ii).

——— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers *re* (remarks) 2557 (ii).

Ottawa City Health Conditions (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).

Pickford and Black SS. Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re* (Ques.) 4465 (iii).

Poisons (Cocaine) Sales (B. 13) 1° m., 259 (i).

LEWIS, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*

Secret Commissions (B. 87) 1° m., 1646 (i).
Sewage Disposal (B. 122) 1° m., 4039 (iii).
Water for Drinking Purposes (B. 131) 1° m., 4564 (iii).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships (B. 41) 1° m., 988 (i).

LOGGIE, Mr. W. S., *Northumberland, N.B.*

Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10239 (v).
Herring Traps, Close Season *re* (remarks) 2086 (ii).
I.C.R. Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1160 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 863 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S. (remarks) 10084 (v).

LORTIE, Mr. J. A., *Soulanges.*

Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt. &c. (M. for copy*) 1501 (i).
Reciprocity, Vote *re*, Par. in "Le Canada", Ques. of Priv., 3953 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c. (Ques.) 1491 (i).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted (Ques.) 9780 (v).

LOW, Mr. T. A., *Renfrew, South.*

Bankers' Association, Agreement *re* Competition (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5297 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7186 (iv).

MACDONALD, Mr. E. M., *Pictou.*

Address, The, 567 (i).
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change, on M. (Mr. McKenzie) for Cor., 2172 (ii).
British National Songs in N. W. Schools, Remarks of Mr. Armstrong (remarks) 4932 (iii).
C.P.Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c., on Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1856 (i).
Dom. Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c. (Ques.) 9690 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Ques. of Order, 144 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8464 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P. M. G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr Beattie) 4361; (M.) to adjn., Debate, 4364; Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief B. 200 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8975 (v).
Imperial Conference, Secretariat Formation, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7390 (iv).
I. C. R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1159 (i).
——— Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute *re* Granted (Ques.) 2853 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com., 9177 (v).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6527 (iv).
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c. (Ques.) 2854 (ii).
Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8594 (v).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3890 (ii).
Public Works promised during Western Tours (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1632 (i).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5114 (iii).
Reciprocity, Agricultural Implements (remarks) 5745 (iii).

SUPPLY.

Lighthouse and Coast Service ('Earl Grey') 6485 (iv); Postoffice (ry. mail clerks) 4285 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Parrsboro) 1632 (i).

West Indies Trade, Exports and Imports, Total Value (Ans.) 2854 (ii).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C., *Toronto, South.*

American War Vessels, passing through Canadian Canals, Request from Washington *re* (Ques.) 10334 (v).
Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re* (Ques.) 2155 (ii).
See 'Toronto Barracks.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7573 (iv).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Census, Omissions in Enumerations, in Toronto (remarks) 10099 (v).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board, &c., on M. (Mr. Goodeve) 9704 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re* (Ques.) 5134 (iii).
——— Legislation *re* (remarks) 9595 (v).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

Coronation, Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c. (Ques.) 9986 (v).

Curran, R. E., Compensation for Injuries *re* Ry. Mail Service (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenues, &c. (Ques.) 4042 (iii).
See 'Postoffice.'

Dom. Elections Act (deposits) Amt. (B. 37) 1° m., 924 (i).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, &c., Name of Contractor (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Donlands Postoffice, Removal of Site (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff (Ques.) 10196 (v).

Empire Life Insurance Co., of Canada, incorp., (B. 71) 1°*. 1488 (i).

Farm Labourers, O.C., *re* Immigration Regulations from U.S., (remarks) 10099 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res. (Mr Beattie) 4355 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8664 (v).

Garden Seeds purchased for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re* (Ques.) 1717 (i).

Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U. S. and British, Authority *re* (Ques.) 9985 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550 (v).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron as Investigator (Ques.) 2158 (ii).

——— Resolution from Order of Ry. Conductors, (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock (Ques.) 1105 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1421, 1548. 1729, 1761 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re* (Ques.) 2885 (ii).

Hydo-Electric Power Commission, Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re* (remarks) 1574 (i).

Immigrants, Efficient Medical Inspection, &c., (Ques.) 1716 (i).

Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1520 (i).

International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 878 (i); in Com., 9193 (v).

International Waterways Commission, Names of Members, Amounts paid to, &c.. (Ques.) 3861 (ii).

——— Regulations *re* (remarks) 7259 (iv).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*

International Waterways Commission, Inquiry for Ret., 4569 (iii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act (Ques.) 1488 (i).

Levis Dry Dock, Plans Filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c., (Ques.) 712 (i).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re* (Ques.) 9988 (v).

——— Speech of Sir Richard Cartwright (remarks) 9693 (v).

Munderloh and Company Limited Patent Relief (B. 203) 1°*, 8582 (v).

N. T. Ry. and Temiskaming and Northern Ont. Ry., Agreement *re* running Rights, &c., (Ques.) 2435 (ii).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in 'Navy,' (Ques.) 793 (i).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations by U. S. Govt. (Ques.) 2375 (ii).

Orders Discharged (M.) 4464 (iii).

Postoffice Collections. Revenue in Cities, &c., (Ques.) 3862 (ii).

Postoffice and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910 (Ques.) 4673 (iii).
See Customs.

Printing Bureau, Paper purchased, Inspection of (Ques.) 2373 (ii).

Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. (B. 78) 1° m., 1551 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).

Ry. Employees Protection B. 114 (Mr. R. Smith) on M. for 1°, 3219 (ii).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10191 (v).

Railway Mail Clerks, Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c. (Ques.) 3859 (ii).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase. &c., (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Railway Sectionmen, Complaints *re* Overwork, &c. (Ques.) 9987 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9938 (v).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4078 (iii).

———Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10016 (v).

——— North York, Challenge to Contest Riding (remarks) 7220 (iv).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, &c., (remarks) 6791, 6895 (iv).

Roman Catholic Church, Attack *re* by Member, Protest *re*, 3371 (ii).

Steel Bounties. Total Amount paid, &c., (Ques.) 3470 (ii).

Toronto Barracks Site, (Baby Farm) Re Valuations, Cor., &c. (M. for copies*) 981 (i).

MACDONELL, Mr. A. C.—*Con.*
Toronto Barracks Site, (Ques.) 2153 (ii).
——— (remarks) 7557 (iv).
See 'Baby,'
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. (B. 175) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8235, 8535 (v).
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal of (Ques.) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re* and Fair Wage Clause (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specifications (Ques.) 805 (i).
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow (Ques.) 3861 (ii).
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps., O. Cs., &c., (M. for copies*) 1339 (i).
See 'International.'

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F., *York, South.*
Address, The, 98 (i).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
B.C. Ry. Belt and Peace River Water B. 124 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 1°, 4110 (iii).
C. P. Ry., Reduction of Rates, &c. (Amt.) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
——— (remarks) 1573 (i).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2509 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
——— (remarks) 9999 (v).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of (remarks) 1507 (i).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10103 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1425 (i).
Imperial Conference Rep. presented to Parlt., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 10117 (v).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2949 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Mail Service with Allan SS. Co. (remarks) 4428 (iii).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9909 (v).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced, Notice of, 1502 (i).
Ry. Act (commutation tickets) Amt. B. 78 (Mr. Macdonell) on M. for 1°, 1551 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, 5233, (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5246 (iii).

MACLEAN, Mr. W. F.—*Con.*
Railway Rates in the West (remarks) on Address, 104 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2459 (ii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4856 (iii).
——— on Amt. (Mr. Monk) *re* Loyalty, 4062 (iii).
——— Amendments *re*, on Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4125 (iii).
——— Announcement *re*, Treatment of Press Reporters (remarks) 2643 (ii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10020 (v).
——— Notice of Motion, 4049 (iii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties, Information *re* (remarks) 2646 (ii).
——— Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald' (read) 2638 (ii).
Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2654 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2719 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1372 (i).
Telegraph and Cable Service Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9636 (v).

MacNUTT, Mr. T., *Saltcoats.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2398 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7262 (iv).

McCALL, Mr. A., *Norfolk.*
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnstone before Com. on Ag. (remarks) 2993 (ii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8854 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2700 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (enlargement) 6401 (iv).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S., *Calgary.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp, (B. 93) 1°, 1969 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5568, 5630; 3° m., 5252 (iii).
Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.'s (B. 162) 1°*, 6756 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c. (M. for ret.) 2679 (ii)
Dakin, Violet Jane Relief (B. 190) 1°*, 8187 (v).
Elbow and Bow River Water Powers, Applications *re* (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCARTHY, Mr. M. S.—*Con.*
Elbow River, Conserving of Water Flow (M. for cor.*) 1912 (i).
—— Water Power License, Agreements, &c. (M. for copies) 1501 (i).
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Applications *re* (Ques.) 1492 (i).
Langdon Subdivision of C.P.Ry., Mail Service in Northwest (Ques) 1346 (i).
Manitoba and Southwestern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c. (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
N.W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c. (Ques.) 800 (i).
School Lands in Sask. and Alberta, Total Acreage, Revenues from Sales (M. for ret.*) 1911 (i).
—— Revenues from, &c. (Ques.) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal (Ques.) 1345 (i).

McCOIG, Mr. A. B., *Kent West.*
Negro Immigrants, Treatment of (remarks) 5944 (iv).

McCOLL, Mr. J. B., *Northumberland West.*
British Crown Assurance Co.'s (B. 65) 1°*, 1487 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8839 (v).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E., *Saskatoon.*
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 92) 1°*, 1969 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5572 (iii).
British Columbia and Central Canada Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. Smith) in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8581; in Com., (amt.) 8981 (v).
C. P. Ry. (B. 108) 1°*, 2983 (ii).
Canadian Surety Co.'s incorp. (B. 151) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Canada West Loan Corporation Co.'s incorp. (B. 169) 1°* 6906 (iv); in Com., 8563 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3501 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief (B. 144) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation Co.'s incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 3994 (iii).
La Banque du Canada B. 123 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 5776 (iii).
Reciprocity—Saskatchewan Boards of Trade Res. (read) 5751 (iii).
—— Stmnt, of Mr. Shepherd (remarks) 5752 (iii).

McCRANEY, Mr. G. E.—*Con.*
Regina and Moose Jaw Town Sites, C.P.R.'s Interest *re* (Ques.) 2281 (ii).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers (Ques.) 3848 (ii).
Senate, Abolition of, on Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2706 (ii).

McGIVERIN, Mr. H. B., *Ottawa City.*
Address, The, in Ans. to His. Ex.'s Speech (moved) 10 (i).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 46) 1°*, 1069 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (water supply) 2588 (ii).

McKENZIE, Mr. D. D., *Cape Breton North.*
Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change (M. for cor.) 2166 (ii).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081 (iii).
All Red Steamship Route incorp. (B. 105) 1°*, 2827 (ii); in Com., 4239 (iii)
See 'Imperial.'
Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c., (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2226 (ii).
—— and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1061 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2015 (ii).
Imperial Steamship's Co.'s incorp. (B. 105) on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).
I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, (prop. res.) 1106 (i).
See 'All Red.'
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 970 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2547 (ii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2331 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 5014, 5260 (iii).
Reciprocity Debate, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotation, 5410 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1061 (i); Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3434 (ii).
Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 875 (i).

McLEAN, Mr. H. H., *Sunbury & Queen's (N.B.)*

Canada Shipping Act (coal barges) Amt. (B. 118) 1° m., 3664 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Militia (allowance) 8532 (v).

McLEAN, Mr. M. Y., *Huron South.*

Combines Investigation Act, Restraint *re* United Shoe Machinery Co.'s Investigation (remarks) 5953 (iv).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5438 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 7110 (iv).

Reciprocity—Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff (read) 5546 (iii).

Senate of Canada, Reform of (prop. res.) 4306 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6219 (iv); Railways—I.C.R. (freight service) 5988 (iv).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W., *Cape Breton South.*

Alien Labour Law, Emplymt. of Foreign Labour on Public Contracts (remarks) 10374 (v).

Birch Grove, Pet. *re* Mail Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ques.) 4464 (iii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10 (Ques.) 2369 (ii).

Combines Investigation Act, Report *re* (remarks) 1987 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c. (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

Fire Brick, imported into N. S., Number, Ports, &c. (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N. B., (inquiry for ret.) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

——— (remarks) on Ret., 5733 (iii).

Glace Bay Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c. (Ques.) 4044 (iii).

——— Payments to from 1906-10, Dates &c. (Ques.) 3670 (ii).

——— (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).

G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) 5803 (iii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ques.) 2161 (ii).

Hague Arbitration, Atlantic Coast Fisheries (Fundy Bay)on M.(Mr. Jameson) to Com. of Sup., 4618, 4687 (iii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com.. 1441 (i).

MADDIN, Mr. J. W.—*Con.*

I.C.R., Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1127 (i).

McGillivray, Judge, and Conciliation Boards (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4274 (iii).

Naval Service, Medical Examiners *re* Recruits (Ques.) 8991 (v).

North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board (M. for cor.*) 3947 (ii).

——— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board (remarks) 4209 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10550 (v).

Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board Settlements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4262 (iii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1058 (i).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 3401 (ii) 4262 (iii).
Militia (allowance) 8533 (v)
Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8693 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (mails) 6073 (iv); (superanuation *re* clerks) 4284 (iii).

'Wanda' Yacht, Valuation of (remarks) 5627 (iii).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used (Ques.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N. S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ques.) 2160 (ii).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A., *Medicine Hat.*

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s (B. 51) 1°*, 1277 (i).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data &c. (M. for copies) 4677 (iii).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8123 (v).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8607 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7850 (iv).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 874 (i); on M. for 2°, 9101; in Com., 9212 (v).

Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2901 (ii).

Milk River and St. Mary's Boundary: *See* "Long Sault" International Waterways (B. 36).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9321 (v).

Railway Charters, Granting by Parlt., Conditions *re* (remarks) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).

Railway Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5122 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8373 (v).

MAGRATH, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Immigration (agents) 5196 (iii); Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Alta (Lethbridge) 3009 (ii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Application *re* Irrigated Lands Reserve (Ques.) 803 (i).

MAJOR, Mr. C. B., *Labelle.*

Reciprocity—Statistics &c. Hearing of Motion read. Vote *re* 6839 (iv).

MARSHALL, Mr. D., *Elgin East.*

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

——— Post Office Revenue for 1908-1909 &c. (Ques.) 984 (i).

Canned Peas, Number of Cans imported and Amount of Revenue *re* &c. (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Census Appointments for East Elgin, Names &c. (Ques.) 4302 (iii).

Fish Hatchery in East Elgin, Construction *re* (remarks) 5137 (iii).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections &c. (Ques.) 985 (i).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9327 (v).

Railways—Transportation Problem. on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Com. of Sup., 5101 (iii)..

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number &c. (Ques.) 983 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6242; (seeds) 6222; Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (Printing Bureau) 2363 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v).

MARTIN, Mr. A. M., *Wellington North.*

Reciprocity, Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2614 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M., *Montreal, St. Marys.*

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation Reps. *re*, on M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

——— Grantees, Rentals, &c., Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2200 (ii).

Govt. Business, Precedence on Mondays, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Numbers (remarks) 2647 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. M.—*Con.*

Railway Act Amt., (B. 4), 1°*, 148 (i); 2° m., 3943 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2570 (ii).

MARTIN, Mr. W. M., *Regina.*

Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s. (B. 201) 1°*, 8476 (v); 2°m., 8581 (v).

Casualty Co., of Canada, incorp. (B 174) 1°, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8566 (v).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain (prop. res.) 2377 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5456 (iii).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543 (v).

Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief (B. 200) 1°*, 8477 (v); in Com., 8971 (v).

Grant, Maud Gertrude, Relief (B. 138) 1°*., 5619 (iii).

Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malbœuf, (M. for cor.*) 2161 (ii).

High River, Saskatchewan & Hudson Bay Ry. Co''s incorp., (B. 202) 1°* 8582 (v); 2°m., 8642 (v).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7844 (iv).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey Relief (B. 164) 1°*, 6756 (iv).

N. W. Mounted Police, Pay and Allowance &c., (Ques.) 8101 (v).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8589 (v).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Advances, &c., (Ques.) 7245 (iv).

Reciprocity,Fleming Grain Growers Ass'on. Res. (remarks) 5551 (iii).

———Tels. from Saskatchewan Municipalities (read) 5534 (iii).

St. Peter Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) 5883 (iii).

Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., (B. 32) 1°*, 817 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).

SUPPLY—

R. N. W. M. Police (subsistence) 8603 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A., *Portage la Prairie.*

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties (prop. res.) 1915 (i).

——— Resuming Adjnd. Debate (remarks) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).

Austin Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Battleford Public Buildings, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3031 (ii).

Casualty Co., of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8571 (v).

Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4585 (iii).

Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res., (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2401 (ii).

Ennis. D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

Estimates *re* Man., Discussion *re* (remarks) 2970 (ii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, Control of Ry. Rates, &c. (remarks) 1508 (i).

Flags Flying in Canada, on Prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4353 (iii).

Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).

Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10255; 10293 (v).

Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240, 8541 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1429, 1756 (i).

Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6000 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Inquiry for Ret. 6119 (iv).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to. on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2811 (ii).

Minnedosa Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3049 (ii).

Neepawa Post Office, Mail Route, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8351 (v).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, given precedence over new ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Works Building Plans, approved by Depts, previous to Aug. 5th, &c. (Ques.) 698 (i).

Railway Act (animals killed) Amt. (B. 23) 1° m., 529 (i).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9401 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. (remarks) 4498 (iii).

Reciprocity Papers, Comparative Prices, Printing of (remarks) 10469 (v).

MEIGHEN, Mr. A.—*Con.*

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10524 (v).

Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).

——— Refusal of Claims (remarks) 1293 (i).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4730 (iii); Militia (salaries) 1029; Public Works (salaries) 1034 (i).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8683 (v).

Post Office—Outside Service (ry. mail clerks compensation) 6088 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Dresden) 2105; (Gananoque) 2112 (ii); (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2130; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2148; (Peterborough) 2608; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Waterloo) 2634 (ii);

Public Works — Buildings — Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1892 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2972 (ii).

U.S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U.S. Courts, &c. (M. for ret.) 4342 (iii).

MICHAUD, Mr. P., *Victoria, N.B.*

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).

Inspection and Sale Act Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on M. for 2°, 1301 (i).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S., *Grey, North.*

Address, The, on Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 423 (i).

Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop, Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1939 (i).

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).

Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Termination of, Cor. *re* (remarks) 2003, 2271 (ii).

Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).

Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7560 (iv).

Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ques.) 1905 (i).

Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9260 (v).

Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c. (Ques.) 3608 (ii).

Civil Servants and Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1067 (i).

Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9708 (v).

Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to, &c. (Ques.) 1455 (i).

Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 10337 (v).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Combines Investigation at, Charges *re* (Ques.) 663 (i).

Coronation Contingent from Canada, Regulations *re* Apptmts (Ques.) 3220, 3277 (ii).

Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition (remarks) 5737 (iii).

Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2129 (ii).

Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ques.) 2374 (ii).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2191 (ii).

Farmers Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5324 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8217 (v).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9595; Amt. Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Estimated Number surviving, Pensions, &c. (Ques.) 1715 (i).

——— Grants to (Ques.) 1089 (i).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6620 (iv).

Fishery Regulations at Washington, *re* Newfoundland (remarks) 2071 (ii).

See "International".

Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8487 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4364 (iii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8622, 8652, 9346 (v).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8240, 8920 (v).

G.T.R., Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).

Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available, &c. (Ques.) 1907 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1436, 1530, 1741 (i).

Indian Act Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8407 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. 8078 (v)

I.C.R. Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration, Montreal (remarks) 2997 (ii).

International Fisheries Regulations, Ratification of (remarks) 1654 (i).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary water) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9097 (v).

International Railway Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c. (Ques.) 4466 (iii).

Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062 (ii).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c. (Ques.) 9538 (v).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8338 (v).

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6122 (i).

Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. King) in Com., 2532 (ii); on Senate Amts., 8091 (v).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction (Ques.) 10337 (v).

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9316, 9380 (v).

Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U.S., and Can. (remarks) 3054 (ii).

Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9228 (v).

——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).

Ry. Telegraph, &c., Rates, Treaty *re* Control (remarks) 8356 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2465 (ii); in Com. on Res., 4535 (iii).

——— Absence of Ministers during discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).

——— Articles in Press *re* Obstruction (remarks) 9999 (v).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2989 (ii).

——— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5950 (iv).

——— Res. by Associated Boards of Trade, Ont. (read) 4121 (iii).

——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3609 (ii).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, 6797 (iv).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2601 (ii).

Steel Bounties, Renewal of (remarks) 3275 (ii).

Stone, Cut, Duty Between U.S. and Can., Value, &c. (Ques.) 1287 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9087 (v).

Civil Govt., Customs (salaries) 1067; Public Works (salaries) 1041 (i).

Fisheries (fish transportation) 6105 (iv); Ont. (inspectors) 6620 (iv); (overseers) 3819 (ii); (Robichaud, Wm., compensation) 6106 (iv).

Indians—N. W. T. (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6036 (iv).

MIDDLEBRO, Mr. W. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Fergus) 2111; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2136; (Peterborough) 2605 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1688 (i).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c., for 1910 (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H., *Grey, South.*

Address, The, 229 (i).

Adjournment, Extension of Time (remarks) 9566 (v).

Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum (M.) 2365, 2129, 3599 (ii).

——— (M.) to sit during Sessions of the House, 8355 (v).

Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation, &c. (prop. res.) 3922 (ii).

Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).

Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8576 (v).

Companies Act Amt. (B. 7) M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1309 (i).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5354 (iii).

——— on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8227 (v).

——— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2241 (ii).

Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 9346 (v).

Interest Act Amt. (B. 6) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 968; agreed to (Y. 87; N. 24) 975; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510-11; on Order for Com., 1406 (ii).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Res. *re* (remarks) 3059 (ii).

——— Attacks *re* by h. m. (remarks) 3372 (ii).

Minister of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2768 (ii).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 229 (i).

Quebec Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9345 (v).

Race Track Gambling, (M.) to print Evidence, 10467 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., on Com. on Res., 4906, 4937 (iii).

Révillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8580 (v).

Security Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2652 (ii).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2721 (ii).

MILLER, Mr. H. H.—*Con.*

South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3348 (ii).

SUPPLY.

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (animals health) 5978; Ques. of Order, 5964 (iv).

House of Commons (telephones) 6337 (iv).

Miscellaneous—Coronation (members and senators) 8690 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Lambert) 1900 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6434 (iv).

MOLLOY, Mr. J. P., *Provencher.*

Absence from H. of C., Ques. of Priv., 1353 (i).

Continental Fire Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 196) 1°*, 8403; in Com., 8968 (v).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4373 (iii).

Manitoba Radial Ry. Co.'s (B. 148) 1°*, 5726 (iii).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com., on Res., 4183 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5908 (iii).

MONK, Mr. F. D., *Jacques Cartier.*

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie, Post Office Revenues (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

Address, The, 111 (amt.) 133; on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 595 (i).

Address to His Majesty King George, Intention of Govt. *re* (remarks) 7824 (iv).

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220, on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. orders, 9350 (v).

Arthabaska and Drummond Elections, Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).

See 'Drummond.'

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6304, 6324 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re* (M. for cor.) 2214 (ii).

——— (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Beauharnois Canal Grantees, Improvements, Value of Franchise, &c. (Ques.) 1711 (i).

——— Rentals, Sums expended by Govt., &c. (M. for ret.) 2194 (ii).

——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders, &c. (Ques.) 1712 (i).

——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).

Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmts. *re* (Ques.) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).

Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid to, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 655 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Canadian Light and Power Co.'s Plans *re* Improvements (remarks) 7261 (iv).
—— Plans, &c., Date of Approval (Ques.) 7591, 7805 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9265 (v).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c. (M. for cor.) 766 (i).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints, &c. (Ques.) 661 (i).
Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c. (Ques.) 8700 (v).
See 'Ottawa River.'
Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase of by Govt. Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 8992 (v).
Census Enumerators in Man., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9049 (v).
Census Enumerators, Names, Number, &c. (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
Census, Hochelaga Division, Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
Census for Jacques Cartier, Names of Enumerators, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
—— Names of Officers, &c. (Ques.) 9372 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2504 (ii).
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration (Ques.) 8308 (v).
Co-operation Credit (B. 11) 1° m., 194; 2° m., 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of, Inquiry for Papers, 3530 (ii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' Speech of Notary Begin (remarks) 57 (i).
—— on Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Gauvreau's insulting language (remarks) 77 (i).
—— quotations from Speeches, &c., on Address, 125 (i).
Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegation, Rep. *re* (remarks) 3529 (ii).
—— French Edition, Inquiry for, 9075 (v).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ques.) 1489 (i).
Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue, &c. (Ques.) 3854 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, Use of by Americans (Ques.) 7804 (iv).
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices (M. for stmnt.) 944 (i).
G.T.R. Trainmen's Strike, Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).
MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c. (Ques.) 9432 (v).
Hydro-Electric Co., Limited Water Power Lease on Ottawa River (Ques.) 9130 (v).
—— Tenders called, &c. (Ques.) 9352 (v).
Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete, presented to Parlt. (amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).
—— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Rep. (remarks) 9783 (v).
—— Inquiry for Rep., 9690 (v).
—— Precis *re* (remarks) 9694 (v).
—— Premier's Return from, Amount expended (Ques.) 9780 (v).
Imperial Defence Committee Report (M. for copy) 944 (i).
—— Additional Copies (prop. res.) 2215 (ii).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re* (prop. res.) 2927, 2967 (ii).
I. C. R., Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup Terms, &c. (Ques.) 2137, 3853 (ii).
International Naval Conference, Final Protocol, (M. for copy) 3073 (ii).
International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c. (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Crairman, Mr. George Gibbons (remarks) 4741 (iii).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections (Ques.) 1907 (i).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* Priv. and Elections.
'Le Devoir,' Quotations from, *re* Drummond Elections, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 471 (i).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmt., Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.) 771 (i).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns, &c., Conditions *re* (Ques.) 4925 (iii).
Maple Sugar Adulteration, Pet. *re*, Amt. to Foods Act (Ques.) 5131 (iii).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 4636 (iii).
Mergers, Competing Industries, Notice of Discussion, 2736 (ii).
See 'Industrial.'
Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c. (Ques.) 1713 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 45) on M. for 3°, (amt.) 7717, 7560; in Com., 7718 (iv).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Post Office, Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re* (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Mailing and Registering Facilities (Ques.) 1715 (i).
Naval Defence, Govt. Proposals, on Address, 112, (amt.) 133 (i).
Naval Policy of Govt., Conscription *re* (remarks) on Address, 241 (i).
Naval Policy, Amt. to Address, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651; on Amt. (Mr. Borden) to Address, 595 (i).
Naval Service of Can., 'Bristol' Type, Specifications &c. (Ques.) 1279 (i).
—— Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity, &c., per day (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— Construction, Tenders *re* (remarks) 8355 (v).
—— (Ques.) 8700 (v).
—— Expenditure *re* (M. for stmt.*) 786 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret., 4471, 4659 (iii).
—— Names of Employees, Domicile, Duties Assigned, Salaries, &c. (M. for stmnt.) 932 (i).
—— Navy Act, Rules and Regulations (M. for ret.) 1499 (i).
—— (Ques.) 7804 (iv).
—— Navy Regulations, Printing, &c. (Ques.) 4665 (iii).
—— 'Niobe', Contracts *re* Provisions, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe', Date of laying of the Keel, Repairs in England, &c. (Ques.) 793 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Gun Practice, Approximate Cost., &c. (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Loan by Imp. Govt. (Ques.) 983 (i).
—— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Speed, Result of Official Trials (Ques.) 7209 (iv).
—— Par. in 'Naval Annual' *re* Scrapping of Cruisers (remarks) 931 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' Guns, Type of (Ques.) 1490 (i).
—— 'Rainbow' listed as ineffective (remarks) 1070 (i).
—— 'Rainbow,' Struck off Effective List (Ques.) 1081 (i).
—— Recruiting by Postmasters (remarks) 7261 (iv).
—— Ships building for Govt., Par. in 'Ottawa Free Press' (remarks) 866 (i).
—— Total Expenditure since 31st Oct., 1910 (Ques.) 5638 (iii).
Netherland Loan Co., Rep. by Mr. W. T. R. Preston *re* Establishment in Canada (M. for copy) 766 (i).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Netherland Loan Co., (prop. res.) for Com., 781 (i).
—— Cor. between Mr. Preston and Govt. (M. for copies*) 3142 (ii).
—— Further Cor., Reps., &c. (Ques.) 5639 (iii).
—— Inquiry for, 7349 (iv).
—— Statement by W. T. R. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification (Ques.) 2669 (ii).
Ottawa River and Carillon Water Powers, Lease, &c. (M. for cor.*) 9994 (v).
Pecuniary Claims Convention, *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c. (Ques.) 802 (i).
Post Office Act B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 9567, (amt.) in Com., 9568, 9577 (v).
Preston, W. T. R., and Sir Chas. Fitzpatrick: *See* 'Netherland.'
Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. A. Lanctot), on M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com. 7889; (amt.) 7899, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 98) 8030 (v).
—— (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Proportional Representation, (M.) for Sel. Com., 3228 (ii).
Quebec Bridge. British Empire Bridge Co.'s. Deposit, Amount, &c., (Ques.) 9981 (v).
—— Agreement *re* Commission (remarks) 3073 (ii).
—— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to, &c., (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Contract for Reconstruction (remarks) 4740 (iii).
—— Members of Construction Board, (Ques.) 9981 (v).
—— Tenders *re* Carriage Way, &c., (Ques.) 9979 (v).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase of by Govt. (Ques.) 8992 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2456 (ii).
—— in Com. on Res., 3284; (amt.) 3289; Neg. (Y. 72; N. 97) 3292 (ii).
—— (amt.) *re* Loyalty to G. B., 4051 (iii).
—— Answer to Question on Paper (remarks) 4114 (iii).
—— Cor. with American Govt. *re* Champ Clark's Speech, Inquiry for, 3954 (iii).
—— Debate, Resuming of, (remarks) 5939 (iv).
Restigouche Riparian Association B. 176 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 7589 (iv).
Returns, Inquiry for, 2150 (ii).
Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c., (Ques.) 1714 (i).
—— Dredging, Rep. of *re*, on M. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) for Copy. 2163 (ii).

MONK, Mr. F. D.—*Con.*
Riviere des Prairies, Survey, Rep. of Engineer, &c., (M. for ret.) 2161 (ii).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt. (Ques.) 799 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service at public function (remarks) 932 (i).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N. T. Ry., &c., (Ques.) 2851 (ii).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re* (Ques.) 1489 (i); 4666 (iii).
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyard, Charges *re* (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
Ste. Marie Division Postoffice, Defective Site. &c., (Ques.) 10336 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com. 9170 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) 10132 (v).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2731 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, Application *re* Increase of Salary (Ques.) 5404 (iii).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ques.) 4825 (iii).
Sorel Marine Shops, Complaints *re* Theft, &c., (Ques.) 1088 (i).
Sorel Shipyards, Investigation, Instructions to Commissioners, &c.. (Ques.) 7039 (iv).
——— Investigation into Irregularities (remarks) 6758 (iv).
——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation, Inquiry for, 9994, 10096, 10203 (v).
Soulanges Canal, Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration of (remarks) 6273 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que., (Montreal barracks) 3152 (ii).
Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., (Ques.) 1723 (i).
Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor (Ques.) 5133 (iii).
Tobacco Duties of Canada and U. S., (Ques.) 7025 (iv).
——— Leaf Tobacco, Total Imports, &c., for last three years (Ques.) 5405 (iii).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Apptmt. of Mr. Bouley (Ques.) 8993 (v).
Transportation—Georgian Bay as a Waterway (amt.) on M. for Sup., 5137, on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5163 (iii).
Trusts: *See* "Industrial."
Water Powers (conservation) (B. 49) 1° m., 1277 (i).
Water Powers, Conservation of, Legislation *re* (remarks) 7261 (iv).
Water Powers owned by Dom., Legislation Regulating (Ques.) 7803 (iv).

MURPHY, Hon. C., (Secretary of State), *Russell.*
Aliens employed by Govt. living outside of Canada, on Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).
Book-keeping in Depts., Names of Employees, &c., (Ans.) 1718 (i).
'Canada's Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Canned Peas, imported into Canada (Ans.) 3279 (ii).
Civil Service, Appointments from South Grey, on Inquiry for Ret., 2555 (ii).
Civil Servants, filling Municipal Positions, on Inquiry for Ret., 7554 (iv).
Companies' Act Amt. B. 7 (Mr. S Sharpe) on M. for 2°, 1297 (i).
Dom. Steel Co. of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital Stock, &c. (Ans.) 9690 (v).
External Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Stmt., 944 (i).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner, Number of Convictions before (Ans.) 1569 (i).
Ministers, Travelling Expenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 3954, 4568 (iii).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons Imported (Ans.) 1721 (i).
Postoffice Dept., Money Orders, &c. (Ans.) 1101 (i).
Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status (Ans.) 3606 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation, Report (presented) 8 (i).
——— Printing, &c. (M.) 8 (i).
——— Distribution of Evidence (remarks) 1364 (i).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7706, 7729 (iv).
——— Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook (Ans.) 2672 (ii).
——— Money Loss, &c., (Ans.) 794 (i).
——— Number of Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ans.) 709 (i).
——— Paper purchased, Inspection of (Ans.) 2375 (ii).
Public Buildings, Inquiry for Ret., 7348 (iv).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Reciprocity, Canadian Coasting Laws affecting Grain and Hogs (Ans.) 5134 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8093 (v).
'Rexall' Registration by United Drug Co. of U. S. in Canada (Ans.) 4672 (iii).

MURPHY, Hon. C.—*Con.*
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep., (presented) 7 (i).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—External Affairs (salaries) 1472; Secretary of State (salaries) 1472 (i).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, (remarks) 10096 (v).
Yukon Ter. Ordnances (presented) 8 (i).

NANTEL, Mr. W. B., *Terrebonne.*
Address, The, 179 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6312 (iv).
Arthabaska and Drummond Election (remarks) on Address, 179 (i).
Laurier Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure (Ques.) 9982 (v).
Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years (Ques.) 1102 (i).
Naval Service for Can.. Par. in Ottawa 'Journal' *re* Cruiser building, 196 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7988 (v).
Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9427 (v).
Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling, Notice of Motion, 4566 (iii).
Rigaud Postoffice Buildings, Contract *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8130 (v).
Ste. Thérèse Postoffice, Purchase of Site (Ques.), 1715 (i).

NEELY, Mr. D. B., *Humboldt.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. *re* Naval Policy, 325 (i).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., Investigation *re* Management, on Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2403 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer System, *re* Operation, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3488, (amt.) 3491, Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).
Fiscal Policy of Can., Speech of P. M. G. at Manufacturer's Banquet, Montreal (remarks) 2079 (ii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4368 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9517 (v).
Homestead Irregularities, Punishment *re*, on Ques. of Order, 5563 (iii).
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c. (Ques.) 3223 (ii).

NEELY, Mr. D. B.—*Con.*
Privileges, Ques. of, *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan, 5620 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3563 (ii).
SUPPLY.
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5560, 5595 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3007 (ii).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W., *Oxford, North.*
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup.. 6297 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s. incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5081, 5572 (iii).
Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3026 (ii).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4241 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2433, 3604 (ii).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 69) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3182, 3454 (ii).
Conciliation Board, Settlement of Strikes, Ques. of Order, 4267 (iii).
Co-operative Credit Society's B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1311 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission, Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5424 (iii).
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Company's incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8550, 8919 (v).
Grand Trunk Railwaymen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4257 (iii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7856 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8082, 8747 (v).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2596 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3062, 3182 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1232 (i).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024, 3181 (ii).
Milk and Cream shipped in Western Ont., Complaints *re* (remarks) in Com of Sup., 6436 (iv).

NESBITT, Mr. E. W.—*Con.*
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., 7723 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com., 8522; on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster, 8958 (vi).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2337 (ii).
Peoples Ry. Co.'s, (B. 110), 1°*, 2983 (ii); on Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9326, 9390 (v).
Railway Committee (M.) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) 7549 (iv).
—— (remarks) 7627 (iv).
—— British Preference, Increase of (remarks) 7214 (iv).
—— Farmers' Interests, &c., (remarks) 5544 (iii).
Revillon Frères Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8966 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2596, 2649, 3180, (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610, (iv).
Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2703 (ii).
Sheldon. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1390 (i).
South Ontario Pacific Ry. Co.'s (B. 33) 1°*, 817 (i).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238; (seeds) 6219 (iv); Labour Dept., (conciliation board) 4257 (iii).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings, East.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 378 (i).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080, 5570 (iii).
Canada Cement Co.'s (B. 205) 1°*, 8582 (v).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary, &c.. (Ques.) 8582 (v).
External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations (remarks) 1658 (i).
Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission to Investigate, on Amt., (Mr. Henderson) 5363 (iii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of men, Apptmt. of Judge Barron (M. for cor.*) 2376 (ii).
—— Inaction of Labour Dept., (amt.) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
—— (M. for cor.*) 786 (i).

NORTHRUP, Mr. W. B., *Hastings East.*
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1077 (i).
—— Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4248 (iii).
Lymburner Contracts with Govt. (remarks) in Com of Sup., 3206 (ii).
Matches, Phosphorus, Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2041 (ii).
Printing Bureau Investigation (M.) for Royal Commission 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).
—— Evidence under Oath, Printing, Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook (Ques.) 2672 (ii).
Private Bills, Second Readings and in Com. (remarks) 8641 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Investigations *re* River Bed, Tests, &c. (Ques.) 658 (i).
Ry. Act (telegraphs) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) on M. for 1°, 8402 (v).
Rainbow' and 'Niobe', Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c. (Ques.) 792 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4861 (iii).
Reciprocity, Denial of Statement of Member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) Ques. of Priv., 5035 (iii).
—— Quotation by Member for Cape Breton (Ques. of priv.) 5293, 5407 (iii).
Reciprocity, Letter of 'Globe' Reporter, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7677 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 4248 (iii).
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c. (Ques.) 2672 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F. (Minister of the Interior), *Edmonton.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5083, 5568 (iii).
Algoma Timber Permits, Amount of Dues paid (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Aylwin Irrigation Grant, Papers *re*, on Inquiry for, 8192, 9076 (v).
Bear Indian Reserve, Medical Officer, Payments to (Ans.) 3224 (ii).
Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence (Ans.) 5289 (iii).
Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits to cut Timber, Agent's Name, &c. (Ans.) 4304-5 (iii).
See 'Christian.'
Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ans.) 3464 (ii).
Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead (Ans.) 3221 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Bidwell Bay, B.C. Govt. Land Reserve, Disposition of (Ans.) 1284 (i).
B.C.Ry. Belt and Peace River Water (B. 124) 1° m., 4110 (iii).
See 'Homestead Regulations,' &c.
Bradley, Mr. John, Irregularity *re* Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5585 (iii).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5191 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8326 (v).
—— (personal explanation) 8387 (v).
—— (remarks) 8092 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com. 8566 (v).
Chacastapsin Indian Reserve, Owner &c. (Ans.) 4301 (iii).
Chinese Immigration Act Amt. (B. 147) 1°*, 5726 (iii); in Com., 7869 (iv).
Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question (remarks) 4568 (iii).
See 'Beausoleil.'
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases to (Ans.) 5291 (iii).
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 8309 (v).
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S. (remarks) 4471 (iii).
See 'Negroes.'
Courtice, Mr., Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau (stmnt.) 9897 (v).
Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent (Ans.) 4828 (iii).
Dominion Lands Act (school lands) Amt. (B. 107) 1° m., 2851 (ii); (M.) to discharge order for 2°, 8088 (v).
—— (B. 194) 1° m., 8187 (v).
Dom. Lands Act Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1982 (i), 8087 (v).
Dominion Lands, Sask., Gross Receipts, Cost of Administration, &c. (Ans.) 3221 (ii).
Se 'Saskatchewan,' &c.
Elbow and Bow River Water Powers, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1345 (i).
Elevators, Terminals, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3512 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8113 (v).
Ennis, N. D., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses (Ans.) 3847 (ii).
Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Cor., 2189 (ii).
—— Stmt. *re*, 2263 (ii).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*
Farm Labourers from U. S., O. C. Regulations *re* Immigration (remarks) 10099 (v).
Forests Reserves and Parks (B. 85) 1° m., 1640 (i); in Com., 8084, 8606, 8652, 9345 (v).
Garden Seeds purchased for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1717 (i).
Graham, Mr. D., Apptmt. as Indian Agent (Ans.) 5291 (iii).
Grain Act (standards) Amt. (B. 209) 1°*, 8887, 2° m., 9512 (v).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve on Homestead Lands (Ans.) 3466 (ii).
—— Number of Acres sold to, Price, &c. (Ans.) 2366 (ii).
Grazing Leases in Foothills, Applications *re* (Ans.) 1492 (i).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, &c. (Ans.) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908 in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23 (Ans.) 4112 (iii).
Homesteads, Pre-emptions and Purchased, Total Acreage, &c. (Ans.) 812 (i).
Homestead Regulations in B. C., Application *re* Ry. Belt, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2857 (ii).
See 'B. C. Ry. Belt,' 'Indian Reserve,' &c.
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage Available (Ans.) 1907 (i).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* (Ans.) 1284 (i).
Hope Suburban Townsite, Date of Payment of Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* (Ans.) 3068 (ii).
—— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval of Govt. (Ans.) 3846 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund (Ans.) 796 (i).
Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination (Ans.) 814 (i).
—— Number from G. B., and U. S., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c. (Ans.) 808 (i).
Immigration Act Amt. (B. 47) 1° m., 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 2005 (ii).
Immigration Agents, Total Amount of Commissions paid (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
Immigration, Amount expended in Belgium and France (Ans.) 9991 (v).
—— Amount expended in U. S. (Ans.) 9991 (v).
—— Bonus paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c. (Ans.) 2436 (ii).
—— Commissions to Agents for Western Canada (Ans.) 9991 (v).
—— Efficient Medical Inspection (Ans.) 1716 (i).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Immigration, Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910 (Ans.) 4300 (iii).

——— Immigration into Eastern Canada (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

——— Money Qualification, *re* Operation of Act (remarks) 151 (i).

——— Number received from Europe, Amount expended, &c. (Ans.) 809 (i).

——— Number since 31st March last to the present, on M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1498 (i).

——— Organization, Cor. with Miss Wileman (remarks) 9376 (v).

——— Premiums paid by Can. Govt. for 1910-11 (Ans.) 9991 (v).

——— Statistics, Publishing of (remarks) 2366; (stmt.) 2557 (ii).

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. (B. 177) 2° m., 7825; in Com., 7846 (iv), 8406; 3° m., 8104, 8193, 8403 (v).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).

Indian Reserve Lands outside of Ry. Belt, B. C., Jurisdiction *re* (Ans.) 2678 (ii).
See 'B. C.'

Indian Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re* (Ans.) 1910 (i).

International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9123 (v).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians, &c. (Ans.) 1083 (i).

Japan and Canada Trade Relations, in Com. on Res., 9487 (v).

Japaneese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications (Ans.) 791 (i).

Land Patents for S. E. ¼ of Section 6, Tp, 7, Issue of (Ans.) 5834 (iii).

Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5605 (iii).

McGillicuddy Charges: *See* 'Can. Northern.'

Man. Swamp Lands, Concession to Prov. (remarks) 6759 (iv).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B. (remarks) 9376 (v).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of into N. W. (remarks) 5912 (iii).

——— Restrictions *re* (remarks) 5944, 6524 (iv).
See 'Colored Aliens.'

New Westminster, Govt. Land Grants issued, &c., (Ans.) 1291 (i).

Northern Ontario, Settlement of, Govt. Assistance (remarks) 6767 (iv).

Obabikong and Sabikong Indian Reserves, Tenders *re* burned Timber (Ans.) 1344 (i).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8590 (v).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

Ry. Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9419 (v).

Railway Committee, on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10192 (v).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Sites, C.P.R.'s Interest, &c. (Ans.) 3281 (ii).

Ruddick, R. F.. Application *re* Homestead (Ans.) 3279 (ii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions, &c., to Rev. J. McDougall, on M. (Mr. Bradbury) for Copies, 1292 (i).

——— Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5865 (iii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Amount of Sales, Expenses. &c., (Ans.) 787 (i).

——— Cor. *re* Original Documents (remarks) 8111 (v).

——— Investigation by Rev. J. McDougall, &c., (Ans.) 787 (i).

——— Moneys paid Govt., Complaints, &c., (Ans.) 1974 (ii).

——— Original Documents before Royal Commission (stmnt.) 8477 (v).

——— Original Documents, &c., (remarks) 8192 (v).

——— (remarks) 8356 (v).

——— Rep. in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech, Ques. of Priv., 3840 (ii).

——— Request for Official Documents (remarks) 9899 (v).

School Lands in Man., Sask., and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal (Ans.) 1345 (i).

——— Procedure *re* Disposal (Ans.) 800 (i).

——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c. (Ans.) 1489, 1908 (i).
See 'Dom. Lands Act.'

Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers, on M. (Mr. Meighen) 10133 (v).

——— Refusal of Claims, &c. (Ans.) 1294 (i).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amounts still owing by Farmers (Ans.) 3848 (ii).

——— Amount *re* (Ans.) 3225 (ii).

Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. of (Ans.) 6272 (iv).

Songhees Indian Reserve (B. 179) in Com. on Res., 7248; in Com., 7824-5 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Civil Govt.—Indians (contingencies) 4726; (salaries) 4725; Interior (clerical assistance) 4739; (salaries) 4726 (iii).

Dom. Lands—(Banff water works) 6052; (buffalo) 6049; (forestry convention) 6052; (parks) 6049 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5165 (iii); (seed grain) 3836 (ii), 6047 (iv).

Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8884 (v); N.W.T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046; (payments to Rev. J. Semmens) 6036; N.S. (medical attendance) 6036; Que. (medical attendance) 6035 (iv).

OLIVER, Hon. F.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Interior (boundary surveys) 9546 (v); (Dom. lands, homesteads) 5553. 5581 (iii); (Dom. lands, surveys) 9547 (v); (immigration agents) 4729 (iii); (seed grain) 9551; (water investigations) 9550 (v).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept. (Ans.) 1723 (i).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Lands reserved, &c. (Ans.) 803 (i).

Timber Berths in B.C., Removal of from Hall's Prairie (Ans.) 3282 (ii).

Timber Lands, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ans.) 3222 (ii).

Water Powers Conservation B. 49 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 1°, 1278 (i).

Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ans.) 799, 1284 (i).

Winnipeg River Water Powers, &c., on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (ii).

Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal of, in Com. on Res., 1977 (ii).

OSLER, Mr. E. B., *Toronto West.*

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) on M. for 2°, 1302; in Com., 1303 (i).

Farmers' Bank Proceedings, Stmnt. *re* Warning to Fin. Minister (remarks) 10472 (v).

Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10517 (v).

OWEN, Mr. C. L., *Northumberland East (O.)*

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1655 (i).

Census Enumerators, Inaccuracies in Quebec (remarks) 7217 (iv).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal (remarks) 4824 (iii).

Fish Preservation in Trent River, Action of Govt. (remarks) 1503 (i).

Homestead Applications in New Westminster Districts, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1237 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to refer Aud. Gen.'s Rep., 845 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com. on Ways and Means, 2449 (ii).

—— Opposition to in Riding, Ques. of Priv., 6767 (iv).

—— Ques. of Priv. *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

OWEN, Mr. C. L.—*Con.*

—— Tel. of Senator Cummins, *re* Manufactured Products (remarks) 4115 (iii).

Supply for Public Works, &c. (remarks) 10354 (v).

Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7349 (iv), 9252 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E., *L'Islet.*

Address, The, 197 (i).

Agriculture, Govt Aid to, on Amt (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6287 (iv).

Archives Dept., Commission of Historical Work, Care of Documents, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

—— Names of Staff (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Census Commissioner, French Apptmt. (Ques.) 2155 (ii).

Cold Storage Depots during 1907-10, Total Amounts paid (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters (Ques.) 1080 (i).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer (Ques.) 799 (i).

Exhibition Grants, Subsides paid *re* (Ques.) 2437 (ii).

Fisheries Service, Control by Federal Govt. (Ques.) 983 (i).

—— Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 805 (i).

Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4378 (iii).

Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplmt. by Govt., fined for Electoral Corruption (Ques.) 2673 (ii).

Immigration, Amount expended in Belgium and France (Ques.) 9990 (v).

—— Amount expended in U.S. (Ques.) 9991 (v).

—— Commission to Agents in Western Canada (Ques.) 9991 (v).

—— Number received from Europe, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 809 (i).

—— Number from G.B., U.S., &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c. (Ques.) 807 (i).

—— Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11 (Ques.) 9991 (v).

I.C.R. Mail Clerks allowing friends to travel in mail cars (Ques.) 8584 (v).

Naval Bill, Govt. Policy *re* (remarks) on Address, 197 (i).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c. (Ques.) 8585 (v).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11 (Ques.) 8584 (v).

PAQUET, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 8584 (v).
——— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c. (Ques.) 8789 (v).
——— Pet. *re* Annex, &c. (Ques.) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ques.) 8585 (v).
Paper Imports into U.S., Value, &c. (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure (M. for ret.*) 7602 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 8019 (v).
——— Ques. of Order, 8010 (v).
Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of (Ques.) 2674 (ii).
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c. (Ques.) 2851 (ii).
——— Members *re* (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Railway Commission, Aptmt. of French Canadian (Ques.) 1103 (i).
SUPPLY—
Immigration (agents) 5182 (iii).
Trade Commissioners for Can., Names of Countries, &c. (Ques.) 2156 (ii).

PARDEE, Mr. F. F., *Lambton, West.*
Currie, Wm. Francis Relief (B. 215) 1°*, 8955 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 42) 1°*, 1069 (i).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7836 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2959 (ii).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1518 (i).
Ontario, Michigan Ry. Co.'s (B. 168) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Railway Locomotive Boiler Inspection (B. 30) 1° m., 699 (i).
SUPPLY—
Fisheries (overseers) 3810; Public Works —Buildings, Ont. (Brantford) 2098 (ii).
U.S. Immigration Officers residing in Can., &c. (Ques.) 1723 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. W. (Minister of Customs), *Brant.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 346 (i).
Agricultural Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 1350 (i).
——— Complaints *re* Manipulation of Duties &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Agricultural Products imported into B.C. from U.S., Australia, &c. (Ans.) 7345 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U.S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 9992 (v).
Agricultural Products imported into Canada, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 5402 (iii).
Beef, Pork, &c., Quantity imported from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911 (Ans.) 6265 (iv).
Bounded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c. (Ans.) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Number imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10 (Ans.) 2370 (ii).
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported into Canada, Weight, Value, &c. (Ans.) 4927 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada for Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ans.) 4671 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table, 6177 (iv.)
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Officials (Ans.) 4672 (iii).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Canned Peas, Amount imported, Revenue received (Ans.) 3221 (ii).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. (B. 208) M. for Com. on Res., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8715 (v).
Coal and Coke, Quantity, Value imported into Canada from U.S. (Ans.) 4674 (iii).
Coal imported from U.S. into Ont., Value of Duties (Ans.) 4041 (iii).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re* (Ans.) 4675 (iii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity (Ans.) 7025 (iv).
Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1910 and 1896 (Ans.) 801 (i).
Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c. (Ans.) 985 (i), 4042 (iii).
Customs, Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Customs Entries at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co., &c., on M. (Mr. Barnard) for Copies, 713 (i).
Customs Free Entry of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ans.) 804 (i).
Customs Goods entered free at Vancouver by Kelly & Co., on M. (Mr. Bernard) for Copies, 932 (i).
Customs Preventive Officers, Duties, &c. (Ans.) 2161 (ii).
Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity, Value, &c. of Importation from U.S. (Ans.) 9362 (v).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ans.) 6268 (iv).
Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value on Articles in Schedules of Customs Act, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Ret., 1105 (i).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries (Ans.), 4467 (iii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks), 8116-18 (v).
Exports and Imports, Quantity and Value to Australia, Japan, &c. (Ans.), 9369 (v).
Farm and Garden Products, Imports, Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.), 7034 (iv).
Farm Products entered at Windsor, (Ans.), 7597 (iv).
——— exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8701 (v).
Farm Products imported from U. S. into Kingston, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 3668 (ii).
Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U. S. (Ans.) 7026 (iv).
Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U. S. (Ans.) 1496 (i).
Fire Bricks imported into N. S., Number, &c. (Ans.) 3471 (ii).
Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty (Ans.) 2886 (ii).
Govt. Officials in Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1058 (i).
——— *See* "Mercier."
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c. (Ans.) 794 (i).
Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount (Ans.) 2161 (ii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value, &c. (Ans.) 8984 (v).
Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 5634 (iii).
Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid, &c. (Ans.) 3470 (ii).
Loans in 1909, 1910, Negotiations *re*, &c. (Ans.) 797 (i).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal of (Ans.) 4302 (iii).
Mercier, Mr. George, Customs Official, Member of Town Council (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Mica Exports 1900 to 1910 (Ans.) 5290 (iii).
Mica Imports, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4827 (iii).
Milk and Cream, Quantity exported (Ans.) 6269 (iv).
——— Exports to U. S. for March and April, 1911 (Ans.) 8790 (v).
——— Exports to U. S. for 1910-11, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 7038 (iv).
N. T. Ry., Customs Duties on Supplies, &c. (Ans.) 8583 (v.)
Newfoundland Export Trade, Imports, &c. Total Value (Ans.) 2854 (ii).
Nicolet Customs Collections from 1906-11 (Ans.) 8584 (v).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Oshawa Customs Collector, Resignation of Mr. G. F. Blamey (Ans.) 3225 (ii).
Paper Imports into U. S., Value of (Ans.) 2674 (ii).
Pig Iron imported for Steel Rail Mills, Quantity, &c. (Ans.) 4829 (iii).
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c. (Ans.) 3223 (ii).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections (Ans.) 985 (i).
Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910 (Ans.) 6271 (iv).
Pulp Wood, Exports to the U. S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 2674 (ii).
——— Corrected Answer, 5126 (iii).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 3316 (ii).
——— Absence of Ministers during discussion (remarks) 8365 (v).
——— Dairymen's Ass'cn. of Ont., (remarks) 4570 (iii).
——— French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c. (Ans.) 8098 (v).
——— Inquiry for Pets, &c. (Mr. Bradbury) 3058 (ii).
——— Oleomargarine, Admission of (Ans.) 6668; (remarks) 6504 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order *re*, 4137 (iii).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6889 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6820 (iv).
——— Statistics from Trade and Commerce Dept., Reply of Dep. Min. (remarks) 6511 (iv).
——— Summerland 'Review,' Editorial *re* Fruit Growers (read) 4123 (iii).
Shafting imported since April, 1910, Quantity and Value, &c. (Ans.) 7594 (iv).
Sheep, Lambs, Horses, &c., imported or admitted into Canada, &c. (Ans.) 8988 (v).
Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c. (Ans.) 4467 (iii).
Sinking Funds, Legal Amounts required, Bounties paid, &c. (Ans.) 982 (i).
Stone Cut, Duty between Can. and U. S., Value, &c. (Ans.) 1288 (i).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1048 (i)., 5992 (iv).; Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008 (ii).
Tobacco, Duties on Imports and Exports to U. S. (Ans.) 7025 (iv).
Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years (Ans.) 5405 (iii).
'Wanda,' Yacht, Date of Entry at Customs Port in Canada, Notice *re* (Ans.) 5934 (iv).

PATERSON, Hon. W.—*Con.*
'Wanda' Yacht, Ques. of Priv., 5623 (iii).
West Indies Trade, Exports and Imports, Total Value, &c. (Ans.) 2854 (ii).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise, &c. (Ans.) 7601 (iv).
Wolfe Island Custom Official, Apptmt., &c. (Ans.) 8100 (v).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H., *Argenteuil.*
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. orders, 9350 (v).
Bank Act. Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9340 (v).
British Development Ry. Co.'s incorp, B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9274 (v).
Census, Omissions in Enumeration (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9711 (v).
Census Taking, System *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4340 (iii).
Civil Servants and Municipal Offices. Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2222 (ii).
Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9710 (v).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1310 (i).
Coronation Celebration at Ottawa, Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10354 (v).
Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Moneys used, &c. (personal explanation) 196 (i).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8124 (v).
Estimates, Mail Service, Objection *re* passing, 4296 (iii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8472 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada and P. M. G.'s Speech in Montreal (remarks) 2266 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8606, 8669, 9346 (v).
Franking for Fraudulent Purposes (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of (Ques.) 930 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4224 (iii).
Indian Reserve Lands outside of Ry. Belt, B. C., Jurisdiction *re* (Ques.) 2678 (ii).
I. C. R., Excursion Rates *re* Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, &c. (Ques.) 1347 (i).
——— (remarks) 2996 (ii).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3061 (ii).
Montreal Legal Firms, Answer to Question, (remarks) 1012 (i).
Mounted Police—Death of Inspectors on Northern Patrol (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
N. T. Ry., Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, Contracts, &c. (Ques.) 1099 (i).
Naval Dept., Boot Contract, Tenders, Patterns, &c. *re* (Ques.) 2675 (ii).
'Niobe' Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re* (remarks) 530 (i).
Nominingue Postoffice Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2335 (ii).
Postmasters' Salaries (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6065 (iv).
Postoffice Act (stamp vending machines) Amt. B. 104 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 2°, 8069 (v).
Privileges and Elections Com., (A. Lanctot) 3rd Rep. of Com. (remarks) 6756 (iv).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties, *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Inquiry for Rets., 4567 (iii).
Public Works Supply, Objection *re* Full Vote, 9555 (v).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9345 (v).
Questions and Answers, Orally and Written (remarks) 989 (i).
Ques. of Priv., Riordon Paper Co., Cor. *re* Connection with, 10197 (v).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3943 ; in Com., 3947 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Can., 6769; Amt. Neg. (Y. 64; N 98) 6837 (iv).
——— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U.S. (Ques.) 4468 (iii).
——— Butter and Eggs Prices in London, Information *re* by Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6508 (iv).
——— Negotiations at Washington, Reported Draft of Proposals (remarks) 2065 (ii).
——— U.S. Trade Statistics, Inquiry for, 6675 (iv).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Question *re* hearing Motion Read, 6839 (iv).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c. (Ques.) 3608 (ii).
Ste. Marie de Monnoir Post Office (remarks) in Com of Sup., 1698 (i).

PERLEY, Mr. G. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 9082 (v).

Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Aud. Gen. (salaries) 1485 (i); Post Office (clerical assistance) 6065 (iv).

Fisheries (Robichaud, Wm. compensation) 6106 (iv).

Geological Survey (explorations) 9551 (v).

Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9548 (v).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Cuba) 8777; (Canada and Mexico) 8782; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8784; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788 (v).

Militia (allowances) 8533 (v)

Miscellaneous — (Coronation decorations) 9565; (coronation trip, members and senators) 8681 (v).

Mounted Police (pay of force) 8598; (subsistence) 8602 (v)

Public Works—Buildings, N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Hartland) 1619; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624 (i).

Public Works—Buildings, N.S. (Parrsboro) 1629 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2619 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (generally, repairs) 1675; (Lévis armoury) 1679; (Maisonneuve) 1692; (Marieville) 1698; (Quebec custom house) 1885; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (Three Rivers) 1902; (Westmount) 1903 (i).

Railways—I.C.R. (Halifax docks) 9561; (highway protection) 9560 (v).

PICKUP, Mr. S. W. W., *Annapolis.*

Dominion Atlantic Ry. Co.'s (B. 53) 1°*, 1277 (i).

SUPPLY—

Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8769 (v).

PORTER, Mr. E. G., *Hastings, West.*

Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Public Building, Draping for His Maj.'s Death (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board, incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7565 (iv).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8850; in Com., 9268 (v).

Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7818 (iv).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5321, 5487 (iii).

Fisheries Appointments, Inquiry for Ret. 5836 (iii).

PORTER, Mr. E. G.—*Con.*

Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 7829 (iv).

N. T. Ry. Contractors and Labour Conditions (remarks) 8597 (v).

Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidies, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8336 (v).

Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c (Ques.) 6157 (iv).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages *re* Fires (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8590 (v).

Port Credit Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7712 7771 (iv).

Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9318, 9381 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9745 (v).

——— on Ques. of Order, referring to previous debate, 8258 (v).

——— Res. from Trent River Paper Co. (read) 4117 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, Quarantine, &c (animals health) 5962; (dairying) 6244 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8768; (Canada and Cuba) 8776 (v).

Mounted Police (subsistence) 8599 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers) 6027; (quarantine stations) 6027; (draping buildings) 6026 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Belleville drill hall) 6033; Ottawa (heating, &c.) 6027 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (L'Ardoise) 6029; Margaree) 6029; Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

PRICE, Mr. W., *Quebec West.*

Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c. (Ques.) 9988 (v).

Freight Car Service, I.C.R. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Quebec Bridge, Contract, Plans, &c. (remarks) 7103 (iv).

Reciprocity, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6820 (iv).

——— (remarks) 6894 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Marieville) 1697 (i); Railways—I.C.R. (freight car service) 5983 (iv).

PROULX, Mr. E., *Prescott.*

Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions Heard, Travelling Expenses, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

PROULX, Mr. E.—*Con.*
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge (remarks) *re* Answer to Questions, 4227 (iii).
Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 497 (i).

PROWSE, Mr. L. E., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3901 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W. (Minister of Public Works), *St. John City and County.*
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5568 (iii).
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).
Armouries, &c., in Canada, on Inquiry for Ret., 1461 (i).
Assiniboine River Improvements (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7470 (iv).
Bathurst, N.B., Dredging, Total Quantity and Cost (Ans.) 803, 1285 (i).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3005 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3030 (ii).
Beauharnois Canal, Grantees, Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2201 (ii).
Belleville Docking Facilities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6012 (iv).
Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).
Breakwaters in Digby County, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 657 (i).
Brighton Wharf, Vote *re* (remarks) 1657 (i).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1683 (i).
Bronte Harbour Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6303 (iv).
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ans.) 7341 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Questions, 7349 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7561 (iv).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c. (Ans.) 1905 (i).
Canadian Light and Power Co., Date of Approval of Plans, &c. (Ans.) 7591, 7806 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8840; in Com., 9265 (v).
Canada West Loan Corporation incorp. B. 169 (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8564 (v).
Carman Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3020 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Carrier-Lainé Public Works, Purchase of, &c. (Ans.) 8892 (v).
Casualty Co. of Canada incorp. B. 174 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 8566 (v).
Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction (Ans.) 8984 (v).
Chatham, N.B., Public Buildings, Purchase of Site, Names of Owners (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, &c. (Ans.) 10337 (v).
—— Subsidy (prop. res.) 9244 (v).
Coronation Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers (Ans.) 9990 (v).
—— Invitation to Ministers (remarks) 10353 (v).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for current year (Ans.) 814 (i).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2116 (ii).
Drill Halls in Man., Cost of (Ans.) 1975 (ii).
Dry Dock at Quebec, Construction *re*, &c. (Ans.) 9988 (v).
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by "International", on M. (Mr. S. Sharpe) for Ret., 1498 (i).
Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts to (Ans.) 813 (i).
Ellis, J. A. & Ottawa Lighting Contracts: *See* 'Woods.'
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Dept., (remarks) 2994 (ii).
—— *See* 'Public Works,' &c.
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Number of Buildings decorated at Govt. Expense (Ans.) 4667 (iii).
—— Authority of Govt. *re* Decorations of Govt. Buildings (Ans.) 925 (i).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4350 (iii).
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders *re* (remarks) 2648, 3671 (ii), 4724 (iii).
—— Names of Days ordered by Dept., 4382 (iii).
See 'St. George's.'
Fredericton Pavement (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
French River Dam (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re* (Ans.) 1489 (i).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10248 (v).
Georgetown Govt. Buildings, Drainage *re* (Ars.) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup, 5157 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8543, 8917 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Grand Bend, Right of Way, Purchase of (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. &c. (Ans.) 9371 (v).
See 'St. John Valley Ry.'
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Reinstatement of Men (remarks) 1507 (i).
G.T.P. Developing Co., Land purchased from (Ans.) 2666 (ii).
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 7806 (iv).
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of (Ans.) 930 (i).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer to Question, 4225 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1543, 1778 (i).
House of Commons, Ottawa, Water supplied to (statement) 2553 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4480 (iii).
——— Rep. of Agriculture Dept. (read) 5401 (iii).
——— *See* 'Smallpox,' 'Typhoid.'
——— Ventilation in House of Commons (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4480 (iii).
——— *See* 'Ottawa,' 'Typhoid.'
Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation incorp. B. 56 (Mr. Knowles) in Com., 3994 (iii).
Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re* (Ans.) 2885 (ii).
——— Obstruction to Navigation (Ans.) 5403 (iii).
Hydro Electric Power, Connection across McGann Property (remarks) 1598 (i).
Imperial Realty Co.. *See* 'Woods Building.'
Imperial Steamship's Co.'s incorp., B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Interest Act (Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 979, 1524 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (B. 36) in Com. on Res., 867; 1°* of B., 923 (i); 2° m. 9091, (amts.) 9094; on M. for 2°, 9139; in Com., 9156, 9183 (v).
See 'Waterways' 'Long Sault.'
——— Ques. of Order in Com., 9180 (v).
International Waterways Commission (Lake Erie) Rep. (presented) 924 (i).
See 'Waterways' 'Long Sault.'
Jardine, Mr. John, Payment by Govt. in excess of Work (Ans.) 4670, 5405 (iii).
Jesus River Improvements, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 804 (i).
King, Dr., Cost of Residence at Experimental Farm (Ans.) 804 (i).
——— Rental *re* (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Kingston Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 7805 (iv).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv)
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re* (remarks) 4222 (iii).
Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Levis Dry Dock, Plans filed, Subsidy, &c. (Ans.) 713 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2909 (ii).
——— (remarks) on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3234 (ii).
——— *See* 'International B. 36.'
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Lunenburg Tower Clock, Specifications *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2578 (ii).
——— Stmt. of Chief Architect (read) 2360 (ii).
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re* (Ans.) 2158 (ii).
McClary Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3389 (ii).
Marieville Postoffice, Purchase of Site (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c. (Ans.) 1348 (i).
Meteghan Landing Place, Rep. *re* Defective Condition (Ans.) 4044 (iii).
Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
Milton Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1872 (i).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses, on M. for Com. of Ways and Means, 7440 (iv).
See 'Public Works.'
Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site *re* (Ans.) 9993 (v).
——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3049 (ii).
Monetteville Cut, Lake Nipissing, Total Expenditure (Ans.) 1495 (i).
Montreal Postoffice, Electrical Fixtures, Drawings, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
——— Mailing and Registering Facilities (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Napanee River Dredging, Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).
——— (remarks) 4050 (iii).
Negro Immigrants, Prohibition of (remarks) 5913 (iii).
New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1283 (i).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 8642; on Amt., 8956; on M. for 3°, 8963 (v).
Niagara River Water Power, Regulations, &c. (stmnt.) 8890 (v).
——— *See* 'International B. 36.'
Nicolet Military Accommodation (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Nicolet Post Office, Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c. (Ans.) 8789 (v).
——— Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 8584 (v).
——— Pet. *re* Annex (Ans.) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re* (Ans.) 8585 (v).
Nominingue Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ans.) 2435 (ii).
Ottallie Creek Public Works, N.B., Construction, &c. (Ans.) 1287 (i).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2275 (ii).
——— New Leases, &c. (Ans.) 1281 (i).
——— *See* 'Victoria Museum.'
——— Parliament Grounds, Water Supply, &c. (remarks) 2583 (ii); 7346 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
——— Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement *re* Installation (Ans.) 1350 (i).
——— Sussex Street, Deptl. Block, Plans laid on Table, 4824 (iii).
——— Sussex St. Govt. Properties, Names of Owners, &c. (Ans.) 6666 (iv).
Ottawa Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted (Ans.) 1280 (i).
——— *See* 'Woods Building, &c.'
Ottawa City Sanitary Conditions, Conditions *re* Public Health (remarks) 5539 (iii).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of (Ans.) 2852 (ii).
Owen Sound Dock, Proceeding with Work (Ans.) 10337 (v).
Parrsboro Public Building, Instructions *re* Plans, &c., on M. (Mr. Rhodes) for copy, 1728 (i).
——— Post Office Return, on Inquiry for, 8535 (v).
Parry Sound Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1879 (i).
Perley, Mr., Connection with Riordan Paper Co. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April, 1910 (Ans.) 6267 (iv).
Petawawa Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re* (Ans.) 7590 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Piles Federal Works, Charges *re* (Ans.) 8104 (v).
Port Credit, Harbour Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
——— Public Works Expenditure, for 1909-10 (Ans.) 5638 (iii).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re* (Ans.) 1101 (i).
——— Lowest Tender (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Port Perry Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1881 (i).
Post Office Buildings, Advertisement for Tenders (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1882 (i).
——— Policy of Govt. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1871 (i).
P. E. I. Tunnel, Memorials, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2181 (ii).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Lennox) *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com., 997 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 840 (i).
Public Buildings, on Inquiry for Ret., 7347 (iv).
Public Buildings, Cost of, Ques. of Order *re* discussion in Sup., 2101 (ii).
Public Buildings in former estimates, given Precedence over new ones (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2113 (ii).
Public Works Building Plans, approved by Dept. previous to Aug. 5th, (Ans.) 698 (i).
Public Works Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Public Works Deptl. Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
——— on Inquiry for Ret., 4567 (iii).
Public Works, Travelling Expenses, on Inquiry for Ret., 7440 (iv), 8356, 9071 (v).
Public Works, Vote for Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Discussions *re* in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Quebec Public Works Estimates (remarks) 1639 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9331, 9380 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6806 (iv).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10024, 10051 (v).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7610, 7673; Letter from Hansard Reporter, (read), 7675; Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, 7675 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, 7616 (iv).
Red Point Wharf, Expenditures *re* (Ans.) 3469 (ii).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Returns, on Inquiry for, 4570 (iii).
Returns, on Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7257 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 8577, 9166 (v).
Rigaud Post Office Building, Contract *re* (Ans.) 3067 (ii).
Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c. (Ans.) 1714 (i).
—— Rep. of *re*, on M. (Mr. Wilson) for Copy, 2164 (ii).
St. Andrews. Man., Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3039 (ii).
St. Andrew's Dam, Sum for Completion, (remarks) 1509 (i).
St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c., (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction Contracts, &c. (Ans.) 3608 (ii).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale, Valuation, &c. (Ans.) 7343 (iv).
St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re* (Ans.) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re* (Ans.) 4666 (iii).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 1489 (i).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag (remarks) 7553, 7687 (iv).
See 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c. (Ans.) 2675 (ii).
St. John Drill Hall, Contract *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c. (Ans.) 5129, 5631 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, Completion, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).
—— Rental of Office, &c. (Ans) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 5646 (iii); in Com., 8411 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Lands, Options on Land, &c. (Ans.) 2677 (ii).
St. Lambert Public Buildings, Option *re* (stmnt.) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lambert River Dam, Legislation *re* at Washington, 3283 (ii).
—— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Ste. Marie Post Office Division, Defective Site, &c. (Ans.) 10336 (v).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repairs, &c. 7344 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
St. Peter's Bay Wharf, Repair of (Ans.) 7247 (iv).
Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1715 (i).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Seagull Dock, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c. (Ans.) 1349 (i).
Security (Stirling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2600, 2655 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6609 (iv).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure *re* Decorations (Ans.) 1100 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c., (Ans.) 4826 (iii).
Smallpox Epedimic, Condition of House of Commons, 7253 (iv).
See 'House of Commons.'
South African Parliament, Rep. of Postmaster General (remarks) 1580 (i).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry, (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3346 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Militia— (salaries), 1027; Public Works (contingencies) 1047 (i); 5993 (iv); (salaries) 1032 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Alberta (Calgary) 3007; (Lethbridge) 3009; (Macleod) 3003; (Strathcona) 3011; (Vegreville) 3011; (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Duncan) 3014; (Fernie) 3014; (Grand Forks) 3015; (Greenwood) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3015; (Nelson) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016; (Revelstoke) 3017; (Vancouver) 3018; (Vernon) 3018 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027; (electric power) 3210; (engineers, salaries) 3212; (fire escapes) 3160; (quarantine stations) 3213 (ii), 6027 (iv); (renewals) 2969; (rents, &c.) 3212 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3157; (immigration buildings) 3156; (sundries) 3161 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018, 3029; (Winnipeg armoury) 3052 (ii).
Public Works—Buildngs—N. B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Chatham) 1610; (Fairville) 1611; (Fredericton pavement) 1612; (Grand Falls) 1614; (Hampton) 1614; (Hartland) 1617; (Hillsborough) 1621; (Moncton armoury) 1623; (St. John drill hall) 1624; (Tracadie) 1625 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax) 1592; (Halifax citadel) 1581; (Halifax post office) 1583; (Lunenburg) 1592, 1625; (Parrsboro) 1598, 1625; (Weymouth) 1601;

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

(Wolfville) 1599; (iv); (Yarmouth) 1600 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2088 (ii); (Belleville drill hall) 6033 (iv); (Brantford drill hall) 2098; (Chesley) 2103; (Dresden) 2105; (Dundas) 2109; (Elora) 2109; (Essex) 2110, (Fergus) 2111; (Fort William) 2111; (Gananoque) 2112; (Goderich) 2115; (Harriston) 2115; (Kingston P. O.) 2130; (Kingston, R. M. C.) 2130, 3156; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2142; (Mitchell) 2146; (Mount Forest) 2149; (Peterborough) 2603; (Seaforth) 2626; (Sudbury) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2627; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wallaceburg) 2634; (Waterloo) 2634; (Wiarton) 2636 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating, &c.) 2590, 3162 (ii), 6027, (iv); (H. of C. improvements) 2590 (ii); (lavatories) 2583; (lighting) 3173, 3187 (ii); (McGillivray's contract) 5993 (iv); (pavements) 2593, 2602 (ii), 8883 (v); (Printing Bureau) 2361, 2582; ; (Rideau Hall) 3170 (ii), 8872 (v); (steel cases) 2582; (Sussex St. block) 3172; (telephones) 3169; (water supply) 2583; (Woods building lighting) 3175 (ii).

Public Works — Buildings—Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v); (draping buildings) 6026 (iv); (tobacco curing stations) 3161 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—P. E. I. (Summerside armoury) 1602; (Tignish) 1602 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Arthabaska) 1665; (Aylmer) 1672; (generally, repairs, &c.) 1675; (Grosse Isle) 1675; (Levis armoury) 1678; (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1697; (Megantic) 1710, 1860; (Montreal barracks) 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii); (Montreal postal station) 1861; (Montreal P.O. alterations) 1862; (Napierville) 1865; (Que. custom house) 1885; (Quebec drill hall) 1886; (Quebec immigrant) 1886; (Rigaud) 1887; (Roberval) 1887; (Rock Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1890; (St. Lambert) 1894; (Shawinigan) 1890; (Three Rivers) 1901; (Westmount) 1903 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2970, 3001; (Battleford cor. read) 3005; (Humboldt) 3007; (Lloydminster) 3009; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Saskatoon) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Dredging (generally) 9555 (v).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N.S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9501; (Argyle Sound) 9501 (v); (Cribbins Point) 6029 (iv); (generally) 9554 (v); (L'Ardoise) 6029; (Margaree) 6029; (Upper Prospect) 6030; (West Dublin Bay) 6030; (Yarmouth) 6030 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ontario (Port Arthur, &c.) 5994 (iv); (repairs, &c.) 9551 (v); (Victoria) 6021 (iv).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. and Alberta (repairs, &c.) 9553 (v).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Telegraphs, B. C. (Okanagan) 6033; Sask. and Alta., (maintenance) 6034 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (Halifax) 5922 (iii); (Halifax docks) 9561 (v).

Sussex Street, Ottawa, Deptl. Buildings, Alterations, &c. (remarks) 2077 (ii).

See 'Ottawa,' 'Supply—Public Works—Ottawa.'

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings for 1910 (Ans.) 2159 (ii).

Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Amount paid in Interest, &c. (Ans.) 814 (i).

Three Rivers Post Office, Temporary Building (Ans.) 8984 (v).

Tilbury Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1667 (i).

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection (remarks) 8479 (v).

Toronto Harbour Consolidation Act Amt. B. 175 (Mr. Macdonell) in Com., 8234, 8536 (v).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Change *re* Specification (Ans.) 805 (i).

Typhoid in Ottawa: *See* 'House of Commons, Ottawa,' &c.

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ans.) 1084 (i).

—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ans.) 9782 (v).

Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ans.) 3469 (ii).

Victoria Memorial Museum, Ottawa, Total Cost, Space allotted (Ans.) 1975 (ii).

—— Cor. *re* Foundation, on Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

—— Cracking of Tower, &c. (Ans.) 5938 (iv).

—— Inspection *re* Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Walkerville Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1705 (i).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ans.) 1101 (i).

Water-Power on St. Lawrence, Concession *re* (Ans.) 9780 (v).

—— *See* 'Long Sault.'

Waterways Treaty, on Inquiry for Plans, 3681 (ii).

—— *See* 'International Waterways' B. 36.'

Westville Postoffice, Number of Bricks used (Ans.) 3471 (ii).

Wharfs, N.S., Contracts *re* Construction (Ans.) 2160 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ans.) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Clock, Expenditure *re* (Ans.) 6664 (iv).

PUGSLEY, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Winnipeg, Govt. Buildings, Pavements, &c., Corrected Stmnt., 8923 (v).
—— Rifle Range: *See* 'St. Charles.'
Wolfe Island Dredging (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellations of Heat and Lighting Contract (Ans.) 795, 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Cor. with Mr. Ellis (read) 3672 (ii).
—— Inaccurate Answer to Question (remarks) 1000 (i).
—— Stmnt., *re* Discrepancy in figures, 1011 (i).
—— Last Cheque paid to Imp. Realty Co. (Ans.) 1280 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3175, 3187 (ii).
See 'Supply — Pub. Works — Buildings — Ottawa.'

RANKIN, Mr. J. P., *Perth North.*
Commercial Travellers' Accident Assurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 52) 1°*, 1277 (i).
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.'s (B. 31) 1°*, 817 (i).
Imperial Traction Co.'s incorp. (B. 102) 1°*, 2434 (ii).
Logan, Robt. William, Relief (B. 173) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Meyer, Paulina Verena, Relief (B. 145) 1°*, 5933 (iv).
Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief (B. 142) 1°*, 5726 (iii).
Western Central Ry. Co.'s (B. 94) 1°*, 1969 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D., *Grenville.*
Advertising Policy of Government. Works (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6284 (iv).
All Red Steamship Co.'s incorp. B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) in Com., 4239 (iii).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c. (Ques.) 1909 (i).
—— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son (Ques.) 2438 (ii).
Baggage Smashing Prevention B. 124 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4199 (iii).
Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2432 (ii).
Boat painted by Govt. Officials, Denial *re*, 7942 (v).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9261 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3455 (ii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Cardinal Canal Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Civil Service Apptmt. of Coloured Persons (remarks) 4930 (iii).
Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9709 (v).
Coloured Person appointed to Experimental Farm (remarks) 5039 (iii).
Conciliation Boards, Principle *re* Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4244 (iii).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8713 (v).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau (remarks) 9784 (v).
Customs Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry (Ques.) 803 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 479 (i).
'Earl Grey,' Ice-breaker, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
Estimates, Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2994 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9612 (v).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) 10235 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s. incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8916 (v).
Grand Trunk Trainmen's Strike, Settlement of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
—— Reinstatement of dismissed Employees (remarks) 1078 (i).
House of Commons Galleries, Applause by Visitors (remarks) 4468 (iii).
I. C. R., Accidents, Causes of (remarks) 6680 (iv).
—— Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union (read) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).
—— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1162 (i).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. on Res., 913 (i); on M. for 2°, 9099 (v); in Com., 9157, 9182 (v).
Lighthouse Construction, and Marine Purchases (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2897 (ii).
—— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3231 (ii).
See 'International B. 36,' 'Long Sault.'
Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchasing of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Markey Fishing Lease, Cancellation of, Delays, &c. (remarks) 6764, 6914 (iv).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services (Ques.) 984 (i).
Morning Sittings, on M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887 (v).
Naval Service, Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow' (Ques.) 1091 (i).
Negroes in Civil Service: *See* 'Civil Service.'
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5563 (iii).
Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c. by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2282 (ii).
——— Plaza, Removal of Poles, &c. (remarks) 6507 (iv).
——— Sussex St. Deptl. Buildings, Tenders *re* (remarks) 4824 (iii).
P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments (remarks) 6925 (iv).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7731 (iv).
Privileges and Elections Com., (Mr. Lanctot) on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to M. (Mr. German) to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7970 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 857 (i).
Public Works Expenditures, Investigation *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 700 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., Alterations, &c., Better Information placed before House (remarks) 4933 (iii).
——— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10062 (v).
——— Importations from Favoured Nation Countries (Ques.) 4111 (iii).
——— (remarks) *re* Answer, 4113 (iii).
——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* importations into Canada, 4131 (iii).
——— Oshawa Fruit Growers' Association (remarks) 5747 (iii).
——— on Ques, of Order *re* Referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
——— Speech of Champ Clark *re* Annexation (remarks) 3610 (ii).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6829 (iv).
——— Statistics *re* Prices, Information *re* from Trade and Commerce Dept. (remarks) 6512 (iv).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Statement (read) 6840 (iv).
St. John Valley Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., on Ruling (Dep. Speaker) *re* Amendments, 5723 (iii).

REID, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
St. Lawrence River, Damming the Long Sault, Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison (read) 3767 (ii).
——— Legislation at Washington, &c. (remarks) 3282 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix (read) 3839 (ii).
——— Protests *re* Bill now before U.S. (remarks) 4210 (iii).
——— *See* 'Long Sault.'
Sadler, Maggie Florence Relief (B. 137) 1°*, 6116 (iv).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9171 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 3843 (ii).
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry (Mr. Blain) for Ret., 3345 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3790 (ii).
Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6395; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6392; Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3810 (ii).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5613 (iii).
Labour Dept. (conciliation board) 4244 (iii).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6460; (lighthouses) 6461 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and S.S. Subventions (Canada and Australia) 8769; (Canada and Newfoundland) 8783; (Canada and South Africa) 8784; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (elevators) 3161; (furniture) 3163; (heating) 3162; (lighting contracts) 3196(ii); (Rideau Hall) 8874 (v); (Rideau Hall Grounds) 3170; (telephones) 3169 (ii)
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 3002 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (freight cars) 5985 (iv).
Woods Building Lighting Contracts (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3196 (ii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N., *Cumberland.*
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c. (M. for copies*) 2161 (ii).
Battleford Public Buildings, Cor., &c. (read) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Civil Servants in Political Contests (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
Coal Strikes in the West, Settlement of (remarks) 6913 (iv).
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8712 (v).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen Relief (B. 180) 1°*, 7666 (iv).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reports, &c. (M. for cor.*) 1340 (i).
Drummond, &c., Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir,' 480 (i).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2269 (ii).
Fisheries Regulations, Penalties *re* Violation of, Inquiry for Ret., 1806 (ii).
G. T. Trainmen's Strike, on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5779 (iii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1753 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Demand for Repeal, &c., (remarks), 6929 (iv).
I. C. R., Accidents, Pars. from N.S Newspaper (read) 6676 (iv).
—— Branch Lines, Acquisition of (remarks) 6769 (iv).
—— Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Proves. (Ques.) 5134 (iii).
Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt. (Ques.) 656 (i).
Parrsboro, N.S., Public Building, Instructions *re* Plans, &c. (M. for copy) 1727 (i).
—— Inquiry for, 8535 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 854 (i).
Railways, Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5078 (iii).
Reciprocity Announcement, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press,' *re* Treatment of Reporters (remarks) 2642 (ii).
—— Debate, Obstruction *re* (remarks 10066 (v).
—— Kentville Board of Trade Res. (read) 5749 (iii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 1001 (i).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1054; Militia (salaries) 1021; Public Works (salaries)) 1033 (i).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board) 3378 3399 (ii).
Mounted Police (subsistence) 8600 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3029 (ii); N.S. (Lunenburg) 1625; (Parrsboro) 1625 (i); Ont. (Wiarton) 2636 (ii); Ottawa (lighting) 3174 (ii); Sask. (Battleford) 2978, 3001 (ii).
Railways—I. C. R. (airbrakes) 5913; (airbrakes, freight cars) 5915; (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (draw bars) 5915; (fire extinguishers) 5927; (Fredericton) 5916; (Halifax) 5924; (highways protection) 5918; (rolling stock) 5927; (Truro) 5929; (surveys) 5928 (iii).

RHODES, Mr. E. N.—*Con.*
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of (Ques.) 3469 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of (Ques.) 1101 (i).
Woods Building Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

RICHARDS, Mr. J. W., *Prince, P.E.I.*
P.E.I. and Mainland Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3879 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial Reps., &c. *re* Survey (M. for copies) 176 (ii).

RIVET Mr. L. A. A., *Hochelaga.*
Address, The, 208 (i).
Goldschmidt Thermit Co. Patent Relief B. 165) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1514 (i).
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Munderloh and Co.'s Patent Relief (B. 203) in Com., 8970 (iv).
Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 208 (i).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Montreal barracks) 2574 (ii).

ROBB, Mr. J. A., *Huntingdon.*
Beauharnois Canal, Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
—— Rentals, Sums expended, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 2199 (ii).
C.P.R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Cor., 769 (i).
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, on prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3487 (ii).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8460 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7328 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J., *Marquette*
Agricultural Implements imported into Can., Valuations, &c. (remarks) 1361 (i).
Census Enumerators in Man. and N. W., on Amt. (Mr. Staples) 9041 (v).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3519 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2417 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085, 8631 (v).
Fort Osborne, Purchase of Grounds (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

ROCHE, Mr. W. J.—*Con.*
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5616 (iii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1284 (i).
Immigration Act. Amt. B. 47 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 2018 (ii).
Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site (Ques.) 9993 (v).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).
Ry. Rates, Comparison with U. S. Rates (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res. (read) 5550 (iii).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7623 (iv).
Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).
St. Andrews Dam Bridge (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3046 (ii).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Interior (salaries) 4728 (iii).
Immigration (seed grain) 3836 (ii).
Indians—N.W.T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5616 (iii).
Militia—(Winnipeg rifle range) 6053 (iv).
Ocean and River Service (Arctic) 6089 (iv).
Railways—Miscellaneous (Ry. Commission) 6431 (iv).
Trade and Commerce (inspectors) 6059 (iv).
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe (Ques.) 799, 1284 (i).

ROSS, Mr. D. C., *Middlesex West.*
Globe Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).

ROY, Mr. C., *Montmagny.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1770 (i).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1168 (i).
Light-House Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., 775 (i).
Privilege, Ques. of, Montmagny Electors, Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

ROY, Mr. E., *Dorchester.*
Naval Service for Can. (remarks) on Address, 204 (i).

RUSSELL, Mr. J., *Toronto East.*
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8721 (v).
Civil Service Act (postoffice) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8913, 8928 (v).

RUSSELL, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of (remarks) 9996 (v).
Postoffice Act Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9570 (v).

SUPPLY.
Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453; (Newmarket) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6397 (iv).
Indians—Man., &c. (annuities) 8885 (v).
Post Office (letter carriers' boots) 4283; (ry. mail clerks) 4286 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (caretakers, &c.) 6027 (iv); Ottawa (Rideau Hall) 8882 (v).

RUTAN, Mr. W. W., *Prince Albert.*
Alberta, Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.'s incorp. (B. 133) 1°*, 4740 (iii).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).
Farm Products, Dutiable Exports from Provs. for 1908-10 into U.S. (Ques.) 7026 (iv).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. (B. 171) 1°*, 6906 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916 (v).
Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Co.'s incorp. (B. 166) 1°*, 6906 (iv).
Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts (Ques.) 5634 (iii).
Railways owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c. (M. for ret.*) 6158 (iv).
Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L., *Souris.*
Agricultural Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1941 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8807 (v).
Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c. (Ques.) 4301 (iii).
Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating (prop. res.) 3472, Neg. (N. 96; Y. 54) 3524 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2414 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8122 (v).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c. (Ques) 10196 (v).
—— *See* 'Parcel.'
Farmers' Bank, Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier (remarks) 2264 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation *re* Tarifl Changes, Distribution of Copies (remarks) 6908 (iv).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8610 (v).

SCHAFFNER, Mr. F. L.—*Con.*
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9526 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8243 (v).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull,' Conditions, on M. (Mr. Lake) 1558 (i).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 968 (i).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5612 (iii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead Irregularities (remarks) 5562 (iii).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9923 (v).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9313 (v).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8281 (v).
—— Consolidated Boards of Trade, Sask., Despatch from W. A. Shepherd (read) 5752 (iii).
—— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10019 (v).
—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6815 (iv).
Rural Mail Routes, Number operating in Man. (Ques.) 1105 (i).
SUPPLY—
Charges of Management (foreign and uncurrent coin) 6060 (iv).
Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6053 (iv).
Immigration (agents) 5171 (iii); (seed grain) 6048 (iv).
Indians—N. W. T. (Dr. J. D. Lafferty, payments to) 6046; (Rev. J. Semmens, payments to) 6038 (iv).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).
Labour Dept. (Labour Gazette) 4230 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B. C. (Prince Rupert) 3016; Man. (Souris) 3019; Sask. (Humboldt) 3007; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).
Typhoid Epidemic and Water Supply (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4481 (iii).
Yukon Beer Import Tax, Repeal Bill (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 1978 (ii).

SCHELL, Mr. M. S., *Oxford South.*
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6212 (iv).
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Agricultural Com. (remarks) 2992 (ii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage Systems, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1258 (i).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O., *Wentworth.*
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c. (Ques.) 7341 (iv).
—— (remarks) *re* Question, 7348 (iv).

SEALEY, Mr. W. O.—*Con.*
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c. (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).
Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.'s (B. 101) 1°*, 2434 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7530, (amt.) 7547 (iv).
—— Vote *re* Amendment, Ques. of Priv., 7666 (iv).
Selkirk Route, Rep. *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

SEXSMITH, Mr. J. A., *Peterborough, East.*
Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900 (Ques.) 10196 (v).
Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8952 (v).
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure (Ques.) 7806 (iv).
Indian Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re* (Ques.) 1910 (i).
Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8079 (v).
Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting (Ques.) 6269 (iv).
Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910 (Ques.) 6269 (iv).
Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910 (Ques.) 6271 (iv).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Statement (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5072 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7224 (iv).
—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8372 (v).
—— Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co. (read) 4120 (iii).
—— Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (read) 5750 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6814 (iv).
Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6190 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c (animals health) 5963; (dairy experiments) 6235; (seeds) 6221 (iv).
Canals—Trent (improvements) 6419 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1478 (i).
Post Office—Outside Service (rural) 6089 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).
Victoria Museum, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 5937 (iv).

SHARPE, Mr. S., *Ontario, North.*
Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c. (Ques.) 5401 (iii).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Agriculture and Militia Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 33 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5079, 5574, 5630 (iii).
Bank Act Amt. (B. 14) 1° m., 261 (i).
Bank Act Amt. B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9335 (v).
Bank Failures, Statement of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses (Ques.) 2670 (ii).
See 'Farmers' Bank.'
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept. (Ques.) 926, 1091 (i).
See 'Justice.'
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds (Ques.) 1716 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. (bonds) Guarantee B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9277 (v).
Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 9431 (v).
Companies Act (annual stmnts.) Amt. (B. 7) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1296 (i).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr Monk) in Com., 1336 (i).
Coronation Contingent, Patronage *re* (remarks) 4662 (iii).
Dom. Elections Act (counting ballots) Amt. (B. 16) 1° m., 377 (i).
Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron (Ques.) 6288 (iv).
See 'Steel.'
Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International' (M. for ret.*) 1498 (i).
Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Payments to, Contracts *re*, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Ellis, Mr., Ottawa City Lighting Co. *See* 'Woods.'
Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission, *re* (remarks) 1510 (i).
——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston (Ques.) 4826 (iii).
——— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5465 (iii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9624 (v).
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c. (Ques.) 794 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
G.T.P, Classification, Arbitrator's Rep. (Ques.) 696 (i).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1408, 1527 (i).
House of Commons, Sessional Employees since 1896, &c. (M. for ret.) 3471 (ii).
Immigration Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c. (Ques.) 2436 (ii).
Imperial Realty Co.: *See* 'Woods.'
Indian Act (fences) Amt. (B. 95) 1° m., 1969 (ii).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8408 (v).
I.C.R. Freight Rates on Coal, &c., in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c. (Ques.) 6156 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. B. 6 (Mr. Miller) in Com., 1522 (i).
Justice, Deputy Minister of, acting as counsel for outside Cases (remarks) in Sup., 1014 (i).
See 'Bank of Montreal.'
Loans, Negotiations for, 1909, 1910, Financial Agents, &c. (Ques.) 797 (i).
——— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c. (Ques.) 3281 (ii).
Militia and Agriculture, Expenditure from 1867 to 1910 (Ques.) 9371, 9432 (v).
Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, Quebec, &c. (Ques.) 7595 (iv).
Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business, for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1340 (i).
Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9-10 (Ques.) 817 (i).
——— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7442 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. of Mr. Walsh, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10502 (v).
Ottawa Buildings, Rental by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup.. 2300 (ii).
——— New Leases, Rentals, &c. (Ques.) 1281 (i).
Ottawa Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted (Ques.) 1280 (i).
See 'Woods.'
Parry Sound Post Office Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1881 (i).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 849 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3933 (ii).
Railway Act (express cos.) Amt. (B. 8) 1° m., 149; 2° m., 1298 (i).
Railway Act (telegraphs, &c.) Amt. B. 197 (Mr. Graham) in Com., 9312, 9320 (v).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9227 (v).

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 10151, 10310 (v).
—— Conferences Length of Sessions, Names of Representatives, &c. (Ques.) 7036 (iv).
—— Stmnt. in White Book, &c. (Ques.) 10193 (v).
—— Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations, &c. (Ques.) 7037 (iv).
—— Trade with other Countries affected (Ques.) 3667 (ii).
Returns, Inquiry for, 4569 (iii).
Ross Rifles, Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment (Ques.) 9781 (v).
St. Lambert Govt. Buildings, Option on Lands (Ques.) 2677 (ii).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2577 (ii).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power, &c. (Ques.) 3468 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9167 (v).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails, (remarks) 1385 (i).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re* (M. for memorials*) 3948 (ii).
—— Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c. (Ques.) 5936 (iv).
—— Renewal of (remarks) 3274 (ii).
—— Total Amounts paid since 1896 (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
See 'Dumping.'
Sub-targets, Number purchased by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 8583 (v).

SUPPLY—
Civil Govt.—Justice (salaries) 1014; Militia (salaries) 1029 (i).
Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2610; (Seaforth) 2626; (Tilbury) 2627; (Tillsonburg) 2628; (Uxbridge) 2630; (Wiarton) 2637 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Quebec (Napierville) 1867; (Roberval) 1888; (Rock-Island) 1889; (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1891; (St. Lambert) 1895; (Shawenegan) 1890 (i).

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c. (Ques.) 1084 (i).
—— Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 9782 (v).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c. (M. for reps.*) 4678 (iii).
—— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c. (Ques.) 4300 (iii).
—— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept. (Ques.) 5933 (iv).
—— Length, Motive Power, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
—— Valuation by Customs, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5624 (iii).
See 'Farmer's Bank.'

SHARPE, Mr. S.—*Con.*
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Woods and Canadian Buildings, Heating and Lighting Contract, Cancellation of (Ques.) 794, 1088, 1344 (i).
—— Inaccurate Answer (remarks) 999 (i).
—— (M. for cor.*) 3948 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts, *re* Cor. with Mr. Ellis (remarks) 3675 (ii).
—— Lighting Contracts (remarks) 1011 (i).
—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3176 (ii).
—— Date of last cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting (Ques.) 1279 (i).
See 'Ottawa.'

SHARPE, Mr. W. H., *Lisgar.*
Battleford Public Buildings (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
British Preference Trade Policy (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
Census, Omissions from Enumerations (remarks) 9726 (v)
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued, &c. (Ques.) 5291 (iii).
Elevators, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3495 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8125 (v).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Sale of Eggs, &c. (Ques.) 662, 1285 (i).
G.T.P. Developing Co., Land Purchase from (Ques.) 2666 (ii).
—— Govt. Reserve on Homestead Lands (Ques.) 3466 (ii).
—— Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c. (Ques.) 2366 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5593 (iii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy, &c. (Ques.) 660 (i).
Interest Act Amt B. 6 (Mr. Miller) on M. for 2°, 972 (i).
Lands, Mineral Rights, &c., Inquiry for Ret., 3955 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1253 (i).
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c. (Ques.) 1090 (i).
See 'St. Andrews.'
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5052 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8162 (v).
—— British Preference, &c. (remarks) 5545, 5619 (iii).
—— Farm Products imported from other countries (Ques.) 3668 (ii).

SHARPE, Mr. W. H.—*Con.*

St. Andrews Rapids, Fish Ladder, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
See 'Pembina.'

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of (remarks) 10509 (v).

Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount *re* (Ques.) 3225 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (seeds) 6226 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Mines (salaries) 1484 (i).
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5587 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Wetaskiwin) 3011 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. Chilliwack) 3013; (Cranbrook) 3013; (Fernie) 3015; (Nanaimo) 3016; (Prince Rupert) 3016 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Winnipeg) 3032, 3053 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008; (Melfort) 3010; (Moosejaw) 3010; (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).

Wheat Prices in West and in Canada and Liverpool Market (Ques.) 6267 (iv).

SIFTON, Hon. C., *Brandon.*

Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6146 (iv).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4385 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H. *Guysborough.*

Canadian Northern Ry., Guarantee of Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8862 (v).

Grain Stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 3605 (ii).

Guysborough, 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges, (M. for cor.*) 6505 (iv).

I.C.R., Eastern N.S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1115 (i).

—— Westbound and Eastbound Traffic for five Years, &c. (M. for ret.*) 2162 (ii).

Life Saving Rewards, Names of Recipients (Ques.) 3849 (ii).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2774 (ii).

Post Office Service in N.S., Weekly and Biweekly, &c. (Ques.) 982 (i).

Reciprocity, Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7626 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c. (Ques.) 4467 (iii).

Sick Mariners, Law *re* Payment of Dues, &c. (Ques.) 1904 (i).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting (prop res.) 3074, 3138 (ii).

Steam Trawlers, 'Wren' and 'Croquette,' Registration in Can. (Ques.) 4046 (iii).

SINCLAIR, Mr. J. H.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6187 (iv).
Civil Govt.—Customs (salaries) 1057 (i).
Fisheries (fish transportation) 6101 (iv).
Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8760 (v).
Marine Hospitals (sick seamen) 6567 (iv).
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8688 (v).
Ocean and River Service—Govt. Steamers —(maintenance, &c.) 5813 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).

Water Carriage of Goods Act (wood) Amt. (B. 21J) 1°*, 8887, in Com., 9349 (v).

SMITH, Mr. A. W., *Middlesex, North.*

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1248 (i).

Reciprocity Treaty, Statistics *re* Comparative Prices (remarks) 6776 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Nanaimo.*

Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 402 (i).

British Columbia and Central Can. Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 113) 1°*, 3143 (ii), in Com., 5127, 5253 (iii).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.'s (B. 204) 1°*, 8582 (v).

Chinese Immigration, Stmt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister (remarks) 2738 (ii).

—— Total Number, Capita Tax, Exempts, &c. (Ques.) 788 (i).

Co-operation (B. 29) 1° m., 699 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1431 (i).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in "John Bull", Conditions *re* (remarks) 1564 (i).

'Iroquois,' Str., Report *re* Wreck (remarks) 7104 (iv).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c. (Ques.) 790 (i).

Naval Policy of Govt. (remarks) on Address, 548 (i).

Netherland Mortgage Loan Co., Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c. (Ques.) 789 (i).

Ottawa Buildings, Rentals, &c., by Govt., Censure *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2352 (ii).

Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 167) 1°*, 6906 (iv).

Railway Accidents, since 1st April ,1909, on running trains, construction work, &c. (M. for ret.) 713 (i).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 6709 (iv).

SMITH, Mr. R.—*Con.*
Ry. Employees Protection (B. 114) 1° m., 3218 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Nanaimo) 3016 (ii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington Relief (B. 183) 1°*, 7666 (iv).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.'s (B. 21) 1°*, 377 (i).

SMITH, Mr. R., *Stormont.*
Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3240 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Canals—Welland—(enlargement) 6407 (iv).

SMYTH, Mr. W. R., *Algoma, East.*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie, 4371 (iii).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Lancaster) 8959 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6141 (iv).
Porcupine Disasters by Fire, Aid by Govt. (remarks) 9635 (v).
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Com., 827 (i).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9966 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10011 (v).
——— Resolutions *re*, on M. (Mr. Fielding) for Com., 10146 (v).
SUPPLY—
Miscellaneous—Coronation Trip (members and senators) 8681 (v); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1695 (i).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of (remarks) 10532 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Delay, &c. (remarks) 9907 (v).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C..) *Bonaventure.*
Address, The, Order, Ques, of *re* 'coward,' member asked to withdraw expression, 462, Apology asked for, 463 (i).
Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup. (remarks) 6321 (iv).
Alien Labour Law, Emplymt of Foreign Labour in B.C., Members remarks checked 10372 (v).
Bank Act Bill, Discussion *re* (remarks) 6442 (iv).
Beauharnois Canal Grantees, &c, on M. (Mr. Monk) for Ret., Member's remarks checked, 2213 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 4231, 6574 (iii), 9536 (v).
Bois Blanc Island Dam: (ruling) *re* Discussion, 1575 (i).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) Member's remarks checcked, 8190 (v).
Cobalt Mail Service, Members' remarks checked, 1650 (i).
Divorce Bills, on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Ethier) Members' remarks checked, 4204 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Electoral District, Certificate *re*, 259 (i).
——— Election, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Gauvreau) insulting language (ruling) 77 (i).
——— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Macdonald) 144 (i).
——— on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) and Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) (ruling) 472-3 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. B. 101 (Mr. Conmee) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
——— Ruling *re* Introduction of, 2364 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 159 (i).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Objection (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Amt. (Mr. Monk) (ruling) 5164 (iii).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox) 9524 (v).
Hours of Labour Bill, on M. for 3° (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order (Mr. Lancaster) 2874 (ii).
House of Commons Speaker's Gallery, Rules *re* Allotment of Seats (remarks) 270 (i).
Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions (ruling) 1551 (i).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Limiting remarks, 6946 (iv).
Inspection and Sale Act (potatoes) Amt. B. 9 (Mr. Carvell) on Senate Amts., 3460 (ii).
Labour Strikes, Cor. with Mr. Geo. Taylor (ruling) 10349 (v).
Mails, Illegal Use of *re* C. D. Sheldon (ruling *re* M. to adjn. hse., 1357 (i).
See 'Sheldon.'
Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Members remarks checked, 6763 (iv).
Ministerial Association Ottawa, Res. *re* Member checked, 3059 (ii).
Ministers' Speeches distributed by Postmasters, Members' remarks checked, 9255 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Boyce) 2769, 2814 (ii).
Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse., Members' remarks checked, 2262 (ii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
National Battlefields in Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on Regularity of Proceedings (ruling) 9500 (v).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) Members' remarks checked, 10522 (v).
Offensive Weapons, Sale of (Mr. Lewis) Members' remarks checked, 2559 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill (Mr. Conmee) on M. to introduce, 2829, Ruled out of Order, 2850 (ii).
—— Printing in English (remarks) in Com., 3184 (ii).
—— Ruling *re* Procedure, 2883 (ii).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to apologize for using word 'liar,' (remarks) 463 (i).
—— Member asked to withdraw and apologize, 462 (i).
Parliament, Opening of, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec. (read) 1 (i).
Privileges and Elections Com., on Ques. of Order, 7974 (v).
Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Boyce) irrelevancy of debate, 6361 (iv).
—— (Mr. Paterson)—(remarks) 5626 (iii).
—— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) Unparliamentary Language (ruling) 9784 (v).
Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders, on M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copies, Ques. of Order (ruling) 3073 (ii).
Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Perley) on Ques. of Order (ruling) 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* Answering, Orally or Written (remaks) 700 (i).
Railways, Capitalization of, Member asked to withdraw words, 5258 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to meet during sittings of the House (ruling) 9228 (v).
Reciprocity with U. S., Absence of Miinsters, Ques. of Order, 8359 (v).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Monk). Ques. of Order. (Mr. Currie) 4055 (iii).
——Answers of Ministers to Questions (ruling) 4137 (iii).
—— Importation from other Countries, Members' remarks checked, 4114 (iii).
—— Members' remarks checked, 5545 (iii).
—— Negotiations at Washington, Instructions to Mr. Bryce *re* (ruling) *re* answers of Ministers, 4141 (iii).
—— Objections *re* Interruptions (remarks) 4451 (iii.)
—— Obstruction *re*, Member requested to withdraw stmnt., 10008 (v).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Lennox), Sustaining of Deputy Speaker's Ruling (ruling) 5032 (iii).

SPEAKER, Mr. (Marcil, Hon. C.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Ministers of the Crown (ruling) 4124 (iii).
—— on Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) Remarks checked, 5744 (iii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
—— Statistics, Members' remarks checked, 4473 (iii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6835 (iv).
—— Tel. read by Mr. Burrell, Remarks checked, 3771 (ii).
—— Vote of Member for Labelle. 6839 (iv).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Pugsley) 7616 (iv).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675 (iv).
Returns, Notice of, Member's remarks checked, 5939 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co., Ltd., incorp. B. 159 (Mr. Devlin) on M, for 1°, 6439 (iv).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly the Flag. Member's remarks checked, 7687 (iv).
St. Lawrence Dam, Member's remarks checked, 4211 (iii).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Bradbury) 5865 (iii).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of (ruling) 3845 (ii).
Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (ruling) *re* M. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
See 'Mails.'
South Grey Appointments, on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) Member's remarks checked, 3350 (ii).
Speech from Throne (read) 2 (i).
Sterling Trusts Corporation incorp., B. 32 (Mr. Martin) on Senate Amts.. 6609 (iv.)
SUPPLY—
House of Commons (charwomen) 6174; (committees) 6170; (debates) 6171; (Dep. Clerk Crown in Chancery) 6167; (electric light attendant) 6175; (messengers) 6172; (pages) 6174; (servants) 6175; (sessional clerks) 6168; (stationery) 6176; (telephones) 6171, (Senate stationery) 6337 (iv).
Typhoid Epidemic in Ottawa, Member's remarks checked, 4657 (iii).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District (notification) 1 (i).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.), *Perth South.*
'Arctic,' Capt. Bernier's Report, Member's remarks checked, 6541 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., Objection to proposed Amt., 5127 (iii).
Canada Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com. on Amt. (Mr. Middlebro) 7564 (iv).
Canada and Japan Trade Relations, on Ques of Order, 9484 (v).
Canada National Fire Insurance Co.'s B. 201, on Amt. (Mr. McCraney) in Com., 8982 (v).
Chatham. Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.'s B. 206 (Mr. D. A. Gordon) in Com., 8970 (v).
Conciliation Board and Labour Dept., on Ques. of Order (Mr. Nesbitt) 4267 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 482 (i).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8921 (v).
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. B. 150 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., (ruling) *re* Power of Govt. to introduce word 'Equipment,' 5721 (iii).
Homestead Irregularities, &c., on Ques. of Order (rulings) 5561-3 (iii).
Hours of Labour B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., Irrelevancy of deb. (remarks) 1433 (i).
Indian Act (Treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. (remarks) *re* discussion 7857 (iv).
International Waterways Treaty B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) in com., 9158, 9180 (v).
—— Irrelevancy of debate, 9177 (v).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou, Acceptance of Denial (remarks) 1877 (i).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) in Com., on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7724 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Irrelevancy of Debate, 10523-4 (v).
Order, Ques. of, Member asked to withdraw word 'Liar', 5561 (iii).
Postoffice Estimates, on objection to passing (remarks) 4298 (iii).
Public Buildings, Cost of (ruling) *re* Ques. of Order, on Discussion in Com. of Sup., 2101 (ii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., Interruptions not relevant (ruling) 7527 (iv).
—— on Amt. (Mr. Sealey) Quotations, &c. (read) 7548 (iv).
—— Interruptions to speakers (remarks) 5030 (iii).
—— Letter read by member for Saltcoats, Giving of Names (ruling) 7265 (iv).

SPEAKER, Mr. Deputy, (McIntyre, Mr. G. H.)—*Con.*
Reciprocity with U. S., Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (ruling) *re* reading, 8279 (iv).
—— Member (Mr. Geo. Taylor) referring to previous debate (ruling) 8252 (v).
—— Obstruction by Opposition (remarks) 9889 (v).
——on Ques. of Order (Mr. Talbot) *re* 'Cowardice' applied to Minister of Crown, 10564 (v).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3705 (ii).
—— on Ques. of Order (Mr. Guthrie) *re* ref. to former debate, 3690-91 (ii).
—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Irrelevancy of debate (ruling) 6899 (iv).
—— Statistics *re* Comparative Prices, on Ques. of Order *re* Addressing the Chair, 6890 (iv).
—— Talking of Ministers, on Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7293 (iv).
—— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (explanation) 7670 (iv).
—— (remarks) 7619 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com. on amts. 8966 (v).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. Martin) in Com., 2649 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture (animals health) member's remarks checked, 5964; (dairying) Member's remarks checked, 6247 (iv); (exhibitions) Member's remarks checked, 3796 (ii).
Labour Dept. (Conciliation Board), Ques. of Order, 3448 (ruling) 3448, 3450, 3451 (ii).
Marine—Public Works—St. Lawrence ship channel, Discussion *re*, 6555 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Mitchell) 2148 (ii).
Whitby Postoffice Site (ruling) on Ques. of Order, 1870 (i).
Winnipeg World's Fair, Irrelevancy of debate, in Com. of Sup., 5982 (iv)
Woods Building Lighting Contract, Ques. of Order, 3194 (ii).
SPROULE, Mr. T. S., *Grey East.*
Address, The, on Amt. to Amt. (Mr. Borden) *re* Naval Policy, 334 (i).
Alberta Central Ry. Co.'s B. 92 (Mr. Cash) on Senate Amts., 6469 (iv).
Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5080; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).
Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 220 (Mr. Emmerson) on M. for 1°, 9225; on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to place on Govt. Orders, 9350 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s B. 62 (Mr. Tolmie) in Com., 3459 (ii).
Anglo-American Arbitration Treaty, Communication *re* (remarks) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Treaty, Favoured Nation Clause &c. (remarks) 6758 (iv).
—— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause (remarks) 6906 (iv).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c. (Ques.) 8699, 9352 (v).
Bahama Islands, Annexation to Canada, Rumours *re* (remarks) 9372 (v).
Banking Act Amt. B. 50 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 1°, 1341 (i).
—— B. 213 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 3°, 9337 (v).
—— B. 207 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 8698 (v).
Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2431, 3600 (ii).
Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec B. 152 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7480 (iv).
Births and Deaths in Canada, Number &c., on M. (Mr. McCarthy) for Ret., 2680 (ii).
British Columbia Development Co.'s incorp. B. 113 (Mr. R. Smith) in Com., 5127 (iii).
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s B. 17 (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com., 1682 (i).
Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6208 (iv).
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board incorp. B. 161 (Mr. Fowke) in Com., 7564 (iv).
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827; in Com., 9261, 9297 (v).
Canadian Northern Ontario Ry. Co.'s B. 69 (Mr. Nesbitt) in Com., 3454 (ii).
Canada Shipping Act Amt. B. 155 (Mr. Broděur) on M. to ref. to Committee on Marine and Fisheries, 6675 (iv).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sanford Fleming (remarks) 9372, 10468 (v).
Census Enumerators, Completion of Work (remarks) 7220 (iv).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter of Mr. Jardine and Min. of Inland Revenue (remarks) 2739 (ii).
Chinese Investigation Commission, on M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9832 (v).
China-Japan SS. Subsidy B. 103 (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) in Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).
Cholera Precautions &c. (remarks) 10197 (v).
Civil Service Act (customs) Amt. B. 208 (Mr. Paterson) in Com. on Res., 8716 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Civil Servants and Municipal Office, Govt. Policy *re*, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2225 (ii).
Civil Servants earning Extra Salaries, &c. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1019 (i).
Coal Miners' Strike in the West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9701 (v).
Cocaine: *See* 'Opium,' 'Poisons.'
Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions &c. (M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt.), 949 (i).
Convicts liberated from Penitentiaries, Clothing &c. (remarks) 2069 (ii).
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1316 (i).
Copyright Act Amt. B. 184 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 7813 (iv).
Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).
Debates Committee, Status *re* (remarks) 7016 (iv).
Dom. Lands Act, Orders in Council, Amendments to, in Com. on Res., 1984 (ii).
Drill Halls Generally, Construction of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 2128 (ii).
Drummond &c. Elections, on Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 473 (i).
Electricity Exportation Act Amt. (B. 101) on M. for 1°, 2260 (ii).
Elevators, Terminal, &c., on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3502 (ii).
Elevator Terminals at Fort William and Port Arthur, Investigation *re* Management, on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2379 (ii).
Embargo on British Cattle (remarks) 10344 (v).
Estimates, Discussion of (remarks) 2970 (ii).
—— Order of Discussion *re* Depts. (remarks) 2995 (ii).
Eucharistic Congress, Montreal, Ref. to Questions, Ques. of Order, 158 (i).
—— Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vannutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress (Ques.) 702 (i).
—— Guards of Honour, Authority for (Ques.) 704 (i).
—— Reception to Cardinal Vannutelli, Telegram *re* Govt., Answers *re* (remarks) 6518 (iv).
—— Speaker's Attendance in Official Robes (Ques.) 706 (i).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Eucharistic Congress, Telegram from Mr. Justice Girouard *re* Visit of Cardinal Vannutelli (Ques.) 702 (i).
Explosives Importation Regulation B. 79 (Mr. Templeman) in Com., 8453 (v).
Express Rates: *See* 'Parcel Post.'
Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8215 (v).
—— Cor. with Govt. *re*, on M. (Mr. Foster) for Copy, 2244 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation &c., on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9607 (v).
Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal (remarks) 2270 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B. C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8422 (v).
Fishery Inspectors in Ont., Dom. Appointments (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6618 (iv).
Fisheries Treaty Regulations, Changes at Washington (remarks) on M. for Sup., 8490 (v).
Flags Flying on Public Buildings (remarks) 3672 (ii).
Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale, on prop. Res. (Mr. Stanfield) 3227 (ii).
Forest Reserves and Parks (B. 85) Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8619, 8655 (v).
Gaspereau Dredging, on Amt. (Mr. Crocket) Ques. of Order, 10228 (v).
'Globe' Printing Co.'s B. 121 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) in Com., 5128 (iii).
Govt. Business, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Morning Sittings, 10095 (v).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M for 2° 9522, 9528 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines B. 73 (Mr. Turriff) in Com., 3021 (ii).
Grand Trunk Western Ry. Co.'s B. 223 (Mr. A. H. Clarke) on M. to correct clerical error, 9306; in Com., 9510 (v).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding (remarks) 10102 (v).
High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay. Ry. Co.'s incorp., B. 202 (Mr. W. M. Martin) on M. for 2°, 8642 (v).
Hours of Labour on Public Works B. [illegible] (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1423 (i); on [illegible] for 3°, 3526 (ii).
House of Commons, Speaker of, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, &c. (Ques.) 705 (i).
See 'Eucharistic.'
—— Sessional Employes, Names. Ages. &c. (M. for ret.*) 980 (i).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
House of Commons, Ventilation (remarks) on M. for Sup., 4479 (iii).
Imperial Steamship Co.'s incorp., B. 105 (Mr. McKenzie) on Senate [illegible]nts, &c. (iv).
Industrial Disputes Investigation Act (remarks) 6938, 6946 (iv).
Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 2951 (ii).
Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).
I. C. R., Branch Lines Lease, (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).
I. C. R., Special Excursion Trains &c.. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
International Waterways Treaty (boundary waters) B. 36 (Mr. Pugsley) on M. for 2°, 9091 (v).
Japan and Canada Trade Relations B. 223 (Mr. Fielding) in Com., 9495 (v).
See 'China.'
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.'s B. 44 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 2595 (ii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.'s B. 60 (Mr. Geoffrion) in Com., 3182 (ii).
Lighthouse Keepers, Salaries, &c., on M. (Mr. Monk) for ret. (remarks) 773 (i).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System (prop. res.) 1184, neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
McClary's Manufacturing Co.'s B. 75 (Mr. Beattie) in Com., 3024 (ii).
Militia Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910 (Ques.) 8699 (v).
See 'Annual Drill.'
Ministers. Travelling Expenses, Tips, &c., on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 7476 (iv).
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.'s B. 45 (Mr. Ecrement) on M. for 3°, 7717; in Com., 7720 (iv).
National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9230; in Com., 9495 (v).
Naval Service of Canada, Total Cost of Cruisers, &c. (Ques.) 791 (i).
Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6525 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co.'s Investments in Canada, on prop. Res. for Com. (Mr. Monk) 780, 783 (i).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 (Mr. Gordon) in Com., 8648 (v).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Oliver, Hon. Mr.. Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8329 (v).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s Bill, on M. (Mr. Conmee) to introduce, 2848 (ii).
Opium, Importation of, Prohibition B. 22 (Mr. King) on M. for 1°, 469 (i).
Opium and Drug Prohibition B. 97 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 2532 (ii).
Ottawa City Sanitary Conditions, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts (remarks) 5535 (iii).
Ottawa Government Buildings, Parliament Grounds, Condition of (remarks) 7024 (iv).
Oyster Culture, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Cor. (remarks) 762 (i).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Associations, Expenditure *re* (Ques.) 7340 (iv).
Parcel Post System, Express Rates, &c. (remarks) 9920 (v).
Pelagic Sealing, Treaty between G.B. and U.S. *re* Protection (remarks) 3670 (ii).
——— Further information *re* (remarks) 3839 (ii).
——— Ratification of (remarks) 3769 (ii).
See 'Sealing.'
People's Railway Co.'s B. 110 (Mr. Nesbitt) on Senate Amts., 6611 (iv).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity, &c. (Ques.) 4828 (iii).
Poisons, Sale of, B. 13 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 261 (i).
Post Office Amt. B. 216 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com., 9578 (v).
Post Office Dept., Overcrowding in Basement (Ques.) 6667 (iv).
Precedence at Official Receptions (M. for cor.) 949 (i).
Preston, Mr.: *See* 'Netherlands.'
Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Report, 846 (i).
Public Works Supply, Objection *re* Full Vote, 9558 (v).
Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts, O.Cs, &c (M. for copies*) 981 (i).
Quebec Savings Bank Act Amt. B. 219 (Mr. Fielding) on M. for 2°, 9343 (v).
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of (remarks) 7109 (iv).
Ques. of Order, *re* Mr. Pugsley's Record in Public Life, 10202 (v).
Questions, Procedure *re* answering orally, &c. (remarks) 701 (i).
Rabies Outbreak, Expenditure *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*
Race Track Gambling, on M. (Mr. Miller) to print evidence, 10467 (v).
Railway Act Amt. B. 4 (Mr. Martin) on M. for 2°, 3944, in Com., 3946 (ii).
Ry. Act Amt. B. 2 (Mr. Lancaster) on M. for 2°, 959 (i).
Railway Accidents, Investigation *re*, on prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3939 (ii).
Railways, Capitalization of, on Amt (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 5254 (iii).
Railway Com., on M. (Mr. Guthrie) to sit during sittings of the House, 9226 (v).
——— on M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of the House, 10190 (v).
Railways — Transportation Problem, on Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3980, 3995 (iii).
——— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8370 (v).
——— Berlin Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5729 (iii).
——— Editorial in Montreal 'Star' (remarks) 4139 (iii).
——— Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer (remarks) 7264 (iv).
——— Oleomargarine, Admission of (remarks) 6504 (iv).
——— Ques. of Order, *re* Interruptions, 4451 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order *re* Obstruction by Ministers of Crown (Mr. Paterson) 4124 (iii).
——— on Ques. of Order, *re* referring to previous debate (remarks) 8253 (v).
——— in Com. on Res. (remarks) on handing in Statements, 6954 (iv).
——— Statistics of Comparative Prices, on Amt. (Mr. Perley) 6823 (iv).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7613, 7669 (iv).
——— Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Reading of, Ques. of Order, 7675 (iv).
Revillon Freres Trading Co.'s incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) in Com., 9166 (v).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3230 (ii).
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.'s B. 214 (Mr. Bickerdike) in Com., 9168 (v).
Scrip to Northwest Settlers, Claims of Pioneers (remarks) 10138 (v).
Seal Fisheries Negotiations (remarks) 9594 (v).
——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 10196 (v).
See 'Pelagic.'

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

Security (Sterling) Trusts Corporation incorp. B. 32 (Mr. W. M. Martin) in Com., 2597, 2649, 3844 (ii); on Senate Amts., 6610 (iv).

Senate, Abolition of, on prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2715 (ii).

Sewage Disposal B. 122 (Mr. Lewis) on M. for 1°, 4040 (iii).

Sheldon, C. D., Illegal Use of Mails (remarks) 1373 (i).

Songhees Indian Reserve B. 179 (Mr. Oliver) in Com. on Res., 7249 (iv).

South African Parlt., Rep. *re* from P.M.G. (remarks) 1581 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (animals health) 5955; (dairying) 6238 (iv); (exhibitions) 3781 (ii); (seeds) 6223; (tobacco production) 6262 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6412 (iv)

Canals—Chambly — (macadamizing) 6408; (machinery) 6357 (iv).

Canals—Lachine (concrete walls) 6358 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (working expenses) 6453 (iv).

Canals—St. Ours (electric equipment) 6396 (iv).

Canals—Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391 (iv).

Canals—Trent—(lift lock) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Canals—Williamsburg (machinery) 6426 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); Justice (salaries) 1019; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1472; Militia (salaries) 1031 (i); Privy Cuncil (clerkships) 8752 (v); Public Works—(salaries) 1033 (i).

Fisheries (Canadian exhibit) 6661; Ont. (inspectors) 6618 (iv).

Indians—Man. Sask. &c. (annuities) 8884 (v); Que. (medical attendance) 6036 (iv).

Labour Dept. (technical education commission) 3803 (ii).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (aids to navigation) 6455; (pensions to pilots) 6533; (shipbuilding) 6484; (Thunder Bay) 6500 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions (Annapolis and London) 8752; (Canada and G.B.) 8774; (Canada and S. Africa) 8784; (Gaspe and Dalhousie) 8786; (Port Mulgrave, &c.) 8786; (P.E.I. and G.B.) 8788; (Quebec and Blanc Sablon) 8788 (v).

Militia (allowance) 8518 (v).

Ocean and River Service (cattle inspection) 5828; (schools of navigation) 5824 (iii).

Public Works—Buildings—Dom. (electric power) 3210; (engineers) 3213; (Quarantine stations) 3213 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2096; (Dresden) 2107; (Dundas) 2109; (Essex) 2110; (Fort William) 2111; (Kingston) 2130; (Kingston, R.M.C.) 2132; (Listowel) 2141; (Midland) 2144; (Mitchell) 2146; (Peterborough) 2604 (ii).

SPROULE, Mr. T. S.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (H. of C. improvements) 2591; (Montreal barracks) 2569; (Printing Bureau) 2361 (ii); (Rideau Hall) 8878 (v); (water supply) 2583 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1686; (Marieville) 1697 (i).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3215; (salaries) 3214 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—N. S. (Amaguadees Pond) 9500 (v); Ont. (Victoria) 6022 (iv).

Railways—I. C. R. (working expenses) 6338; Miscellaneous (ry. commissioners) 6429 (iv).

Victoria Museum, Defects in Building (remarks) 7350 (iv).

Western Alberta Ry. Co.'s (B. 135) in Com., 6950 (iv).

Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to (Ques.) 708 (i).

—— (remarks) in Com. of Sup. 5982 (iv).

Woods Building Lighting Contract, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3195 (ii).

STANFIELD, Mr. J., *Colchester.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) on M. for 3°, 5253 (iii).

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S. (Ques.) 4674 (iii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Farmer Delegate to G. B., Payments to (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

—— (Ques.) 4828 (iii).

'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c. (Ques.) 1972 (ii).

Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale (prop. res.) 3226 (ii).

See 'Inspection.'

Hickman, W. A., Payments to *re* Immigration Agent to G. B. (M. for ret.*) 6505 (iv).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 3276 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (flour and meal) Amt. (B. 117) 1° m., 3453 (ii).

I. C. R., Accidents, Passes, &c., Inquiry for Return, 1571 (i).

—— I. C. R. and P. E. I. Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments (Ques.) 2159 (ii).

—— Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

—— Porters (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

—— Special Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings (remarks) 2999 (ii).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1724 (i).

STANFIELD, Mr. J.—*Con.*
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt. (Ques.) 5135 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ques.) 2668 (ii).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 2435 (ii).
Postoffice Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names &c. (Ques.) 1568 (i).
P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, on M. (Mr. Warburton) for Reps., 3889 (ii).
Railways—Transportation Problem, on Stmt. (Mr. Graham) to Sup., 5066 (iii).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction &c. (Ques.) 8103 (v).
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c. (Ques.) 3607 (ii).
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c. (Ques.) 1910 (i).
Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3112 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Campbellton) 1603; (Fredericton pavement) 1612 (i)
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1586; (Lunenburg) 1592; (Parrsboro) 1599 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (heating, &c., 6027 (iv); (lighting) 3175 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—P.E.I. (Tignish) 1603 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Battleford) 2971 (ii).
Railways—I.C.R. (bridge strengthening) 5914; (Campbellton) 5915; (Chatham) 5915; (facilities and accommodation) 5929; (highways protection) 5917; (Moncton car shops) 5926; (Truro) 5930 (iii); (working expenses) 6339 (iv).
Railways—P.E.I. (working expenses) 6356 (iv).
Truro Political Meeting, Instructions *re* Special Rates over I.C.R. (remarks) 2999 (ii).
Victoria Memorial Museum, Expenditures *re*, Space allotted, &c. (Ques.) 1975 (ii).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D., *Macdonald.*
Agricultural Implements, Imports since 1908, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).
—— Imported into Can., Valuations, &c., Complaint *re* Manipulation of Duties, &c. (remarks) 1359 (i).
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Carman Public Building (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii.
Census Enumerators for Man., Recommendations *re* Apptmt (remarks) 8889 (v).
—— Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor., &c. (read) on M. for Sup., 9006, (amt.) 9015; Neg. (Y. 51; N. 84) 9068 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c. (Ques). 5937 (iv).
Drill Halls, Man., Cost *re* (Ques.) 1975 (ii).
Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re* (remarks) 8128 (v).
Estimates for Man. Buildings, Objection to Discussing, 2969 (ii).
Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators (remarks) 1504 (i).
Flax exported from Saskatchewan (remarks) 10521 (v).
Fort Osborne Grounds, Purchase of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).
Grain Act Amt. B. 209 (Mr. Oliver) on M. for 2°, 9520 (v).
Grain Growers Grain Co.'s incorp. B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8095, 8550, 8921 (v).
Indian Act (treaty) Amt. B. 177 (Mr. Oliver)) in Com., 7848 (iv).
Interest Act Amt. (B. 146) 1° m., 5618 (iii).
Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land (M. for cor.*) 2225 (ii).
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Sec. 6, Tp. 7, Issue of, &c. (Ques.) 5834 (iii).
Leech, R. E. A., Payments to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5611 (iii).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re* (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6201 (iv).
—— Negotiations with Dom. Govt. (M. for cor*) 980 (i).
—— Speech of Prime Minister at Winnipeg *re* Cor., &c. (Ques.) 709 (i).
Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents, Cor. with Miss Wileman (remarks) 9376 (v).
Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials to, on Amt. (Mr. Boyce) 2770 (ii).
Newmarket Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10514 (v).
Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re* (Ques.) 3067 (ii).
Ry. Commission, Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Reciprocity Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (remarks) 6510 (iv).
—— Western Farmers' Interests (remarks) 5543 (iii).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re* (Ques.) 1291 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Extravagance of (remarks) 10519 (v).

STAPLES, Mr. W. D.—*Con.*

Seed Control Act (weeds) Amt. B. 157 (Mr. Fisher) in Com. on Res., 6194 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6251 (iv); (exhibitions) 3794 (ii), 9076 (v); (Quarantine, public health) 5981; (seeds) 6217; (tobacco production) 6263 (iv).

Canals—Welland (Port Colborne) 6400 (iv).

Civil Govt.—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955; Postoffice (contingencies) 6068 (iv).

Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).

Interior—Dom. Lands (surveys) 9547 (v).

Militia (rifle ranges) 6056 (iv).

Public Works—Buildings—Man. (Portage la Prairie) 3019; (Souris) 3019; (Winnipeg) 3018 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Sask. (Humboldt) 3008 (ii).

Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Sask. (repairs) 9553 (v).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv), 9076 (v).

STRATTON, Mr. J. R., *Peterborough West.*

Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.'s (B. 66) 1°*, 1487 (i).

Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1313 (i).

Fergus Postoffice Site, (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

Reciprocity, Peterborough Board of Trade Res. (remarks) 5750 (iii).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture &c. (seeds) 6218 (iv).

TALBOT, Mr. O. E., *Bellechasse.*

Drummond &c. Elections, on Personal Explanation (Mr. Brodeur) *re* Quotations from 'Le Devoir', 483 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8749 (v).

Naval Defence, Govt. Policy (remarks) on Address, 127 (i).

Privileges and Elections Com. (Mr. Lanctot) Ques. of Order, 7973 (v).

Quebec Members, Revolt against extra Session, Newspaper Articles, Denial of, 10096 (v).

Reciprocity with U. S., Ques. of Order, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) 4066 (iii).

——— Ques. of Order, calling Minister a coward, 10564 (v).

——— Statistics of Comparative Prices (remarks) 6808 (iv).

——— Vote of member for Labelle &c., 6839 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture—Quarantine (public health) 5980; Fisheries (inspectors) 6635 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G., *Leeds.*

Agriculture Implements, Reduction of Duties, on prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1944 (i).

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry Co., Amount paid, &c. (Ques.) 3853 (ii).

Banking and Commerce Committee, Reduction of Quorum, on M. (Mr. Miller) 2433 (ii).

Beef, Pork, &c. and other Animal Products, Imports, Quantity from Oct. 1, 1910, to Feb. 1911 (Ques.) 6264 (iv).

Bliss, Lt. Col. D. C. Foster, Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c. (Ques.) 8100 (v).

Butter, Cheese and Meats, Imported, Value, Weight, &c. (Ques.) 4926 (iii).

Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911 (Ques.) 4670 (iii).

Buoys, Stolen at Sorel Shipyards, Investigation *re* (remarks) 7216 (iv).

Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares. Payments for last year to Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).

See 'Ministers Travelling Expenses.'

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8835 (v).

Census, Omissions *re* Enumerations (remarks) 9720 (v).

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of (Ques.) 8095 (v).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909 (Ques.) 1103 (i).

Civil Service Act (post office) Amt. B. 217 (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. on Res., 8908 (v).

Coal Strike in the West, Agreement of Two Years past (remarks) 6365 (iv).

——— Suggestions to Minister of Labour (remarks) 9720 (v).

See 'Labour.'

Committees, Sel. Standing, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* (remarks) 5 (i).

Coronation, Adjournment for (remarks) 8714 (v).

Drummond and Arthabaska Elections (personal explanation) *re* Speech of Mr. Miller, M.P., *re* 'disloyalty,' 489 (i).

Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c. (M. for ret.*) 4383 (iii).

Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

——— Salary, Date of Increase (Ques.) 7701 (iv).

Escott Postmastership, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster (Ques.) 4926 (iii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* **Establishment** (M. for papers*) 1726 (i).

—— Royal Commission, Investigation *re*, **on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5450** (iii).

Fishery Inspectors in Ont., appointed by Dom. Govt., Duties, &c.. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6614 (iv).

Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8243 (v).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1779 (i).

House of Commons, Number of People Residing in, (Ques.) 3847 (ii).

—— Restaurant and Speaker's Rooms, Number of Employees (Ques.) 1085 (i).

—— Speakers' Chambers, Expenditure *re* Piano Rental (Ques.) 927 (i).

—— Speakers' Chambers, Purchase of Birds (Ques.) 928 (i).

—— Speakers' Chambers. Purchase of Glassware (Ques.) 928 (i).

—— Speakers' Chambers, Purchasing of Gramophone Records (Ques.) 927 (i).

Inspection and Sale Act (weights) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8750 (v).

I.C.R., Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation, (Ques.) 6665 (iv).

—— Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* appropriating Scrap Brass, &c., (Ques.) 6634 (iv).

—— Gaskin, Mr. John, Investigation *re* Charges, &c., (Ques.) 7601 (iv).

—— Hawke, Mr. J. T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds, &c., (Ques.) 6665 (iv).

—— Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., (Ques.) 6666 (iv).

—— Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray, *re* Tickets, &s. (,Ques.) 7031 (iv).

Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C. (Ques.) 2665 (ii).

Labour Strikes, 'Point of the Bayonet,' Ques of Priv., 9784 (v).

—— Use of Militia, Cor., &c., (remarks) 10345 (v).

See 'Coal.'

Letter Carriers, Free Transportation on Electric Rys. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Long Sault Dam, on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3266 (ii).

Mahone Bay Customs Collector. Dismissal, &c., (Ques.) 4301 (iii).

—— (M. for cor.*) 4383 (iii).

Marriages, Power of Parlt. to Legalize (Ques.) 8585 (v).

—— Govt.'s Intention *re* (Ques.) 10195 (v).

Matches, Phosphorus Prohibition B. 96 (Mr. King) in Com. on Res., 2060 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Meteorological Service (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Ministers, Speeches of, Distributed by Postmasters (remarks) 9253 (v).

—— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters (remarks) 9071 (v).

—— Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c., (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret., 3954 (iii).

—— on M. for Com. on Ways and Means. 7432 (iv).

See 'Cab', 'Public Works.'

National Battlefields at Quebec B. 222 (Mr. Lemieux) on M. for 1°, 9243 (v).

Post Office Buildings, Necessity of, Quotation from President Taft's Speech (read) in Com. of Sup., 1873 (i).

Precedence at Official Receptions, on M. (Mr. Sproule) for Cor., 954 (i).

Printing Bureau Investigation, Number of Dismissals, Names, &c. (Ques.) 708 (i).

Public Accounts Com., on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to ref. to Aud. Gen.'s Report, 839 (i).

Public Works, Travelling Expenses, Inquiry for Ret., 8356, 9071 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 8244 (v).

—— Absence of Ministers during Discussion (remarks) 8358 (v).

—— Admission of Agricultural Products free from Foreign Countries (remarks) 4934 (iii).

—— Letter of Sir Charles Tupper (read) 8277 (v).

—— Negotiations at Washington, Instruction to Mr. Bryce, Cable Dispatch (read) 4140 (iii).

—— Statistics of Comparative Prices, Ques. of Order, 6835 (iv).

—— accepting as read and printing in Hansard (remarks) 6857 (iv).

Rideau Canal Lockmen, Increased Pay (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).

St. Lawrence, Aids to Navigation, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c. (Ques.) 799 (i).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (exhibitions) 3777 (ii), 9080 (v); (farm bulletins) 6187; (Patent Record) 6184; Quarantine (public health) 5980 (iv).

Canals—Beauharnois (Hungry Bay dyke) 6411; Chambly (macadamizing) 6409; Cornwall (Robertson's culvert) 6409; Lake St. Francis (protection walls) 6412; Soulanges (leaks, &c.) 6391; (mooring posts) 6389 (iv).

TAYLOR, Mr. G.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Civil Govt—Agriculture (contingencies) 5955 (iv); (salaries) 1475; Marine and Fisheries (salaries) 1464 (i).
Fisheries—Ont. (inspectors) 6614; (overseers) 6159 (iv).
House of Commons (messengers) 6172 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service (buoy steamers) 6546; (Lime Kiln Crossing) 6546; (maritime road) 6545 (iv).
Marine—Public Works (St. Lawrence ship channel) 6556 (iv).
Public Works—Buildings—N.S. (Halifax post office) 1587; (Parrsboro) 1598; (Wolfville) 1599 (i).
Public Works—Buildings—Ottawa (lighting contracts) 3174, 3191 (ii).
Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Napierville) 1865 (i).
Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Port Arthur) 5994 (iv).
Quarantine (Tracadie Lazaretto) 6187 (iv).
Railways—I.C.R. (freight cars) 5989 (iv).
Scientific Institutions (magnetic observatory) 6558; (meteorological service) 6561, 6566 (iv).
Senate (address to His Ex.) 6167 (iv).
Steamboat Inspection (salaries) 6572 (iv).

Technical Education, Progress re, Total Expenditure, &c. (Ques.) 1721 (i).

Truro Freight Shed Fire (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Whip, Chief, Retirement of, on M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Sel. Com. (remarks) 6 (i).

Winnipeg, St. Charles Rifle Range, Sale of, Valuation, &c. (Ques.) 7343 (iv).

Woods Building, Lighting Contract (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 3194 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D., *New Westminster.*

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, &c., (Ques.) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of (Ques.) 1284 (i).

British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.'s (B. 17) 1°*, 376; in Com., 1682 (i).

Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.'s (B. 67) 1°*, 1487 (i).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt. B. 147 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 7870 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission. Censure to Govt. (Amt.) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).
—— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy, Inquiry for, 9594 (v).
—— (evidence read, &c.) 9786 (v).
—— Accusation *re* Obstruction (Mr. Fielding) 9888 (v).
—— Discussion *re* Rep., 9926 (v).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*

Conciliation Board of Labour Dept., Principle of Action (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).

Dog Fish Industry (remarks) 8049 (v).

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of (M. for cor.) 2188 (ii).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9630 (v).

Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com. on Res., 8044; in Com., 8419 (v).
See 'Supply Fisheries'.

Fisheries Treaty. 1908, Non-fulfilment by U. S. (remarks) 6528 (iv).
—— Proclamation *re* (remarks) 5035 (iii).

Fisheries Treaty, Further Information *re* (remarks) 8479 (v).
—— Regulations, Changes at Washington, on M. for Sup., 8479 (v).

Fishery Regulations *re* International Commission, Date of Operation *re* (Ques.) 3465 (ii).
—— Regulations, Mess. from Wash. (remarks) 6504 (iv).

Fraser Mills, Postmaster, Defalcation of Funds, Bonds *re* (Ques.) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re* (Ques.) 3463 (ii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c., (Ques.) 1285 (i).

Fruit Growers Association, B.C., Protest *re* Duty, &c. (read) 3373 (ii).

G. T. P. Labourers at Lafond, in Alberta, Amounts owing for work, &c., (Ques.) 3669 (ii).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pet. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c., (Ques.) 3468 (ii).

Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber, &c. (Ques.) 3282 (ii).

Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re* (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).
See 'New Westminster.'

Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application, &c., Ry. Belt, &c., (M. for ret.) 2855 (ii).

Hope Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* (Ques.) 3068 (ii).
—— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt. (Ques.) 3846 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works B. 3 (Mr. Verville) in Com., 1447 (i); on M. for 3°, 2864 (ii).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings of Com. (Ques.) 3280 (ii).

TAYLOR, Mr. J. D.—*Con.*
Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes (M. for ret.*) 1339 (i).
Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.'s (B. 18) 1°*, 376 (i).
Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways (M. for cor.) 2194 (ii).
Miner. Bill, Capture of, Return to Canada (remarks) 4384 (iii).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grant issued, &c. (Ques.) 1291 (i).
See 'Homestead,' 'Timber,' &c.
New Westminster Penitentiary, Increase of Pay to Employees (M. for cor.) 2183 (ii).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8343 (v).
Printing Bureau Investigation, on M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7785 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res. 9673 (v).
—— Cor. *re* (remarks) 2988 (ii).
—— Resolutions, Presenting of (remarks) 5948 (iv).
—— Tels. read from B.C. Agricultural Associations, 3955 (iii).
See 'Fruit.'
Ruddock, R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B.C., &c. (Ques.) 3279 (ii).
Springhill Strike, Action of Conciliation Board (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 4241 (iii).
SUPPLY—
Arts, Agriculture, &c. (dairying) 6238 (iv).
Fisheries (overseers) 3825 (ii).
Labour Dept (conciliation board) 4244; (Labour Gazette) 4235 (iii); Ques. of Order, 3451 (ii).
Post Office (clerks) 4288; (postmasters' salaries) 4290; (stamps) 4280 (iii).
Public Works—Buildings—B.C. (Chilliwack) 3012; (Cranbrook) 3014; Generally (experimental farms) 3159 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster District, Pets. against Renewals, &c. (Ques.) 3222 (ii).
See 'New Westminster.'

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W. (Minister of Inland Revenue, *Comox-Atlin.*
Astronomers Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt by Govt. (Ans.) 8583 (v).
Canning, J. H., Inland Revenue Inspector, Retirement of (Ans.) 1350 (i).
Chinese Immigration, Encounter with Mr. Jardine (remarks) 2740 (ii).

TEMPLEMAN, Hon. W.—*Con.*
Chinese Investigation Commission, on Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10392, 10422 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9805 (v).
Elections Deferred (remarks) 10381 (v).
Elliott, George E., Emplymt. by Govt. (Ans.) 1497 (i).
Explosives Regulations (B. 79) M. for Com. on Res., 989; in Com. on prop. Res., 1577 (i); in Com., 8451 (v).
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c. (Ans.) 2374 (ii).
Fisheries Act (B.C. licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8426 (v).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Excessive Measurements (Ans.) 3280 (ii).
Geological Survey Rep. (presented) 9690 (v).
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption (Ans.) 2673 (ii).
Holland Peat Bog (Ans.) 4303 (iii).
Inland Revenue Act (French version), Correction of Clerical Error (B. 132) 1°*, 4566 (iii); in Com., 8088 (v).
Inland Revenue Rep. (presented) 7 (i).
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act (Ans.) 5131 (iii).
Mineral Notices, Circular of Mr. F. H. Fourchet, &c. (Ans.) 4306 (iii).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt by Govt in Inland Revenue, P.E.I. (Ans.) 2668 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c. (Ans.) 5132 (iii).
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c. (Ans.) 708, 986 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 4811 (iii).
Statutes, French Translations, Corrections (remarks) 8089 (v).
SUPPLY—
Civil Govt—Inland Revenue (contingencies) 1048; Inland Revenue (salaries) 1047; Mines (salaries) 1475 (i).
Geological Survey (explorations, &c.) 9551 (v).
Public Works—Buildings—Yukon (Dawson) 3216 (ii).

THOBURN, Mr. W., *Lanark, North.*
Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W Dept (remarks) 2648 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, B. 3 (Mr. Verville) on M. for 3°, 2880 (ii).
James Bay, Fishing Lease to A. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c. (Ques.) 4830 (iii).
Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1206 (1).
Mississippi Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re* (remarks) 9252 (v).

THOBURN, Mr. W.—*Con.*

Negro Immigration, Restrictions *re* (remarks) 6523 (iv).

Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 9764, 9879 (v).

SUPPLY—

House of Commons (charwomen) 6174 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Que. (St. Jacques de l'Achigan) 1893 (i).

Telegraph and Cable Services, Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9644 (v).

THORNTON, Mr. C. J., *Durham.*

Brown, George Addison, Relief (B. 139) 1°*, 5525 (iii).

Butter and Cheese, Protection *re* Marketing (remarks) on M. for Sup., 6211 (iv).

Farmers' Bank, Failure, Assets, &c., Keely Mine, Value &c. (Ques.) 2152 (ii).

—— Royal Commission *re* Investigation, on Amt. (Mr. Henderson) 5315, 5440 (iii).

Forest Reserves B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8085 (v).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8080 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7040 (v).

—— Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs (Ques.) 5133 (iii).

—— Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian' (read &c.) 9072 (v).

SUPPLY—

Art, Agriculture &c. (dairying) 6248 (iv); Public Works—Buildings—Generally (experimental farms) 3158 (ii).

Sussex Street, Govt. Properties, Names of Owners (Ques.) 6666 (iv).

TOBIN, Mr. E. W., *Richmond and Wolfe.*

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Denial by Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence, 134 (i).

TODD, Mr. W. F., *Charlotte.*

Fisheries Act (B.C. Licenses) Amt. B. 185 (Mr. Brodeur) in Com., 8447 (v).

TOLMIE, Mr. J., *Bruce North.*

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.'s (B. 62) 1°*, 1487 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459 (ii).

Bell, Hugh Samuel Relief (B. 191) 1°*, 8187 (v).

Johnston, Mary Hamilton Relief (B. 140) 1°*, 5619 (iii).

Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.'s (B. 159) 1°*, 6439 (iv).

Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 76) 1°*, 1488 (i).

TOLMIE, Mr. J.—*Con.*

Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.'s incorp. (B. 83) 1°*, 1640 (i).

Stapleton, Dalton Mabel Relief (B. 141) 1°*, 5619 (iii).

Sutherland, George Mackay Relief (B. 218) 1°*, 9089 (v).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Peterborough) 2609 (ii).

Western Canal Co.'s incorp. (B. 195) 1°*, 8308 (v).

TURCOTTE, Mr. G. A., *Nicolet.*

Naval Policy and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 494 (i).

TURCOTTE, Mr. J. P., *Quebec County.*

Address, The, 190 (i).

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6320 (iv).

Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries, on M. (Mr. Beauparlant) to Sup., 4579 (iii).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election (remarks) on Address, 190 (i).

Indian River Ry. Co.'s (B. 90) 1°*, 1710 (i).

I.C.R., St. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction (Ques.) 2436 (ii).

Privileges and Elections Com., Ques. of Order, 8000 (v).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 7506 (iv).

—— Convention at Washington, Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c. (M. for copy*) 3948 (ii).

Revillon Freres Trading Co., Limited, incorp. B. 158 (Mr. Devlin) on M. for 2°, 7147 (iv).

TURGEON, Mr. O., *Gloucester.*

I.C.R., Branch Lines Lease (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 9590 (v).

—— Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1166 (i).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G., *Assiniboia.*

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 93 (Mr. McCarthy) in Com., 5082, 5575; on M. for 3°, 5252 (iii).

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.'s B. 51 (Mr. Crothers) in Com., 3028 (ii).

Athabaska Northern Ry. Co.'s (B. 59) 1°*, 1453 (i).

Bradley, Mr. John, Irregularity *re* Homestead Entry (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5586 (iii).

Canadian Western Ry. Co.'s (B. 70) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3062 (ii).

Coal Miners' Strike in West, Rep. of Conciliation Board (remarks) 9705 (v).

TURRIFF, Mr. J. G.—*Con.*
Elevator Terminals at Port Arthur, &c., on prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2421 (ii).
Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation, on M. (Mr. Middlebro) 9620 (v).
Flax Exports from Saskatchewan, &c., (remarks) 10521 (v).
Forest Reserves and Parks B. 85 (Mr. Oliver) in Com., 8620 (v).
Grain Growers' Grain Co.'s incorp., B. 171 (Mr. Rutan) in Com., 8238, 8559 (v).
G. T. P. Branch Lines (B. 73) 1°*, 1488 (i); in Com., 3021 (ii).
Homestead Irregularities (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5592 (iii).
I. C. R. Eastern N. S. Extension, on prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie), 1124 (i).
Long Sault Dam on St. Lawrence River, on M. for Com. of Sup., 2895 (ii).
——— on M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3265 (ii).
Ontario and Minnesota Power Co.'s B. 109 (Mr. Conmee) in Com., 6145 (iv).
Reciprocity with U. S., in Com. on Res., 8148 (v).
——— Obstruction *re* (remarks) 10023 (v).
——— Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt. (remarks) 7679 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Interior—Dom. Lands (homesteads) 5559 (iii); Public Works—Buildings—Sask., (Weyburn) 3012 (ii).
Telegraph and Cable Services Improvements (remarks) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9645 (v).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govt. Intention, (remarks) 8895 (v).

VERVILLE, Mr. A., *Maisonneuve.*
Co-operative Credit Societies B. 11 (Mr. Monk) in Com., 1333 (i).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, (B. 3) 1°*, 148; 2° m., 1407, in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728-9 (i); 3° m., 2864, 3276, 3526 (ii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause, &c. (Ques.) 5835 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G., *York Centre (O.)*
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res., (Mr. Beattie) 4360 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Arrangement *re* re-instatement (Ques.) 654 (i).
Humber River Bridge, Obstruction to Navigation (Ques.) 5403 (iii).
Newmarket Canal, Rep. and Cor. of Mr. Walsh (read) 10474, (amt.) 10489, Neg., Y. 45; N. 79) 10533 (v).
——— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. (M. for copies*) 5136 (iii).

WALLACE, Mr. T. G.—*Con.*
——— Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Inquiry for Ret. (remarks) 7556 (iv).
Cost, &c. (Ques.) 5830 (iii).
Porcupine Fire Sufferers, Request for Tents, Supplies, &c. (Ques.) 9983 (v).
Reciprocity Vote, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) Ques. of Priv., 3461 (ii).
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22, &c., in Tp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re* (M. for copies*) 980 (i).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values, since April, 1910 (Ques.) 7593 (iv).
SUPPLY—
Post Office (free delivery) 4295 (iii).

WARBURTON, Mr. A. B., *Queen's, P.E.I.*
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c. (M. for cor.) 714 (i).
P.E.I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c. (M. for copies) 3863, 3917 (ii).
P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorial, &c., on M. (Mr. Richards) for Copies, 2179 (ii).
Public Accounts Com. (M.) to ref. Aud. Gen.'s Rep. to Committee, 527, 818 (i).
——— on Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 836 (i).
Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 3709 (ii).
SUPPLY—
Marine ('Earl Grey') 6477 (iv).

WHITE, Mr. G. V., *Renfrew, North.*
American Bank Note Co.'s Contract *re* Bank Notes, Acceptance of Designs for Postage Stamps (Ques.) 7247 (iv).
See 'Stamps.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8823; in Com., 9304 (v).
Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries (Ques.) 4467 (iii).
Flags Flying in Canada, on prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4348 (iii).
Georgian Bay Canal, on Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. of Sup., 5148 (iii).
——— Estimates *re* &c. (remarks) 2004 (ii).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.'s incorp. B. 170 3° m., 8962 (v).
Pensions to Veterans (remarks) 6915 (iv).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Forces in Training (Ques.) 4465 (iii).
——— Extent of Damage by Fire (remarks) 9090 (v).
Petawawa Wharf (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Postage Stamps, Canadian Design, (remarks) 7106 (iv).
——— New Issue, Condemnation *re* (Ques.) 9990 (v).

WHITE, Mr. G. V.—*Con.*

Postage Stamps, Prizes *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c. (Ques.) 5402 (iii).
See 'American.'

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re* (Ques.) 4045 (iii).

Rural Mail Delivery (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture, &c. (farm bulletins) 6185 (iv); Civil Govt.—Militia (salaries) 1032 (i).

Tariff Resolutions, Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2641 (ii).

WHITE, Mr. W. H., *Victoria, Alta.*

Elevators, Terminal, &c. on Amt. (Mr. Neely) to prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3509 (ii).

Live Stock Industry, Cold Storage System, on prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1274 (i).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Alta. (Vegreville) 3011 (ii).

WILCOX Mr O. J., *Essex, North.*

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules, &c. (remarks) 310 (i).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiations with U.S. *re* (remarks) 1575 (i).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of, &c. (Ques.) 1350 (i).

Farm Products entered at Windsor, from 1906-1910 (Ques.) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c. (Ques.) 8701 (v.)

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission (remarks) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations, Modification of (remarks) 1803 (i)

G.T.Trainmen's Strike, Inaction of Govt., on Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5809 (iii).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c. (Ques.) 9782 (v).

Negro Immigrants, Treatment of, Prohibition of into Canada (remarks) 5941 (iv).

Post Office Revenue at Tlbury, Essex, &c., for the years 1904-10 (Ques.) 807 (i).
See 'Walkervlle.'

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—N.B. (Hartland) 1617; Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685 (i).

Walkerville Post Office Building, and Mail Distribution (remarks) *re* Post Office Staff 2559 (ii).

——— (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
See 'Post Office.'

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of (Ques.) 6272 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. C. A., *Laval.*

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to, on Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6316 (iv).

Banking and Commerce Com., on M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 3603 (ii).

Canadian Commissioner at Paris, Contradiction of Question asked in Senate, 9545 (v).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c. (Ques.) 804 (i).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896 (M. for ret.*) 1340 (i).

National Weekly Indemnity Co., Change of Name (B. 77) 1°*, 1488 (i).

Racial and Religious Prejudices in Liberal Pamphlets (remarks) on Address, 542 (i).

Riviere des Prairies Dredging, Rep. *re* (M. for copy) 2162 (ii).

SUPPLY—

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Maisonneuve) 1685; (Marieville) 1698 (i); (Montreal barracks) 3149 (ii).

WILSON, Mr. U., *Lennox and Addington.*

Cameron, Miss, Immigration Agent in G. B. (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 5191 (iii).

Canadian Northern Ry. Guarantee Bonds B. 211 (Mr. Graham) in Com. on Res., 8827 (v).

Immigration Agents in G.B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c. (M. for ret.*) 981 (i).

Immigration Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910 (Ques.) 4300 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c. (M. for ret.) 1498 (i).

Immigration Statistics, Publication of (remarks) 2366, 2556 (ii).

Inspection and Sale Act (weight) Amt. B. 153 (Mr. Fisher) in Com., 8745 (v).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c. (Ques.) 1104 (i).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions, &c. (M. for cor.*) 981 (i).

——— Cor. *re* (remarks) 1903 (i), 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Reciprocity with U.S., in Com. on Res., 9727 (v).

SUPPLY—

Arts, Agriculture — Quarantine (public health) 5981 (iv).

Canals—Miscellaneous (lock keepers) 6453; Welland (Port Colborne) 6398 (iv).

Dom. Lands—(Forestry convention) 6052 (iv).

Immigration (agents) 5166, Reply to Minister, 5177 (iii).

Interior (immigration agents) 4729 (iii).

Justice—Miscellaneous (Hague arbitration) 6164 (iv).

Labour Dept—(Labour Gazette) 6057 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service (lighthouses) 6460, 6496 (iv).

WILSON, Mr. U.—*Con.*

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Marine (supplies) 6473 (iv).

Miscellaneous (coronation decorations) 9565 (v).

Public Works—Buildings—Ont. (Athens) 2089; (Peterborough) 2603 (ii).

Public Works—Buildings—Que. (Grosse Isle) 1677; (Montreal barracks) 1864; (Napierville) 1866 (i).

Railways—Miscellaneous (Gov. Gen's cars) 6446 (iv).

WRIGHT, Mr. W., *Muskoka.*

Bracebridge Post Office (remarks) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Reciprocity with U.S. in Com. on Res., 7461 7481 (iv).

SUPPLY—

Immigration (Agents) 5166 (iii); Public Works—Harbours and Rivers—Ont. (Victoria) 6023 (iv).

Technical Education Commission, Completion of Work (remarks) 1662 (i).

INDEX—SUBJECTS

Absence of Ministers during Discussion *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Accidents on Rys: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

———*See* 'Finance.'

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post-office Revenues: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).

Address, The, M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) *re* Precedence, 5 (i).

Address, The, in Ans. to His Ex.'s Speech: Moved (Mr. McGiverin) 10; Seconded (Mr. Lapointe) 16 (i).

Debate:—(Mr. R. L. Borden) 22; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 44; (Mr. Foster) 60; (Mr. Guthrie) 77; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98; (Mr. Monk) 111; (amt.) 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651; (Mr. Brodeur) 135, 152; (Mr. Blondin) 169; (Mr. Beland) 172; (Mr. Nantel) 179; (Mr. Jos. Turcotte) 190; (Mr. Paquet) 197; (Mr. Rivet) 208; (Mr. R. L. Borden) Amt. to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649; (Mr. Miller) 229; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 246; (Mr. Fowke) 254, 271; (Mr. M. Clark) 297; (Mr. Burrell) 303, 311; (Mr. Neely) 325; (Mr. Sproule) 334; (Mr. Paterson) 346; (Mr. Blain) 355; (Mr. Kyte) 369; (Mr. Northrup) 378; (Mr. Ralph Smith) 402; (Mr. Middlebro) 423; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 441; (Mr. Crothers) 491; (Mr. G. A. Turcotte) 494; (Mr. Proulx) 497; (Mr. Carvell) 512; (Mr. Foster) 531; (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 567; (Mr. Monk) on Amt. (Mr. Borden) 595;(Mr. Lafortune) 615; (Mr. Gilbert) 624; (Mr. Fisher) 626; (Mr. Campbell) 640; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).

Address in Ans. to His Ex's Speech: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to present, 694 (i).

Address, the, Reply from His Ex.: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1487 (i).

Address to His Ex., Casket for: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

Adjournment for Coronation, Definite Date: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9090 (v).

———Extension of Time: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 9566 (v).

——— M. (Mr. Fielding) 9580 (v).

See 'Coronation', 'Business.'

Adjournment of House: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 866 (i).

Administration of Oaths: *See* 'B. No. 1.'

Admiralty Court, N.S., Proposed Change: M. for Cor. (Mr. McKenzie) 2166 (ii).

Administrator of the Govt. during His Ex.'s Absence, Emoluments for: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1089 (i).

Adulteration of Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).

See 'Public Works.'

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Reciprocity; Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

See 'Agriculture, Implements.'

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U. S. *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

———*See* 'Reciprocity.'

AGRICULTURE:

Agriculture, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).

——— Deptl. Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Agriculture, Govt. Aid to: Amt. (Mr. Gilbert) to Com. of Sup., 6274 (iv).

——— Notice of Motion (Mr. Gilbert) 5938 (iv).

Agricultural Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

Agricultural Products, imported into B. C. from U. S., Australia, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 7344 (iv).

Agricultural Products and Dairy Produce imported from U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9991 (v).

Agriculture, Total Expenditure from Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 4302 (iii).

Agricultural Products of Canada, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6756 (iv).

Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).

Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).

Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct. 1910 to Feb. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).

——— Supply. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).

Cattle exports to the U.S., Bonded to G.B.: Remarks (Mr Blain) 7426 (iv).

——— Reshipped to G.B.: Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cheese and Butter, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).

Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).

Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).

Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i).

Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii).

Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v).

Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).

Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).

——— See 'Winnipeg.'

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Expenditures on Militia and Agriculture from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371, 9432 (v).

Expenditures in Ontario for 1910; Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).

Experimental Farms Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).

Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).

Experimental Farms, Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best), in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).

Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).

——— Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).

Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906-1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farm and Dairy Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingson Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt. Qualifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).

Hay Claims, Delay in repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).

Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U.S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).

Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).

Implements, Reduction of Duties: Prop. Res. (Mr. Meighen) 1915 (i).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

—— Resuming adjd. Debate: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 2253 (ii), 4383 (iii).

Implements, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

Imports into Canada, Quantity, Average Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5401 (iii).

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).

Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).

Milk and Cream shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

—— Exports to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 3530 (ii).

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques., (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).

Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).

Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).

Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U.S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).

Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).

Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5105 (iii).

Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).

AGRICULTURE—*Con.*

Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).

Winnipeg World's Fair, Grant to: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).

Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).

See '*Marine*'.

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Air Brakes, Triple Valve, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Alaskan Boundary Commission's Report: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3952 (iii).

Alberta Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 92'.

Alberta Electric Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 93'.

Alberta Ry. and Irrigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 51'.

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organisation of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's Connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 133'.

Albert and Moncton Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 220'.

Alcoholism International Congress, Delegates to: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 5632 (iii).

Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 62'.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Alien Labour Law, Administration at Sault Ste. Marie: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).

—— Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).

Aliens Naturalization, Legislation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2666 (ii).

See 'Labour'.

Aliens, Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

All Red Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

See 'Atlantic'.

Alsek and Yukon Ry. Co.: *See* , B. No. 162.'

'Alva' Str., Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).

—— Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).

Amaguadees Pond, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).

American Bank Note Co.'s Contract, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 7247 (iv).

See 'Post Office'.

American Boats through Can. Canals, Reciprocity for: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).
American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
——— *See* 'Coin.'
American War Vessels passing through Canadian Canals, Permission from Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10334 (v).
——— *See* 'U.S.'
Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Anglo-American Treaty, Arbitration, Communications *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5619 (iii).
Anglo-Japanese Commercial Treaty, Signing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6673 (iv).
——— Cor. *re* Favoured Nation Clause: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 6758, 6906 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Burrell) 7255 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2271 (ii).
——— Termination of, Cor. *re* Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 2003 (ii).
——— *See* 'Japan.'
Animals Health, Quarantine, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Animal Industry in Canada, Reps. Data, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Magrath) 4677 (iii).
Animals transported between Can. and U.S., Disregard of Rules: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 310 (i).
Annapolis and London Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
Annual Drill, Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).
See 'Militia.'
Annuities for Indians, Man., Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8884 (v).
Answers of Ministers to Questions *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).
Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).
Archives: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Archives, Historical Researches, Names of Staff: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).
'Arctic,' Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
——— Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
Argentine Canned Meats, Embargo *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 10350 (v).
Argyle Sound, N.S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).
Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Arthabaska Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 59.'
Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics: in Com. of Sup., 1474 (i), 5955 (iv), 9076 (v).
Ash Wednesday Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4115 (iii).
Assiniboine River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).
Associated Boards of Trade of Ont. and Reciprocity: Res. Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'
Astronomers Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
See 'Post Office.'
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co., and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
See 'Charing Cross.'
Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).
Aud. Gen's Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).
Aud. Gen.'s Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).
Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).
Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).
Aylwin Irrigation Grant: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).
——— *See* 'Interior.'
Babcock, Mr., Payments *re* Extra Work: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6108 (iv).
Baby Farm, Toronto Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2155 (ii).
———*See* 'Militia'

Baddeck, Grand Narrows and Iona Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8763 (v).
Baggage Smashing: *See* 'B. No. 129.'
Bahamas and Canada, Negotiations *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8955 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).
Bait Freezers Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).
Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).
Bank Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 5, 14, 50, 213, 219.'
Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).
Bank Act, Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).
Bank Act, Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).
——*See* 'Finance.'
Bank Charters, Extension: *See* 'B. Nos. 213, 219 and 221.
Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4569 (iii), 7556 (iv).
——— Explanation (Mr. Foster) 5038 (iii).
Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).
——— Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).
Bank Failures, Rep. of Curators to Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii).
——— Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).
——*See* 'Finance.'
Banking and Commerce Com.: M. (Mr. Miller) to reduce Quorum, 2364, 2429, 3599 (ii).
——— M. (Mr. Miller) to sit during Sessions of House, 8355 (v).
Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt. ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).
Bank Officers and Creditors: *See* 'B. No. 207.'
Baptist Convention of Ont. and Que.: *See* 'B. No. 152.'
See 'Can. Baptist.'
Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).
Barlow, John R., Emplymt. by Geological Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8533 (v).
Barrett, Mr., Payments to *re* Lifting Buoys: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Barrington Bait Freezer: *See* Bait 'Freezer.'
Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).
——— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'
Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).
——— Cor. Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).
——— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Fisheries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).
——— *See* 'Hague Arbitration.'
Bay of Quinté Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 88.'
Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
Bear River Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range, Pets *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).
Bear River Rifle Range: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).
Beatty, Mary Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 163.'
Beauharnois Canal, Alienation of, Reps. *re*: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).
——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).
——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).
——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).
——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).
See 'Canals.'
Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).
Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).
See Indians.'
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Beef, Pork, &c., and other Animal Productions, Imports, Quantity, &c. from Oct., 1910 to Feb., 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6264 (iv).
See 'Butter.'
Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application re Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).
Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Bell, Hugh Samuel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 191.'

Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Belleville Govt. Buildings, Draping for King's Death: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Bellevue Mining Disaster, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 1079 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).
See 'Reciprocity.'

Bermuda, Information *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 5216 (iii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bills, Royal Assent, Com. from Gov. Gen.'s Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 6574 (iv) 9536 (v).

Bills, Royal Assent, 9591 (v).

BILLS:

Bill (No. 1) Respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).
1°*, 2 (i).

Bill (No. 2) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Lancaster).
1°, 8; 2°, 956, 1407, 1797 (i).

Bill (No. 3) Respecting the Hours of Labour on Public Works.—(Mr. Verville).
1°*, 148; 2°, 1407; in Com., 1408, 1527, 1728 (i); 3° m., 3276, 3526 (ii).

Bill (No. 4) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Martin, St. Mary's).
1°*, 148 (i); 2°, 3943; M. for Com., 3945; in Com., 3946 (ii); 3°*, 4583 (iii).

Bill (No. 5) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Demers).
1°, 148 (i).

Bill (No. 6) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Miller).
1°, 149; 2°, 968; in Com., 976, 1294, 1510; 3°*, 1728 (i).

Bill (No. 7) To amend the Companies Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1296 (i); M. to place on Govt. Orders, 8789 (v).

Bill (No. 8) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 149; 2°, 1298 (i).

Bill (No. 9) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Carvell).
1°, 150; 2°, 1300; in Com., 1301, 1526; 3°*, 1527 (i); Sen. Amts., 3460, 3845 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 10) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosporus.—(Mr. King).
1°, 194; 2°, 1576 (i).

Bill (No. 11) Respecting Co-operative Credit Societies.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 194; 2°, 1302; in Com., 1302 (i).

Bill (No. 12) To amend the Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908.—(Mr. Beauparlant).
1°, 195 (i); Order dschgd., 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 13) Respecting the Sale of Poisons. (Mr. Lewis).
1°, 259 (i).

Bill (No. 14) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 261 (i).

Bill (No. 15) To amend the Canada Medical Act.—(Mr. Black).
1°, 309 (i); 2°, 2253 (ii); in Com., 6067; 3°*, 6068 (iv).

Bill (No. 16) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).
1°, 377 (i).

Bill (No. 17) Respecting the British Columbia Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700; in Com., 1682; 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 18) Respecting the Kootenay and Arrowhead Railway Company.—(Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).
1°*, 376; 2°*,700; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 19) Respecting the Manitoba and Northwestern Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Cash).
1°*, 376; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 20) Respecting the Mather Bridge and Power Company.—(Mr. German).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 21) Respecting the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).
1°*, 377; 2°*, 700 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2100 (ii).

Bill (No. 22) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal Purposes.—(Mr. King).
1°, 468 (i).

Bill (No. 23) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Meighen).
1°, 529 (i).

Bill (No. 24) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Edwards).
1°, 530 (i).

Bill (No. 25) To amend the Exchequer Court Act.—(Mr. Barnard).
1°, 663 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 26) Respecting the Saving of Daylight.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°*, 663 (i).

Bill (No. 27) Respecting Licenses to Fishing Vessels.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 698 (i).

Bill (No. 28) To amend the Elections Act.—(Mr. Jameson).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 29) Respecting Co-operation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 30) Respecting the Inspection of Railway Locomotive Steam Boilers.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°, 699 (i).

Bill (No. 31) Respecting the Guelph and Goderich Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1080; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 32) To incorporate the Sterling Trusts Corporation.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032 (i); in Com., 2596, 2648, 3021, 3180, 3453, 3841 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6609 (iv).

Bill (No. 33) Respecting the South Ontario Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 34) Respecting the Walkerton and Lucknow Railway Company.—(Mr. Donnelly).
1°*, 817; 2°*, 1032; in Com., and 3°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 35) Respecting Pure Foods.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).
1°, 865 (i).

Bill (No. 36) Relating to the establishment and expenses of the International Joint Commission under the Waterways Treaty of January the eleventh, nineteen hundred and nine.—(Mr. Pugsley).
Prop. Res., 695; in Com. on Res., 867; 1°* of B., 923 (i); 2° m., 9091; in Com., 9156, 9172; 3°*, 9220 (v).

Bill (No. 37) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Macdonell).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 38) To amend the Dominion Elections Act.—(Mr. Conmee).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 39) To amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°, 924 (i).

Bill (No. 40) To amend the Criminal Code, respecting Homicide while Hunting.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 987 (i).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 41) Respecting Wireless Telegraphy on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).
1°, 988 (i).

Bill (No. 42) Respecting the Collingwood Southern Railway Company.—Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 43) Respecting a Patent of Conduits Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); 3°*, 4241 (iii).

Bill (No. 44) Respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 2594, 3021 (ii).

Bill (No. 45) Respecting the Montreal Park and Island Railway Company.—(Mr. Ecrement).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3180, 3389, 3454 (ii), 3993 (iii); 3°, 7560, 7717; in Com., 7718 (iv); 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 46) Respecting the Ottawa, Northern and Western Railway Company. —(Mr. McGiverin).
1°*, 1069; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 47) To amend the Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 2005; 3°*, 2740 (ii).

Bill (No. 48),to amend the Montreal Harbour Commissioners Act, 1894.— (Mr. Brodeur).
1°, 1069 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451; 3°*, 8451; Sen. Amt., 9534 (v).

Bill (No. 49) Respecting Water Powers.—(Mr. Monk).
1°, 1277 (i).

Bill (No. 50) Respecting Banks and Banking.—Mr. Fielding).
1°, 1340 (i).

Bill (No. 51) Respecting the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company.—(Mr Magrath).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181 3391; 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 52) To incorporate the Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Rankin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i).

Bill (No. 53) Respecting the Dominion Atlantic Railway Company.—(Mr. Pickup).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684; in Com., and 3°* 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 54) Respecting the E. B. Eddy Company.—(Mr. Devlin).
1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3028 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 55) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 56) To incorporate the Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation. (Mr. Knowles).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3994; 3°*, 3995 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6952 (iv).

Bill (No. 57) Respecting the London & Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1277; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 58) To amend the Fisheries Act. —(Mr. Barnard).

1°, 1343 (i).

Bill (No. 59) Respecting the Athabasca Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 60) Respecting the Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Company.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3060, 3182; 3°*, 3183 (ii).

Bill (No. 61) Respecting the Pontiac Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 1453; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 62) Respecting the Algoma Central and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3392, 3459; 3°*, 3460 (ii).

Bill (No. 63) To incorporate the British Columbia and Dawson Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 64) To incorporate the British Columbia and White River Railway Company.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 65) Respecting the British Crown Assurance Company, Limited.—(Mr. McColl).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1848 (i).

Bill (No. 66) Respecting the Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Railway Company.—(Mr. Stratton).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2601 (ii).

Bill (No. 67) Respecting the Burrard, Westminster Boundary Railway and Navigation Company. — (Mr. Taylor, New Westminster).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 68) Respecting the Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°* 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 69) Respecting the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 1487; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3183, 3454; 3°*, 3459 (ii).

Bill (No. 70) Respecting the Canadian Western Railw y Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3062; 3°*, 3064 (ii).

Bill (No. 71) To incorporate the Empire Life Insurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 72) Respecting the Georgian Bay and Seaboard Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3029 (ii).

Bill (No. 73) Respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Turriff).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., 3021; 3°*, 3024 (ii).

Bill (No. 74) Respecting the International Railway Company and International Traction Railway.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 75) Respecting the McClary Manufacturing Company.—(Mr. Beattie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., 3024, 3181, 3389; 3°*, 3391 (ii).

Bill (No. 76) Respecting the Ontario, Hudson Bay and Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1710 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3392 (ii).

Bill (No. 77) Respecting the National Weekly Indemnity Company, and to change its name to the National Guarantee and Accident Company.—(Mr. Wilson, Laval).

1°*, 1488; 2°*, 1684 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 78) To amend the Railway Act.—(Mr. Macdonnell).

1°, 1551 (i); order dschgd, 4464 (iii).

Bill (No. 79) To regulate the Manufacture, Storage and Importation of Explosives.—(Mr. Templeman).

Res. prop., 989; in Com. on Res., 1577; 1°* of B., 1580 (i); 2° and in Com., 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 80) Respecting the Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Railway Company.—(Mr. Lancaster).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100, in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 81) To incorporate the Canadian Northern Branch Lines Company.—(Mr. Cash).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii); Sen. Amts., 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 82) Respecting the Kettle River Valley Railway Company, and to change its name to the Kettle Valley Railway Company.—(Mr. Burrell).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 2602 (ii).

Bill (No. 83) To incorporate the Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 84) Respecting the Southern Central Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 1640; 2°*, 1848 (i); in Com., and 3°*, 3808 (ii).

Bill (No. 85) Respecting Forest Reserves and Parks.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 1640 (i); 2° and in Com., 8084, 8606, 8650, 9345; 3°*, 9348 (v).

Bill (No. 86) To amend the Criminal Code respecting Offensive Weapons.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1642 (i).

Bill (No. 87) To prevent giving and taking Secret Commissions.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 1646 (i).

Bill (No. 88) Respecting the Bay of Quinté Railway Company.—(Mr. Currie, Prince Edward).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 89) Respecting the Canadian Northern Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Lafortune).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 90) Respecting the Indian River Railway Company.—(Mr. Turcotte, (Quebec).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 91) To incorporate the Pacific and Peace Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas).

1°*, 1710 (i); 2°*, 2100 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 92) Respecting the Alberta Central Railway Company .—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii); Sen, Amts., 6469 (iv).

Bill (No. 93) To incorporate the Alberta Electric Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii); in Com., 5079, 5252, 5568, 5630; 3°*, 5631 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 94) Respecting the Western Central Railway Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 1969; 2°*, 2295 (ii), in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 95) To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Sharpe, Ontario).

1°, 1969 (ii).

Bill (No. 96) To prohibit the Manufacture and Importation of Matches made with White Phosphorus.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2021; 1°* of B., 2062 (ii).

Bill (No. 97) To prohibit the Importation, Manufacture, Sale and Use of Opium for other than Scientific or Medicinal purposes.—(Mr. King).

Res. prop., 1803 (i); in Com. on Res., 2062; 1°* of B., 2063; 2°, 2518; in Com., 2532; 3°, 2740 (ii); Sen. Amts., 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 98) Respecting Load Lines on Ships.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2063 (ii).

Bill (No. 99) To incorporate the Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. German).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3809 (ii).

Bill (No. 100) Respecting the Orford Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Hunt).

1°*, 2254; 2°*, 2602; in Com., and 3°*, 3393 (ii).

Bill (No. 101) Respecting the Huron and Ontario Railway Company.—(Mr. Sealey).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (iii), in Com., and 3°* 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 102) To incorporate the Imperial Traction Company.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 2434; 2°*, 2665 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 103) Relating to Steamship Subsidies.—(Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

Res. prop., 1802 (i); in Com. on Res., 2503; 1°* of B., 2518 (ii); 2° and in Com., 8675; 3°*, 8678 (v).

Bill (No. 104) To amend paragraph (*l*) of Section 2, and paragraphs (*n*) and (*o*) of Section 9 of the Post Office Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1° m., 2736 (ii); 2°, 8065; in Com., 8070; 3°*, 8077 (v).

Bill (No. 105) To incorporate the All Red Steamship Company (title changed to Imperial Steamship Company). — (Mr. McKenzie).

1°*, 2827; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., 4239; 3°*, 4428 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6610 (iv).

Bill (No. 106) To incorporate the Lake Erie and Northern Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 2828; 2°*, 3064 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 4606 (iii).

Bill (No. 107) To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 2851 (ii); wthdwn., 8088 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 108) Respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3183 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 109) Respecting the Ontario and Minnesota Power Company, Limited.—(Mr. Conmee).

1°*, 2983; 2° m., 3184; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 6121; 3°*, 6156 (iv).

Bill (No. 110) Respecting the People's Railway Company.—(Mr. Nesbitt).

1°*, 2983; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii); Sen. Amts., 6611 (iv).

Bill (No. 111) To incorporate the Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°*, 2983; 2°, 3184 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 112) Respecting the Storage of Food.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 2983 (ii).

Bill (No. 113) To incorporate the Dominion Development Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3184; 2°*, 3393 (ii); in Com., 5127, 5253 3°*, 5254 (iii).

Bill (No. 114) For the Protection of Railway Employees.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°, 3218 (ii).

Bill (No. 115, from the Senate), To incorporate the Guardian Accident and Guarantee Company.—(Mr. Doherty).

1°*, 3453, 2°*, 3563 (ii); in Com., and 3°*, 3993 (iii).

Bill (No. 116) To amend the Telegraphs Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 117) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Stanfield).

1°, 3453 (ii).

Bill (No. 118) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. McLean, Queens).

1°, 3664 (ii).

Bill (No. 119, from the Senate), Respecting the Ontario Northern and Timagimi Railway Company.—(Mr. Proulx).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 120, from the Senate), Respecting the Quebec and New Brunswick Railway Company.—(Mr. Carvell).

1°, 4110; 2°*, 4241 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6066 (iv).

Bill (No. 121, from the Senate), Respecting the Globe Printing Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°, 4040; 2°*, 4300; in Com., 5127; 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 122) Respecting Sewage.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4039 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 123) To incorporate La Banque Internationale du Canada.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 4109; 2°*, 4241; in Com., 5631, 5768 (iii), 6120; 3°*, 6121 (iv).

Bill (No. 124) Relating to the Water in the Railway Belt and Peace River Block of Land.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 4110 (iii).

Bill (No. 125, from the Senate), Respecting the Pacific, Northern and Omenica Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 126, from the Senate) Respecting the Quebec, Montreal and Southern Railway Company.—(Mr. Fortier).

1°*, 4384; 2°*, 4606; in Com., and 3°*, 5088 (iii).

Bill (No. 127, from the Senate), To Incorporate the Universal Life Assurance Company of Canada.—(Mr. Low).

2°*, 4300; in Com., and 3°*, 4664 (iii).

Bill (No. 128) For granting to His Majesty certain sums for the Public Service of the financial year ending the 31st March, 1911.—(Mr. Fielding).

1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 4210 (iii).

Bill (No. 129) Respecting Baggage Smashing.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4198 (iii).

Bill (No. 130, from the Senate), For the Relief of Matilda Emo.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 4298; 2°*, 4428; in Com., and 3°*, 5128 (iii).

Bill (No. 131) Respecting Drinking Water.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 4564 (iii).

Bill (No. 132) To correct certain Clerical Errors in the French Version of the Inland Revenue Act.—(Mr. Templeman).

1°*, 4566; 2° and in Com., 8088; 3°*, 8090 (v).

Bill (No. 133 from the Senate), To incorporate the Alberta-Saskatchewan Life Insurance Company.—(Mr. Rutan.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 134, from the Senate), To incorporate the Canadian Inter-Mountain Railway Company.—(Mr. Goodeve.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129; in Com., and 3°*, 5631 (iii).

Bill (No. 135, from the Senate), Respecting the Western Alberta Railway Company.—(Mr. Douglas.)

1°*, 4740; 2°*, 5129 (iii); in Com., 6950; 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 136, from the Senate), To correct a Clerical Error in the Title of the French Version of Chapter 142 of the Statutes of 1910.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°*, 4740 (iii).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 137, from the Senate), For the relief of Maggie Florence Sadler.—(Mr. Reid, Grenville).

2°*, 6224; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 138, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Maud Grant.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 139, from the Senate), For the relief of George Addison Brown.—(Mr. Thornton).

1°*, 5525; 2°*, 5631 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 140, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Hamilton Johnston.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 141, from the Senate), For the relief of Dalton Mabel Stapleton.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 5619; 2°*, 5776 (iii); in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 142, from the Senate), For the relief of Lorne Forbes Robertson.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 143, from the Senate), For the relief of Cecil Ernest Freeman.—(Mr. Blain).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 144, from the Senate), For the relief of Ethel May Hornell.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6066; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 145, from the Senate) For the relief of Paulina Verena Meyer.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 146) To amend the Interest Act.—(Mr. Staples).

1°, 5618 (iii).

Bill (No. 147, from the Senate), To amend the Chinese Immigration Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2° and in Com., 7869 (iv).

Bill (No. 148, from the Senate), Respecting the Manitoba Radial Railway Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 149, from the Senate), Respecting the Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Railway Company.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 5726 (iii); 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 6468 (iv).

Bill (No. 150) To authorize the Government of Canada to acquire, by lease, a certain line of railway in the Province of New Brunswick.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 4200; in Com. on Res., 5640; 1°* of B., 5726 (iii); 2°, 8410; in Com., 8411; 3°*, 8419 (v).

Bill (No. 151, from the Senate) To incorporate The Canadian Surety Company.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 5933; 2°*, 6067; in Com., and 3°*, 7024 (iv).

Bill (No. 152, from the Senate) Respecting the Baptist Convention of Ontario and Quebec.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 7470 (iv).

Bill (No. 153, from the Senate) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act, as regards the Weight of a bushel and a bag of certain articles.—(Mr. Fisher).

1°*, 6035 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8078, 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 154) To amend the Inspection and Sale Act.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 6034 (iv).

Bill (No. 155) To amend the Canada Shipping Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

1°, 6112; 2° and ref. to Marine Com., 6675 (iv).

Bill (No. 156) To amend the Department of Railways and Canals Act.—(Mr. Graham).

1°, 6188 (iv); 2°, 8409; in Com., 8409; 3°*, 8410 (v).

Bill (No. 157) Respecting the Inspection and Sale of Seeds.—(Mr. Fisher).

In Com. on Res., 6188; 1°*, 2°* of B., 6196 (iv); in Com. on B., 8077; 3°*, 8078 (v).

Bill (No. 158, from the Senate) To incorporate Revillon Frères Trading Company, Limited.—(Mr. Devlin).

1°, 6439; 2°, 7147, 7590 (iv); in Com., 8577, 8966, 9165, 9575; 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 159, from the Senate) To change the name of the Manitoulin and North Shore Railway Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 6439; 2°*, 6504; in Com., and 3°*, 6951 (iv).

Bill (No. 160) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service of the financial years ending respectively the thirty-first March, 1911, and the thirty-first March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).

In Com. on Ways and Means, 6440; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°, 6441 (iv).

Bill (No. 161, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board.—(Mr. Fowke).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6951; in Com., 7470, 7560; 3°*, 7589 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 162, from the Senate) Respecting the Alsek and Yukon Railway Company.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 163, from the Senate) For the relief of Mary Jane Beatty.—(Mr. Congdon).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 6952; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 164, from the Senate) For the relief of Walter Harvey Kirkland.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6756; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 165, from the Senate) Respecting a Patent of the Goldschmidt Thermit Company.—(Mr. Rivet).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 166, from the Senate) To incorporate the Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Railway Company.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 167, from the Senate) To incorporate the Pacific and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 168, from the Senate) To incorporate the Ontario-Michigan Railway Company.—(Mr. Pardee).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8070 (v).

Bill (No. 169, from the Senate) To incorporate the Canada West Loan Corporation.—(Mr. McCraney).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8563; 3°*, 8566 (v).

Bill (No. 170, from the Senate) To incorporate the New Ontario and Quebec Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Nipissing).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8094, 8233, 8519, 8535, 8642, 8916, 8956; 3° m., 8962 (v).

Bill (No. 171, from the Senate) To incorporate the Grain Growers' Grain Company, Limited.—(Mr. Rutan).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., 8095, 8236, 8536, 8916; 3°*, 8923 (v).

Bill (No. 172 from the Senate) Respecting the Hamilton Provident and Loan Society.—(Mr. Barker).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7024 (iv); in Com., and 3°*, 8069 (v).

Bill (No. 173, from the Senate) For the relief of Robert William Logan.—(Mr. Rankin).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., and 3°*, 7590 (iv).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 174, from the Senate) To incorporate the Casualty Company of Canada.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7025; in Com., 8566; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 175, from the Senate), To amend and consolidate the Acts relating to the Harbour of Toronto.—(Mr. Macdonell).

1°*, 6906; 2°*, 7148 (iv); in Com., 8234, 8535; 3°*, 8536 (v).

Bill (No. 176, from the Senate), to incorporate the Restigouche Riparian Association.—(Mr. Geoffrion).

1°*, 7019; 2°*, 7148; in Com., 7589; 3°*, 7590 (iv).

Bill (No. 177), To amend the Indian Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 7019; 2°, 7825; in Com., 7846 (iv); 3°m., 8104, 8193, 8403 (v).

Bill (No. 178, from the Senate), Respecting the Pollution of Navigable Waters.—(Mr. Currie, Simcoe).

1°*, 7339 (iv).

Bill (No. 179), Respecting the Songhees Indian Reserve.—(Mr. Oliver).

Res. prop., 7248; in Com. on Res., 7248; 1°* of B., 7252; 2° and in Com., 7824; 3°*, 7825 (iv).

Bill (No. 180, from the Senate), For the relief of Mary Kathleen Crittenden.—(Mr. Rhodes).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 181, from the Senate), For the relief of Pauline Winslow Saunderson.—(Mr. Todd).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 182, from the Senate), For the relief of Nellie Bridgland Morrison.—(Mr. Harris).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577(v).

Bill (No. 183, from the Senate), For the relief of Frances Whittington Truesdell.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 7666 (iv); 2°*, 8070; in Com., and 3°*, 8577 (v).

Bill (No. 184), Respecting Copyrights.—(Mr. Fisher).

Res. prop., 7807; in Com. on Res., 7817; 1°* of B., 7824 (iv); 2° and in Com., 8895 (v).

Bill (No. 185), To amend the Fisheries Act.—(Mr. Brodeur).

Res. prop., 4201 (iii); in Com. on Res., 8042; 1°* of B., 8065; in Com., 8419; 3°*, 8451 (v).

Bill (No. 186, from the Senate), Respecting The Joliette and Lake Maruan Colonization Railway Company.—(Mr. Dubeau).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 187, from the Senate), Respecting a Patent of the Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Company, Limited.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 188, from the Senate), To confer on the Commission of Patents certain Powers for the relief of Trussed Concrete Steel Company of Canada, Limited. —(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 189, from the Senate), To amend The Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908.—(Sir Allen Aylesworth).

1°*, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 190, from the Senate), For the relief of Violet Jane Dakin.—(Mr. McCarthy).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 191, from the Senate), For the relief of Hugh Samuel Bell.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 192, from the Senate), To provide for increasing the Capital Stock of the Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).

1°*, 8187; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8969; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 193, from the Senate), Respecting La Sauvegarde Life Insurance Company —(Mr. Geoffrion)

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 ,v).

Bill (No. 194), To amend the Dominion Lands Act.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°, 8187 (v).

Bill (No. 195, from the Senate), To incorporate the Western Canal Company.—(Mr. Tolmie).

1°*, 8308; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 196, from the Senate), To incorporate The Continental Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Molloy).

1°*, 8403; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8968; 3°*, 8969 (v).

Bill (No. 197), To amend the Railway Act. —(Mr. Graham).

1°, 8399; 2° and in Com., 9312, 9377; 3°*, 9430 (v).

Bill (No. 198, from the Senate), To incorporate the Quebec and Great North Western Railway Company.—(Mr. Hodgins).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 9936 (v).

Bill (No. 199, from the Senate), For the relief of Fanny Mary Healey.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 200, from the Senate), For the relief of Gertrude Mary Grantham.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8477; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8971; 3°*, 8981 (v).

Bill (No. 201, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada National Fire Insurance Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8476; 2°*, 8581; in Com., 8981; 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 202, from the Senate), To incorporate the High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—(Mr. Martin, Regina).

1°*, 8582; 2°, 8642; in Com., and 3°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 203, from the Senate), Respecting certain Patents of Munderloh and Company, Limited.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8970 (v).

Bill (No. 204, from the Senate), Respecting the Caribou, Barkerville and Willow River Railway Company.—(Mr. Smith, Nanaimo).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8641; in Com., and 3°*, 8983 (v).

Bill (No. 205, from the Senate), Respecting the Canada Cement Company, Limited. (Mr. Northrup).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642 (v).

Bill (No. 206, from the Senate), Respecting the Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Railway Company.—(Mr. Gordon, Kent).

1°*, 8582; 2°*, 8642; in Com., 8970; 3°*, 8971 (v).

Bill (No. 207), Respecting Bank Officers and Creditors.—(Mr. Lewis).

1°, 8695 (v).

Bill (No. 208, To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Paterson).

Res. prop., 8477; in Com. on Res., 8716; 1°* of B., 8743 (v).

Bill (No. 209, from the Senate), Respecting Grain.—(Mr. Oliver).

1°*, 8837; 2°, 9512 (v).

Bill (No. 210, from the Senate), To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act as regards the delivery of wood.—(Mr. Sinclair), 1°*, 8887 (v).

Bill (No. 211) Respecting aid towards the construction of the Canadian Northern Ontario Railway.—(Mr. Graham).

Res. prop., 8704; M. for Com. on Res., 8801; in Com. on Res., 8825; 1°* of B., 8872; 2° and in Com., 9222, 9255; 3°m., 9294 (v).

Bill (No. 212) To amend the Water Carriage of Goods Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).

1°*, 8887; 2° and in Com., 9348; 3°*, 9349 (v).

BILLS—*Con.*

Bill (No. 213) To amend the Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 8887; 2°, 9221; in Com., 9222; 3°, 9334 (v).

Bill (No. 214, from the Senate) Respecting the Sault St. Louis Light and Power Company.—(Mr. Bickerdike).
1°*, 8955; 2°*, 8983; in Com., 9167 (v).

Bill (No. 215, from the Senate) For the relief of William Francis Currie.—(Mr. Pardee).
1°*, 8955; 2°*, 9172 (v).

Bill (No. 216) To amend the Post Office Act, —(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 8585; in Com. on Res., 8906, 8924; 1°* of B., 8954; 2°, 9567; in Com., 9568, 9576; 3°*, 9580 (v).

Bill (No. 217) To amend the Civil Service Act.—(Mr. Lemieux).
Res. prop., 8586; in Com., on Res, 8954; 1°* of B., 8955 (v).

Bill (No. 218, from the Senate) For the relief of George Mackay Sutherland.—(Mr. Tolmie).
1°*, 9089; 2°*, 9576 (v).

Bill (No. 219) To amend the Quebec Savings Banks Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
1°, 9089; 2°, 9343; in Com., and 3°, 9343 (v).

Bill (No. 220 from the Senate) To incorporate the Albert and Moncton Railway Company.—(Mr. Emmerson).
2°, 9224; M. for Com., 9350; in Com., 9351; in Com., and 3°*, 9377 (v).

Bill (No. 221) To amend the Penny Bank Act.—(Mr. Fielding).
Res. prop., 8104; M. for Com. on Res., 9220; 1°*, 2°*, in Com. and 3°* of B., 9221 (v).

Bill (No. 222) Respecting the National Battlefields at Quebec.—(Mr. Lemieux).
1°, 9228; 2°, in Com., 9495; 3°*, 9499 (v).

Bill (No. 223) Respecting the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada.—(Mr. Clarke, Essex).
M. for 1°, 9305; 1°*, 2°*, and ref. to Ry. Com., 9308; in Com. of the Whole, 9509, 3°*, 9511 (v).

Bill (No. 224) Respecting Duties of Customs on Importations from Japan.—(Mr. Fielding).
M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9432; in Com., 9445; 1°*, 2°* and in Com. on B., 9494; 3°, 9533 (v).

Bill (No. 225) For granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the Public Service for the financial years ending respectively 31st March, 1911, and 31st. March, 1912.—(Mr. Fielding).
In Com. on Ways and Means, 9580; 1°*, 2°*, in Com., and 3°*, 9589 (v).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Birthday Congratulations to Prime Minister (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).

Births and Deaths in Canada, Number, &c.; M. for Ret. (Mr. McCarthy) 2679 (ii).

Blackhead in Turkeys, Investigation by Govt., Remedy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 655 (i).

Bliss, Lt.-Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8100 (v).

Boiler Flue Cleaner and Supply Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 187.'

Boiler Inspection on Vessels: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N. B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).

Bookkeeping: *See* 'Falconer.'

Boot and Shoe Lasts, Names of Manufacturers, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Hughes) 1340 (i).

Boot Contract: *See* 'Naval Service,' &c.

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia, *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

Boundary Surveys and Demarcation: in Com. of Sup., 9546 (v).

Bracebridge Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Bradford Channel, Newmarket: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount Imported from G. B. and U. S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).

Bridge Strengthening on I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Brier Island Light, Application *re* new house: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
—— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).

Britain's Demand for Tariff Concession *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

B. C. and Central Can. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'

B. C. Coal Strike, Agreement of Two Years ago: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6365 (iv).

B. C. Coal Strike: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363 (iv).
——— *See* 'Coal,' 'Militia.'
British Columbia and Dawson Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 63.'
B. C. Fisheries Regulations: *See* 'B. No. 185.' *See* 'Fisheries.'
B. C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B. C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).
B. C. Ry. Belt, Water: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
British Columbia Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 17.'
British Columbia and White River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 64.'
British Crown Assurance Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 65.'
British Patriotic Songs in Western Schools and American Pupils: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 656 (i).
——— Remarks of Mr. Armstrong: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4931 (iii).
British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).
British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, Reciprocity, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).
British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Brockville, Westport and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 66.'
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3859 (ii).
Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).
Brown, George Addison, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 139.'
Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
Budget, The, Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).
——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6439 (iv). *See* 'Address,' 'Finance,' 'Reciprocity.'
Buffalo Herds in National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Buffalo, Niagara and Toronto Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 80.'
Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Buildings, Public Works, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).
Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).
Burrard, Westminster Boundary Ry. and Nav. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 67.'
Business of the House, Adjournment for Coronation: Stmnt. (Mr. Fielding) 9309 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Business of the House, Morning Sittings: M. (Mr. Fielding) 8887, 10095 (v).
Business of Hse. for Thursdays, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1550 (i).
——— Public Bills for Thursdays: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2064 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Business.'
Butter, Cheese and Meats imported, Value, Weight, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
Butter and Eggs, Quantity and Value imported into Canada, Dec. 1910 and Jan. 1911: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4670 (iii).
——— Suppl. Answer laid on Table (Mr. Paterson) 6188 (iv).
Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re* Reciprocity: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Cab Fares and Street Ry. Fares, Payments for last year to Govt. Employees: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1339 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works. &c.'
Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).
Campbellford, Lake Ontario and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 68.'
Campbellton Increased Accommodation, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5914 (iii), 5983 (iv).
Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).
Canada and Australia SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v).
Canada Cement Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'
Canada Cement Co., Charges by Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372 (v).
——— *See* 'Cement.'
Canada and Cuba Mail Subsidies: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8775 (v).
'Canada's Farthest South,' Cost of Printing and Preparing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2885 (ii).
Canada and G.B. SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8773 (v).
——— *See* 'Atlantic,' 'Post Office,' &c.

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i), 2503 (ii).
——— *See* 'Bill No. 103.'
Canada-Japan Trade Treaty, Expiration of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5638 (iii).
——— *See* 'Japan.'
Can. Medical Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 15.'
Canada and Mexico SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8781 (v).
Can. National Fire Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 201.'
Canada and Newfoundland SS. Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8783 (v).
Can. Shipping Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 24, 118, 155.'
Canada and S. Africa SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 8784 (v).
Canada and S. America SS. Service, Subsidies to: Ques. (Mr. Daniel), 5290 (iii).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).
Canada and West Indies SS. Subsidy Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5936 (iv).
Canada and W. Indies Trade Relations, Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).
Can. West Loan Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 169.'
Canadian Baptist Foreign Mission Board: *See* 'B. No. 161.'
See 'Baptist.'
Canadian Coasting Laws, Reciprocity affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).
Canadian Commissioner for France, Vacancy, Apptmt. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1971 (ii), 8103 (v).
——— Contradiction of Question asked in Senate (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 9545 (v).
Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities, Dredges, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).
Canadian Fisheries Exhibition: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).
——— Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Canadian Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).
———*See* 'Reciprocity.'
Canadian General Development Co., Total Amounts paid by, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 655 (i).
Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).
Can. Inter-Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 134.'
Canadian Light and Power Co., Lease between Govt., &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lortie) 1501 (i).
——— Plans, &c., Date of Approval: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7591, 7805 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Canadian Loans and Investments in U. S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6505 (iv).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Canadian National Parks: in Com. of Sup., 6049 (iv).
Canadian Naval Service, Applications from Canadians and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).
——— 'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).
——— Date and Port of Sailing of 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow': Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).
——— Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).
——— 'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).
——— Number of Battleships withdrawn from Can. by G. B. during the past five years: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i).
——— 'Rainbow' Type, Guns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).
——— 'Rainbow' listed as ineffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).
——— Total Expenditure since 31st Oct. 1910: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).
See 'Naval Service,' &c.
Can. Northern Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Can. Northern Ont. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. Nos. 69 and 211.'
Can. Northern Quebec Ry Co.: *See* 'B. No. 89.'
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
C. P. Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 108.'
C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 i).
——— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
——— Reduction of Rates &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i); Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
——— *See* 'Railways.'
Canadian Railways, Accidents *re*, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Can. Surety Co.: *See* 'B. No. 151.'
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U. S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: *See* 'Militia.'

Can. Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 70.'

CANALS—

Arbitrations, &c. and Awards, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv).

Beauharnois Canal, Alienation, Rep. *re* Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

——— M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 2214 (ii).

——— Grantees, Improvements, Valuation of Franchise &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1711 (i).

——— M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 2194 (ii).

——— Lease to McIntyre & Robert, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2677 (ii).

——— Privileges, Advertisement for Tenders: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1712 (i).

——— Total Cost, Revenue from Grantees, Arrears, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

Canal Statistics: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7019 (iv).

——— Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 8453 (v).

Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

——— Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Carillon Water Power Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

——— Names of Lessee, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).

Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

——— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup. 6408 (iv).

Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).

——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).

Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Lock, 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Lock. 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Farran's Point, Lower Entrance Improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Georgian Bay Canal, Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).

——— *See* main heading.

Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Lachine Canal: New Tug: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).

——— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv

——— Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).

Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).

Lockmen, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6413, 6453 (iv).

Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Su 6410 (iv).

——— New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Newmarket Canal, Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).

——— Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept. M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).

——— Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).

Newmarket Canal: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).

——— Bradford Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).

Quebec, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

——— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

——— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).

St. Peter's Canal, C. B., Construction, &c., Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).

——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).

Sault Ste. Marie, Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).

——— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).

——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup , 6397 (iv).

——— Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).

——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

CANALS—*Con.*

Soulanges Canal, Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).

—— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).

—— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).

Trent Canal, Damages by Floods: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).

—— Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

—— Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).

—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).

—— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

—— Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).

—— Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv). *See* 'Newmarket.'

Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

—— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).

—— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

—— Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).

—— Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).

—— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).

—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).

Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).

—— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

—— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

—— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).

Canned Goods: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Canned Pease, Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).

—— Quantity imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii).

Canning, J. H., Inspector of Inland Revenue, Retirement of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 1350 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Capital Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'

Cardinal Canal Bridge: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Cardinal Dock Rebuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Cariboo, Barkerville and Willow River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 204.'

Carillon Water Power, Lease, Date, Rental, Name, &c.: (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

—— Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2668 (ii).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Carrier-Laine Works, Purchase by Govt., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992

Casualty Co. of Canada: *See* 'B. No. 174.'

Cattle Exports to the U. S., Bonded to G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7426 (iv).

—— Remarks *re* Return (Mr. Blain) 7558 (v).

Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).

Cattle Inspection on Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Cattle Quarantine Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

Cement Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 205.'

Cement Merger, Charges of Sir Sandford Fleming: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9372, 10468 (v).

Cement Production, Total Production annually since 1900: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 10196 (v).

CENSUS—

Appointments for East Elgin, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 4302 (iii).

Census Commissioner, Apptmt. of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2155 (ii).

Census Methods: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6669, 7556 (iv).

Census of North and South Ontario, Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9431 (v).

Census, Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L Borden) 9594 (v).

Census Returns: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 8193 (v).

Census, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 9694 (v).

Census, System of Taking: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Papers, 4337 (iii).

Commissioner for York County, N.B.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 8704 (v).

Enumerators, Apptmt. of Enumerators: M. for Cor.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9994 (v).

—— Apptmt. of by Liberal Associations: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7021 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 2887 (ii), 4933 (iii).

CENSUS—*Con.*

Enumerators, Circulating Pets. *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Best) 6507 (iv).

—— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7218 (iv).

—— Inaccuracies in Quebec: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7217 (iv).

Enumerators in Man., Apptmt. of by Liberal Organizers, Cor. &c., Read: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Staples) 9006, 9015 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Staples) 8889 (v).

Enumerators, Names, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4465 (iii).

Enumerators in Peel County, Number, Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

Omissions *re* Enumerations: Further information re (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9897 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Perley) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9711 (v).

—— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Questions, Preparation of Lists, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 659 (i).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7556 (iv).

Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

Certificates to Masters, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 155.'

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Chambly Canal: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (v).

—— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

—— Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

—— *See* 'Atlantic, Quebec & Western.'

Charwomen, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Chatham, N. B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

—— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chatham, Wallaceburg and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 206.'

Cheese Cool Curing Room, Brockville, Sale of: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8095 (v).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Official Referee, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 5406 (iii).

Cheese Weighing at Montreal, Protection *re* Marketing: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 6203 (iv).

See 'Butter'.

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

—— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7210 (iv).

Chesley Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

China, Japan and Can. SS. Subsidy: *See* 'B. No. 103.'

China-Japan SS. Subsidy: M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Chinese Immigration Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 147.'

See 'Immigration.'

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Investigation Commission, Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

—— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

—— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

—— Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

—— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

—— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Cholera Precautions: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10197 (v).

Christian Island Indian Reserve, Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

—— *See* 'Beausoleil.'

Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).

Chrysler, Mr. F. H., Amounts paid by Govt. *re* Legal Services from 1896 to 1910 (M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 1727 (i).

Civil Servants, Garnishee of Salaries: on M. for Sup. (Mr. Beauparlant) 4571 (iii).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: M. for O. Cs., &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7553 (iv).

—— Notice (Mr. R. L. Borden) of Discussion, 1912 (i).

Civil Servants and Municipal Offices, Govt. Policy *re*: *See* 'Govt. Officials.'
Civil Service Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 12, 208 & 217.'
Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).
Civil Service Apptmts. from South Grey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555 (ii).
——— *See* 'Govt. Apptmts.'
Clarry, Mr. L. F., Payments to by Govt. for Professional Services: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
——— Charges against: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).
Coal Barges and Pilotage Fees: *See* 'B. No. 118..
Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).
Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
Coal imported from U. S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).
Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Coal Strike in Alberta and B. C., Conciliation by Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6197 (iv).
Coal Strikes in the West, Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 6363, 6908, 7105 (iv).
Coasting Trade Act, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4675 (iii).
Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).
Cocaine, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).
Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Cold Storage in Can., Govt. Aid to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1455 (i).
Cold Storage Depots, Total Amounts paid from 1907-10: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii). *See* 'Agriculture.'
Cold Storage Warehouses: *See* 'B. Nos. 36 & 112.'
Collingwood Corner Postmaster, Name, Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).
Collingwood Dry Dock, Capital Cost, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middleboro) 10337 (v).
Collingwood Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 42.'
Colonial Conference, 1911, Canada's Proposals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1280 (i).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).
——— *See* 'Civil Service,' 'Negroes,' &c.
Combines Investigation Act: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
Combines Investigation Act, Charges re: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro), 663 (i).
Combines Investigation Act, Rep of: Inquiry for (Mr. Maddin) 1987 (ii).
Combines Investigation in United Shoe Machinery Co., Restraint, &c.: Remarks (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5953 (iv).
Commercial Agent for Canada at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).
Commercial Agencies: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Commercial Relations Documents, Translation of: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3462 (ii).
Commercial Travellers Accident Assurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 52.'
Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).
Commissions, Taking of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Committees, Sel. Standing: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
——— Lists: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 262 (i).
——— M. to add Names (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 377 (i).
Committees, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Commutation Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Companies Act Amt.: *See* 'B No. 7.'
Compensation to Workmen for Injuries: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Conciliation Board, Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii), 4244 (iii).
Conciliation Board, Principle of Action: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4242 (iii).
——— *See* 'Industrial.'
Conduits Co.'s Ltd., Patent of: *See* 'B. No. 43.'
Conservation Commission, Annual Rep.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 698 (i).
Conservation of Natural Resources, Number of Copies printed: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 660 (i).
Consolidated Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Constantineau, Judge, Number of Motions heard ,Travelling Expenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Proulx) 982 (i).

Consuls General, Foreign, Status at Official Receptions, &c.: M. for Cor. with Imp. Govt. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).
Continental Fire Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 196.'
Convicts liberated from Penitentiary at Kingston without Clothing or Means: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) 1913 (i), 2065 (ii).
——— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1986 (ii).
Co-operation: *See* 'B. Nos. 11 & 29.'
Copyright Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 184.'
Copyright Act Amt., Legislation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 7557 (iv), 9594 (v).
Copyright Law and Imperial Copyright Conference, Canada's Action *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 5134 (iii).
Cornwall Canal, Enlargement of Office: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 17: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Lock 19: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Removing High Spots from Prism: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
——— Robertson's Culvert, Reinforcing Bank: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).
Coronation of King George V, Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
Coronation, Adjournment for: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8709 (v).
——— *See* 'Adjournment.'
Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii)
——— Apptmt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemieux) 8093 (iv)
——— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).
——— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3220, 3277 (ii).
——— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).
——— Names of Officers, &c., Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).
——— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).
Coronation Day Celebration in Ottawa, Absence of Ministers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9989 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Beattie) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10351 (v).
Coronation Decorations: in Com. of Sup. 9565 (v).
Coronation Expenses of Members and Senators: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).
Coronation Holiday and Bank Holiday: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 5836 (iii).
Coronation Naval Cadets, Method of Selection &c.: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).
Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
Courtice, Howard, Emplymt. by Liberal Bureau: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 9784 (v).
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 9897 (v).
Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).
Cream Exports from Can. for 1911, Total Quantity: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent,: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
Creston Fruit and Produce Association: Reciprocity Treaty, &c.: Res. *re* Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).
Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Criminal Code Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 40, 86.'
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Crittenden, Mary Kathleen, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 180.'
Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Crop Statistics, Policy of Collecting, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5937 (iv).
Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr.Paquet) 805 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service &c.
Cumberland Coal and Ry. Co., Strike of Employees, Reps., &c.: M. for Cor.*: (Mr. Rhodes) 1340 (i).
——— *See* 'Conciliation'
Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Injuries: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).
Currie, Wm. Francis, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 215.'
Customs Dept. Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 208.'

CUSTOMS:

Bonded Freight in Guysborough County, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4464 (iii).
Bricks, Tiles, &c., Amount imported from G.B. and U.S., 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2369 (ii).
Canadian Vessels, Clearance at Canadian Customs by U.S. Citizens: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4672 (iii).
Canned Peas, Quantity Imported into Can.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 3221 (ii)
——— Impure, Importation of into Canada, Number of Cases, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 3279 (ii).
Coal imported from U.S. for 1910 for Ont., Total Amounts of Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. D. Gordon) 4041 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Coal and Coke, Quantities imported into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4674 (iii).

Customs Act Schedules, Average Value in 1896 and 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 801 (i).

Customs Collections in Cities, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4042 (iii).

Customs Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1018 (i), 5992 (iv).

——— Dept. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Paterson) 7 (i).

Customs Duties, Average Value for 1896 and 1910, Units of: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2162 (ii).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Fielding) *re* Speech of Hon. Mr. Foster, 7022 (iv).

——— Correction (Mr. Foster) 7104 (iv).

Customs Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Customs, Free Entries of Goods, Date of last Entry: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 803 (i).

——— Free Goods entered at Vancouver, by Kelly & Co.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 931 (i).

Customs Officer at Ingram Dock, Dismissal of *re* Municipal Elections: M. for O. Cs, &c. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2218 (ii).

Customs Preventive Officers, Duties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

Customs Tariff with Foreign Countries, Arrangements by Govt.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).

Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-1911, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Fire Bricks imported into N. S., Number of Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).

Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R.L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).

CUSTOMS—*Con.*

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Montreal Customs House, Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).

Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).

Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).

Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).

Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).

Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).

Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).

Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).

Vancouver Customs, Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).

'Wanda' Yacht, Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).

——— Appraising by Customs &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).

——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c,: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).

——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).

——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).

Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).

See 'Reciprocity.'

Dairy and Farm Products, Quantity and Value of Importation from U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9361 (v).

Dairy and Fruit Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6234 (iv).
Dairy Industry, Memorials *re*: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 2671 (ii).
Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario: (Mr. Lalor); Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) about Reciprocity, 4223 (iii).
——— Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Dakin, Violet Jane, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 190.'
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. re Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Daylight, Saving of: *See* 'B. No. 26.'
Debates Committee, 1st Rep.: M. (Mr. Gervais) to conc., 6438 (iv).
——— Status of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7015 (iv).
Debates Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).
Declaration of London, Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
——— Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).
Deferred Elections: *See* 'Elections.'
Deptl. Expenditure of Public Moneys, Investigations *re*: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 37 (i).
Departments Generally, Cleaning, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1486 (i).
Deputy Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Deputy Governor or Administrator, Apptmt. of Mr. Justice Girouard, Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli *re* Eucharistic Congress: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
Digby Public Works, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).
Dini, Victor, Release from Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 8582 (v).
Dissolution of Parlt., Par. in 'Globe' *re* Opposition: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 5737 (iii).
Divorce: *See* 'B. Nos. 130, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145, 163, 164, 173, 180, 181, 182, 183, 190, 191, 199, 200, 215 and 218.'
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Dixon Postoffice, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).
Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).
Dog Fish Works: *See* 'B. No. 185.'
Dom. Atlantic Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 53.'
Dom. Buildings, Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).
——— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).
——— Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— Que., General Repairs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
——— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Dom. Development Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 113.'
Dom. Lands Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 107 and 194.'
Dominion Lands, Administration of : in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).
Dom. Lands in Alberta, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).
Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).
See 'Interior.
Dom. Police Gratuities: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Donland Postoffice, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).
Don Postoffice, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
Drawbars for Freight Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).
Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2105 (ii).
Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
See 'Militia,' 'Public Works,' &c.
Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).
Drinking Water, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 131.'
Drugs made with Opium, Regulation: *See* 'B. No. 97.'
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Cartoons used by Min. of Marine, published in 'Le Canada' of 1904: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 223 (i).
——— Cor. laid on Table, 194 (i).
Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Denial of Mr. Begin *re* words quoted by Mr. Monk *re* Naval Defence (Mr. Tobin) 134 (i).
——— Statements in 'Le Devoir', Denial, &c. (Mr. Blondin) 145 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, Cartoons displayed to Hse. (Mr. Brodeur) 146 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska, Electoral Dis trist: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).

——— Disloyal Speeches: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) on Address 169 (i).

——— 'Le Devoir,' Quotations: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Brodeur) 469.

——— Ques. of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 472 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Elections, Moneys used, &c.: Personal Explanation (Mr. Perley) 196 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Election, 'pounding England' speech of Notary Begin: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 57; Ques. of Order, Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 57 (i); Telling hon. mem. he 'lied to the House,' (Mr. Gauvreau) 57 (i): Ques. of Order, Insulting Language: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 77 (i).

——— Speeches: Remarks (Mr. S. Hughes) 153 (i).

Drummond and Arthabaska Elections: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) on Address, 54 (i).

Dry Docks, Applications for Subsidies, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).

——— *See* 'Collingwood.'

Dry Docks at Quebec, Construction *re* by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Price) 9988 (v).

Dry Farming Convention at Spokane, Reps. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 662 (i)

Dufferin Board Trade Res., Reciprocity Treaty: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).

Dumping Clause in Ontario, Operation *re* Bounties on Steel and Iron: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6268 (iv).

——— *See* 'Iron.'

Dumping Clause, Provision in Tariff: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 10196 (v).

Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii)

Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).

Dunnville Postoffice; :Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup. 1668 (i).

Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).

Duties in 1896 and 1910, Average Value of Articles in Schedules of Customs Act: M. for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1105 (i).

——— *See* 'Customs.'

Dynamite, Storage of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'

'Earl Grey.' Ice Breaker, Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).

'Earl Grey', Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).

East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).

Easter Adjournment: Notice of M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 6758 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).

E. B. Eddy Co.: *See* 'B No 54.'

Echo Lake Postoffice, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).

Eclipse Mfg. Co., Office Specialty Co., and Ahearn & Soper, Paymenis to *re* Contracts: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1339 (i).

Eggs imported into Canada from Foreign Countries: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4467 (iii)

Elbow River Conserving of Water Flow: M. for Cor. (Mr. McCarthy) 1912 (i).

Elbow River Water Power License, Agreements, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).

Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power Privileges, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).

Elections Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 16, 28, 37, 38.'

Elections Deferred in B. C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).

Electricians at Sault Ste. Marie, Protest *re* Dismissals, Alien Labour Law Administration: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) on M. for Sup., 5525 (iii).

Electricity Exportation B. 101 (Mr. Conmee): Ruling (Mr. Speaker) *re* Introduction, 2364 (ii).

Electric Light Attendant, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).

Elevators at Port Arthur and Fort William Terminals, Investigations *re* Mixing of Grain; Prop. Res. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2377 (ii).

Elevators, Terminal and Transfer, System *re* Operating: Prop. Res. (Mr. Schaffner) 3472; Amt. (Mr. Neely) 3488. Agreed to (Y. 96, N. 54) 3524 (ii).

Elliott, Geo., Emplyt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Broder) 1497 (i).

Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

Elora Post Office Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).

Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Embargo on British Cattle: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10344 (v)

Emigration from Canada to U.S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).
Emo, Matilda, Relief of: *See* 'B. No. 130.'
Empire Life Insurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 71.'
Employees of Rys. paid fortnightly: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
English Mail Service to Maritime Provs: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).
—— *See* 'Post Office.'
English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).
—— *See* 'Naval Service, &c.
Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).
Escott, Postmaster, Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).
—— Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
—— Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).
Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 799 (i).
—— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).
Essex Public Building: in Com of Sup., 2110 (ii).
Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).
—— Further Suppl.: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii), 5525 (iii), 8355, 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).
Estimates of Depts., Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).
Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).
Estimates for Man., Objections *re* Discussion (Mr. Staples) 2969 (ii).
Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).
—— Special Items reported as passed, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9076 (v).
Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).
Eucharistic Congress at Montreal, Guards of Honour: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) on Address, 289 (i).
—— Authority for: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 704 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Govt. Authority *re* Decoration of Govt. Buildings: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i); Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3369 (ii).
—— Number of Buildings decorated by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 4667 (iii).
Eucharistic Congress and Mess. of Homage from Administrator of Can. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).
—— Militia Officers at Reception in Uniform: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
—— Public Procession, Authority of Govt. *re* State Officials: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 925 (i).
Eucharistic Congress, Reception to Cardinal Vanutelli, Imperfect Answer: Remarks Sproule) 158 (i).
—— Reception to by Federal Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5935 (iv).
—— Ref. to Questions: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 158 (i).
—— Tel. to Cardinal Vanutelli by Administrator: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 702 (i).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Exchequer Court Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 25.'
Exchequer Court, Contingencies: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
—— Reports, Printing, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6161 (iv).
Excursion Trains *re* Political Meeting, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
—— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Exhibitions: in Com. of Sup., 3776 (ii), 9076 (v).
Exhibition Grants, Subsidies paid to: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2437 (ii).
See 'Agriculture.'
Experimental Farm Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).
Experimental Farm Bulletins: in Com. of Sup., 6185 (iv).
Experimental Farms, Number established for past year: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 656 (i).
Experimental Farms, Number operated in Dom., Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1102 (i).
Experimental Farm, Ottawa, Milk Average, Eggs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 662, 1285 (i).
Experimental Farms, Reps.: Presented (Mr. Fisher) 7 (i).
—— Stock *re*: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 3795 (ii).
Experimental Fruit and Vegetable Farms, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) on M. for Sup., 8995 (v).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Explosives, Regulation of: *See* 'B. No. 79.'
Explosives, Number of Factories, Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2374 (ii).

Exports and Imports from Canada to Australia, Japan, &c. from 1906-11, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9369 (v).

Express Co.s.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Express Cos'. Unclaimed Balances: *See* 'B. No. 8.'

Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).

—— *See* 'Post Office—Parcel Post.'

External Affairs, Absence of Minister from Washington Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 1658 (i).

—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).

Extradition: *See* 'Fedorenko.'

Fabre, Mr. Hector, Date of Apptmt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5933 (iv).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Falconer System of Book-keeping, Adoption of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1904 (i).

—— *See* 'Govt. Bookkeeping.'

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Applications *re* Establishment: M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

—— Assets *re* Keely Mine, Value &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

—— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

—— Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

—— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

—— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

—— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

Farmers' Bank, Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

—— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

—— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

Farmers' Bank, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295: Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Debate:

(Mr. Fielding) 5306; (Mr. Lalor) 5314; (Mr. Beattie) 5316; (Mr. Middlebro) 5324; (Mr. Porter) 5325; (Mr. Foster) 5329; (Mr. Miller) 5354; (Mr. Northrup) 5363; (Mr. Crothers) 5377; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5389; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5395; (Mr. Edwards) 5412; (Mr. Nesbitt) 5424; (Mr. Blain) 5431; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5438; (Mr. Thornton) 5440; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 5450; (Mr. Armstrong) 5453; (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5456; (Mr. Lalor) 5456; (Mr. Donnelly) 5461; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5465; (Mr. Carvell) 5481; (Mr. Porter) 5487; (Mr. Hughes) 5496; (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 5498; (Mr. Boyce) 5508; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

Farmers' Bank Investigation, Treasury Board Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

—— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

Farmers' Bank Failures, Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

—— Remarks *re* Answer to Question, 2679 (ii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry., Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

—— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

—— Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

Farmers' Delegation: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

—— Distribution of Rep.: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

—— Printing, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm and Garden Products imported from Sault Ste. Marie, Quantity, Value, &c. (Mr. Boyce) 7034 (iv).

Farmers' Interests, Assurance of Member for N. Oxford *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Labourers, O.C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Farm Products, Dutiable Exports by Provs. into U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 7026 (iv).

Farm Products entered at Windsor from 1906-1910: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 7596 (iv).

Farm Products exported through Windsor, Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 8701 (v).

Farm Products imported from U.S. into Kingston Port, Quantities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c., Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Farm Products, Prices in Foreign Markets, 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 8096 (v).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Farm Stock and Products, Value of Customs Imports from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1496 (i).

Farran's Point, Lower Entrance improvement: in Com. of Sup., 6409 (iv).

Favoured Nation Treaties before Imperial Conference, Abrogation of: Par. in Toronto 'Globe' (Mr. Armstrong) 5292 (iii).

——— Importations from Most Favoured Nations: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113 (iii).

——— Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

——— Names of Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

——— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4104; Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

———Names of Favoured Nation Treaty Countries: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fedorenko, A., Extradition of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10 (i).

Fences on Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 23.'

Fencing along Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197.'

Fenelon Falls Bridge: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: on Amt., M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

——— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

——— Grants to: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089 (i).

——— Number surviving, Pensions &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1715 (i).

——— *See* 'Militia.'

Fergus Post Office Site, Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Festival of the Empire in London: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) in Com. of Sup., 3775 (ii).

Festival of the Empire: Chateauguay, Battle, Abandonment of: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 8105, 9251 (v).

FINANCE :

Accounts Outstanding, Total Amounts *re* Financial Statement: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5403 (iii).

American Silver Coin, Amount exported from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Aud. Gen., Cor. *re* Overpayments by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Best) 1010 (i).

——— Report: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 7 (i).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).

Bank Act, Consideration of by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6674 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6441, 7557 (iv), 8801 (v).

——— Prosecutions *re* Failures, Govt. Action: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 5632 (iii).

——— *See* 'Farmers Bank.'

Bankers Association, Agreement *re* Competition: Ques. (Mr. Low) 3466 (ii).

Bankers Association, Bylaws, &c.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4116 (iii).

Bank Curators' Reports: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 3142 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2670 (ii), 4569, 5038 (iii), 7556 (iv).

Bank Failures, Stmnt. of Mr. H. C. McLeod *re* Losses: (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2670 (ii).

Bank of Montreal, Disputes with Govt., Ref. to Justice Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 926, 1091 (i).

Budget, The—Financial Statement (Mr. Fielding) 6577 (iv).

——— Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

Canadian Guardian Life Insurance Co., Insolvency, Charge *re* Frauds: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1716 (i).

Charing Cross Bank and Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry. Co.: M. for Cor. with Govt. (Mr. Ames) 1726 (i).

——— *See* 'Railways.'

Coins, Foreign and Uncurrent, Removal of: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).

Estimates, 1912: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

——— Suppl. (1911): Presented (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii). 5525 (iii), 8355 (v).

——— Suppl, 1912: Presented (Mr. Fielding) 8534, 8675, 9312 (v).

Estimates, Order for Discussion *re* Depts: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2994 (ii).

——— Procedure *re* Discussing: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) in Com. of Sup., 3185 (ii).

Estimates to be Voted *re* Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. Fielding) 9223 (v).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Farmers' Bank Failure, Royal Commission *re* Investigation: Amt. (Mr. Henderson) to Com. on Ways and Means, 5295; Neg. (Y. 62; N. 97) 5523 (iii).

——— Negligence of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. Lennox) to Com. on Ways and Means, 8193, 8209, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 97) 8232 (v).

——— Application *re* Charter, Date and Names: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 1970 (ii).

——— Assets *re* Keeley Mine, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 2152 (ii).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1726 (i).

——— Deputation *re* Royal Commission, Legislation *re* Double Liability: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 4111 (iii).

——— Incorporation, Cor. with Dom. Govt.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 1726 (i), 2230 (ii).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 4468 (iii).

——— Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 7560 (iv).

——— Par. in 'News' *re* Endorsation of Premier: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 2264 (ii).

——— Proceedings *re* Commission: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10471 (v).

——— Question *re* Incorp.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1904 (i).

——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) *re* Mr. Calvert's connection, 5730 (iii).

——— Removal of Mr. Travers to Kingston Penitentiary: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4826 (iii).

——— Representations to Finance Dept. *re* Stability: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 2151 (ii).

——— Royal Commission *re*: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1510 (i).

——— Treasury Board, Ref.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Crothers) 5552 (iii).

——— Treasury Board Minutes: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4741 (iii).

——— *See* 'Treasury.'

——— Warning to Govt. previous to Issue of Certificate: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 2666 (ii).

——— Remarks re answer to question, 2679 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577; Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

——— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).

Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).

Loans and Investments in U.S., Amount, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Rutan) 6595 (iv).

FINANCE—*Con.*

Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).

——— Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).

Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation, &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9992 (v).

Sinking Fund, Legal Amount required, Bounties paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).

Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).

Treasury Board Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).

——— *See* 'Bank Curators,' &c.

Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).

Financial Statement—The Budget, 6577: Reply (Mr. Foster) 6588 (iv).

——— Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6441 (iv).

Fire Arms, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'

Fire Bricks imported into N.S., Number of, Ports &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars, I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fires in Forest Reserves: *See* 'B. No. 85.'

Fiscal Policy of Canada, P.M.G.'s Speech at Montreal Banquet: Remarks (Mr. Neely) 2079 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2266 (ii).

Fisheries Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 58 & 185

FISHERIES—

Bait Freezer at Barrington Passage, Assistance *re* Construction: M. for Papers* (Mr. Jameson) 3947 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5039, 5293 (iii), 8791 (v).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 8889 (v).

Bait Freezers, Construction in Louisburg, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McKenzie) 6505 (iv).

Bay of Fundy Fishing Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5815 (iii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Bounty in Kings, P.E.I., Names of Persons Receiving Amounts: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7246 (iv).

Bounties, Payments *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries Exhibit: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Canadian Fisheries, Extent in Marine Miles, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Dog Fish Industry: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 8044 (v).

Fish Ladders on Trent Canal: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4824 (iii).

——— Preservation, Action of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1503 (i).

Fish Landed by Canadian Atlantic Fisheries since 1870, Quantities, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1501 (i).

Fish Transportation: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).

Fish Transportation, Expenditure annually, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6271 (iv).

——— Amounts paid out of Aiding Funds, Further Information: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6506, 7106 (iv).

——— Statement read (Mr. Brodeur) 7259 (iv).

Fisheries Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Porter) 5836 (iii).

Fisheries Commission *re* Saskatchewan and Alberta, Interim Rep., laid on Table (Mr Brodeur) 10590 (v).

Fisheries Arbitration at Washington, Sir John Thompson's Memorandum: M. for Copy* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 2004 (ii).

Fisheries on the Great Lakes, Regulations *re* Commission: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) on M. for Sup., 5217 (iii).

Fisheries Inspectors, Dom. Appointments in Ontario: in Com. of Sup., 6613 (i).

Fisheries Regulations, Changes at Washington: on M. for Sup. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Further Information: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 8479 (v).

——— Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).

——— 1908, Proclamation *re*: Remarks (Mr. . D. Taylor) 5035 (iii).

———1908, Non-fulfilment by U.S.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6528 (iv).

——— *See* 'Fisheries, International.'

Fisheries Regulations between Can. and U.S., Proclamation *re*, Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Fisheries Regulations at Washington Conference, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4207 (iii).

Fisheries Regulations at Washington, Trap Nets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

Fisheries Regulations agreed to at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 2088 (ii).

Fishery Regulations, Complaint *re* C. K. Golden for Violation of: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Penalties *re* Violation of: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 1806 (i).

Fisheries Service of Can., Control by Federal Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 983 (i).

Fisheries Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).

Fishing Vessels and Customs Regulations, Request to place on Govt. Orders (Mr. Jameson) 3373 (ii).

Fish Tariff Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fish Wardens in Victoria, N.B.: Inquiry for Rets. (Mr. Maddin) 5629 (iii), 6672 (iv).

———Remarke (Mr. Brodeur) 5732 (iii).

Fishways and Clearing Streams: in Com. of Sup., 6659 (iv).

Fishways on Pembina River: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3031 (ii).

—— *See* 'Pembina.'

Glace Bait Association, Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).

——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).

——— M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).

Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).

Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).

——— Hatcheries under Dom. Control, Location, Applications for Fish Fry, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1494 (i).

——— Hatcheries in East Elgin, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) 5137 (iii).

Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).

International Fisheries Commission Regulations, Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).

——— Date of Operation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3465 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries Regulations.'

FISHERIES—*Con.*

International Fisherise Commission Regulations: Proclamation *re* Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1725 (i).

——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).

James Bay, Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).

Legal Expenses *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).

Manitou Lake, Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).

Markey Fishing Rights on Nelson River, Extension of, Cancellation of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 6119 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).

Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).

Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmnt. &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).

Newfoundland Fisheries, North Atlantic, &c.: *See* main heading 'Hague.'

Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).

Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).

Otter, Beaver or Stream Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).

Overseers: in Com. of Sup., 3809 (ii), 6159 (iv).

Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).

Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).

——— Further Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670, 3769, 3839 (ii).

——— *See* 'Seal'.

FISHERIES—*Con.*

Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).

——— *See* 'Fishway'.

Poachers in Lake Superior, Par. in Otawa Free Press: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1459 (i).

Poachers on Pacific Coast, Protective Service *re*: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 2080 (ii).

——— Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 1458 (i)

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i).

——— Seizure by 'Rainbow' of Str. 'Edric': Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 4116, 4208 (iii).

Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fire: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).

St. Andrew's Dam, Fishway, Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).

St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).

Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii)

Seal Fisheries Treaty, Cor. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594, 10196 (v).

——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).

——— *See* 'Pelagic.'

Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii)

Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).

Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).

——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).

Steam Trawling Fishing, Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).

Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishing: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).

Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).

Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).

Fishing Vessels' Licenses: *See* 'B. No. 27'.

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P. W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

——— *See* 'St. George's'

Flags flying on Govt. Buildings on St. David's Day: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3671 (ii).

Flags Flying on Public Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4724 (iii).

Flags, Regulation by Govt. *re* Flying with Foreign Flags: Prop. Res. (Mr. Beattie) 4347; M. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) to adjn. Debate, Agreed to (Y. 89; N. 49) 4380 (iii).

Flax Exports from Saskatchewan: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 10521 (v).

Fleming Grain Growers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).

Floods on the Assiniboine, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii), 6006 (iv).

Flour and Meal, Sale of in Bags: *See* 'B. No. 117'.

Flour and Meal, Stamping for Sale: Prop. Res. (Mr. Staples) 3226. (ii)

Foods; Adulteration of: *See* 'B. No. 35 & 112.

Foreign Consuls, Official Status: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 9511 (v).

Forest Fires caused by Rys.: *See* 'B. No. 197'.

Forest Reserves and Parks: *See* B. No. 85'.

Forestry Convention at Quebec, in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).

Fort Churchill and Nelson River Survey: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

Fort Frances Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 109'.

Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).

—— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

'Fossy Jaw': *See* 'B. No. 10 & 96.'

Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).

Fredericton, Increased Accommodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612, 1665 (i).

Freight Car Service, I.C.R., Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).

—— *See* 'C.P.R.'

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).

Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

—— *See* 'Post Office.'

Freeman, Cecil Ernest, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 143.'

Free Trade Offer by U.S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

French, Gen. Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).

—— Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).

French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c., Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).

French Translation of Inland Revenue Act: *See* 'B. No. 132.'

French Translation of Revised Statutes: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa Citizen: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).

Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).

Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).

—— Burlington: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).

—— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).

—— Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn.: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3955 (iii).

Fruit Growers Delegation: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).

Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).

—— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).

—— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).

Fruit and Vegetables Amt. *re* Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).

—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Fruit Inspector, T. A. Peters, Date of Apptmt., Qualifications &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 8701 (v).

Fruit Packing and Marking: *See* 'B. No. 154.'

Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).

—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

Galops Canal—Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).

Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N.W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).

Garnishment of Civil Servants' Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 12.'

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).
Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriatinfg Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664 (iv).
——— Investigation *re* Charges: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).
Gas Meters in Toronto, Complaints *re* Excessive Measurements: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3280 (ii).
Gaspe and Dalhousie SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8785 (v).
Gaspe Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).
Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).
Geological Survey Explorations: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
Geological Survey Rep.: Presented (Mr. Templeman) 9690 (v).
Georgetown Public Building, Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).
Georgian Bay Ship Canal, Estimates *re*: Remarks (Mr. G. White) 2004 (ii).
——— Par. in 'Globe' *re* Commencement of: Remarks (Mr. German) 2261 (ii).
——— Use by Americans: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).
——— *See* 'Transportation.'
Georgian Bay and Seaboard Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 72.'
Germany, Trade Relations with: *See* 'Trade Relations.'
Gervais, Mr. Alphonse, Emplymt. by Govt., Fined for Electoral Corruption: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2673 (ii).
Glace Bay Bait Association, Application re Subsidy for Building: M. for Copy* (Mr. Maddin) 3948 (ii).
——— Application *re* Subsidy, Names, &c.: (Mr. Maddin) 4044 (iii).
——— Payments to from 1906-10, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3670 (ii).
Globe Printing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 121.'
Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Gold Circulation in Canada, Amount of U.S. and British, Authority *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9985 (v).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Goldschmidt Thermit Co.: *See* 'B. No. 165.'
Govt. Appointments from South Grey since 1904, Names, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 1912 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2555, 3059 (iii).
Govt. Bills, Withdrawal of: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 2080 (ii).
Govt. Book-keeping, Names of Employees in Depts: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1718 (i).
——— *See* 'Falconer.'
Govt. Business, Morning Sittings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10095 (v).
——— Precedence on Mondays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4114 (iii).
——— Precedence on Wednesdays: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).
See 'Business.'
Govt. Buildings, Draping for His Majesty's Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Govt. Goods purchased in U.S., Amounts paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 817 (i).
Govt. Loans, Negotiations for 1909-10, Financial Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
Govt. Loans and Sinking Funds, ref. to by Mr. Guthrie for 1895-6: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Foster) 3772 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Foster) 982 (i).
Govt. Loans, Total Expenditure *re* Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3281 (ii).
——— *See* 'Finance.'
Govt. Officials in Political Contests: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1054 (i).
——— *See* 'Civil Servants.'
Govt. Printing, Amounts paid to Newspaper Offices: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).
Govt. Railways constructed previons to Comfederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Govt. Savings Banks, Number of Depositors, &.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com of Sup., 5811 (iii).
Govt. Steamers of Marine Dept., Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Gov. General, Duke of Connaught, Rumours *re* Apptmt: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1725 (i).
Gov. Gen.'s Sec. Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).
Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).
Grain Elevators: *See* 'Elevators.'
Grain Growers Grain Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 171.'
Grain Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 209.'
Grain stored in Port Arthur and Ft. William Elevators, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3605 (ii).
Grand Bend, Ont., Right of Way, Purchase of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1287 (i).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Grand Falls and St. John Valley Ry. Subsidy, Cor. re: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* 'St. John Valley.'
Grand Forks Public Building, in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grand Manan Fishery Officer, Prevention of Dynamiting Pollock: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1976 (ii).
Grand Manan Fisheries, Prices charged per Hogshead, Weir Licenses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2367 (ii).
Grand Narrows, I.C.R. Construction at, O.C.s, &c., *re* Claims of Contracts: M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
G.T.R. Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. Nos. 55 and 223.'
G.T.Ry. and I.C.R., Arbitration Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).
——— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).
Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3466 (ii).
G.T.Ry., Pension Fund. Rules, Regulations, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2153 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, and Action of Labour Dept.: Amt. (Mr. Northrup) to Com. of Sup., 5753 (iii).
——— Agreement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 811 (i).
——— Arrangement *re* Reinstatement: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 654 (i).
——— Basis of Settlement by Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 809 (i).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 3383 (ii).
G. T. Ry. Trainmen's Strike, Apptmt. of Judge Barron *re* Investigation: Ques. Mr. Macdonell) 2158 (ii).
——— Investigation by Judge Barron, Remuneration to: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1805 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike, Minister's Efforts a Success: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 810 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Dismissed Officials: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1071 (i).
——— Reinstatement of Employees: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 1507 (i).
——— Res. from Order of Ry. Conductors: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).
——— Settlement of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 786 (i).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— Settlement of: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 4246 (iii).
G. T. R. Trainmen's Strike: Status of Men Reinstated: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 3375 (ii).
——— Tel. sent by Minister of Labour to Messrs. Berry and Murdock: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1105 (i).
G. T. P. Branch Lines Co.: *See* 'B. No. 73.'

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY:

Classification, Arbitrators Rep.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 696 (i).
Eastern Division Overbreak, Agreement *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1570 (i).
Government Director, Remuneration, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6448 (iv).
G. T. P. Developing Co., Number of Acres sold by Govt., Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2366 (ii).
——— Land Purchased from: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 2666, 3466 (ii).
Labourers at Lafond in Alberta, Amounts owing for Wages: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3669 (ii).
Lake Superior Division, Construction Limit, Penalties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1492 (i).
Lumsden Investigation, Total Cost re: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1493 (i).
See 'Natl. Transcl.'
Grant, Gertrude Maud, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 138.'
Grantham, Gertrude Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 200."
Grazing Leases in the Foothills, Application *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).
G. B. and Canada, State-owned Cable, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1905 (i).
G. B. and U. S., Arbitration Treaty, Information *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fowke) 5834 (iii).
——— *See* 'U. S.'
Great Northwestern Telegraph Co., Request for Board of Conciliation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Conditions *re* Public Health: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 5535 (iii).
——— Water Filters, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).
Guardian Accident and Guarantee Co.: *See* 'B. No. 115.'
Guelph and Goderich Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 31.'
Guysborough Customs Revenue, Total Amount: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2161 (ii).
Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).
Guysborough 'Times', Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Hague Arbitration (Bay of Fundy) North Atlantic Fisheries, Production of Papers: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) on M. for Sup., 4588 (iii).
—— Debate resmd.: (Mr. Brodeur) 4678 (iii).
Hague Arbitration Award, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8093 (v).
Hague Arbitration Expenditure: in Com. of Sup., 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).
Hague Arbitration, Award *re* Fisheries: Remarks in Speech on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 24 (i).
—— Fisheries Negotiations with U. S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1725, 1804 (i).
—— Fisheries Regulations: Papers laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 2365 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 1988 (ii).
Hague Arbitration: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 4337 (iii).
Hague Arbitration *re* Newfoundland Fisheries, Counsel, Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 797 (i).
—— Statement on Address (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 664 (i).
Hague Tribunal, Stmnt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1913 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).
Half-breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).
Half-breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malboeuf: M. for Cor* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).
Halifax Citadel, New Quarters: on Com. of Sup,. 1581 (i).
Halifax Customs Officials, Complaint *re* Treatment *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Bill, 8723 (v).
—— *See* 'Civil Service'.
Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).
Halifax Dom. Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (v).
Halifax Increased Accomodation I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).
—— Pier at Cunard Wharf, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2150 (ii).
Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).
—— Completion of Repairs &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).
Halifax and St. John Wharfage &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 7807 (iv).
Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).
—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).
—— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Hall's Prairie P. O., Pets *re* Location, Postmaster &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).
Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).
Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
Hamilton Provident and Loan Society: *See* 'B. No. 172'.
Hamilton, Waterloo and Guelph Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 149'
Hampton Public Building: Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).
Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy*(Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).
Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).
—— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).
—— *See* 'Public Works'.
Harling, Mr. Thos., Compensation *re* Report: in Com. of Sup., 6092 (iv).
Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).
Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).
Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).
Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
See 'I. C. R.'
Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i).
Hawkesbury Interprovincial Bridge: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Perley) 4224 (iii).
Hay Claims, Delay in Repayment to Canadian Exporters: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5403 (iii).
Hay and Grain Imports into Canada from U. S., Quantity, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8984 (v).
Hay transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).
Healy, Fanny Mary, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 199'.
Herring Traps, Close Season *re*: Remarks (Mr. Loggie) 2086 (ii).
Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).
High Commissioner's Office, Salaries: in Com. of Sup. 1486 (i).

High River, Saskatchewan and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 202.
Highways on I. C. Rys., Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii), 9560 (v).
Hillsborough Brirge, P. E. I., Material purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).
Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).
Hochelaga Census Enumerators, Name, &c : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9432 (v).
Holland Peat Bog, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4303 iii).
Hollow Lake and Gull River Channels: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6421 (iv).
Homage: *See* 'Eucharistic.'
Homestead Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).
—— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).
Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re* : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).
Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).
Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).
Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).
Homestead Regulations in B.C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).
Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re* : Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).
Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).
—— *See* 'Interior.'
Homicide while Hunting: *See* 'B. No. 40.'
Hope Suburban Townsite, Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re* : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).
—— Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).
Hornell, Ethel May, Relief: *See* 'B. No 144.'
Horses admitted into Canada from U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Horses Diseased, Inspection *re* entering Canada: Remarks (Mr. Beland) 7427 (iv).
Hours of Labour on Govt. Works : *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).
Hours of Labour on Public Works, Representation *re* I.C.R. Workingmen: Correction of Stmnt. (Mr. King) 4116 (iii).

HOUSE OF COMMONS :

Bristol, Mr., M.P., Indemnity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lancaster) 4825 (iii).
Charwomen: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Christmas Adjournment: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1453 (i).
Clerk of Crown in Chancery, Salary : in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Committees: in Com. of Sup., 6170 (iv).
Coronation of King George V., Invitation to Members of Parlt: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1580 (i).
See main heading.
Divorce Bills: Ques. of Privilege *re* Remarks made by Senator Kirchhoffer (Mr. Ethier) 4201 (iii).
Drummond and Arthabaska , Electoral District: Certificate *re* (Mr. Speaker) 259 (i).
Elections Deferred in B.C. and Generally: Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 10376 (v).
Electric Light Attendant: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).
Franking Privilege, Fraudulent Use of : Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 6085 (iv).
Galleries of the House of Commons, Applause by Visitors : Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4468 (iii).
Hamilton Electoral District, Changes in Riding : Remarks (Mr. Barker) 10101 (v).
House of Commons' Appointments : M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to conc., 5288, 5400 (iii).
—— Number of people residing in: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3847 (ii).
See 'Restaurant.'
—— Sessional Employees since 1896 :M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3471 (ii).
House of Commons and Senate : Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 2556 (ii).
Library Improvements *re*, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).
Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).
Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).
Pages : in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Date of from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Quebec Members, Revolt against Extra Session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr. Talbot) 10096 (v).

Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).

——— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).

——— Procedure *re* Answering orally or written: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).

——— Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

Restaurant and Speaker Rooms, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1085 (i).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).

Servants: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Sessional Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).

——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).

Sessional Employees of H. of C., Names, Ages, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).

Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).

——— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

——— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).

——— Purchasing Gramaphone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).

Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).

Speaker of House of Commons, Wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).

Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).

Stationery: in Com. of Sup., 6175 (iv).

Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 6171, 6337 (iv).

Translators for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).

——— Translation Staff, Promotions: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 527 (i).

Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).

HOUSE OF COMMONS—*Con.*

Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).

——— *See* 'Ottawa Buildings.'

——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).

Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).

Voter's Lists, Preparation of: Inquiry for Stmnt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).

——— On Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).

Voter's Lists in Unorgnized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9900, 10142 (v).

Hudson Bay Mortgage Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 56.'

Hudson Bay, Peace River and Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 166.'

Hudson Bay, Position *re* Hague Award: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 673 (i).

Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).

——— Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).

Humber River Bridge, G.T.Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).

——— Obstruction to Navigation: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5403 (iii).

Humboldt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Hunting Accidents: *See* 'B. No. 40.'

Huron and Ontario Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 101.'

Hydro-Electric Commission Toronto, Mr. McGann's Application *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 1574 (i).

——— Decision of Minister: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1598 (i).

Hydro-Electric Commission, Water Power Lease on Ottawa River: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9430 (v).

———Tenders called for: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9352 (v).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Ice Contracts, I.C.R., at Rivière du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

Immigration Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 47, 146.

IMMIGRATION:

Agencies, Can. and G.B.: in Com of Sup., 6047 (iv).

Agents in G. B. and Europe, List, Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).

———Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) in Com. of Sup., 5165; Reply (Mr. U. Wilson) 5177 (iii).

Agents: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) in Com. of Sup., 4729 (iii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Aliens Outside of Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 7554 (iv).

Amount expended in Belgium and France: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9990 (v).

Amount expended in U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Bonuses paid *re* Three Swiss Girls, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2436 (ii).

Cameron, Miss, Emplymt. by Govt. as Immigration Agent: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 5191 (iii).

Chinese Immigration Act, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv).

Chinese Immigration, Total Number, Capita Tax, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 788 (i).

Chinese and Japanese, Number naturalized from 1900 to 1909: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1103 (i).

Chinese Immigration, Investigation Commission, Rep. of Mr. Justice Murphy: Inquiry for (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9594 (v).

——— Censure of Govt.: Amt. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10383, Neg. (Y. 54; N. 90) 10454 (v).

——— Discussion *re* Rep. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9926 (v).

——— Evidence read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9786 (v).

——— Rep. of Judge Murphy: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 9897 (v).

——— Stmnt. by Mr. McInnes *re* Discussion with Prime Minister: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 2738 (ii).

Civil Service, Apptmt. of Coloured Persons: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4930, 5038 (iii).

Coeli, Mr. Treau de, Payments to *re* Immigration: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8308 (v).

Coloured Aliens as Immigrants from U.S.: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4470 (iii).

Commission to Agents in Western Canada: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Commission to Immigration Agents, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Robb) 2436 (ii).

Creighton, Mr. W. O., Emplymt. as Immigration Agent: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 4828 (iii).

——— Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Emigration from Canada to U. S., Statistics *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8111 (v).

Ennis, D. N., Claims *re* Immigration Expenses: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 3847 (ii).

Expenditure in U.S. and G.B. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 4300 (iii).

Farmers sent to G. B. from Man.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1489 (i).

——— as Immigration Agents: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Farm Labourers, O. C. *re* Immigration Regulations: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 10099 (v).

Hickman, W. A., Immigration Agent to G. B.: Payments to: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Stanfield) 6505 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Immigrants entering Canada, Cognizance of Destination: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 814 (i).

Immigrants, Money Qualifications *re* Operation of Act: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 150 (i).

Immigrants, Number received from Europe, Amount expended &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 809 (i).

——— Number from G. B., U. S. &c., Amount expended, Names of Agents, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 807 (i).

Immigration into Eastern Canada: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 4728 (iii).

Immigration, Number since 31st March last to present, &c.: M. (Mr. U. Wilson) for Ret., 1498 (i).

Immigration Organizations, Cor. with Miss Wileman: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 9376 (v).

Immigration into Western Canada, Article in 'John Bull' *re* Conditions in Canada: M. (Mr. Lake) to adjn., 1551 (i).

——— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Lake) 1503 (i).

——— Ruling *re* Discussion (Mr. Speaker) 1551 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Medical Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1716 (i).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

——— Restrictions re: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

——— Treatment of, Prohibition into Canada &c.: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

See 'Civil Service', 'Coloured' &c.

Premiums by Canadian Govt. for 1910-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 9991 (v).

Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).

Statistics, Publication of: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2366, 2556 (ii).

IMMIGRATION—*Con.*

Statistics, Publication of: Statement (Mr. (Mr. Oliver) 2557 (ii).

Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).

U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).

U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can. Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).

Imperial Conference, Attendance of Prime Minister, Opposition Compromise: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8033 (v).

Imperial Defence Conference, Additional Copies: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2215 (ii).

——— M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i). 3073 (ii).

——— Navy Defence Papers: Laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10467 (v).

Imperial Conference Proceedings, Cor. with Mr. Harcourt: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10338; M. to print, 10340 (v).

Imperial Conference, Minister's Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 8679 (v).

Imperial Conference, Precis *re* Conference: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9693 (v).

——— Information *re* Precis Rep. and Further Reps.: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 9690, 9783 (v).

Imperial Conference, Report *re*, Complete Rep. presented to Parlt.: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10103 (v).

Imperial Conference, Questions to be submitted by Canada: Par. from 'Morning Post' quoted (Mr. Lennox) 4298 (iii).

——— Secretariat Formation: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Foster) 7352 (iv).

Imperial Steamship Co.: *See* 'B. No. 105.'

Imperial Traction Co.: *See* 'B. No. 102.'

Implements, Agricultural, Imports into Can. since 1908, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1350 (i).

——— Manipulation re Duties: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1358 (i).

——— *See* 'Agriculture.'

Imports by Provinces into U. S., Total Amounts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rutan) 5634 (iii).

Indian Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 95 & 117.'

Indian River Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 90.'

INDIANS—

Annuities for Indians, Man. Sask., &c.: in Com. of Sup. 8884 (v).

Bear Indian Reserves, Medical Officer, Payments to: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 3223 (ii).

Beausoleil Indian Agent at Christian Island, Place of Residence: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5288 (iii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

Beausoleil Indian Reserve, Permits *re* cutting Timber, Agent's Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4304-5 (iii).

——— Answer to Question: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).

Chacastapasin Indian Reserve, Owner, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 4301 (iii).

Garden Seeds, Purchase for Indians in N. W., Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1717 (i).

Graham, Mr. Duncan, Apptmt. as Indian Agent: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Indian Affairs, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Oliver) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4725 (iii).

——— Medical Attendance, Que.: in Com. of Sup., 6035 (iv).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).

Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).

Pasqua's Indian Reserve, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).

——— Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

Reserves in Ont., Fences, Settlement of Disputes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 1910 (i).

Reserve Lands Outside of Ry. Belt, B.C., Jurisdiction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2678 (ii).

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).

——— Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).

——— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

——— Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).

——— Investigation by Rev. Dr. McDougall: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).

——— Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).

——— Original Document, Cor., &c.: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 8109, 8192 (v).

——— Original Documents before Royal Commission: Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).

——— Rep. in 'Winnipeg Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).

INDIANS—*Con.*

St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).

Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).

Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).

Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).

Industrial Disputes Investigation Act, Amts. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii).

—— Act, Demand for Repeal: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 6929 (iv).

—— *See* 'Conciliation.'

Industrial Mergers, Investigation *re*: Prop. Res. (Mr. Monk) 2927 (ii).

Industrial Training Royal Commission, Incompetent Reporting: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3463 (ii).

Inland Revenue Act, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 132.'

Inspection and Sale Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 9, 35, 117, 153, 154, 157.'

I.C.Ry., Equipment Renewal: *See* 'B. No. 156.'

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY:

Accidents, Causes of, Pars. from N. S. Newspapers: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 6676 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Stanfield) 1571 (i).

Advertising Time Tables in Conservative Papers, N.B.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) in Com. of Sup., 6388 (iv).

——*See* 'Printing.'

Air Brake, Triple Valve: in Com of Sup., 5913 (iii)

Air Brakes for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii)

Bell, G. W., Pass Investigation *re* I. C. R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Branch Lines, Acquisition of: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 6768 (iv).

Bridge Strengthening: in Com. of Sup., 5913 (iii).

Builders Woodworking Co., Expropriation of Land for Moncton Extension: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Crocket) 6158 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Campbellton, Increased Ry. Accommodation in Com. of Sup., 5914, 5983 (iv).

Chatham, Diversion of Line: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Construction, Letter of Gloucester Farmers Union: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 5985 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Dartmouth Wharf, Pet. *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).

Dismissals from Nov. 1908, Number reinstated &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3666 (ii).

Drawbars for Freight Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5915 (iii).

Eastern Extension: Prop. Res. (Mr. McKenzie) 1106 (i).

Excursion Rates *re* Monument National Demonstration in Montreal: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).

Excursion Trains *re* Political Meetings: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
See 'Special Trains,' 'Truro' &c.

Fire Extinguishers for Passenger Cars: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii).

Fredericton Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5916 (iii).

Freight Car Service, Complaints, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Freight Rates on Coal &c. in Mar. Provs., Classification, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 6156 (iv).

Gaskin, Mr. J. W., Charges *re* Appropriating Scrap Brass, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6664, 7601 (iv).

General Operations: in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

Grand Narrows Contract: *See* 'Macdonald' &c.

Gross Earnings, Cost per Ton Mile, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5129 (iii).

Halifax, Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5918 (iii).

Halifax Terminals, Accommodation *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

—— Stmnt. (Mr. Graham) 2647 (ii).

Halifax Docks: in Com. of Sup., 9561 (v).

Hawke, Mr. John T., Special Privileges *re* Freight Sheds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

—— *See* 'Moncton.'

Hay Transported free from Quebec Prov. to Mar. Provs.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 5134 (iii).

Highways Protection: in Com. of Sup., 5917 (iii); 9560 (v).

Ice Contracts at Riviere du Loup, Terms, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2437, 3853 (ii).

I.C.R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).

I.C.R. and G.T.Ry. Arbitration, Commission, Points to be determined, Cost, &c.: (Mr. Foster) 3665 (ii).

—— Disputed Questions: Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. Foster) 4205 (iii).

Locomotives purchased since 1896, Prices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7033 (iv).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Macdonald and McLellan, Construction at Grand Narrows, O. Cs., &c. *re* Claims of Contracts, M. for Copies* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5640 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).

Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).

Mail Clerks, allowing Friends to travel in Mail Cars: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

Moncton Extension, Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworking Co., Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).

—— Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).

—— *See* 'Builders.'

Moncton Freight Transfer, Letter to Agent: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

—— *See* 'Hawke.'

Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).

Payments to Dr. C. A. Murray *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).

Pension Fund, Delegation *re* Amendments: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2159 (ii).

Petit Rocher, Spur, Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).

Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).

Porters: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) in Com. of Sup., 6339 (iv).

Printing, Amounts paid to 'Globe': Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 2886 (ii).

—— See 'Advertising.'

Pullman Berths: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Renewal Equipment, Cor. &c., with Aud. Gen., Stmnts. &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Barker) 784 (i).

Rolling Stock,: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).

Rolling Stock, &c., Mileage, Value of: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3668 (ii).

Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).

Special Trains *re* Monument National Demonstration: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).

—— *See* 'Excursion.'

Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).

Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Telegraphers Board of Conciliation, Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).

INTERCOLONIAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Traffic Westbound and Eastbound for five Years, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sinclair) 2162 (ii)

Truro, Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).

—— Increased Accommodation: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).

Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I.C.R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).

—— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).

——*See* 'Excursion.'

Windsor Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

Working Expenses: in Com of Sup., 6338 (iv).

Interest Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 6, 146.'

INTERIOR.

Algoma Timber Permits, Amounts paid *re* Dues: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 4673 (iii).

Aylwin Irrigation Grant, O.Cs., &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 6445 (iv), 8192, 9076 (v).

Bellerose, Edwin V., Application *re* Land, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Bellerose, Mr. Geo., Application *re* Homestead, Date of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3221 (ii).

Bidwell Bay, B.C., Govt. Land Reserves, Disposition of: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1284 (i).

Coal Mining Rights in School Lands, Leases issued: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5291 (iii).

Dominion Lands, Administration of: in Com. of Sup., 5553, 5581 (iii).

——Patents for S. E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Stables) 5834 (iii).

—— Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).

——S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).

—— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9547 (v).

Dom. Lands, Timber, Natural Resources &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Herron) 2271 (ii).

Dom. Lands in Saskatchewan, Gross Receipts &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3221 (ii).

Dom. Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Fanny Louise Irwin Land Patent, Cancellation of: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2188 (ii).

——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 2263 (ii).

Grand Trunk Development Co., Govt. Reserve *re* Homestead Lands: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3476 (ii).

Grazing Leases in Foothills, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1492 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip, Cor. with Rt. Rev. George Holmes: M. for Copy* (Mr. Ames) 1912 (i).

Half-Breed Scrip issued to J. W. Malbœuf: M. for Cor.* (Mr. W. M. Martin) 2161 (ii).

Hall's Prairie Timber Limits, Requests *re* Removal of Timber: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3282 (ii).

Homesteads, Applications, Cancellations, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5553 (iii).

——— Infractions of Regulations, Punishment &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5561-2 (iii).

Homestead Applicants in New Westminster District, Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 4732 (iii).

Homestead Entry of Mr. John Bradley, Cancellation of: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 5584 (iii).

Homestead Inspectors at Medicine Hat, Number, Salaries, Duties, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 1722 (i).

Homestead Lands thrown open since 1908, Total Amount in Townships 21 to 33, Ranges 18 to 23: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4112 (iii).

Homestead Regulations in B. C., Application *re* Ry. Belt: M. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) for Ret., 2855 (ii).

Homesteading in Western Ters., Acreage available: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1907 (i).

Homesteading by Women, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 1284 (i).

Hope Town Lots, Payments by T. D. Shorts, Approval by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3846 (ii).

——— Date of Payment by Mr. Wardle, Compensation *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3068 (ii).

Interior, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4726 (iii).

Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).

Leech, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).

Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).

New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Tayloy) 1291 (i).

———*See* 'Timber.'

INTERIOR—*Con.*

Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).

Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).

School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).

School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800, 1345 (i).

——— Total Acreage, Revenue from Sales: M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).

School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).

Total Acreage, Amounts realized &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).

Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).

Seed Grain, Advances to Settlers: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).

——— Indebtedness, Amount *re*: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).

——— Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).

Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).

Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).

——— *See* 'New Westminster.'

Internal Economy Commission: Mess. from His Ex., 377 (i).

International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).

——— *See* 'Imperial.'

International Fisheries Regulations, Mess. from Wash.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 6504 (iv).

——— Modifications of: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1803 (i).

——— Regulations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7259 (iv).

——— Ratification of: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 1654 (i).

——— *See* 'Hague.'

International Prison Congress, Canadian Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).

International Ry. Co. and International Traction Ry.: *See* 'B. No. 74.'

International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing Boundary &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).

International Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Sir George Gibbons: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4741 (iii).

——— Names of Members, Amounts paid to: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Macdonell) 4569 (iii).

International Waterways Commission (Lake Erie) Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 924 (i).

International Waterways Commission: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Iron and Steel Bounties, Total Amount paid: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 6158 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3470 (ii).

Iron and Steel Bounties, Renewal of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3274 (ii).

——— Total Amounts paid since 1896: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3607 (ii).

'Iroquois', Str. Report *re* Wreck: Remarks (Mr. Ralph Smith) 7104 (iv).

Irrigation Rights in Boundary Rivers: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Jacques Cartier Census Enumerators, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9372, 9431 (v).

James Bay Fishing Lease to Arch. McNee, Duration of, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Thoburn) 4830 (iii).

James Smith Indian Reserve, Burning of two Indians &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1082 (i).

——— *See* 'Indians.'

Japan, Customs Arrangements: *See* 'B. No. 224.'

Japanese Immigration, Application *re* Special Purposes: M. for Ret.* (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1339 (i).

Japanese Immigration, Number landed, Special Applications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 790 (i).

Japanese Treaty, Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9076 (v).

Jardine, John, Par. in 'Daily Times' *re* Claims on Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3847 (ii).

——— Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 4670 (iii).

——— Payment to by Govt. in excess of Work performed: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 5405 (iii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

'John B. Young' Str., Stranding of, Govt. Assistance *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2368 (ii).

Johnston, Mary Hamilton, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 140.'

Joliette and Lake Manuan Colonization Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 186.'

Judges appointed since 1896, Names, Residence &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8095 (v).

Judicial Vacancy in P.E.I., Délay in Apptmt.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 7553 (iv).

——— *See* 'P. E. I.'

Justice, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Allen Aylesworth) 469 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i), 6160 (iv).

——— Deputy Minister acting as Counsel for outside Cases: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1014 (i).

——— *See* 'Bank of Montreal.'

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amt.: *See* 'B. Nos. 39 & 189.

Juvenile Delinquents Act, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bickerdike) 4383 (iii).

Kelly, Robt., Emplymt. by Govt. at Vancouver, B.C.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 2665 (ii).

Kentville Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

——— Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

Kerr, Mrs. Elizabeth, Compassionate Allowance: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

Kettle Valley Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 82.'

King, Dr., Residence at Experimental Farm, Rental, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 804, 1349 (i).

Kingston Harbour Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston R. M. College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

——— Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kingston Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Kirkland, Walter Harvey, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 164.'

Knight's Point Breakwater, P.E.I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Kootenay and Arrowhead Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 18.'

Krenzer, Mr. J., Dispute with Mr. Greenway *re* Purchase of Land: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Staples) 3225 (ii).

La Banque International du Canada: *See* 'B. No. 123.'

Labour Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).

——— Conciliation Board: in Com. of Sup., 3378, 3399 (ii).

——— *See* 'G.T. Trainmen.'

——— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. King) 7 (i).

Labour Dept., Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1484 (i).
'Labour Gazette:' in Com. of Sup., 4229 (iii), 6057 (iv).
—— Name on Mailing List: M. for Copy* (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1727 (i).
Labour, Hours of on Govt. Works: *See* 'B. No. 3.'
Labour Strikes, Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P., *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).
—— 'Point of Bayonet': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).
—— Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).
—— *See* 'Coal Strikes.'
Lachine Canal, Concrete Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6358, 6410 (iv).
—— Tugs: in Com. of Sup., 6359, 6388 (iv).
Lachine, Jacques-Cartier and Maisonneuve Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 44.'
Lachine Wharfs and Basins: in Com. of Sup., 6359 (iv).
Lafleur, Dr., Emplymt. by Govt., Interference in Elections: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1907 (i).
Lafferty, Dr. J. D., Payments to, *re* Indians N.W.T.: in Com. of Sup., 6046 (iv).
Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).
Lake Champlain and St. Lawrence Ship Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 60.'
Lake Erie and Northern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 106.'
Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).
Lake St. Francis Protection Walls: in Com. of Sup., 6412 (iv).
Lake St. John Repatriation Society, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Girard) 9994 (v).
Lake Winnipeg Fisheries Investigation Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 796 (i).
—— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Lake Winnipeg Navigation: Ice-breaker, *re* Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Lanctot, Mr. A.: *See* 'Privileges and Elections,' 'Richelieu.'
Land Patents for S.E. ¼ of Section 6, Twp. 7, Issue of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 5834 (iii).
—— *See* 'Southwest.'
Lands, Timber and Mineral Rights: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3955 (iii).
Land, Timber, Natural Resources, &c. of Alberta, Provl. Control of: M. for Cor. (Mr. Herron) 1500 (i).
—— *See* 'Interior.'
Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).
L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
La Sauvegard Life Insurance Co.: *See* 'B. No. 193.'
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, Prime Minister's Birthday, Congratulations (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8 (i).
—— Reception at Montreal, Montreal Harbour Commission's Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 9982 (v).
—— See 'Post Office, Ministers' Speeches.' 'Premier', &c.
Leach, R. E. A., Payments to: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 5604 (iii).
Leamington Postoffice, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).
"Le Devoir": *See* 'Drummond', &c.
Legal Agents, appointed by Govt. Precautions *re* acting for Private Parties: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 813 (i).
—— *See* 'Justice'.
Legal Expensese re Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).
Lethbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Lethbridge, Speech of Member for Pictou: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1877 (i).
Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).
Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1104 (i).
—— M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).
Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).
Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).
Levis Dry Dock, Plans filed by Sir Robt. Perks, Subsidy, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 712 (i).
Library of Parlt., Apptmt. of Mr. O. Souliere: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8789 (v).
—— Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).
Lt. Governor, N.S., Apptmt. of, Cor. *re* Director of N. S. Steel & Coal Co.: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 2670 (ii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
—— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).

Lighthouse Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse, Construction and Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
——— Salaries, &c.: in Com of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lindsay River, Removal of Deadheads: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6423 (iv).
Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).
Live Stock Industry and Cold Storage Systems: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sproule) 1184; Neg. (Y. 66; N. 111) 1275 (i).
Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).
Load Lines on Ships: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Lobster Fishery Regulations laid on Table (Mr. Brodeur) 529 (i).
Lockmen Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
——— *See* 'Canals.'
Logan, Robert William, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 173.'
London and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 57.'
Long Sault Dam, Cor. between Govt. and British Ambassador: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3530 (ii).
Long Sault Dam, on St. Lawrence River: M. (Mr. R. L. Borden) for Cor., 3228 (ii).
——— on M. for Sup., 2887 (ii).
——— Rep. of American Commissioners, Canada's action, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1651 (i).
——— *See* 'St. Lawrence.'
Long Sault Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).
Loughrin, Police Commissioner at Cochrane, Number of Convictions before: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1568 (i).
Lumber Cargoes Regulations: *See* 'B. Nos. 210 and 212.'
Lunenburg, N.S., Dredging, Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).
Lunenburg Postoffice, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359, 2578 (ii).
Lunenburg Post Office Clock, Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).
Lymburner Contracts with Govt.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3205 (ii).
Macdonald & McLellan, Construction Contract, I.C.R.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10470 (v).
——— *See* 'I.C.R.'
Macleod Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).
McClary Manufacturing Co.: *See* 'B. No. 75.'
McGillivray, Judge *re* Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Wm. Chisholm) in Com. of Sup., 4272 (iii).
McGill University, Grant *re* Applied Science: in Com. of Sup., 6445 (iv).
Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv,.
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Magee, Blair, Dismissal from Electrical Dept., I.C.R.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 6665 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Mahone Bay Customs Collector, Dismissal, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4383 (iii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4301 (iii).
Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii) 4667 (iii).
Mail Delivery Free in Towns &c., Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).
Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356; ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Statement (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Mildlebro) 9538 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Service with Allan SS Co.: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Mail Subsidies and SS Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).
Maisonneuve Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).
Man. Boundaries, Govt. Proposals *re*: Remarks (Mr. Staples) on M. of Sup., 6201 (iv).
——— Negotiations with Dom. Govt.: M. for Cor *(Mr. Staples) 980 (i).
——— Speech of Prime Min. at Winnipeg re, Cor. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 709 (i).

Manitoba Fisheries Commission: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Bradbury) 4207, 5035 (iii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Man. Grain Act, Inspection &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Man. Legislative Building, Purchase of Fort Osborne Barracks, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).
Man. and Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 19.'
Man. Radial Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 148.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Ry. Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).
——— Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).
Manitoba Swamp Lands, Concession to Province: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 6759 (iv).
Manitou Lake Fishing Privileges, Lease *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1348 (i).
Manitoulin and North Shore Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 159.'
Maple Sugar, Adulteration, Pet. *re* Amt. to Foods Act: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5131 (iii).
Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).
Marieville Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).
Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

MARINE:

Aids to Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 6455 (iv).
Aids to Navigation on St. Lawrence, Number of Steamers, Scows, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 799 (i).
'Alva' Str., Purchase of, Dimensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1909 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* to Philip & Son: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 2438 (ii).
'Arctic' Str., Provisions: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).
——— Rep. of Capt. Bernier: Inquiry for (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Bay of Fundy Buoy Lights: in Com. of Sup., 6458 (iv).
Beddington, Mr., Pension *re* Pilotage: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6534 (iv).
Brier Island Light, Application *re* new House: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
——— Lightkeeper's Salary: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).
Bronte Harbour Master, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 3859 (ii).
Callender Lighthouse: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 6497 (iv).
'Canada' SS., Subsidy paid *re*, Complaints of Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 661 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Clayoquot Life Saving Station, Investigation *re* Irregularities: M. for Reps.* (Mr. Barnard) 785 (i).
'Crissie Toomey' Schooner, Purchase of, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Dalhousie Pilotage Dues, Exemption *re*: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 9247 (v).
——— Ans. (Mr. Brodeur) 9374 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 9374 (v).
Declaration of London, Consideration by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5935 (iv).
——— Adoption of: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Monk) 3530 (ii).
'Earl Grey' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1972 (ii).
——— Construction: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6462 (iv).
'Eureka' Pilotage Boat, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6502-3 (iv).
Govt. Steamers, Maintenance and Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii).
——— Winter Commissions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5833 (iii).
Govt. Steamers for Pacific Coast: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) in Com. of Sup., 6550 (iv).
Lake Winnipeg Navigation, Icebreaker *re*: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 4217 (iii).
Life Saving Awards: in Com. of Sup., 5822 (iii).
——— Names of Recipients: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 3849 (ii).
Life Saving Stations: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Lighthouse, Agencies, Rents: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamers: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091, 6454 (iv).
Lighthouse Construction, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6454 (iv).
——— Purchase of Supplies: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).
Lighthouse Keepers from Quebec to the Gulf of St. Lawrence, Names, Dates of Apptmts., Salaries, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 771 (i).
Lime Kiln Crossing Boat: in Com. of Sup., 6546 (iv).
Magnetic Observatory: in Com. of Sup., 6557 (iv).
Marine and Fisheries Committee, Meetings, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 4048 (iii).
Marine and Fisheries, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

MARINE—*Con.*

Marine and Fisheries Supplies, Purchase of Ships: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 6470 (iv).

Marine Hospitals: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).

Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lighthousekeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii), 5832 (iii).

Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).

'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).

Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).

Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).

——— *See* 'Sorel'

Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).

Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).

Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).

Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).

MARINE—*Con.*

Shipping List: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).

Shipwrecks on B.C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).

Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Sick Mariners Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).

——— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).

Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).

Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

Sorel Shipyards, Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv).

——— Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).

——— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).

——— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks (Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).

——— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).

——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9994, 10203, 10096 (v).

Sorel Shipyards: Painting Member's House

——— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).

Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).

Telephone for Life Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).

Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).

Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).

U.S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).

Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).

Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).

Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (i).

Wireless Telegraph Stations owned by Govt., Locations, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Armstrong) 1340 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).

MARINE—*Con.*

Wood Island Life Boat, Dimensions, Accommodation, &c., :Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).

Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).

Maritime Mail, Delays *re*, Representations by Board of Trade at Halifax: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

——— *See* 'Postoffice.'

Maritime Road, Gaspé Shore: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Markey Fishing Leases, Cancellation of, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 4208 (iii), 6761 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6914 (iv).

——— M. for Papers (Mr. Campbell) 4382 (iii).

——— Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4664 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5954 (iv).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 5630 (iii), 6119 (iv).

Marriage Inducements by Immigration Agents in G. B.: Remarks (Mr. Doherty) 9375 (v).

Marriage Laws, Parliamentary Powers, Govt.'s Intention: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8585, 10195 (v).

Marriage Laws in Quebec, Action of Roman Catholic Church: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Marriages, Validity of, Law respecting: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Masonic Property stolen in Montreal, Par. in 'Free Press' *re* Apology to Counsel: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Hughes) 7873 (iv).

——— Verdict of Montreal Jury, Counsel's Action: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

——— Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).

Masters Certificates for Inland Lakes, Dates, Examiners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).

Masters and Mates Examiners Certificates, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5821 (iii).

Match Factories, Number of Employees: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1976 (ii).

Match Factories using Phosphorus, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1717 (i).

Matches of White Phosphorus: See 'B. Nos. 10 and 96.'

Mather Bridge and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 20.'

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Medical Council Bill, Par. in 'Globe', Correction *re* (Mr. Black) 2991 (ii).

Megantic Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1710 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Menzies, Wm., Payments to *re* Magnetic Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Merchants and Employers Guarantee and Accident Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'

Mercier, Mr. Geo., Customs Official at Dalhousie, Member of Town Council: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4044 (iii).

Mergers: *See* 'Industrial.'

Mess. from His Ex., Estimates 1912, Suppl.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 8534 (v).

——— Estimates, 1911: Presented (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695 (i).

Messengers, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6172 (iv).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Conditions: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Meteghan River Foreshore Lots, Grants, Rentals, &c.: Ques.: (Mr. Jameson) 4929 (iii).

Meteorological Service: in Com. of Sup., 6561 (iv).

Mexico Trade: *See* 'Trade Commissioner.'

Meyer, Paulin Verena, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 145.'

Mica Exports 1900 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Best) 5290 (iii).

Mica Imports: Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4827 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Midland and Tiffin Lighthouse: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).

MILITIA:

Alberta Rangers, Macleod Squadron, Organization of, Capt. D. J. Campbell's connection *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7340 (iv).

Annual Drill, Number called out from 1894 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 8699 (v).

——— Number of Officers, Men, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 9352 (v).

Armouries, &c. in Canada: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Edwards) 1460 (i).

——— *See* 'Drill Halls.'

Baby Farm, Toronto, Sale of, Competition *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 2155 (ii).

——— *See* 'Toronto.'

Bear River Rifle Range, Pets. *re*: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 3606 (ii).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii), 6057 (iv).

Bliss, Lt.-Col. D. C., Emplymt. by Govt., Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Taylor) 8100 (v).

B.C. Militia, Complaints *re* Treatment, Par. in B.C. Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) 9248 (v).

MILITIA—*Con.*

Coal Miners Strike, Remarks of Mr. Geo. Taylor, 9720 (v).

—— *See* 'Labour.'

Clifford, W. J., Winner of King's Prize at Bisley, Recognition of: Remarks (Mr. Russell) 9996 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Abuse of Patronage *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4659 (iii).

—— Apptmnt. of Col. Landry: Personal Explanation (Mr. Lemeiux) 8093 (iv).

—— Cadets from Canada: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 706 (i).

—— Canadian Veterans at Coronation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3608 (ii).

—— Indian Contingent, Par. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6506 (iv).

—— Names of Officers, Cadets, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7105 (iv).

—— Naval Cadets, Method of Selection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9986 (v).

—— Regulations *re* Apptmt., Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 3277 (ii).

—— Regulations *re* Selecting Corps: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4464 (iii).

—— Rule *re* Apptmts: Ques. (Mr Middlebro) 3220 (ii).

—— Selection of Officers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4828 (iii).

Customs Duties *re* Militia: in Com of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Drill Halls, Generally, Construction *re*: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Drill Halls, Man., Cost of: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1975 (ii).

Esquimalt Fort, Removal of Guns: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 3220 (ii).

Esquimalt and Halifax Naval Stations, Transfer to Canada: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 799 (i).

—— Negotiations *re* Transfer: Ques (Mr Paquet) 799 (i).

Eucharistic Congress, Militia in Attendance, Authorization for: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3219 (ii).

—— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Fenian Raid Veterans, Claims *re* Compensation: Amt. to Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Middlebro) 9595, Neg. (Y. 45; N. 61) 9633 (v).

—— Compensation to: Ques. (Mr. Beauparlant) 658 (i).

—— Number surviving, Pensions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1089, 1715, (i).

—— *See* 'Veterans.'

Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase by Man. Govt.: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii), 6054 (iv).

—— *See* 'Winnipeg.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

French, Gen.: Inquiry for Report (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9 (i).

—— Report: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 76 (i).

Imperial Conference, Military Adviser to, Apptmt. of Mr. S. Hughes: Remarks (Mr. Barker) 9072 (v).

Imperial Defence Committee Report: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 944 (i).

Kingston Military Batteries, Contract *re* Hay, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 2886 (ii).

Kingston Military College Improvements, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

—— *See* 'R.M.C.'

Labour Strike, Militia Interference: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 10345 (v).

—— Privelege, Ques. of: (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9784 (v).

—— Letter from Mr. Geo. Taylor, M.P. *re* Militia: Read (Mr. King) 10344 (v).

—— *See* 'Coal.'

Military School, Montreal, Selection of Site, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1713 (i).

Militia Allowances: in Com. of Sup., 8514 (v).

Militia and Agriculture Expenditure from 1867 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9371 (v).

Militia Dept, showing Passes by Members of Parlt.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

—— Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Sir Frederick Borden) 7 (i).

—— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1020 (i).

Militia Expenditures, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

Militia Officers: *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Militia Regiments, Number in Montreal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7595 (iv).

Militia Regulation governing Admission to Militia Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 1001 (i).

—— Ques.(Mr. Campbell) 1090 (i).

Militia Supplies, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4667 (iii).

Militia Surveys, Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1102 (i).

Militia, Total Annual Cost from 1867 to 1910, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1289 (i).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse.: Remarks (Mr Crosby) 2261, 2265; Members' remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 3144 (ii).

MILITIA—*Con.*

N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).

Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).

Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 6915 (iv).

—— *See* 'Veterans.'

Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).

—— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090 (v); Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rockliffe Rifle Ranges, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).

—— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).

Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).

—— Loaned by Can. to G.B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).

—— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).

—— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).

R.M. College, Additions, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

—— College Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

—— *See* 'Kingston.'

St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).

Springhill Mines, N.S., Strike: Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).

Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).

—— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).

Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps., Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).

—— *See* 'Baby.'

Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).

Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).

—— *See* 'Fenians.'

Winnipeg, Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).

—— Fort Osborne Barracks, Purchase of, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) 4469 (iii).

—— *See* 'Ft. Osborne.'

MILITIA—*Con.*

Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).

—— Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).

Milk and Cream exported to U.S. for 1910-11, Quantity, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 7038 (iv).

—— Value of Export to U.S. for March and April, 1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8790 (v).

Milk and Cream exported, Quantity for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6269 (iv).

Milk and Cream Shipped from Western Ont., Accommodation *re* Handling: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6436 (iv).

Milk River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Milk River and St. Mary's River Boundary: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) in Com. on Bill, 9101 (v).

Milton Post Office Buildings: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Mineral Deposits, Circular *re* Information by F. H. Forchet: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4305 (iii).

Miner, Bill, Capture of, Return to Can.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 4384 (iii).

Mines Dept., Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1475 (i).

Ministerial Association, Ottawa, Attack *re* Speech: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

—— Res. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Miller) 3059 (ii).

Ministers of Crown, Absence on Public Business for 1908-10, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1340 (i).

Ministers of the Crown, Testimonials, Acceptance of: Amt. (Mr. Boyce) to Com. of Sup., 2747, Neg. (Y. 63; N. 118) 2826 (ii).

—— Explanation *re* Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2438 (ii).

—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Boyce) 2150, 2254 (ii).

Minister of Militia, Absence from Hse: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 2261, 2265; Member's remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 2262 (ii).

Ministers' Travelling Expenses for 1908-9: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 817 (i).

—— *See* 'Public Works.'

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

Minnedosa Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Minority Representation, Redistribution Bill, Intention *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9988 (v).

—— Speech by Sir Richard Cartwright: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 9693 (v).

Mint Operations, Implementing Information: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).
'Minto' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residences, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1724 (i).
Miramichi Bay, N.B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).
Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).
Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).
Modus Vivendi Licenses: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Monarch Bank, Date of Incorporation &c., Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3065 (ii).
Moncton Armoury: in Com of Sup., 1623 (i).
Moncton Extension, I.C.R., Acquisition of Land from Builders Woodworkng Co.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6157 (iv).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moncton, Locomotive and Car Shops: in Com. of Sup., 5926 (iii).
Moncton Station, I.C.R., Site purchased, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1291 (i).
Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).
Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Montreal Customs House Employees leaving since 1st July, 1896: M. for Ret.* (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 1340 (i).
Montreal Govt. Appointments since 1st Jan., 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Gervais) 3225 (ii).
Montreal Govt. Weir: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 2065 (ii).
Montreal Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 48.'
Montreal Legal Firms, Amounts paid for Services: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 984 (i).
Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).
Montreal and Maritime Provs., Mails forwarding of: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Montreal Park and Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 45.'
Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).
Montreal Post Office, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).
——— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
——— Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).
Monument Nationale Demonstration in Montreal, Excursion Rates *re*: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1347 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2996 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Moodie, Maj. J. D., Compensation: in Com. of Sup., 6090 (iv).
Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Mormon Propaganda, Prevention by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 5135 (iii).
Morrison, Nellie Bridgland, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 182.'
Morrison, N. L., Pocock, H. A., and Stevens, Captains, Dates of Masters' Certificates for Inland Lakes, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. A. Currie) 5637 (iii).
Morven Fishery Overseer, Date of Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. U. Wilson) 1104 (i).
Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Mounted Police: *See* 'R. N. W. M. P.'
Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).
Munderloh & Co., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 203.'
Murray Canal Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6410 (iv).
Murray Canal, New Scow: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).
Murray, Dr. C. A., I. C. R. Payments to *re* Tickets: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7031 (iv).
Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).
Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. U. Wilson) 981 (i).
——— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).
——— Ret.: Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).
Napierville Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).
Nash, Fred. J., Emplymt. by Govt. in Inland Revenue, P.E.I.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2668 (ii).
National Battlefields at Quebec: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY:

Changes in Original Specifications &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Change in Structures to the amount of $10,000: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Classification, Arbitration *re*, Rep. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1490 (i).
——— Investigation, Reps.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
——— Information *re*: (Mr. Lennox) 6272 (iv), 9995 (v).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Classification: Reductions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 9899 (v).
Commission, List of Members of Engineering Staff, who have resigned &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Commissioners' Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
Construction Work, Change in Concrete used, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ames) 1499 (i).
Construction Work, Estimated Quantity, Bridges, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
Contracts, Estimated Quantities *re*: Ques (Mr. Ames) 1491 (i).
Contracts, Security Deposit, Amount of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1971 (ii).
Contract Work, Delay *re* Execution: Ques (Mr. Lennox) 6668 (iv).
Contractors, Amounts paid on Force Account, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Cost Estimated and Mileage of Fencing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1094 (i).
Customs Duties on Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8583 (v).
Defaulting Contractors, Penalties &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1281 (i).
Eastern Division, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i); correction of figures (Mr. Graham) 1293 (i).
Eastern Division, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1095 (i).
—— Overbreak, Agreement *re* Progress Estimates: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 2434 (ii).
—— Section Houses, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1099 (i)
Eastern Division, Total Cost to 31st Dec. 1910, inclusive of Quebec Bridge: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5130 (iii).
—— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).
—— M. for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 5136 (iii).
Eastern Div., Total Cost to Dec. 1910: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2434, 3064 (ii).
—— Corrected Answer (Mr. Graham) 3144 (ii).
Expenditure, Difference in Amounts in Ret.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4827 (iii).
Expenditure, Estimated Cost of Completion of Winnipeg and Moncton Div.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1727 (i).
G.T.P. taking over Completed Sections, Provision in Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1093 (i).

NATIONAL TRANSCONTINENTAL RAILWAY—*Con.*

Haney, Quinlan & Robertson, Contract *re* Construction of Locomotive Shops east of Winnipeg: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
Labour Conditions, Charges *re* Supplies: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 8596 (v).
Land Damages, Compensation *re* Delay, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3949 (iii).
Moncton and Winnipeg Contracts, Original Estimates, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
N.B. Section, Pusher Grade: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 4051 (iii).
—— Standard, Estimated Total Cost: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 4047 (iii).
Payments to: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 1572 (i).
Rails and Fastenings, Tenders, Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 1099 (i).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N.T.Ry.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).
St. Lawrence and Moncton Div., Completion of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1711 (i).
Shops, Plans and Specifications for Machinery: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1569 (i).
—— Emplymt. of Mr. W. J. Press: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 2157 (ii).
Temiskaming and Northern Ry., Agreement *re* Running Rights: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2435 (ii).
Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5135 (iii).
Total Expenditure to 31st Dec. 1910, Estimated Cost of Winnipeg and Moncton Section: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1497 (i).
Train Hauled Filling, Payments *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Western Div., Total Cost of Construction: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 7591 (iv).
National Weekly Indemity Co.: *See* 'B. No. 77.'
Natural Resources, &c.: in Sask. and Alberta, Provincial Control, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).
Naval Policy of Govt.: *See* 'Address.'

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA:

Applications from Canadian and British Navy: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Jameson) 1339 (i).
Boot Contract, Tenders, Patterns, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 2675 (ii).
—— Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1723 (i).
'Bristol' Type, Specifications, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1279 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA—*Con.*

'Bristol' Type, Building of Cruiser: Remarks (Mr. Nantel) 196 (i).

Canadian Navy *re* Home Rule: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 1461 (i).

Coal Consumption by Govt. Cruisers, Quantity per Day: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv). (iv).

Construction, Tenders *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 8355 (v).

Coronation Contingent, Names of Officers. &c.: Stmnt. (Mr. Lemieux) 9375 (v).

Cruisers manned by Canadian Marines, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 805 (i)

Date and Port of Sailing of Niobe and Rainbow: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 1091 (i).

English Warships, Withdrawal from Canadian Waters: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1080 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1093 (i)

Expenditure *re*: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Monk) 786 (i).

—— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5638 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 4471 (iii)

—— Remarks (Mr. Brodeur) 4659 (iii).

International Naval Conference, Final Protocol: M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 3073 (ii).

Medical Examiners *re* Recruits: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 8991 (v).

Naval Cruisers ordered for Canada, Stmnt. in 'Navy': Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 793 (i).

Naval Defence Proposals: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 34 (i).

—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 54 (i).

Naval Defence. Govt. Proposals: Amt. (Mr. Monk) to Address, 112, Amt. 133, Neg. (Y. 67; N. 120) 651 (i).

—— Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) to Amt., 228, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 126) 649 (i).

Naval Service Dept., Names of Employees Domicile, Duties assigned, Salaries, &c.: M. for Stmnt. (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

Navy Act, Rules and Regulations: M. for Ret. (Mr. Monk) 1499 (i).

—— Printing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4665 (iii).

Navy Estimates: in Com. of Sup., 1463 (i).

'Niobe', Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

—— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).

—— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).

—— statement : read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow', Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

NAVAL SERVICE OF CANADA—*Con.*

'Niobe' and 'Rainbow,' Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

—— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv)

—— Loan by Imp. Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 983 (i).

—— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).

—— Par. in Naval Annual *re* Scrapping of Cruisers: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 931 (i).

—— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price Paid, &c.: Ques (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

—— Guns, Type, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1490 (i).

—— Listed as ineffective: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 1070 (i).

—— Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

Recruiting by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).

—— Regulations, O. C. *re* Remuneration &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7804 (iv).

Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).

Roper, Commander, Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).

—— Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).

—— Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).

Ships ordered by Govt.: Par. in Ottawa 'Free Press': Remarks (Mr. Monk) 866 (i).

Tenders for Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8700 (v).

Total Cost of Cruisers, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 791 (i).

Navigable Waters, Pollution of: *See* 'B. No. 178.

Navigation Licenses on Great Lakes, Regulations from Washington: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2375 (ii).

Neepawa Postoffice Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Negro Immigrants, Prohibition into N. W.: Remarks (Mr. A. H. Clarke) 5911 (iii).

—— Restrictions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thorburn) 6523 (iv).

—— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 5941 (iv).

—— *See* 'Civil Service.'

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Ne Temere Decree: *See* 'Marriage.'

Netherland Loan Co., Cor. between Mr. Preston and Dom. Govt.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Monk) 3142 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5639 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 7349 (iv).
Netherland Loan Co., Investments in Canada, Rep. of Mr. W. T. R. Preston *re* : M. for Copy (Mr. Monk) 776 ; Prop Res. (Mr. Monk) 781 (i).
——— Rep. of W. T. R. Preston, Cor. with Govt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. Smith) 789 (i).
——— Statement by Mr. Preston *re* Chief Justice Fitzpatrick, Official Notification : Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2669 (ii).
N.B. Regiment of Artillery, Annual Drill: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 8528 (v).
New Edinboro', N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i)
Newfoundland Export Trade, Total Value, Imports, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Newfoundland, North Atlantic Fisheries, &c.: *See* 'Hague.'
New Harmony Post Office : Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).
Newmarket Canal, Cor. with Mr. E. J. Walsh and Dept.: M. for Copies.* (Mr. Wallace) 5136 (iii).
——— Expenditure for 1910, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 5830 (iii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Wallace) 7556 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Walsh *re* : Amt. (Mr. Wallace) 10474; Neg. (Y. 45; N. 79) 10532 (v).
Newmarket Canal : Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6420 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. Russell) in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
New Ontario and Quebec Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation : Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).
New Westminster District, Govt. Lands, Grants issued, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D.Taylor) 1291 (i).
New Westminster Penitentiary Employees, Increase of Salaries: M. for Cor. (Mr. J D. Taylor) 2183 (ii).
Niagara Falls Water Power: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Niagara Falls Water Power, Quantity developed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 5132 (iii).
——— Regulations *re* : Stmnt. (Mr. Pugsley) 8890 (v).
——— Treaty Obligations, &c., Par. in Press: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8791 (v).
Niagara, Welland and Lake Erie Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 99.'
Nicolet Customs Collections for 1906-11: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet Military Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
Nicolet Post Office, Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).
Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
——— Pet. re Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).
Nicolet River Dredging, Contract re : Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).
'Niobe' Cruiser, Contracts *re* Provisions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Date of laying Keel, Repairs in England, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 793 (i).
——— Gun Practice, Approximate Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (v).
——— Names of Officers: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 9090 (v).
——— Speed, Result of Official Trials: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7209 (iv).
——— Wages of Seamen, Discontent *re*: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 530 (i).
——— statement: Read (Mr. Brodeur) 664 (i).
——— *See* 'Naval Service.'
Nomininge Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).
North Atlantic Collieries, Application *re* Conciliation Board: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Maddin) 3947 (ii).
——— Protest *re* Nomination on Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 4209 (iii).
——— *See* 'Labour.'
North Bay; Burk's Falls and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).
——— Information *re* (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).
Northern Ontario, Settlement of by Govt. Assistance: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 6767 (iv).
North Shore Tax Payers and Voting at Federal Elections: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1082 (i).
'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).
Northumberland, East Riding, Opposition to Reciprocity: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).
Northwest Fishing Co.: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Campbell) 5630 (iii).
See 'Markey.'
N. W. Ter. School Lands, Complete Procedure *re* Disposal, &c.: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 800 (i).
N. W. M. Police, Coronation Contingent, Number, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 5836 (iii).

N. W. M. Police, Loss of Men on Macpherson Yukon Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7254 (iv).
Northwest Scrip to Old Settlers, Refusal of Claims &c.: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1293 (i).
North York, Challenge *re* Contest Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).
N. S. Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).
Oaths of Office: B. No. 1, (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1°*, *pro forma*, 1 (i).
Obabikong Bay and Sabiskong Indian Land, Tenders *re* Burnt Timber: Ques. (Mr. Boyce) 1344 (i).
Objections *re* Interruptions Reciprocity Treaty: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ocean and River Service: in Com. of Sup., 5811 (iii), 6089 (iv).
Offensive Weapons: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Offensive Weapons, Pets. *re* Legislation: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 3064 (ii).
——— Sale of, Par. in Montreal Papers: Remarks (Mr. Lewis) 2557 (ii).
Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).
Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Oleomargarine, Admission of Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6504, 6668 (iv).
Oliver, Hon. Mr., Charges Against *re* Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com. 8309; Amt. (Mr. Borden) 8309-14, Neg. (Y. 69; N. 102) 8347; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 8348, Neg. (Y. 65; N. 99) 8353 (v).
——— M. for Com. *re* Investigation (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8791 (v).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 8032 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8092 (v).
——— Inquiry for Meeting of Com. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9899 (v).
Ontario and Abitibi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 170.'
Ontario Fisheries Service, Number of Officers, Services, Salaries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Porter) 6157 (iv).
——— *See* 'Fisheries'
Ont., Hudson Bay and Western Ry. Co.: *See* B. No. 76.'
Ontario-Michigan Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 168.'
Ont. and Minnesota Power Co., Ltd.: *See* 'B No. 109.'
Ont. Northern and Timagimi Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 119.'
Opium, Prohibition of: *See* 'B. Nos. 13, 22, 97.'
Orders Discharged (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4464 (iii).
Orders Dichharged: M. (Mr. Macdonell) 4464 (iii).
Order, Ques. of *re* Homestead, Member asked to withdraw Word 'Liar' (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 5561 (iii).
Orford Mountain Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 100.'
Oshawa Customs Collector, Retirement of Mr. Blamey: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3225 (ii).
Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'cn., Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).
Ottalie Stream, N. B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).
Ottawa Buildings: Elevators &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
——— Excessive Rentals by Govt., Censure *re*: Amt. (Mr. Blain) to Com. of Sup., 2271; Neg. (Y. 61; N. 104) 2358 (ii).
——— Furniture &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3163 (ii).
——— Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590, 3162 (ii), 6027 (iv).
——— Improvement Commission's Report: Inquiry for (Mr. Lake) 2004, 3672 (ii).
——— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
——— Lighting Contract: in Com. of Sup., 3173 (ii).
——— McGillivray's Contract: in Com of Sup., 5993 (iv).
——— Municipal Lighting Plant, Number of Govt. Buildings lighted by: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1280 (i).
——— New Leases, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1281 (i).
——— Parlt. Grounds, Pavement: in Com. of Sup., 2593, 2602 (ii).
——— *See* 'Parliament.'
——— Pavements &c.: in Com. of Sup., 8883 (v).
——— Plaza, 6507 (iv).
——— Rideau Hall Grounds: in Com. of Sup., 3170 (ii), 8872 (v).
——— Sanitary Condition of City, Rep. of Dr. Hodgetts: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 5535 (iii).
——— Seybold Building Elevator, Reimbursement *re* Installation: Ques. (Mr. Goodeve) 1350 (i).
——— Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).
——— Sussex Street Deptl. Buildings, Alterations in Plans: Remarks (Mr. Lake) 2075 (ii); Plans laid on Table (Mr. Pugsley) 4824 (iii).
——— Sussex St. Deptl. Block: in Com. of Sup., 3172 (ii).
——— Telephones: in Com. of Sup., 3169 (ii)
——— Victoria Museum: *See* 'Victoria.'
Ottawa City Health Conditions: Amt. (Mr. Lewis) to Com. of Sup., 6367 (iv).
Ottawa City, Typhoid Epidemic, Criticism of: Remarks: Explanation (Mr. Black) 4720 (iii).

Ottawa City Typhoid Epidemic, Pollution of City Water: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4475 (iii).
——— Prorogation of House: Remarks (Mr. T. Chisholm) 4676 (iii).
——— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Black) *re* Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen' 4656 (iii).
——— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).
——— Water Supply for Parlt. Buildings, *re* Typhoid Epidemic: Remarks (Mr. Daniel) 2004 (ii).
Ottawa City, Woods and Canadian Buildings, Cancellation of Contracts *re* Heating and Elevators: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1088, 1344 (i).
——— Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii).
——— Date of last Cheque paid to Imperial Realty Co. for Lighting: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1279 (i).
——— Lighting Contract with Electric Co.: in Com. of Sup., 3175 (ii).
——— Inaccurate Answer: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) 999 (i).
——— Contract with Imperial Realty Co. *re* Lighting &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 794 (i).
——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharps) 3948 (ii).
——— Stmnt. *re* Discrepancy in Figures (Mr. Pugsley) 1011 (i).
——— *See* 'Public Works.'
Ottawa, Northern and Western Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 46.'
Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).
Ottawa, Beaver or Steam Trawling in Northumberland Strait: M. for Cor.* (Mr. A. W. Chisholm) 980 (i).
Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).
Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).
Owl's Head Harbour, Pet. *re* Light: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3465 (ii).
Owl's Head Lighthouse, N.S., Construction, Apptmt. of Lightkeeper, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 5832 (iii).
Oyster Culture: in Com. of Sup., 6661 (iv).
Oyster Industry, Memorials, Surveys, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Warburton) 714 (i).
Pacific and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 167.'
Pacific, Northern and Omenica Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 125.'
Pacific and Peace Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 91.'
Pages, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6174 (iv).
Papal Zouaves, Organization as Rifle Association, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 7340 (iv).
Paper Imports into U. S., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).
——— *See* 'Pulp.'
Parcel Post between Canada and G. B. Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).
Parcel Post, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).
Parcel Post Rates, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr Armstrong) 5934 (iv).
Paris Agency: in Com of Sup., 8694 (v).
Paris Exposition, 1900, Expenditure *re*: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Paquet) 7602 (iv).
Parliament Grounds, Condition of: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6768, 7023 (iv).
——— *See* 'Ottawa.'
——— Water Supply, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7345 (iv).
Parliament, Opening and Closing Dates from 1896 to 1910: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 786 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Parliament, Opening of: Com. from Gov. Gen's. Sec.: Read (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Parliament Site, Winnipeg, Reservation in Crown Grants, &c.: M. for Papers, &c. (Mr. A. Haggart) 7039 (iv).
——— *See* 'Manitoba,' &c.
Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).
——— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).
——— Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).
Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).
Pasqua's Indian Reserves, Claims for Damages re Fires: Remarks (Mr. Lake) on M. for Sup., 8586 (v).
——— *See* 'Indians.'
Patent Record: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Patent Relief: *See* Bills Nos. 43, 165, 187, 188 203.
Patrol Boats in Northern Waters: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Peace River Water Belt: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Peat Gas, Generating Electric Power, Process, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 708, 985 (i).
Pecuniary Claims Convention, *re* Hay Claims, Objections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 802 (i).
Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'

Pelagic Sealing Conference: in Com. of Sup., 8678 (v).
——— Treaty between G. B. and U. S. *re* Protection to: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 3670 3769, 3839 (ii).
——— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Pembina Fish Dam, Placing of Ladder, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 1090 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries'.
Penny Bank Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 221'.
Pensions for Lighthouse and Coast Service: in Com. of Sup., 6091 (iv).
Pensions to Veterans: Remarks (Mr. G. V White) 6915 (iv).
——— See 'Militia'.
Peoples Ry. Co.: See 'B. No. 110'.
Percy Aylwin Irrrigation Grant, O. Cs.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Campbell) 6158 (iv).
———*See* 'Interior'
Peterborough Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).
Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).
Petewawa Camp, Branches of Permanent Force Training: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4465 (iii).
——— Extent of Damage by Fire: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 9090; Remarks (Mr. King) 9250 (v).
Petewawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).
Petit Rocher Spur, I. C. R., Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6156 (iv).
Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).
'Petra' Norwegian Bark, Information *re* Crew: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3605 (ii).
Pickford and Black, SS Service between Can. and W. Indies, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lewis) 4465 (ii).
——— *See* 'W. Indies.'
Pictou Roundhouse, Names of Employees, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2152 (ii).
Pig Iron Charcoal, Number of Tons, Imported: Ques. (Mr. Barker) 1721 (i).
Pig Iron Imports, used in Steel Rail Mills, Quantity &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 4828 (iii).
Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).
Pilotage Fees on Coal Barges: *See* 'B. No. 118.'
Pilotage Pensions: in Com. of Sup., 6533 (iv).
Pilotage Rules: See 'B. No. 155.'
Plains of Abraham, Battlefield: *See* 'B. No. 222'.
Plaza, Ottawa, Removal of Poles: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 6507 (iv)
——— *See* 'Ottawa.'
Ploughs exported to U. S., Number, Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Neely) 3223 (ii).
Poachers Fishing on Pacific Coast, Par. in Victoria Daily Colonist: Remarks (Mr. Bernard) 1458 (i).
——— *See* 'Fisheries.'
Point Prim Fog Alarm, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9782 (v).
Poisons, Sales of: *See* 'B. No. 13.'
Pontiac Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 61.'
Porcupine, Disasters by Fire, Aid to: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 9694 (v).
———Remarks (Mr. W. R. Smyth) 9635 (v).
——— Request for Tents, Supplies, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 9983 (v).
Pork Packing Industry, Delegation *re*: Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Blain) 3530 (ii).
Portage le Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).
Port Colborne Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Port Credit, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).
——— Public Works, Expenditures for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).
Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).
Port Mulgrave, &c., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8786 (v).
Port Perry Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).
Port Stanley, Port Burwell and Aylmer Customs Collections, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 985 (i).
Post Office Act Amts.: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
Post Office Act (salaries) Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 216.'

POST OFFICE:

Acton Vale, Upton and St. Pie Post Office Revenues: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 980 (i).
Allan SS. Co. Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4428 (iii).
Arrow Lake Postal Clerk: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).
Athol Mail Route, Establishment of, Pets., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Rhodes) 2161 (ii).
Atlantic Fast Service and All Red Route, Establishment of: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1726 (i).
Atlantic Mail Contract, Renewal of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).
Austin Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Aylmer Post Office Revenue for 1908-9, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 984 (i).

Bark Lake Post Office, Closing and Opening: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 6270 (iv).

Beaconsfield Settlement Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

Birch Grove Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Maddin) 6073 (iv).

Bonaventure River, Quebec, and N.B. Mail Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 8764 (v); M. for Com. on Res., 2503 (ii).

Canada and Japan Mail Subsidy: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1802 (i).

Canso and Guysborough Mail Service, Contracts *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 8994 (v).

Chemin Gouin Postmaster, Name, Salary, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 7038 (iv).

——— A. C. Miquelon, Pension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames, 7210 iv).

Cobalt Mail Service, Delays and Inefficient Service: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1649, 1663, 1804 (i).

Coronation Stamps: Inquiry *re* (Mr. Armstrong) 9247 (v).

——— *See* 'Stamps.'

Collingwood Corner, Postmaster, Name Apptmt., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Crooks, Mr. Wesley, Postmaster at Peggy's Cove, Increase in Salary: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Curren, R. C., Gratuity *re* Post Office Service: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 3948 (ii).

Dixon Post Office, Pets. *re* Change of Location: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 4669 (iii).

Donland Post Office, Removal of Site: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Macdonell) 9994 (v).

Don Post Office, Mail Service to Toronto, Name of Contractor: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Dunnville Postal Collections, Customs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3470 (ii).

Echo Lake Post Office, Application *re* Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8993 (v).

English Mail Service to Maritime Provs.: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 8792 (v).

——— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Escott Postmaster, Dismissal of: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

——— Date of Apptmt., Complaints *re* late Postmaster: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4926 (iii).

——— Postmaster's Salary, Date of Increase: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7601 (iv).

Fergus Post Office Site: Remarks (Mr. Stratton) in Com. of Sup., 1883 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Fraser Mills Postmaster, Defalcations, Bonds, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1566 (i).

Fraser River Mail Service, Applications *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3463 (ii).

Free Delivery of Mail: in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Free Mail Delivery in Cities, Restrictions, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1285 (i).

——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4925 (iii).

Gaspé Mail Service, Revenue *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 3854 (ii).

Guysborough Mail Contract, Number of Tenders &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 7038 (iv).

Guysborough 'Times,' Application *re* Postal Privileges: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Sinclair) 6505 (iv).

Halifax Post Office Repairs: in Com. of Sup., 1582 (i).

——— Completion of Repairs, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 653 (i).

Hall's Prairie P.O., Pets. *re* Location, Postmaster, &c.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3468 (ii).

Haskett, Havelock and New Tusket Post Offices, Distance between &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8991 (v).

Jackson Postmaster, Name and Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 656 (i).

Lajord Post Office, Change to Accounting Office: Remarks (Mr. Lake) in Com. of Sup., 4294 (iii).

Langdon Subdivision of C. P. Ry., Mail Service in Northwest: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1346 (i).

Leamington Post Office, Cost in Detail, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 9782 (v).

Letter Carrier's Boots: in Com. of Sup., 4283 (iii).

Letter Carriers, Free Transportation *re* Tramway System : Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 1104 (i).

Letter Carriers in New Westminster, Free Transportation on Tramways: M. for Cor. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 2194 (ii).

Letter Carriers Superannuation, Amt. to the Act: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 1488 (i).

Magazines sent through Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6077 (iv).

——— *See* 'U. S.'

Mails delayed and mutilated in Transmission, Use of Rubber Bands, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii), 4667 (iii).

Mails, Illegal Use of for fraudulent Schemes: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 802 (i).

Mails used Illegally for Lottery Schemes &c.: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1356 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Mails Used Illegally for Lottery Schemes, &c.: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 1364; Stmnt. (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

—— *See* 'Sheldon.'

Mail Service to Mar. Provs., Delivery of English Mails: Remarks on M. for Sup. (Mr. Emmerson) 9541 (v).

——Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2376 (ii).

—— *See* 'English.'

Mail Routes in North Grey, Rural Delivery, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 9538 (v).

—— *See* 'Rural.'

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions: in Com. of Sup., 6058 (iv), 8752 (v).

Meteghan Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 4295 (iii).

Ministers Speeches distributed by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9253 (v).

—— Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071 (v).

Montreal Letter Carriers, Additional Number: Remarks (Mr. M. Martin) 2647 (ii).

Montreal Post Office, Mailing and Registering Facilities: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1715 (i).

Montreal and Maritime Provs., Forwarding of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6070 (iv).

Neepawa Post Office Mail Route: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

Nelson Postal Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Goodeve) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

New Harmony Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6084 (iv).

Newspaper Special Train, Cost of Operation: Ques. (Mr. Beattie) 9982 (v).

Nicolet Post Office Building, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

—— Pet. *re* Annex: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8584 (v).

—— Amount paid to Guardian, Rent collected, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8789 (v).

N. S. Post Office Service, Weekly and Biweekly, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 982 (i).

Parcel Post between Canada and G. B., Colonies, &c., Loss *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 805 (i).

Parcel Post System, Express Rates: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 9930 (v).

—— Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

——Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9909 (v).

Parrsboro Post Office: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Rhodes) 8535 (v).

Peel County Mail Service: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 7247 (iv).

—— Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 10355 (v).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Postal Clerks, Superannuation *re*: in Com. of Sup., 4284 (iii).

Postal Conventions with Spain, Changes *re*: Ques. (Mr. Gervais) 1104 (i).

Postal Regulations, Distribution of short date Newspapers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10340 (v).

Postmasters' Association, Pets. *re* Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

Postmaster General's Mission to Rome, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Postmasters' Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4289 (iii).

—— Increase to, Classification of Offices, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 5934 (iv).

Post Office Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Post Office Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Post Office Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Post Office Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 3954 (iii).

Post Office Collections, Revenues in Cities, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3862 (ii).

Post Office and Customs Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Post Office, Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

—— Clerical Assistance: in Com. of Sup., 6063 (iv).

—— Estimates *re* Mail Service, Objection (Mr. Perley) to Passing, 4296 (iii).

—— Money Orders, Printing of: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 1101 (i).

—— Outside Service, Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 6073 (iv).

—— Outside Service, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 6178 (iv).

—— Overcrowding in Basement: Ques. Mr. Sproule) 6667 (iv).

—— Post Office Matters, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Lemieux) in Com. of Sup., 6089 (iv).

—— Promotions and Salaries: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10469 (v).

—— Revenue and Expenditure: Inquiry *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 10335 (v).

—— Savings Banks, Unclaimed Balances, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1568 (i).

—— Supplies for Western Provs., Distribution of: Ques. (Mr. A. Haggart) 1282 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

P.E.I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).

——— *See* 'Stamps.'

Railway Mail Clerks: in Com. of Sup., 4281, 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).

——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).

——— Accidents to, Grants *re* Injuries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).

——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).

——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armsrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).

——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).

——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).

——— Names and Date of Apptmts. of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).

Railway Mail Clerk's Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217."

Revenue for Montreal, Toronto and Moosejaw from 1906 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 4673 (iii).

Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

'Review of Reviews,' Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).

Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).

Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards, Manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

——— *See* 'Mail Routes,' 'Peel,' &c.

Rural Mail Service in East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).

——— Number operating in Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).

——— Routes, Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).

Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).

St. Johns Postmaster, Refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Ste. Marie de Monnoir Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).

Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6180 (iv).

Saskatchewan Post Offices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).

Selkirk Post Office Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Shelburne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, Mr. C. D., Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).

——— Action of Govt. *re* Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

——— *See* 'Mails,' &c.

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).

Stamps, New Issue by P.O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).

——— Canadian Design: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) 7106 (iv).

——— Condemnation *re*: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 9990 (v).

——— Prize *re* Best Design, Inspection, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 5402 (iii).

——— Refusal of Imperial Design: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6908 (iv).

——— *See* 'Coronation,' 'Quebec,' &c.

Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Apptmt. of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).

Tilbury, &c., Post Office Revenue at, for 1904-10: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 807 (i).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).

Toronto Post Office, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).

Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).

U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).

———*See* 'Magazines.'

Walkerville Post Office Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).

——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).

——— *See* 'Tilbury.'

Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders re: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).

Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).

POST OFFICE—*Con.*

Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).

Potato Barrels, Standard Size: *See* 'B. No. 9.'

Potato Bushel, Standard Weight: *See* 'B. No. 153.'

Potatoes exported, Quantity, Value from 1901 to 1910: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 6271 (iv).

Pratt's Siding, Establishment of Post Office, Requests *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 3067 (ii).

Precedence at Official Receptions: M. for Cor. (Mr. Sproule) 949 (i).

——— *See* 'Eucharistic.'

Pre-emptions and Purchased Homesteads, Total Acreage, Amounts received, Annual Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 812 (i).

——— *See* 'Interior.'

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Premier's Return from Conference, Reception, Amount expended: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9780 (v).

——— *See* 'Laurier, Sir W.'

Prime Minister's Tour through the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 25 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 45 (i).

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Reciprocity and Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

P. E. I. Coast Fisheries, Fines, Penalties *re* Breach of Regulations: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Fraser) 1501 (i).

P. E. I. and G. B., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

P. E. I. Judicial Vacancies, Delay in Appointments: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 6923, 7553 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7428, 7803 (iv) 8355 (v).

P. E. I. and Mainland Winter Communication, Reps., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Warburton) 3863, 3917 (ii).

P. E. I. Supreme Court, Apptmt. of Judges: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).

P.E.I. Tunnel, Memorials, Reps., &c., *re* Survey; M. for Copies (Mr. Richards) 2176 (ii).

P. E. I. Winter Mail Service: in Com. of Sup., 5828 (iii).

——— Contracts *re* Coal, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 2677 (ii).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Prince Rupert and Queen Charlotte Islands, B.C., SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8787 (v).

Printing Bureau Boilers: in Com. of Sup., 2361, 2582 (ii).

Printing Bureau Employees, Religious Status: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 3606 (ii).

Printing Bureau Investigation: M. (Mr. Northrup) for Royal Commission, 7687, Neg. (Y. 56; N. 92) 7801 (iv).

——— Distribution of Evidence: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1364 (i).

——— Evidence under Oath, Printing, &c., Dismissal of Mr. R. E. Cook: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).

——— Irregularities, Money Loss, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 794 (i).

——— Number of Dismissals, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. G. Taylor) 708 (i).

——— Paper purchased, Inspection of: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2373 (ii).

——— Investigation, Report of: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8; M. to print, 8 (i).

——— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1351 (i).

Printing, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 309 (i).

Private Bills: M. to extend Time (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1454 (i).

——— Second Readings: Remarks (Mr. Northrup) 8641 (v).

Privileges and Elections Com., 3rd Rep. of Com.: Presented (Mr. German) 6756 (iv).

Privileges and Elections Com., Charges *re* Mr. A. Lanctot: M. to conc. in 3rd Rep. of Com., 7873; Amt. (Mr. Monk) 7889, Neg. (Y. 56, N. 98) 8030 (v).

Privilege, Ques. of (Mr. Molloy) *re* Absence from his seat in the House, 1353 (i).

——— *re* Blocking Public Accounts Com.: (Mr. Lennox) 990 (i).

——— (Mr. Geo. Taylor) *re* Labour Strikes, 9784 (v).

——— (Mr. Best) *re* Members paying for Speeches, 1355 (i).

——— *re* Montmagny Electors, (Mr. Roy) Correction in Hansard, 1356 (i).

——— *re* Speech by Member for Dauphin as to Selection of Capital for Saskatchewan (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).

——— Telegram delayed, &c: (Mr. Gilbert) 1456 (i).

Privy Council, Clerkships: in Com. of Sup., 8750 (v).

——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1013 (i).

Protection Service *re* Fisheries: in Com. of Sup., 3807 (ii).

——— *See* 'Fisheries.'

Public Accounts Com.: M. (Mr. Warburton) to ref. Aud. Gen's. Rep. to Committee, 527, 818; Amt. (Mr. Lennox) 823; Amt. to Amt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 827; Agreed to (Y. 98; N. 74) 864 (i).

Public Accounts Committee: Meetings and Aud. Gen.'s Rep.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 309 (i).

—— Proposed Amendment (Mr. Lennox) Notice *re*, 696 (i).

Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Buildings: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Armstrong) 5541 (iii).

Public Buildings for Post Offices, &c., Number Expenditure &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).

Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in Com. of Sup., 1669 (i).

—— Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii); Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).

Public Work Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Public Works, Expenditure generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).

Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS:

Advertising Govt. Works, Govt. Policy: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6393 (iv).

Alien Labour Law, Employment of Foreigners on Public Contracts: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 10367 (v).

Amaguadees Pond, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9500 (v).

Ancona Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).

Argyle Sound, N. S.: in Com. of Sup., 9501 (v).

Arthabaska Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

Assiniboine Floods, Pets. to Govt., Political Interference *re*: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2973 (ii).

—— River Improvements: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Athens Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2088 (ii).

Aylmer, Ont., Drill Hall: Remarks (Mr. Marshall) in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).

Aylmer, Que., Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1672 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Banff Park Water Works: in Com. of Sup., 6052 (iv).

Bathurst Dredging Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 803, 1285 (i).

Battleford Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2970 (ii).

—— Cor.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3005 (ii).

—— Further Cor.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 3029 (ii).

Belleville Docking Facilities: Remarks (Mr. Porter) in Com. of Sup., 6011 (iv).

Belleville Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Big Bay Point Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Bois Blanc Island Dam, Negotiation with U. S. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) 1575 (i).

Bracebridge Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Wright) in Com. of Sup., 1671 (i).

Brantford Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 2098 (ii).

Brighton Wharf, Vote *re*: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 1655 (i).

Bronte Harbour Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) in Com. of Sup., 6003 (iv).

Brudenell Wharf, Tenders *re* Building: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).

Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).

—— Caretakers, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6027 (iv).

—— Draping for His Maj.'s Death: in Com. of Sup., 6026 (iv).

—— Electric Power: in Com. of Sup., 3210 (ii).

—— Rents, Engineers Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3212 (ii).

Buildings, Que., General Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).

—— Yukon, Salaries &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).

Burlington Bay Dredging, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sealey) 7341 (iv).

—— Remarks on Question (Mr. Sealey) 7348 (iv).

Calgary Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Campbellton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Canadian Dredging Co.'s Dredges, Quantities dredged, Earnings, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1905 (i).

Carman Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Centreville Breakwater, Pets. *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8983 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Chatham, N.B., Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1610 (i).

—— Purchase of Site, Name of Owners: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (iii).

Chesley Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2103 (ii).

Chilliwack Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Coteau Landing Breakwater, Construction of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).

Cranbrook Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3013 (ii).

Cribbins Point Wharf: in Com of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Deep Brook, N.S., Wharf, Expenditure *re*: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Jameson) 4383 (iii).

—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Jameson) 5293 (iii).

Digby Public Works, Expenditures *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 2616 (ii).

Dredging Contracts let to A. & R. Loggie for Current Year: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

Dresden Public Building: in Com. of Sup. 2105 (ii).

Duncan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Dundas Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Dunnville Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1668 (i).

Dussault & Lemieux, Amounts paid for Dredging by 'International': M. for Ret. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1498 (i).

East Chezzetcook Wharf: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).

Eastern Dredging Co., Letting of Contracts, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 813 (i).

—— *See* 'Gaspereaux.'

Elbow and Bow Rivers Water Power, Privileges *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).

—— M. for Copies* (Mr. McCarthy) 1501 (i).

Elora Post Office, Site, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Henderson) 6505 (iv).

Elora Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2109 (ii).

Essex Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2110 (ii).

Experimental Farms Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3157 (ii).

Fairville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1611 (i).

Fergus Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fernie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3014 (ii).

Fire Escapes for Dom. Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3160 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Flags on Govt. Buildings, Orders from P.W. Dept. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 2648 (ii).

Fort William Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Fredericton Public Building, Pavement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1612 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1665 (i).

French River Dam: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) in Com. of Sup., 6022 (iv).

Gananoque Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2111 (ii).

Garthby Wharf, Parliamentary Vote *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i).

Gaspereau Harbour Dredging Contracts: Amt. (Mr. Crocket) to Com. on Ways and Means, 10203, Neg. (Y. 59; N. 92) 10308 (v).

Gaspé Shore, Maritime Road: in Com. of Sup., 6543 (iv).

Georgetown Public Building Drainage, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Goderich Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Grand Falls Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Grand Forks Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Greenwood Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Grosse Isle Quarantine Station, Water Filters &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1675 (i).

Haileybury Dock, Total Expenditure, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 7806 (iv).

Halifax Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 1592 (i).

—— Citadel, New Quarters: in Com. of Sup., 1581 (i).

Hampton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1614 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Expenditure by Public Works Dept.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1339 (i).

Harbours and Rivers, Generally, Repairs &c.: in Com. of Sup., 9551 (v).

—— N. S., Estimates to be Voted for Interim Supply Bill: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9501 (v).

Harriston Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2115 (ii).

Hartland Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1617 (i).

Hawkesbury and Grenville Bridge, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 930 (i).

Hillsborough Bridge, P. E. I., Montreal, purchased, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Hillsborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1621 (i).

Hours of Labour on Public Works, Printing of Proceedings *re* Com: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3280 (ii).

Humbolt Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3007 (ii).

Hungry Bay Dyke, Macadamizing Road: in Com. of Sup., 6411 (iv).

Iberville Bridge Construction: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Immigration Buildings, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 3156 (ii).

Jesus River Improvements, Completion, Suspension, &c.: Ques. (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 804 (i).

Kingston Postoffice Building: in Com. of Sup., 2130 (ii).

Knight's Point Breakwater, P. E. I., Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7805 (iv).

Lake Manitoba Wharf, Pet. *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 5999 (iv).

L'Ardoise Beach Protection Work: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Lethbridge Postoffice, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Pugsley) in Com. of Sup., 1637 (i).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Levis Armoury and Gun Shed: in Com. of Sup., 1678 (i).

Listowel Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2141 (ii).

Lloydminster Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3009 (ii).

Lorneville Wharf, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. (Mr. Daniel) 5132 (ii).

Lunenburg, N. S., Dredging, Plans re: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2157 (ii).

Lunenburg, Public Building, Clock Tower: in Com. of Sup., 1592, 1625 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2359 (ii).

——— Statement of Chief Architect: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 2360 (ii).

——— Specifications *re* Tower Clock: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 2578 (ii).

Macleod Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3003 (ii).

——— Progress *re*: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9588 (v).

Maisonneuve Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1685 (i).

Margaree Harbour Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6029 (iv).

Marieville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1697 (i).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Marieville Public Building, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4666 (iii).

Meaford Harbour Improvements, Adoption of Plan, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1347 (i).

Megantic Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1710, 1860 (i).

Melfort Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Meteghan Landing Place, Report *re* Defective Condition: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 4043 (iii).

Midland Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2142 (ii).

Milton Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Henderson) 1871 (i).

Minnedosa Public Building, Purchase of Site &c.: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 9993 (v).

——— Remarks (Mr. Roche) 3046 (ii).

Miramichi Bay, N. B., Dredging Contracts, Specifications, Cor. &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Crocket) 1340 (i).

——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Crocket) 2556 (ii).

Mississippi, Dam at Galetta, Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Thoburn) 9252 (v).

Mitchell Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2146 (ii).

Moncton Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1623 (i).

Monetville Cut, Lake Nipissing Public Works, Total Expenditure: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 1495 (i).

Montreal Barracks: in Com. of Sup., 1863 (i), 2567 (ii).

Montreal Postal Station: in Com. of Sup., 1861 (i).

Montreal Postoffice, Alterations &c.: in Com. of Sup., 1862 (i).

——— Electrical Fixtures, Drawings *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

Moosejaw Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Mossy River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

Mount Forest Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2149 (ii).

Nanaimo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3015 (ii).

Napanee River Dredging, Instructions &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Wilson) 981 (i).

——— Papers laid on Table, 1903 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. U. Wilson) 2065 (ii), 4049 (iii).

Napierville Postoffice: in Com. of Sup., 1865 (i).

Nelson Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

New Edinboro, N.S., Breakwater, Tenders *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1283 (i).

Nicolet River Dredging, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 8585 (v).

Nomininge Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1884 (i).

North Bay, Burks Fall and Maganatawan Wharfs, Total Cost, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Arthurs) 981 (i).

——— Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Gordon) 2556 (ii).

'Northumberland' Dredge, Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 2435 (ii).

N. S. Wharfs and Breakwaters, Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).

——— Contracts *re* Constructions in Digby County: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 657 (i).

Okanagan Telegraph Lines: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Ottalie Stream, N.B., Public Works, Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1287 (i).

Ottawa City, Dom. Buildings, Heating, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 2590 (ii).

——— Deptl. Steel Cases: in Com. of Sup., 2582 (ii).

——— Lavatories: in Com. of Sup., 2583 (ii).

——— Water Supply: in Com. of Sup., 2583 Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).

——— Woods Building, Lighting Contract, Cor. with Mr. Ellis and City Council: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 3672 (ii)

——— M. for Cor.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii).

See 'Ottawa.'

Ottawa River and Carillon Water Power, Leases, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Monk) 9994 (v).

Ottlecock Dam, Construction of: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2852 (ii).

Owen Sound Dock, Work *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 10337 (v).

Parrsboro Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1598 (i).

——— Plans, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) in Com. of Sup., 1625 (i).

——— Instructions to Officials *re* Plans, &c.: M. for Copy (Mr. Rhodes) 1727 (i).

Parry Sound Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1878 (i).

Petawawa Wharf: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6005 (iv).

Peterborough Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2603 (ii).

Petit Rocher Wharf, Expenditure since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 6267 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Piles Federal Works, Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 7590 (iv), 8103 (v).

Portage la Prairie Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Port Arthur and Fort William Harbour River Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 5994 (iv).

Port Credit Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 6013 (iv).

Port Credit Public Works, Expenditure for 1909-10: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 5638 (iii).

Port Dalhousie Dredging Contracts, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 1101 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Daniel) in Com. of Sup., 1590 (i).

Port Perry Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) in Com. of Sup., 1880 (i).

Postoffice Buildings, Total Value, Expenditure, Subsidies *re* Mails, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

——— Inquiry for Rets,. 4567. 5541 (iii).

Postoffice Buildings, Policy of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 1870 (i).

Postoffice Buildings in Rural Districts, Policy of Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 1700 (i).

Prince Rupert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3016 (ii).

Public Buildings, Erection of and Construction: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lalor) 4319 (iii).

Public Buildings in former Estimates, Precedence over new ones: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) in Com. of Sup., 2112 (ii).

Public Buildings, Plans approved by Depts. previous to Aug. 5th, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Meighen) 698 (i).

Public Buildings for Postoffices, &c., Number, Expenditure, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).

——— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7347 (iv).

Public Buildings, System adopted *re* Construction: Remarks (Mr. Crothers) in of Sup., 1669 (i).

Public Buildings, Total Cost for several Years: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2100 (ii).

——— Ques. of Order *re* Discussion (Mr. Pugsley) 2101: Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 2101 (ii).

Public Works, Contracts, Penalties *re* Completion: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1603 (i).

Public Works, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Pugsley) 7 (i).

——— Deptl. Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).

——— Travelling Expenses: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8356, 9071 (v).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Public Works Estimates, Objection to Vote in full: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 9552 (v).

Public Works Estimates, Quebec, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).

Public Works, Expenditures generally: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) in Com. of Sup., 3165 (ii).

Public Works, Labour Hours: *See* 'Hours.'

Public Works promised during Western Tour: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1630 (i).

Public Works, Supply for: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 10354 (v).

Quebec City Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).

——— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Rivière des Prairies, Completion of Deepening, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

——— Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

——— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).

St. Andrew's Dam, Bridge, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).

——— Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).

St. Andrew's Wharf, P.Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).

St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).

St. Croix River, N.B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).

St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).

St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

St. John Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i).

——— Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1664 (i).

St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).

——— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques, (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).

——— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).

——— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).

——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).

St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).

Ste. Marie Division Post Office, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).

St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf &c., Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247, 7344 (iv).

Ste. Therese Post Office, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).

Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).

Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditures, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1349 (i).

Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).

Sharbot Lake Post Office Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).

Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).

Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).

Strathcona Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).

Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).

'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).

Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).

Three Rivers, Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).

——— Post Office, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).

Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).

Tilbury Post Office: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).

Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

——— *See* 'Walkerville.'

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).

——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).

——— *See* 'Militia.'

Toronto Federal Buildings, Plans of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).

Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).

Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Uxbridge Post Office, Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).

——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).

Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).

Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).

Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).

Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).

Waterloo Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).

Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).

Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).

West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).

West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).

Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).

Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).

Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).

Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).

Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).

Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).

Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).

Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).

PUBLIC WORKS—*Con.*

Winnipeg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).

Winnipeg River, Water Rights, Grants, Leases, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).

Wolfe Island, Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).

——— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).

Yarmouth, Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).

——— Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).

Pullman Berths, I.C.R.: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 5990 (iv).

Pulp and Paper Duties, Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

——— Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (i).

——— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

Pulp Wood Exports to the U. S., Value of: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2674 (ii).

——— Corrected Answer (Mr. Paterson) 5126 (iii).

——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Pure Foods: *See* 'B. No. 35.'

Quaker Oats Co., Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Quarantine, Animals Health: in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).

Quarantine, Public Health: in Com. of Sup., 5979 (iv).

Quarantine Stations, Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3213 (ii).

Que. Battlefields: *See* 'B. No. 222.'

Quebec and Blanc Sablon SS. Subvention: in Com. of Sup., 8788 (v).

Quebec Boundaries, Cor. with Ont. and Dom. Govts., O.Cs., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Sproule) 981 (i).

Quebec Bridge, Advertisement for Tenders *re* Contract: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 713 (i).

——— Advertisement *re*: M. (Mr. Lennox) for Copy, 1497 (i).

——— Tenders *re*: M. for Copies (Mr. Lennox) 3068 (ii).

Quebec Bridge, American Engineers consulted by Min. of Rys.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 697 (i).

——— British Empire Bridge Co.'s Deposit, Amount, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).

Quebec Bridge, Caisson, Damage to, Claims *re*:Ques. (Mr. G. V. White) 4045 (iii).
—— Carriage Way, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9979 (v).
—— Commission of Expert Engineers, Amounts paid to, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).
Quebec Bridge Construction, Emplymt. of Mr. Cooper *re* Inspection: Ques. Mr. Lennox) 6663 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Construction, Information re: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lennox) 4319 (iii).
Quebec Bridge Contract with M. P. Davis, dated July 27th 1903, Transfer of same to Govt, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lennox) 785 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Lennox) 4567 (iii).
Quebec Bridge, Contract *re* Construction, Resignation of Chairman, Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4205 (iii).
—— Contract *re* Reconstruction: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 4740 (iii).
—— Date of Completion, Total Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2667 (ii).
—— Estimated Cost, Tunnelling, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Donelly) 3278 (ii).
—— Expenditure *re* Investigation: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8102 (v).
—— Fair Wage Clause *re* Workmen: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 6757 (iv).
—— Fair Wage Clause, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Verville) 5835 (iii).
—— Financial Loan, Interest &c.: (Mr. Lennox) 4665 (iii).
Quebec Bridge and Labour Organizations: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 7039 (iv).
Quebec Bridge, Members of Construction Board: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 9981 (v).
—— Payment of $100,000 with Phœnix Bridge Co.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Ames) 981 (i).
—— Plans, Contracts, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6273 (iv).
—— Remarks (Mr. Price) 7103 (iv).
—— Approval by Chief Engineer of G. T. Ry. Co.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4826 (iii).
—— Specifications, Instructions *re*: M. for Papers* (Mr. Lennox) 4677 (iii).
Quebec Bridge River Bed, Tests, &c., Investigations: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 658 (i).
—— Superstructure Contract, Letting of: Announcement (Mr. Graham) 6669 (iv).
—— Supervision, Amount expended: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
—— Supervisor, Remuneration by Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6449 (iv).
—— Tunnel Construction, Investigation *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).
Quebec Civil Servants, Names of Permanent and Temporary Employees since 1st Jan. 1905, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Lachance) 2376 (ii).
Quebec, Custom House: in Com. of Sup., 1885 (i).
—— Drill Hall: in Com. of Sup., 1886 (i).
Quebec Experimental Farm, Purchase by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8992 (v).
Quebec and Great Northwestern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 198.'
Quebec Harbour Commission, Advances to, Rate of Interest, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2851 (ii).
—— Number *re*: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2436 (ii).
Quebec Members, Revolt against extra session, Newspaper Articles: Denial of (Mr Talbot) 10096 (v).
Quebec , Montreal and Southern Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 126.'
Que. and N. B. Ry: Co.: See 'B. No. 120.'
Quebec Public Works Estimates, Discussion *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) in Com. of Sup., 1639 (i).
Que. Savings Banks Act. Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 219.'
Quebec Tercentenary Stamps, Use of: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 7109 (iv).
Questions, Answering orally or written, Procedure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 700 (i).
Questions and Answers, Orally and Written: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 989 (i).
—— Copies given to Press (Mr. Hughes) 900 (i).
Questions answered orally: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1080 (i).
Questions, Incomplete Answers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1013 (i).
Questions and Motions proposed to be Introduced: Notice of (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1502 (i).
Questions of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Mr. Pugsley's Public Record, 10202 (v).
Ques. of Priv., Charges *re* Obtaining Lumber for Govt. Stores (Mr. Lanctot) 8695 (v).
—— *See* 'Privileges and Elections Com.'
Ques. of Privilege, Cor. *re* Connection with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).
—— *See* 'Reciprocity.'
Rabies, Outbreak of, Expenditure *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 5955 (iv).
Racial and Religious Prejudices, Liberal Pamphlets, Quotations &c.: Remarks (Mr. Foster) on Address, 531 (i).
Race Track Gambling: M. to print Evidence (Mr. Miller) 10467 (v).
Ry. Accidents, Inquests: *See* 'B. No. 2.'

Railway Act Amts.: *See* 'B. Nos. 2, 4, 8, 23, 78, 197.'
Rys. and Canals Act Amt.: *See* 'B. No. 156.'
Ry. Act Amt. (1903), c. 31, Proclamation *re*: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lennox) 786 (i).
Ry. Water Belt in B. C.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Railway Commission, Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).
Ry. Commission's Powers: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Railway Committee: M. (Mr. Nesbitt) to sit during sittings of House, 10190 (v).
——— M. to sit during sessions of the House (Mr. Guthrie) 9226 (v).
Ry. Employees, Forthnightly Salaries: *See* 'B. No. 4.'
Ry. Employees, Permission to Vote: *See* 'B. No. 38.'
Ry. Employees, Protection: *See* 'B. No. 114.'
Ry. Locomotive Boilers, Inspection: *See* 'B. No. 30.'
Railway Mail Clerks, Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 4285 (iii), 6179 (iv).
——— Compensations: in Com. of Sup., 6088 (iv).
——— Compensated for Accidents, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 9537 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3859 (ii).
——— Examinations: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6082 (iv).
——— Increases to: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6068 (iv).
——— Maximum and Minimum Salary, Claims *re* Increase, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2160 (ii).
——— Names and Dates of Apptmts, of Persons not passing Qualifying Examinations: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 3855 (ii).
Railway Mail Clerks Salaries: *See* 'Civil Service Bill 217.'

RAILWAYS:

Accidents *re* Canadian Railways, Investigation: Prop. Res. (Mr. Miller) 3922 (ii).
Accidents since 1st April, 1909, on running Trains, Construction Work, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Ralph Smith) 713 (i).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Purchase by Atlantic and Lake Superior Ry. Co., Amount paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3853 (ii).
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Ry., Quebec Oriental Ry. Co. and New Canadian Co., Date of Incorporation, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 2161 (ii).
——— Explanation (Mr. Graham) 4048 (iii).
Canadian Northern Ry. Land Subsidy, Charges *re*: Personal Explanation (Mr. Oliver) 8187 (v).
——— *See* main heading.

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

C. P. R. Bridge at Lachine, Reconstruction, &c.: M. for Cor. (Mr. Monk) 766 (i).
——— Land Tax, Information *re* Privy Council's Decision, (Mr. Bradbury) 2992 (ii).
——— Reduction of Rates, &c.: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) to Com. of Sup., 1806 (i).
——— Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 1573 (i).
Capitalization of Railways: Amt. (Mr. W. F. Maclean) on M. for Sup., 5233, 5246 (iii).
Cattle Guards, Decision of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) in Com. of Sup., 6430 (iv).
Charters to Railway, Granting to by Parlt. Conditions *re*: Remarks (Mr. Magrath) on Railway Estimates, 5122 (iii).
Electric Railway Charters, Number since 1896, Extensions *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 4043 (iii).
Express Rates, Jurisdiction of Ry. Commissioners, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 10196 (v).
——— *See* 'Postoffice—Parcel Post.'
Gov. General's Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6446 (iv).
Govt. Railways constructed previous to Confederation, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 4829 (iii).
See 'I. C. R.'
Grand Falls and St. John Ry. Subsidy, Cor. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Carvell) 9371 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
G. T. Ry. Trainmens' Strike, Reinstatement of, Apptmt. of Judge Barron: M. for Cor.* (Mr. Northrup) 2376 (ii).
——— Settlement *re*: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 9692 (v).
——— *See* main heading.
Humber River Bridge, G. T. Ry. Plans *re*: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2885 (ii).
Hudson Bay Ry., Contracts *re* Construction, Policy of: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 660 (i).
Hudson Bay Ry. Lands, Number of Acres sold *re* Construction Fund: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 796 (i).
I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 8513 (v).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
International Ry. Traffic, Points of Crossing, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 4466 (iii).
Level Crossings: in Com. of Sup., 9509 (v).
——— *See* 'Ry. Crossings.'
Manitoba and Southeastern Railway Co.'s Charter, Transfer, &c.: M. for Cor.* (Mr. McCarthy) 6505 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Manitoba and South Eastern Ry. Co.: Inquiry for O. C. (Mr. Foster) 6915 (iv).

Official Cars: in Com. of Sup., 6447 (iv).

P. E. I. Ry.—Harmony-Elmira Branch: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).

—— Elmira Ry. Station, Name of Contractors, Completion of: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7593 (iv).

—— Working Expenses: in Com. of Sup., 6356 (iv).

Qu'Appelle, Long Lake and Saskatchewan Valley Ry. Co.'s Contract, Security *re* Govt. Advances: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 7245 (iv).

Railway and Canals Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

—— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1473 (i).

Ry. Commission Board: in Com. of Sup., 6427 (iv), 9508 (v).

—— Apptmt. of French Canadian: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 1103 (i).

—— Rep.: Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).

—— Ry. Commission and Interstate Commerce Commission, Agreement *re* Traffic between U. S. and Can.: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 3054 (ii).

—— Vacancy on, Apptmt. of Farmer: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).

Railway Crossings, Action of Ry. Commission: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6429 (iv).

—— *See* 'Level.'

Railways Owned, Operated in U. S. and Can., Mileage, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr Rutan) 6158 (iv).

Ry. Rates to Clergymen, Reduction *re*: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2434 (ii).

Railway Rates in the West: Remarks on Address (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 98 (i).

Railway Rates, Comparison with U.S. Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6431 (iv).

Railway Traffic Connections, Arrangements between Province and Ry. Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 696 (i).

Railways, Transportation problem: Stmnt. on M. for Sup. (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C.P.R.'s Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii)

Section Men, Complaints *re* Overwork: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 9987 (v).

Shelters for Working Men: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) in Com. of Sup., 6437 (iv).

Subsidies, Total Amount since Confederation: Ques. (Mr. Gilbert) 3467 (ii).

—— Corrected Statement (Mr. Graham) 6196 (iv).

RAILWAYS—*Con.*

Surveys and Inspections, Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii) 6452 (iv).

Telegraph &c., Control of Rates: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 8356 (v).

—— *See* 'Express.'

'Rainbow' Cruiser, Date of Purchase, Price paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 788 (i).

'Rainbow' and 'Niobe,' Cost to Date, Price, Repairs and Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 791 (i).

—— Date of Construction, Tonnage, Active Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 792 (i).

'Rainbow', Struck off effective List: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1081 (i).

—— *See* 'Naval Service.'

Rainy River Power Development: *See* 'B. No. 109.'

Rapide Plat Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES.

Absence of Ministers during Discussion: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8358 (v).

Agricultural and Farmers Associations, Res. approving Tariff: Read (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 5546 (iii).

Agricultural Implements: Remarks (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 5745 (iii).

Agricultural and Manufactured Products of the U.S.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) *re* Stmnt. made by Mr. M. Clark, 4196 (iii).

Alterations &c., Better information placed before House: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4933 (iii)

American Boats through Can. Canals: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6357 (iv).

Answers of Ministers to Questions: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4137 (iii).

Associated Boards of Trade, Ont., Res. by: Read (Mr. Middlebro) 4121 (iii).

Australia and Can., Reciprocal Negotiations since 1900: M. for Stmnt.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

Berlin Board of Trade Res., Ques. of Priv. (Mr. King) 5726 (iii).

Boards of Trade, Saskatchewan, Despatch from W. A. Shepherd: Read (Mr. Schaffner) 5752 (iii).

Boston Speech of Min. of Militia: Remarks (Mr. Crocket) 5751 (iii).

British Ambassador's Warning to Can. Ministers: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6200 (iv).

—— *See* 'Negotiations.'

British Demand for Tariff Concessions: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 6574 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

British Preference, Increase of, Readjustment of Tariff, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7210 (iv).

British Preference Trade Policy: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 5619 (iii).

—— *See* 'Preference.'

British Tariff Commission, Rep. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 6268 (iv).

Butter and Eggs, Prices in London, Statistics *re*: Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce *re* Return (Mr. Perley) 6508 (iv).

Canadian Coasting Laws, affecting Grain and Hogs: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 5133 (iii).

Champ Clark, Speech of, *re* Annexation: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3608 (ii).

—— Cor. with U. S., *re* Speech of Champ Clark; Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 3954 (iii).

—— Stmnt. of Mr. Clark *re* Opposition to: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Bradbury) 4227 (iii).

Comparative Prices Special Rep. of: Laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print 10590 (v).

—— *See* 'Statistics.'

—— Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).

Conferences, Length of Session, Names of Representatives, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7036 (iv).

—— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Correction of Figures in Speech in Hansard (Mr. Lennox) 3770 (ii).

Cor. laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 3068 (ii).

Cor. with G. B. and Can. *re* Negotiations &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Turcotte) 3948 (ii).

Countries affected by Treaty *re* Importations into Canada (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4131 (iii).

Creston Fruit and Produce Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 4119 (iii).

Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario, Denial of Stmnt. of Minister of Customs (Mr. Armstrong) 4570 (iii).

—— Correction *re* Stmnt. (Mr. Paterson) from Dairymen's Association of Western Ontario (Mr. Lalor) 4223 (iii).

Debate: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 3143 (ii).

——Resuming of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 5939 (iv).

See 'Obstruction.'

Denial of Stmnt. of member for Cape Breton (Mr. Northrup) 5035 (iii).

—— Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Northrup) *re* Quotations made by member for Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) 5410 (iii).

Dufferin Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Black) 5547 (iii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Editorial in Montreal 'Star': Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 4139 (iii).

Farmers' Delegation from the West, and Govt. Ownership of Elevators: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 1504 (i).

—— Article in Grain Growers' Guide *re* Hudson Bay Ry.: Denial of Stmnt. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 1574 (i).

—— Control of Hudson Bay Ry. Rates: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) 1508 (i).

—— Representations to the Govt., Printing &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1454 (i).

—— M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to print Speeches, 3054 (ii).

—— Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Schaffner) 6908 (iv).

Farmers and Manufacturers Interests, Speech of Mr. Nesbitt: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 4663 (iii).

Farmers Interests, Assurance of member for N. Oxford: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) 5541 (iii).

Farm Products imported from other Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3668 (ii).

Favoured Nations, Importations from: Ques (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4111 (iii).

—— Remarks *re* Answer to Question (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4113; Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 4114 (iii).

—— Entry of Canadian Goods into their Markets (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4134, Reply (Mr. Fielding) 4134 (iii).

—— Favoured Nation Treaty Countries, Names of: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 4665 (iii).

Fishing Bounties, Payments *re*: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) 6670 (iv).

Fish Tariff, Application *re* Reciprocity Treaty: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2886 (ii).

Fleming Grain Growers' Association Res.: Read (Mr. W. J. Roche) 5550 (iii).

Free Trade Offer by U. S., Pres'dt. Taft's Speech *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 5293 (iii).

French Imports, Quantity, Value, Rates of Duty, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 8097 (v).

Fruit Clause in Reciprocity Treaty, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 3283 (ii).

Fruit Duty, Res. from B. C. Inland Board of Trade: Read (Mr. Burrell) 3377 (ii).

—— Tel. read from Fruit Dealers *re* Duty affecting B. C. (Mr. Burrell) 3770 (ii).

—— *See* 'Summerland.'

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Fruit Duty, Tel. from Mission City Agricultural Ass'cn: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3955 (iii).

Fruit Growers Association, B. C., Protest *re* Duty: Read (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3373 (ii).

Fruit Growers, Attendance of Mr. Johnson before Com. on Ag.: Remarks (Mr. Schell) 2992 (ii).

Fruit Growers' Association, Burlington, Res. from: Read (Mr. Henderson) 4122 (iii).

Fruit and Vegetables Amt.: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Sealey) 7666 (iv).

——— *See* 'Vote.'

Fruit and Vegetable Growers Association, Delegates, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 3529 (ii).

——— Report of Proceedings: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) to Print, 3952 (iii).

——— Inquiry for Rep. (Mr. Burrell) 6120 (iv).

——— French Editions: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 9075 (v).

Hamilton Cotton Co., Stmnt. of Employees: Read (Mr. Goodeve) 5747 (iii).

Interruption of Speakers, Denial of Stmt. *re* member for East Hastings, 5029: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 5032 (iii).

——— Interruptions not Relevant: Remarks Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7527 ,iv).

——— Objections *re* Interruptions: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) 4451 (iii).

Kentville Board of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. Rhodes) 5749 (iii).

——— Read: (Mr. Crosby) 5548 (iii).

Letter from Market Gardeners: Read (Mr. Bradbury) 4130 (iii).

Letter read by Member for Saltcoats, Giving Name of Writer: Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7264 (iv).

Lord Strathcona's Telegram *re* Reported Interview: Read (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5126 (iii).

——— Explanation (Mr. Goodeve) 5210 (iii).

——— Mess. from Associated Press : Read (Mr. Fielding) 5292 (iii).

Members remarks checked (Mr. Speaker) 5545 (iii).

Minister's Visit to Washington, Par. in Ottawa 'Citizen': Remarks (Mr. Burrell) 4566 (iii).

——— *See* 'Negotiations.'

Negotiations between U. S. and Can.: Remarks on Address (Mr. R. L. Borden) 32 (i).

——— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).

——— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 72 (i).

Negotiations at Washington: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1506 (i), 2271 (ii).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Negotiations at Washington: Further Information *re* (Mr. Foster) 2070 (ii).

——— Instructions to Mr. Bryce: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 4140 (iii).

——— *See* 'Conferences.'

——— Reported Draft of Proposals: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 2065 (ii).

——— Submission to Hse. for Ratification: Remarks (Mr. J. A. Currie) 1805 (i).

Negotiations by Mr. J. A. Macdonald of 'Globe' at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) *re* Speech at St. Catharines, 2560 (ii).

——— Attack of Ministerial Association, Ottawa: Personal Explanation (Mr. Hughes) 3352 (ii).

——— Editorial in 'Globe': Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 2743 (ii).

——— Letter of J. A. Macdonald in Stratford 'Herald' *re* Visit to Washington: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 4299 (iii).

Newspaper Reporters and Announcement of Treaty, Par. in Winnipeg 'Free Press' *re* Treatment of: Remarks (Mr. Rhodes) 2642 (ii).

North York, Challenge *re* Contest: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7220 (iv).

Obstruction, Articles in Press *re*: Remarks (Mr. Middlebro) 9999 (v).

——— M. to adjn. debate (Mr. Best), Obstruction, &c., 9885 (v).

Oleomargarine, Admission of: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 6668 (iv).

——— Remarks (Mr. Blain) 6504 (iv).

Opposition to Pact: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 5739 (iii).

Opposition in Northumberland, East Riding: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen) 6767 (iv).

Oshawa Fruit Growers Ass'on. Res.: (Mr. Fowke) 5747 (iii).

Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).

Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii).

Par. *re* Quaker Oats Co.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 4120 (iii).

Peterborough Board of Trade Res.: Read (Mr. Sexsmith) 5750 (iii).

Pets. Memorials, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Foster) 980 (i).

——— Inquiry for Pets. (Mr. Foster) 2439, 3057 (ii).

Preferential Tariff Concessions granted to G. B.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1501 (i).

——— *See* 'British.'

Prime Minister's Visit to Imp. Conference, Editorials in 'Christian Guardian': Read (Mr. Thornton) 9072 (v).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Private Cor.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985 (ii).

Private Correspondence produced, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 10197 (iii).

Procedure in the House *re* Resolutions: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5752 (iii).

Protests *re*: laid on Table (remarks) 3951 (iii)

Protocols, Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2555 (ii).

Pulp and Paper Duties: Information *re* (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2646 (ii).

——— Alteration *re* Pulp and Paper by U. S.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 4468 (iii).

——— Par. in New York 'Herald': Read (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 2638 (ii).

Ques. of Priv., Cor. *re* Connections with Riordan Paper Co. and Reciprocity (Mr. Perley) 10197 (v).

Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Owen *re* Vote, 3343 (ii).

Reciprocity with U. S., Resolutions *re*: M. for Com. on Ways and Means (Mr. Fielding) 2440, Schedules laid on Table, 2465, 2477 (ii).

Debate:
(Mr. R. L. Borden) 2497; (Mr. Monk) 3284; (amt.) 3289, Neg. (Y. 72; N. 97) 3292; (Mr. Fielding) 3289; (Mr. R. L. Borden) in Com. on Res., 3294; (Mr Paterson) 3316; (Mr. Foster) 3327, 3530; (Mr. Neely) 3563; (Mr. Burrell) 3579, 3611; (Mr. Guthrie) 3629; (Mr. Lennox) 3681; (Mr. Warburton) 3709 (ii); (Mr. Armstrong) 3737 (ii); (Mr. Kyte) 3956; (Mr. Sproule) 3980, 3995; (Mr. Lemieux) 4005; (Mr. Monk) Amt. *re* Loyalty, 4051; (Mr. Fielding) Denial re Annexationist, 4054; (Mr. Lemieux) Denial *re* Annexationist, 4054; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4057; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4058; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4062; (Mr. Fielding) 4073; (Mr. Macdonell) 4078; (Mr. Devlin) 4082; (Mr. Ames) in Com. on Res., 4083; (Mr. M. Clark) 4143; (Mr. Blain) 4167; (Mr. Molloy) 4183; (Mr. Sifton) 4385; (Mr. Fisher) 4409; (Mr. German) 4482; (Mr. Carvell) 4496; (Mr. Middlebro) 4535: (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4741; (Mr. J. A. Currie) 4771; (Mr. Templeman) 4811; (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4830; Amt. 4844, Neg. (Y. 70; N. 111) 4875 (iii); (Mr. Fielding) 4845; (Mr. Foster) 4852; (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 4856: (Mr. Northrup) 4861; (Mr. Guthrie) 4868; (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 4873; (Mr. Harris) 4877; (Mr. Miller) 4937: (Mr. Goodeve) 4969; (Mr. McKenzie) 5014, 5260; (Mr. Bradbury) 6680 (iv); (Mr. Ralph Smith) 6709; (Mr. Broder) 6739; (Mr. Cash) 6952; (Mr. Jameson) 6966; (Mr. Hunt) 7006; (Mr. Thornton) 7040; (Mr. Devlin) 7064; (Mr. Crothers) 7077; (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 7110; (Mr. Hughes) 7126; (Mr. Sexsmith) 7224; (Mr. MacNutt) 7262; (Mr. Lancaster) 7281; (Mr. Robb) 7328: (Mr. Edwards) 7393; (Mr. Beauparlant) 7450; (Mr. Wright) 7461, 7481; (Mr. Turcotte) 7506; (Mr. T. Chisholm) 7517; (Mr. Sealey) 7530, amt. 7547; (Mr. Henderson) 7633; (Mr. Allen) 7661 (iv); (Mr. Nantel) 8130 (v); (Mr. Turriff) 8148; (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 8162; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 8244; (Mr. Schaffner) 8281 (v); (Mr. Magrath) 8373; (Mr. A. Haggart) 8389; (Mr. Arthurs) 9646; (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 9673; (Mr. U. Wilson) 9727; (Mr. Porter) 9745; (Mr. Macdonell) 9938; (Mr. Smyth) 9966, 10146; (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10151, 10310; (Mr. Donnelly) 10456; (Mr. Beattie) 10533; (Mr. Maddin) 10550; (Mr. Kidd) 10572 (v).

Resolutions, Presenting of, Reading &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 5948; (Mr. Speaker) 5948, Rule Read (Mr. Foster) 5953 (iv)

Ret., Incomplete: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 1652 (i).

Ret. Suppl.: Laid on Table (Mr. Fielding) 4383 (iii).

Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res.: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).

——— Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).

Speech of Min. of Ag. in Montreal: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv)

Statement in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sharpe) 10193 (v).

Statistics, Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 6508 6675 (iv).

Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; (Amt.) Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).

——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Ques. (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).

Statistical Tables of Prices: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840; Accepting as Read, and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).

Statistics, Purpose of Negotiations: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 7037 (iv).

Statistics, Further Inquiry for from Trade and Commerce Dept.: (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).

——— Tabulated Statement: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 2985, 3059 (ii).

——— Trade Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).

Statistics from U. S., Information *re*: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii)

——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).

——— Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6573 (iv).

RECIPROCITY WITH THE UNITED STATES—*Con.*

Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c.: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).

Summerland 'Review', Editorial re Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).

——Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).

Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).

Talking Between Ministers during Debate: Ques. of Order (Mr. Hughes) 7292 (iv).

Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).

—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).

Tel. from Min of Fin. to High Commissioner: Inquiry for (Mr. Foster) 3274 (ii).

Tel. of Senator Cummins *re* Manufactured Products: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 4115 (iii).

Trade with other Countries affected: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3667 (ii).

Trent River Paper Co. Res.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).

Tupper, Sir Charles, Letter from, Ques. of Order (Mr. Dep. Speaker) Reference to Previous Debate, 8252; (Mr. Geo. Taylor) read, 8277; Ruling (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 8279 (v).

Vote on Amt. (Mr. R. L. Borden) Personal Explanation (Mr. German) 4929 (iii).

Vote on Amt (Mr. Monk): Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Wallace) 3461 (ii).

Vote *re*, Par. in 'Le Canada': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Lortie) 3953 (iii).

Vote on Mr. Sealey's Amt.: 'Globe' Report *re* Explanation (Mr. Lennox) 7602: (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7619 (iv).

—— Original Document: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 7668; Letter from Hansard Reporter: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 7675; Letter from 'Globe' Reporter, Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) 7675; Explanation (Mr. Dep. Speaker) 7670 (iv).

Western Farmers Interests: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5543 (iii).

—— *See* 'Farmers.'

Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. from: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).

Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).

Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. from: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).

Red Point Wharf, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 3469 (ii).

Regina and Moosejaw Town Site, C. P. R's. Interest *re*: Ques. (Mr. McCraney) 3281 (ii).

Restaurant, Joint Com.: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 469 (i).

—— *See* 'House of Commons.'

Restigouche Riparian Association: *See* 'B. No. 176.'

Returns, Delay in Preparation: Remarks (Mr. Fisher) 7554 (iv).

Returns: Inquiry for (Mr. R. L. Borden) 5733 (iii), 8093 (v).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Lennox) 7256 (iv).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 2150 (ii).

—— Inquiry for (Mr. Rhodes) 1001 (i).

Returns, Notice to Members: Remarks (Mr. Blain) 5938 (iv).

Revelstoke Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3017 (ii).

Revenue and Expenditure, Total for 1890-1911: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 9992 (v).

'Review of Reviews', Collection of Extra Postage: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2371 (ii).

Revillon Frères Trading Co. Ltd.: *See* 'B. No. 158.'

Revised Statutes, French Translation: *See* 'B. No. 136.'

'Rexall', Registration by United Drug Co. in Canada: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 4672 (iii).

Richelieu Electoral District, Charges against Mr. Lanctot *re* Painting Private Dwelling: Notice of Motion (Mr. Nantel) 4566 (iii).

—— Labour: M. for Com., 4654 (iii).

—— *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'

Richelieu and Ontario Navigation Co.: *See* 'B. No. 192.'

Rideau Canal, Bridges: in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Lockmen, Increase of Pay: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).

—— Removal of Stumps: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).

Riding Mountain Reserve, Pet. *re* Withdrawal of Lands &c.: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 8636 (v).

Rifle Associations: Remarks (Mr. Roche) in Com. of Sup., 6056 (iv).

Rigaud Post Office Building: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).

—— Contract *re*: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 3067 (ii).

Riordon Paper Co. and Reciprocity: *See* 'Reciprocity.'

Riparian Rights in Boundary Waters: *See* 'B. No. 36.'

Riviere des Prairies, Completion of Deepening &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1714 (i).

—— M. for Copy (Mr. C. A. Wilson) 2162 (ii).

—— Survey, Rep. of Engineer &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Monk) 2161 (ii).

Robertson, Lorne Forbes, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 142.'
Roberval Post Office: in Com. of Sup., 1887 (i).
Robichaud, Wm., Compensation *re* Fine: in Com. of Sup., 6105, 6159 (iv).
Rock Island Building: in Com. of Sup., 1889 (i).
Rockliffe Rifle Range, Additional Land purchased: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 8994 (v).
——— M. for Cor.*, 8994 (v).
Rolling Stock, I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5927 (iii), 8513 (v).
Roper, Commander, Emplymt. by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 799 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service at Public Function: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 932 (i).
——— Speech *re* Naval Service, Approval of Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1288 (i).
——— Speech, Meaning of Word 'Faction' Preparation of Answer: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 1351 (i).
Rosendale Mail Service, Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. Staples) 1291 (i).
Ross Rifles furnished to Queen's Own while in England: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1087 (i).
——— Rifles loaned by Can. to G. B. at Bisley, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 1085 (i).
——— Number issued to Queen's Own Regiment: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9781 (v).
——— Recommendation to British Govt.: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7552 (iv).
R. M. College, Additions &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6054 (iv).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
R. N. W. Mounted Police, Coronation Contingent: in Com. of Sup., 8752 (v).
——— Death of Inspector on Northern Patrol: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
——— Pay of Force: in Com. of Sup., 8598 (v).
——— Pay and Allowance, &c: Ques. (Mr. W. M. Martin) 8101 (v).
Roy, Mr. Ferdinand, Emplymt. by Govt., or N. T. Ry. &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 2851 (ii).
Ruddock, Mr. R. F., Application *re* Homestead in B. C.: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3279 (ii).
Rules of House, Amendment *re*: Remarks (Mr. Emmerson) 10470 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Generally: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10365 (v).
Rural Mail Delivery, Number of Offices closed, Stamps and Postcards manufacture of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
——— Number in Operation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 983 (i).
——— East Elgin, Number, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Marshall) 983 (i).
——— Man.: Ques. (Mr. Schaffner) 1105 (i).
Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).
Rural Mail Delivery in Renfrew County: Remarks (Mr. G. V. White) in Com. of Sup., 6182 (iv).
Rural Postmasters: in Com. of Sup., 4281 (iii).
Rutherford, Dr. J. G., Resignation from Govt. Service: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 9995, 10095 (v).
St. Andrews Dam, Bridge &c.: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3035 (ii).
St. Andrews Dam, Sums for Completion: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 1508 (i).
——— Correction in Stmnt. (Mr. Bradbury) 1650 (i).
St. Andrew's Rapids, Fish Ladders &c.: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 3032 (ii).
St. Andrew's Wharf, P. Q., Tenders *re* Construction, Contract, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Perley) 3608 (ii).
St. Catharines Drill Hall Site: Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) in Com. of Sup., 1680 (i).
St. Charles Rifle Range, Winnipeg, Sale of, Valuation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7343 (iv).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
St. Croix River, N. B., Construction of a Public Work, Proposal *re*: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 1348 (i).
St. Gabriel de Stratford Wharf, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1489 (i), 4666 (iii).
St. George's Day, Neglect to fly Flag: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7553, 7687 (iv).
——— *See* 'Flags.'
St. Hyacinthe Military School, Cost of Construction, Maintenance, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 2674 (ii).
St. Jacques de l'Achigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
St. John, N. B., Drill Hall, Contract *re*: Remarks in Com. of Sup., 1624, 1664 (i).
St. John Harbour Dredging, Beacon Bar Contract, Quantity of Material, Prices, Tenders, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5631 (iii).
——— Quantity of Material taken out by Maritime Dredging Co. under Beacon Bar Contract: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 5129 (iii).
St. John River Channel Survey, when commenced, completed, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 814 (i).
——— Rental of Office, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crocket) 2673, 3065 (ii).
St. John River, Navigation Rights: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. John River Vally Ry., Lease to Govt.: *See* 'B. No. 150.'
St. Johns, Que., Postmaster, refusal to deliver 'Le Devoir': Ques. (Mr. Ames) 1089 (i).

St. Lambert Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1894 (i).
——— Option *re* Lands: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 2677 (ii).
——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2577 (ii).
St. Laurent Wharf, Man., Construction of: Remarks (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 10509 (v).
St. Lawrence Power Co., Annual Payments *re* Light and Power &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3468 (ii).
St. Lawrence River, Damming Long Sault Rapids: on M. for Com. of Sup., 2887 (ii).
St. Lawrence River Dams, Diversion of Channel: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 3058 (ii).
——— Information *re* Bill before U.S. Senate: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4210 (iii).
——— Protests *re* from Dom. Govt. (Mr. J. D. Reid) 4210 (iii).
——— Further Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 3058 (ii).
——— Legislation at Washington, &c.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3282 (ii).
——— Letter from Mr. J. Wesley Allison: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3767 (ii).
——— Letter from Gov. Dix.: Remarks (Mr. J. D. Reid) 3839 (ii).
——— *See* 'Long Sault.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, Buoys at Sorel Shipyards, Charges *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
——— See 'Sorel.'
St. Lawrence Ship Channel: in Com. of Sup., 6554 (iv).
——— Depth at Low Tide below thirty feet: Ques. (Mr. Lachance) 1718 (i).
Ste. Marie Division Postoffice, Defective Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 10336 (v).
Ste. Marie de Monnoir Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Perley) in Com. of Sup., 1698 (i).
St. Mary's River Diversion: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
St. Ours Locks, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6395 (iv).
Ste. Perpetue Station, Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Turcotte) 2436 (ii).
St. Peter's Bay, P.E.I., Wharf Expenditure *re* Repairs: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7247 (iv).
St. Peter's Breakwater, Repair, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Fraser) 7344 (iv).
St. Peter's Canal, C.B., Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 8103 (v).
——— Answer to Ques.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8355 (v).
——— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6418 (iv).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Amt. (Mr. Bradbury) to Com. of Sup., 5837 (iii).
——— Amounts received from Sales, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peters Indian Reserve, Chief Justice Howell's Commission: M. for Copy of Evidence* (Mr. Bradbury) 7039 (iv).
——— Instructions to Rev. J. McDougall, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Bradbury) 1292 (i).
——— Amounts received from Sales &c.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 787 (i).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve, Moneys paid by Govt., Complaints, &c.: Ques. Mr. Bradbury) 1974 (ii).
——— Original Document, Cor, &c.: Read (Mr.
——— Stmnt. (Mr. Oliver) 8477 (v).
St. Peter's Indian Reserve: Remarks (Mr. Oliver) 8356 (v).
——— Rep. in Winnipeg 'Telegram' *re* Speech: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Oliver) 3840; Explanation (Mr. Bradbury) 3841 (ii).
——— Request by Commission for Official Documents: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) 9899 (v).
Ste. Therese Postoffice, Purchase of Site: Ques. (Mr. Nantel) 1715 (i).
Sadler, Maggie Florence, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 137.'
Sand supplied to Kingston Penitentiary, Payments to R. H. Fair: Ques. (Mr. Edwards 5406 (iii).
Sardine Canneries, Number, Location, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 2853 (ii).
Saskatchewan Boards of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. McCraney) 5751 (iii).
Saskatchewan Capital City: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Neely) 5620 (iii).
Saskatchewan Municipalities, Telegrams *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. W. M. Martin) 5534 (iii).
Saskatchewan Postoffices, Number not on Ry. Lines, Mail Service, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 6505 (iv).
Saskatoon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3010 (ii).
Saskatoon and Hudson Bay Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 111.'
Sault St. Louis Light and Power Co.: *See* 'B. No. 214.'
Sault Ste. Marie Canal, Upper Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6416 (iv).
——— Concrete Walls: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6358 (iv).
——— Lock Gates, Tugs, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6417 (iv).
——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie Labour Strike: Ques. of Priv. *re* Par. in 'Sault Express', 6359 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Cor. (Mr. Boyce) 6365 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie and Steelton Mail Service: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) in Com. of Sup., 6186 (iv).
Saunderson, Pauline Winslow, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 181.'

School Lands in Alberta, Revenues from, &c.: Ques (Mr. McCarthy) 1488 (i).
School Lands in Man., Sask. and Alberta, Procedure *re* Disposal: Ques. (Mr. McCarthy) 1345 (i).
——— M. for Ret.* (Mr. McCarthy) 1911 (i).
School Lands in Sask., Provincial Control, Decision *re*: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 3462 (ii).
——— Total Acreage, Amounts realized, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 1908 (i).
Schools of Navigation: in Com. of Sup., 5823 (iii).
Scientific Institutions: in Com. of Sup., 6556 (iv).
Scrip to Settlers in Northwest, Claims of Pioneers: Remarks (Mr. Meighen) on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 10121 (v).
— — *See* 'Interior.'
Scugog River Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) in Com. of Sup., 6424 (iv).
Seaforth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Seagull Dock, St. Joseph's Island, Date of Construction, Expenditure, &c.: (Mr. Boyce) 1319 (i).
Seal Fisheries, Negotiations: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 9594 (v).
——— Cor *re*: Remarks (Mr. Sproule) 10196 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 10337 (v).
——— *See* 'Pelagic'.
Secretariat at London: Inquiry for Papers (Mr. Foster) 1506 (i), 5836 (iii).
——— *See* 'Imperial Conference.'
Sec. of State, Deptl. Rep.: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 7 (i).
——— Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1472 (i).
Secret Commissions: *See* 'B. No. 81.'
Sections 11, 12, 14, 22 in Twp. 10, Range 22, Applications *re*: M. for Copies* (Mr. Wallace) 980 (i).
Security Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Seeds and Farm Weeds: in Com. of Sup., 6213 (iv).
Seed Grain for Immigrants: in Com. of Sup., 3836 (ii).
Seed Grain: in Com. of Sup., 6047 (iv), 9551 (v).
Seed Grain Indebtedness, Amount still owing by Farmers: Ques. (Mr. MvCraney) 3848 (ii).
——— Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 3225 (ii).
Seed Grain, Quality and Price: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 8041 (v).
Seeds, Inspection of: *See* 'B. No. 157.'
Selkirk Exhibition: Remarks (Mr. Staples) in Com. of Sup., 9076 (v).
——— *See* "Winnipeg.'
Selkirk Postoffice Box: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (v).
Selkirk Route, Welland Canal: Remarks (Mr. Sealey) in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Semmens, Rev. John, Payments to *re* Indians, N. W. T.: in Com. of Sup., 6036 (iv).
Senate, Abolition of: Prop. Res. (Mr. Lancaster) 2680 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Lancaster) re Discussion, 1726 (i).
Senate Amendments to Public Bills, Consideration of: Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 3845 (ii).
Senate Chamber, Expenditure for Decorating, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 1100 (i).
Senate of Canada, Cost for each year from 1896 to 1911: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Foster) 1339 (i).
——— Correction in Motion (Mr. R. L. Borden) 1453 (i).
——— Inquiry (Mr. Foster) for Ret., 1805 (i).
Senate Messenger: in Com. of Sup., 6166 (iv).
Senate, Preparation of Address to His Ex.: in Com. of Sup., 6167 (iv).
Senate of Canada, Reform of: Prop. Res. (Mr. M. Y. McLean) 4306 (iii).
Senate Stationery: Remarks (Mr. Speaker) in Com. of Sup., 6337 (iv).
Senate Vacancy from P. E. I., Complaints *re*: Remarks (Mr. Fraser) 2072 (ii).
Sessional Clerks, House of Commons: in com. of Sup., 6167 (iv)
——— Application *re* Increase of Salary: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5404 (iii).
——— Names, Age, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Sproule) 980 (i).
Seven Islands Wharf, Total Cost, Revenue &c.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 4825 (iii).
Sevigny Island, Change of Name, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 1491 (i).
Sewage, Disposal of. *See* 'B. No. 122,' also 'Ottawa City.'
Shad Fisheries Commission, Names, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 3607 (ii).
Shafting imported, Quantities and Values since April, 1910: Ques. (Mr. Wallace) 7593 (iv).
Sharbot Lake Postoffice Building: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 2095 (ii).
Shawinigan Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1890 (i).
Sheep and Lambs imported into Canada from U. S., &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8987 (v).
Sheet Steel Co., Emplymt. of Men *re* Ice Blockades, Remarks (Mr. Broder) in Com. of Sup., 6415 (iv).
Shelbourne Rural Mail Delivery: Remarks (Mr. Best) in Com. of Sup., 6069 (iv).

Sheldon, C. D., Action of Govt., re Returning to Canada: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong 6200 (iv).
——— Illegal Use of Mails: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 1364 (i).
——— *See* 'Mails.'
Shipbuilding: in Com. of Sup., 6484 (iv).
——— *See* 'Marine.'
Shipping from Guysborough County, Number of Vessels, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4467 (iii).
Shipping Registration: in Com. of Sup., 5826 (iii).
Ships, Load Lines: *See* 'B. No. 98.'
Shipwrecks on B. C. Coast, Inspection *re* Loading Vessels, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 7257 (iv).
Shipwrecked Seamen, Care of: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Sick Mariners' Dues: *See* 'B. No. 155.'
Sick Mariner's Dues, Amount of Money in Trust, Investment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9993 (v).
——— Law *re* Payment of Dues: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 1904 (i).
Sick Seamen: in Com. of Sup., 6567 (iv).
Signal Service: in Com. of Sup., 6502 (iv).
Simcoe, Grey and Bruce Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 83.'
Sinclair, Mr. John, Indian Inspector, Employment by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Bradbury) 6272 (iv).
Six Nation Indians Reserve, Grant to Merrill to bore for Natural Gas, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Ames) 1500 (i).
Small Pox Epidemic, Sanitary Condition of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 7252 (iv).
——— *See* 'Ottawa', &c.
Smelt Fishing in N.S., Pet. *re* Change for Open Season: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 9984 (v).
Soil Fertility, Memorandum from Experimental Farm: Read (Mr. Armstrong) 5965 (iv).
Songhees Indian Reserve: *See* 'B. No. 179.'
Sorel Shipyard, Buoys stolen, Investigation *re*: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7216 (iv).
——— Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7026 (iv).
——— Complaints *re* Thefts: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1088 (i).
——— Dismissal of Mr. A. Senecal: Remarks Mr. Blondin) 5732 (iii).
——— Rep. of Commissioner *re* Investigation: Inquiry for (Mr. Monk) 10096, 10203 (v).
——— Instructions to Commissioners: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7039 (iv).
——— Investigation into Irregularities: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6758 (iv), 9994 (v).
Sorel Shipyards: *See* 'Priv. and Elections.'
Soulanges Canal, Claim for Damages *re* Mr. Denis Martin: Ques. (Mr. Boyer) 2852 (ii).
——— Electric Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Leaks and Trimming Slopes: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
——— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6389 (iv).
——— Protection Works, Upper Entrance: in Com. of Sup., 6390 (iv).
——— Rep. of Mr. Boyer *re* Administration of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 6273 (iv).
Souris Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3019 (ii).
S. African Parlt, Rep. of Postmaster General: Remarks (Mr. Perley) 1580 (i).
Southern Central Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 84.'
South Grey Appointments: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 3344 (ii).
South Ont. Pacific Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 33.'
S. W. ¼ Section 10, Twp. 38, Range 15, 2nd Meridian, Applications *re* Entry, &c.: M. for Copy* (Mr. Lake) 1501 (i).
——— *See* 'Lands.'
Speakers' Chambers, Articles bought from Sacred Heart Tombola: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 926 (i).
——— Expenditure *re* Pianos: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
——— Purchase of Birds: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
——— Purchase of Glassware: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 928 (i).
——— Purchasing Gramophone Records: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 927 (i).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Speaker's Gallery, Discourtesy to Clergymen: Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 269 (i).
Speaker of House of Commons, wearing of Official Robes on State Occasions, Procedure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 705 (i).
Speech of Min. of Ag. on Reciprocity in Montreal: Ques. of Prv. (Mr. Lake) 6199 (iv).
Speeches of Prime Minister, Distribution by Postmasters: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 9071, 9253 (v).
Speech from Throne: Read (Mr. Speaker) 2 (i).
Springhill Mines Strike, Conciliation Board *re* Labour Dept.: Remarks (Mr. Crosby) 4236 (iii).
——— Further Information: Stmnt. (Mr. King) 2740 (ii).
——— Present Condition: Information *re* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
——— Remarks *re* Militia (Mr. Blain) 2641 (ii).
——— *See* 'Labour.'

Stamp Cancelling Machines, Cost, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 806 (i).
Stamps, New Issue by P. O. Dept.: in Com. of Sup., 4280 (iii).
——— *See* 'Post Office.'
Stamp Vending Machines: *See* 'B. No. 104.'
'Stanley' Str., Officers and Crew, Names, Residence, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1910 (i).
Stapleton, Dalton Mabel, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 141.'
Statistics of Comparative Prices in U. S. and Canada *re* Reciprocity: on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, (Mr. Perley) 6769; Amt. Neg. (Y. 64; N. 98) 6837 (iv).
——— Vote of Member for Labelle, Questioned (Mr. Perley) 6839 (iv).
Statistical Tables of Prices *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. J. D. Reid) 6840 (iv); Accepting as Read and Printing in Hansard (Mr. Hughes) 6840 (iv).
——— Mess. to President Taft *re* Request for Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 4471 (iii).
——— Reply of Dep. Min. of Trade and Commerce (Mr. Perley) 6508, 6675 (iv).
——— Special Rep. Comparative Prices, Printing of: Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) 10469 (v).
——— Special Rep. M. (Mr. King) to print, 10590 (v).
——— Papers laid on Table (Mr. Fisher) 10590 (v).
——— Special Rep. of Comparative Prices laid on Table (Mr. King) 10468; M. to Print, 10590 (v).
——— Stmnt. in White Book, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 10193 (v).
Statistics, Distribution of: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 2737 (ii).
Statistics from U.S., Information re: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4931 (iii).
——— U. S. Govt. Publication *re* Bureau of Statistics: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6673 (iv).
Statutes, French Edition, Corrections in Translation: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 8088 (v).
Steamboat Inspection: in Com. of Sup., 6572 (iv).
Steamer 'Scotia,' New Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii).
Steamship Subsidies: *See* 'B. No. 103.'
Steam Trawlers, Application *re* Fishing Bounty: Ques. Mr. Jameson) 4046 (iii).
——— Negotiations *re* Prohibiting: Prop. Res. (Mr. Sinclair) 3074 (ii).
——— 'Wren' and 'Croquette', Registration in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Sinclair) 4046 (iii).
Steel Bounties, Govt. Inspectors, Salaries, Payments, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5936 (iv).
——— See 'Iron.'
Steel Company of Canada, Date of Incorporation, Capital, &c.: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 9690 (v).
Steel and Iron Bounties, Subsidies *re*: M. for Memorials* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 3948 (ii).
——— Intention of Govt. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 6613 (iv).
Sterling Trusts Corporation: *See* 'B. No. 32.'
Stone Cut, Duty between U. S. and Can., Value, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 1287 (i).
Strathcona Public Building; in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Sub-Target Guns, Number purchased, Price, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Blain) 10335 (v).
——— Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 8583 (v).
Suburban Ry. Tickets: *See* 'B. No. 78.'
Sudbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2626 (ii).
Summerland Farmers' Institute, &c. Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Burrell) 5549 (iii).
Summerland 'Review,' Editorial *re* Fruit Growers: Read (Mr. Paterson) 4123 (iii).
——— Ques. of Order (Mr. Sproule) *re* Obstruction by Minister of the Crown 4124. Ruling (Mr. Speaker) 4124 (iii).
Summerside Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 1609 (i).
Superannuation *re* Postal Clerks: in Com of Sup., 4284 (iii).
Supply Bills: See 'Bills Nos. 128, 160 and 225'
Supply: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com, 695 (i).
Supply for Public Works: Remarks (Mr Owen) 10354 (v).
Supply Schedules, Proportion of Votes Presented (Mr. Fielding) 9566 (v).

SUPPLY—
Committee—
Arts, Agriculture and Statistics:
Archives, 6184 (iv).
Dairying Industry, &c., 6234 (iv).
Dom. Exhibition, Grant, 9089 (v).
Exhibitions, 3775 (ii), 9076 (v).
Farm Bulletins, Printing, &c., 6185 (iv).
Health of Animals, 5955 (iv).
Patent Record, 6184 (iv).
Seed Control Act, 6213 (iv).
Tobacco Industry, 6262 (iv).
Year Book, 6184 (iv).
Charges of Management:
Foreign Coin in Circulation, 6059 (iv).
Civil Government:
Agriculture, 1474 (i), 5954 (iv).
Customs, 1048 (i), 5992 (iv).
Depts., Generally, 1486 (i).
External Affairs, 1472 (i).
Gov. Gen's. Sec's. Office, 1013 (i).
High Commissioner's Office, 1486 (i).
Indian Affairs, 4725 (iii).
Inland Revenue, 1047 (i).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Civil Government—*Con.*

Interior, 4726 (iii).
Justice, 1014 (i).
Labour, 1484 (i).
Marine and Fisheries, 1463 (i).
Militia, 1020 (i).
Mines, 1475 (i).
Post Office, 4280 (iii), 6062, 6068 (iv).
Privy Council Office, 1013 (i), 8750 (v).
Public Works, 1032 (i), 5993 (iv).
Railways and Canals, 1473 (i).
Secretary of State, 1472 (i).
Trade and Commerce, 1485 (i).

Customs:

Salaries, &c., 5993 (iv).

Dominion Lands:

Salaries, &c., 5552, 5581 (iii).

Dominion Police:

Gratuity to Constable Shore, 6161 (iv).

Fisheries:

Building Fishways, &c., 6659 (iv).
Can. Fisheries Exhibit, 6661 (iv).
Compensation to Wm. Robichaud, 6105, 6159 (iv).
Fresh Fish Transportation, 6092 (iv).
Legal Expenses, 6661 (iv).
Licenses, 6160 (iv).
Oyster Culture, 6661 (iv).
Protection Service, 3807 (ii).
Salaries of Inspectors, &c., 6613 (iv).

Geological Survey:

Explorations, 9551 (v).

Immigration:

Agents' Salaries, &c., 5165 (iii).
Contingencies, &c., 5196 (iii), 6047 (iv).
General Vote, 4739 (iii).
Seed Grain, 3836 (ii), 6047 (iv).
Winnipeg Hospital, 5208 (iii).

Indians:

Alberta, 6046 (iv).
North West, 6036 (iv), 8884 (v).
Nova Scotia, 6036 (iv).
Quebec, 6035 (iv).

Justice:

Exchequer Court, 6160 (iv).

Labour Dept.:

Combines Investigation Act, 4280 (iii).
Conciliation, &c., 3378, 3393 (ii), 6057 (iv).
Labour Gazette, 4229, 4232, 4241 (iii).
Technical Education Commission, 3801 (ii).

Legislation:

House of Commons, 6167, 6175 (iv).
Printing, Stationery, &c., 6175 (iv).
Senate, 6166 (iv).

Lighthouse and Coast Service:

Agencies, Rents, &c., 6454 (iv).
Aids to Navigation, 6455 (iv).
Allowance to Mrs. Kerr, 6091 (iv).
Construction of Lighthouses, 6470 (iv).
Ice Breaking, 6500 (iv).
Lifting Buoys at Amherstburg, 6091 (iv).
Lighthouse and Buoy Steamer, 6546, 6550 (iv).
Lime Kiln Crossing, 6545 (iv).
Maintenance and Repairs, 6455 (iv).
Pensions to Pilots, 6091, 6533 (iv).

SUPPLY—*Con.*

Committee—*Con.*

Lighthouse and Coast Service—*Con.*

Repairs to Maritime Road, 6542 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances to Keepers, 6454 (iv).
Signal Service, 6502 (iv).
Steamer 'Eureka', 6502 (iv).
Telephone Reporting Stations, 6538 (iv).
Trade to the Orient, Report on, 6092 (iv).
Wharf Repairs, 6538 (iv).

Mail Subsidies and SS. Subventions:

General Vote, 6058 (iv), 8752, 8788 (v).

Marine Hospitals:

Shipwrecked Seamen, 6572 (iv).
Sick Seamen, 6566 (iv).

Militia:

Allowances, 8514, 8528 (v).
Customs Duties, 6054 (iv).
Military College, 6054 (iv).
Winnipeg Rifle Range, 6053 (iv).

Miscellaneous:

Banff Waterworks, 6052 iv).
Can. National Parks, 6049 (iv).
Dom. Forestry Convention, 6052 (iv).
Imperial Conference, Expenses, 8679 (v).
Members' Contingent to Coronation, 8679 (v).
Paris Agency, 8694 (v).
Pelagic Sealing Conference, 8678 (v).
The Hague Tribunal, 6164 (iv), 9560 (v).

Mounted Police:

Coronation Contingent, 8752 (v).
Pay of Force, 8598 (v).
Subsistence, Forage, &c., 8599 (v).

Ocean and River Service:

'Arctic,' Str., 6089 (iv).
Cattle Inspection, 5828 (iii).
Compensation to Major Moodie, 6089 (iv).
Examination of Masters and Mates, 5821 (iii).
Maintenance and Repairs, 5811 (iii).
Obstructions in Navigable Waters, Removal, 5826 (iii).
Patrolling Northern Waters, 5829 (iii).
Registration of Shipping, 5826 (iii).
Rewards for Saving Life, 5822 (iii), 6090 (iv).
Schools of Navigation, 5823 (iii).
Winter Mail Service, 5828 (iii).
Wrecking Plants, 5829 (iii).

Post Office:

Mail Service, 4296 (iii), 6073, 6179 (iv).
Miscellaneous, 6182 (iv).
Salaries and Allowances, &c., 6178 (iv).

Public Works—Capital:

Buildings:

Archives, Ottawa, 5993 (iv).

Harbours and Rivers:

Port Arthur, &c., 5994 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., 6021 (iv).

Marine Department:

St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 6554 (iv).

Public Works—Income:

Buildings:

British Columbia, 3012-3018 (ii).
Generally, 3156-3161 (ii), 6026 (iv).
Manitoba, 2969, 3018-20, 3029-3054 (ii).

SUPPLY—*Con.*
Committee—*Con.*
Public Works—Income—*Con.*
Buildings—*Con.*
New Brunswick, 1603-1624 (i).
Nova Scotia, 1581-1603, 1625-1639 (i), 9500-09 (v).
Ontario, 2088-2150, 2361, 2582-2594, 2602-2638, 3156 (ii), 6033 (iv), 9551 (v).
Quebec, 1639, 1665-1682, 1685-1710, 1860-1903 (i), 2567, 3144 (ii).
Rents, Repairs, &c., 3161-3180, 3186-3218 (ii), 6027 (iv), 8872 (v).
Saskatchewan and Alberta, 2970, 3001-3012 (ii).
McGill Scholarships, 6445 (iv).
Railway Commission, 6427 (iv).
Surveys and Inspections, 6452 (iv).
Harbours and Rivers:
Nova Scotia, 6029-6033 (iv).
Miscellaneous:
Decorations *re* Coronation, 9565 (v).
Telegraph Lines:
B. C., 6033 (iv).
Sask. and Alta., 6033 (iv).
Quarantine:
Salaries, &c., 5979 (iv).
Tracadie Lazaretto, 6187 (iv).
Railways and Canals:
Canals:
Chambly, 6356, 6408 (iv).
Cornwall, 6409 (iv).
Farran's Point, 6409 (iv).
Galops, 6410 (iv).
Generally, 6452 (iv).
Lachine, 6357, 6410 (iv).
Murray, 6410 (iv).
Quebec Canals, 6388, 6411 (iv).
St. Ours, Lock, 6395 (iv).
St. Peters, 6418 (iv).
Sault Ste. Marie, 6397, 6416 (iv).
Soulanges, 6389 (iv).
Rapide Plat, 6413 (iv).
Rideau, 6413 (iv).
Trent, 6419, 6453 (iv).
Welland, 6397, 6425 (iv).
Williamsburg, 6408, 6426 (iv).
Miscellaneous:
Arbitrations and Awards, 6427 (iv).
Gov. Gen's. Car, 6445 (iv).
G. T. P. Ry., Govt. Director, 6448 (iv).
Railways:
Intercolonial Railway, 5913-5930 (iii), 5983, 6338 (iv), 8513, 9560 (v).
Prince Edward Island Railway, 6352 (iv).
Scientific Institutions:
Astronomical Surveys, 9546 (v).
Magnetic Observatory, 6557 (iv).
Meteorological Service, 6563 (iv).
Surveys of Dom. Lands, 9547 (v).
Steamboat Inspection:
General Vote, 6572 (iv).
Trade and Commerce:
Chinese Immigration Act, 6058 (iv).
Commercial Agencies, &c., 6059 (iv).
Salaries, &c., 6059 (iv).
Unprovided Items, 6160 (iv).
Surveys and Inspection for Canals and Railways: in Com. of Sup., 5928 (iii), 6452 (iv).
Surveys, Militia Expenditure in each of last five years: Ques. (Mr. Nantel 1109 (i).
Sussex Street Govt. Property, Names of Owners, Prices paid: Ques. (Mr. Thornton) 6666 (iv).
—— *See* 'Ottawa.'
Sutherland, George Mackay, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 218.'
Swan Creek Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 6006 (iv).
Swertlove, Berel, Deportation by Immigration Dept., Complaints *re*: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 1723 (i).
Swift Current Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Knowles) 4119 (iii).
'Sydenham' Dredge, Earnings, &c. for 1910: Ques. (Mr. Middlebro) 2159 (ii).
Sydney Mines Diversion: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
Tadousac Postmaster, Dismissal, Charges *re*, Appointment of Successor: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5133 (iii).
Talbot, Hon. Senator, Applications for Irrigated Lands Reserve: Ques. (Mr. Magrath) 803 (i).
Tariff Negotiations &c., Prime Minister's Remarks in the West: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 26 (i).
—— Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 48 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Foster) 65 (i).
Tariff Resolutions, Par. in Moosejaw 'News': Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Knowles) 2639 (ii)
—— See 'Reciprocity.'
Taylor, Mr. Geo., Retirement as Chief Whip: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
Technical Education Commission: in Com. of Sup., 3801 (ii).
—— Completion of Work: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 1661 (i).
—— Progress *re*, Total Expenditure &c.: Ques. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1721 (i)
Telegraphs Act Amt.: See 'B. No. 116.'
Telegraphs and Cable Service,: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9636 (v).
—— See 'Parcel Post,' &c.
Telegraph Cos.' Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Telegraphers Board of Conciliation I. C. R. Statute re Grant: Ques. (Mr. E. M. Macdonald) 2853 (ii).
Telegraph Lines, Sask. and Alberta, Maintenance, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6033 (iv).
Telephone Co.'s Statements: *See* 'B. No. 197.'
Telephones, House of Commons: in Com. of Sup., 6171 (iv).

Telephones for Life Saving Stations on St. Lawrence Route: in Com. of Sup., 6539 (iv).
Tetagouche River Works, Rep. *re* Fishway: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 7806 (iv).
Thessalon Breakwater, Construction of: Remarks (Mr. Smyth) 10532 (v).
Thibaudeau, Mr. Frank, Payments to by Govt.: Ques. (Mr. Blondin) 8100 (v).
Three Rivers Harbour Commission, Interest paid, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ames) 814 (i).
Three Rivers Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Three Rivers Postoffice, Temporary Building: Ques. (Mr. Clare) 8984 (v).
Thunder Bay Ice Breaker: in Com. of Sup., 6500 (iv).
Tignish Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1602 (i).
Tilbury Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Tilbury Postoffice: Remarks (Mr. Lalor) in Com. of Sup., 1666 (i).
Tillsonburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2627 (ii).
Timber Licenses in New Westminster, B.C., Pets. *re*: Ques. (Mr. J. D. Taylor) 3222 (ii).
Tipping System, Abolition of: *See* 'B. No. 87.'
Tobacco Curing Experimental Stations: in Com. of Sup., 3161 (ii).
Tobacco Duties, Imports and Exports from and to U.S.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7025 (iv).
Tobacco Leaf, Total Imports, &c. into Canada for last three years: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 5405 (iii).
Tobacco Production, Encouragement, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6262 (iv).
Toronto Barracks, Erection of: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 7557 (iv).
—— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2153 (ii).
—— See 'Militia.'
Toronto Barracks Site (Baby Farm) Reps. Valuation, Cor., &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 981 (i).
Toronto Federal Buildings, Plan of Erection: Remarks (Mr. Macdonell) 8479 (v).
Toronto Harbour Commission: *See* 'B. No. 175.'
Toronto Island Lighthouse, Protests *re* Removal: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 2367 (ii).
Toronto Mail Collectors, Contract *re*, Fair Wage Clause: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3466 (ii).
Toronto Postoffice, Addition to, Changes *re* Specifications: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 805 (i).
Tower Clock, Parlt. Buildings, Complaint *re*: Remarks (Mr. Campbell) in Com. of Sup., 1901 (i).
Tracadie Lazaretto: in Com. of Sup., 1624 (i), 6187 (iv).
Trade and Commerce Salaries: in Com. of Sup., 1485 (i).
Trade Commissioners: in Com. of Sup., 6059 (iv).
Trade Commissioners for Canada, Names of Countries, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Paquet) 2156 (ii).
Trade Commissioner to Mexico, Date of Mr. Bouley's Apptmt.: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 8993 (v).
—— See 'Can. and Mexico SS. Subsidy.'
Trade Imports and Exports between B. N. A. Possessions and U. S.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. R. L. Borden) 4383 (iii).
Trade Relations with Germany, Negotiations *re*: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 8403, 8534 (v).
Transcontinental Ry., Commissioners' Rep. Presented (Mr. Graham) 7 (i).
—— Eastern Div., Total Expenditure *re* Construction, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lennox) 9430 (v).
—— *See* 'Natl. Transcontineneal Ry.'
Translator for H. of C., Apptmt. of: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 7015 (iv).
—— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Transportation—Georgian Bay Canal as a Waterway: Amt. (Mr. Monk) on M. for Sup., 5137; Ruled out of Order (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5163 (iii).
Transportation Problem, Stmnt. on M. for Sup., (Mr. Graham) 5039 (iii); Reply (Mr. J. Haggart) 5103 (iii).
—— *See* 'Canals', 'Railways', &c.
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Govt. Employees, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 1340 (i).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 3954 (iii), 8356 (v).
—— on Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Murphy) 4568 (iii).
Travelling Expenses of Ministers, Tips, &c.: on M. for Com. of Ways and Means (Mr. Geo. Taylor) 7432 (iv).
Treasury Board, Minutes *re* Bank Curators, Hour of Meeting: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 5136 (iii).
Treasury Board Minutes: Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 4659 (iii).
—— *See* 'Farmers Bank', &c.
Treaty of 1871 *re* Free Fishing in Canadian Waters: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7022 (iv).
Trent Canal, Floods by Damages: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
—— Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6419 (iv).
—— Lift Lock: in Com. of Sup., 6398 (iv).
Trent River Paper Co., Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Porter) 4117 (iii).
Truesdell, Frances Whittington, Relief: *See* 'B. No. 183.'

Trussed Concrete Steel Co. of Can., Ltd., Patent: *See* 'B. No. 188.'
Trusts: *See* 'Industrial.'
Truro Freight Shed Fire: Remarks (Mr. Geo. Taylor) in Com. of Sup., 5983 (iv).
Truro Increased Accommodation I. C. R.: in Com. of Sup., 5929 (iii).
Truro Political Meeting, Excursion Train over I. C. R., Instruction to Agents, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Stanfield) 2999 (ii).
——— Rates on I. C. R.: Explanation (Mr. Graham) 3343 (ii).
——— *See* 'I. C. R.'
Turkeys: *See* 'Blackhead.'
Tye, Wm. D., Contributions *re* Superannuation Fund, Allowance to Widow: Ques. (Mr. Macdonell) 3861 (ii).
——— *See* 'Ry. Mail Clerks.'
Unclaimed Balances in Banks: *See* 'B. No. 14.'
United Shoe Machinery Co., Application *re* Investigation, Govt. Representative, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Northrup) 2672 (ii).
——— Investigation *re* Combines Act, Govtl. Action *re*: Remarks (Mr. Ethier) 4300 (iii).
U. S. Army Deserters at Niagara Falls, Subjects of Extradition: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 707 (i).
U. S. Consuls, Names, Fees &c. residing in Can.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1727 (i).
U. S. Immigration Agents and Canadian Travellers: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 6119 (iv).
U. S. Immigration Officers residing in Can.: Ques. (Mr. Pardee) 1723 (i).
U. S.—Japanese Treaty: Inquiry for Copy (Mr. Foster) 7256 (iv).
U. S. Magazines and Papers, Postal Regulations *re*: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 984 (i).
U. S., Reciprocity with: *See* 'Reciprocity.'
U. S. Tax on Canadian Shipping, Legislation at Washington: Remarks (Mr. Barnard) 9247 (v).
U. S. Trusts and Combines, Regulations in U. S. Courts, &c.: M. for Ret. (Mr. Meighen) 4342 (iii).
U. S. Warships on Great Lakes, Armament of: Ques. (Mr. R. L. Borden) 7026 (iv).
——— Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6362 (iv).
——— Information from Official Sources, Delays, &c.: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6611 (iv).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Foster) 1571, 1805 (i), 2556 (ii), 5629 (iii).
——— Manœuvres at Chicago, Permission of Can. Govt. *re* passing through Canals: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 6116 (iv).
——— Permission to Traverse Canals: Remarks (Mr. Foster) 7253 (iv).
Universal Life Assurance Co. of Can.: *See* 'B. No. 127.'
University of Saskatchewan, Land Endowment, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lake) 4111 (iii).
Unorganized Districts in Northern Ont., Deferred Elections: Remarks (Mr. Arthurs) 10100 (v).
——— *See* 'House of Commons.'
Unprovided Items, Generally: in Com. of Sup., 6160 (iv).
Upper Prospect Breakwater: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Uxbridge Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2630 (ii).
——— Purchase of Site, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 1084 (i).
——— Tenders *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 9782 (v).
Vacancy, Arthabaska and Drummond Electoral District: Notification (Mr. Speaker) 1 (i).
Vancouver Bank, Date of Incorporation, Conditions complied with: Ques. (Mr. Foster) 3066 (ii).
Vancouver Chinese Immigration Frauds: *See* 'Immigration.'
Vancouver Customs Entries by Robt. Kelly, &c.: M. for Copies (Mr. Barnard) 713 (i).
Vancouver Dry Dock Subsidy, Nature of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 3469 (ii).
Vancouver and Lulu Island Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 21.'
Vancouver Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vegreville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Ventilation of House of Commons: Remarks (Mr. Black) on M. for Sup., 4473 (iii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Hughes) 4209 (iii).
Verdict of Montreal Jury *re* Masonic Property stolen: Ques. (Mr. Hughes) 7207 (iv).
——— *See* 'Masonic.'
Vernon Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3018 (ii).
Vessels Registered in Canada, Lists: Presented (Mr. Brodeur) 9690 (v).
Vessels Transferred between Can. and Newfoundland, Names, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 3464 (ii).
Veterans of 1866, Compensation to: Remarks (Mr. W. F. Maclean) 9999 (v).
Veterans, Grants to: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) on M. for Sup., 5211 (iii).
——— *See* 'Militia.'
Victoria Electoral Div., Convictions, Fines, &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Crocket) 7602 (iv).
Victoria Harbour, Ont., Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
Victoria Museum, Ottawa, Cor. *re* Foundation: Inquiry for (Mr. Hughes) 7666 (iv).

Victoria Meseum, Ottawa, Cracking of Tower, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. Sexsmith) 5937 (iv).
——— Cracking of Walls: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 9252 (v).
——— Expenditures *re*, Space allotted &c.: Ques. (Mr. Stanfield) 1975 (ii).
——— Inspection *re* Defects: Remarks (Mr. Owen) 7349 (iv).
Voters' Lists, Preparation of, on Stmnt. of Sec. of State: Remarks (Mr. R. L. Borden) 10455 (v).
——— Inquiry for Stmnt. ((Mr. R. L. Borden) 10096 (v).
Voters' Lists in Unorganized Territories, Proclamation *re* Earlier Date: Remarks (Mr. Boyce) 9900, 10142 (v).
Waddington Power Development, Rep. *re*: Remarks (Mr. Broder) 7210 (iv).
Walkerton and Lucknow Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No 34.'
Walkerville Postoffice Building and Mail Distribution: Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) *re* Staff, 2559 (ii).
——— Remarks (Mr. Wilcox) in Com. of Sup., 1702 (i).
——— *See* 'Post Office—Tilbury.'
Wallaceburg Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2633 (ii).
Wallace Wharfs, Application *re* Use of: Ques. (Mr. Rhodes) 1101 (i).
'Wanda' Yacht, Appraising by Customs, &c.: M. for Reps.* (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4678 (iii).
——— Changed from American to Canadian Register, Date, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 4300 (iii).
——— Date of Entry at Canadian Port, Notice to Customs Dept.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5933 (iv).
——— Length, Motive Power, &c.: Ques. (Mr. S. Sharpe) 5834 (iii).
——— Valuation of: Ques. of Priv. (Mr. Paterson) 5623 (iii).
Water Carriage of Goods, Complaints *re*, Investigation by Com. on Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Brodeur) 6905 (iv).
Water Carriage of Goods: *See* 'B. No. 210.'
Water-Carried Freight, Value, &c.: Remarks (Mr. Lennox) 6671 (iv).
Water Investigations *re* Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9550 (v).
Waterloo Public Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 2634 (ii).
Water Powers: *See* 'B. No. 49.'
Water Powers, Conservation of: Remarks (Mr. Monk) 7261 (iv).
Water Powers owned by the Dom., Legislation *re* Regulation: Ques. (Mr. Monk) 7803 (iv).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence, Concessions granted: Ques. (Mr. Lortie) 9780 (v).
Water Powers on St. Lawrence: See 'Long Sault.'
Water in Ry. Belt, Peace River, &c.: *See* 'B. No. 124.'
Water and Sewage Pollution: See 'B. No. 131.'
Water Supply to Parliament Buildings, Rep. of Agriculture Dept.: Read (Mr. Pugsley) 5401 (iii).
——— Statement (Mr. Pugsley) 2553 (ii).
——— See 'Ottawa.'
Waterways Commission, Apptmt. of Members, Reps. O. Cs.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Macdonell) 1339 (i).
Waterways Commission, International: *See* 'B. No. 36.'
Waterways Treaty: Prop. Res. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 695; in Com. on Res., 867 (i).
Waterways Treaty Bill, Govtl. Intention: Remarks (Mr. Turriff) 8895 (v).
——— Inquiry for Plans (Mr. J. A. Currie) 3681 (ii).
——— *See* 'International Waterways', &c.
Ways and Means: M. (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) for Com., 695 (i).
Weapons, Carrying of: *See* 'B. No. 86.'
Welland Canal, Enlargement, Change of Route, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 6397 (iv).
——— Enlargement, Memorial, Pets, &c.: M. for Copies* (Mr. Hodgins) 1500 (i).
——— Jane St. Bridge: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Stone Protection to Banks: in Com. of Sup., 6425 (iv).
——— Surveys: in Com. of Sup., 9563 (v).
Wentworth, Number of Govt. Appointments since 1904: M. for Ret.* (Mr. Blain) 2162 (ii).
——— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Blain) 2557 (ii).
Westbrook Mail Contract, Tenders *re*: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 1103 (i).
West Coast Trail, Vancouver Island, Amount expended, Estimated Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Barnard) 811 (i).
West Dublin Bay, Dredging: in Com. of Sup., 6030 (iv).
Western Alberta Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 135.'
Western Canal Co.: *See* 'B. No. 195.'
Western Central Ry. Co.: *See* 'B. No. 94.'
Western Coal Miners' Strike, Rep. of Conciliation Board, Settlement, &c.: Remarks on M. for Com. on Ways and Means, 9696 (v).
——— Conciliation Board: Remarks (Mr. Herron) 9070 (v).
——— See 'Coal.'
Western Farmers as Immigration Agents to Europe: Ques. (Mr. Roche) 799, 1284 (i).
Western Farmers Interests *re* Reciprocity: Remarks (Mr. Staples) 5543 (iii).
——— *See* 'Reciprocity.'

West Indies and Halifax SS Service, Arr ngements *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4674 (iii).
—— Specifications *re* Contract: Ques. (Mr. Crosby) 4925 (iii).
West Indies Trade with Canada: on M. for Com. of Sup., 6371 (iv).
—— Notice of Discussion (Mr. Foster) 6274 (iv).
West Indies Trade, Imports, &c., Total Value: Ques. (Mr. Macdonald) 2854 (ii).
Westmount Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1903 (i).
Westport Signal Stations, when erected, Rentals, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Jameson) 1091 (i).
Westville Post Office, Number of Bricks used: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 3471 (ii).
Wetaskiwin Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3011 (ii).
Weyburn Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 3012 (ii).
Weymouth Public Building: Remarks (Mr. Jameson) in Com. of Sup., 1601 (i).
Wharfs for Lighthouse and Coast Service, Maintenance: in Com. of Sup., 6538 (iv).
Wharfs. N.S., Contracts *re* Construction: Ques. (Mr. Maddin) 2160 (ii).
Wheat Prices in West and Canada and Liverpool Market: Ques. (Mr. W. H. Sharpe) 6267 (iv).
Whip, Chief Opposition, Retirement of Mr. Geo. Taylor: Remarks (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) 5 (i).
Whitby Post Office Site, Purchase of: Remarks (Mr. S. Sharpe) in Com. of Sup., 1867 (i).
Whitemouth River Fishway: Remarks (Mr. Bradbury) in Com. of Sup., 3034 (ii).
Wiarton Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 2636 (ii).
Wilhelm Telephone Factory, Seizure at, Compromise, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Lalor) 7601 (iv).
Williamsburg Canal, Electrical Equipment: in Com. of Sup., 6396 (iv).
—— Entrance Pier: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
—— Lockmaster's House: in Com. of Sup., 6408 (iv).
—— Machinery: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
—— Mooring Posts: in Com. of Sup., 6426 (iv).
Windsor Branch, I.C.R. Ry.: in Com. of Sup., 6352 (iv).
Windsor Govt. Dock, Establishment of: Ques. (Mr. Wilcox) 6272 (iv).
Windsor, N.S., Letter Carriers, Salary: Remarks (Mr. Black) in Com. of Sup., 6087 (iv).
Wingham Public Building Tower Clock, Expenditure *re*: Ques. (Mr. T. Chisholm) 6664 (iv).
Winnipeg Armoury: in Com. of Sup., 3052 (ii).
Winnipeg Board of Trade, Res. *re* Reciprocity with U.S.: Read (Mr. Lalor) 4121 (iii).
Winnipeg Buildings: in Com. of Sup., 3018, 3029 (ii).
Winnipeg International Exposition, Govt. Assistance to: Ques. (Mr. Sproule) 708 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. A. Haggart) in Com. of Sup., 5981 (iv).
—— *See* 'Selkirk.'
Winnipeg Rifle Range: in Com. of Sup., 6053 (iv).
—— *See* 'Militia.'
Winnipeg River Water Rights, Grants, Leases &c.: M. for Ret.* (Mr. A. Haggart) 2162 (ii).
—— Inquiry for Ret. (Mr. Bradbury) 3955 (iii).
Winnipegosis Fish Hatchery, Apptmt. of Keeper &c.: Ques. (Mr. Campbell) 4041 (iii).
Wireless Stations, Number, Location, Cost, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Armstrong) 2678 (ii).
—— M. for Ret.* (Mr. Armstrong) 1340 (i).
—— Remarks (Mr. Armstrong) in Com. of Sup., 6457 (iv).
Wireless Telegraphy on Ships: *See* 'B. Nos. 41 and 116.'
Wolfe Island Customs Official, Apptmt. of, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Edwards) 8099 (v).
—— Dredging: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6021 (iv).
—— Protection to Road: Remarks (Mr. Edwards) in Com. of Sup., 6413 (iv).
Wolfville Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1599 (i).
Woods Building: *See* 'Ottawa.'
Wood, Carriage by Water: *See* 'B. No. 210 & 212.'
Wood Island Life Boat Dimensions, Accommodation, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Daniel) 3224 (ii).
Wool in the Fleece omitted from Free List *re* Reciprocity: Ques. (Mr. Elson) 6264 (iv).
Working Expenses, Canals: in Com. of Sup., 6453 (iv).
Workingmen's Wages, Increased Cost of Living, &c.: Ques. (Mr. Ecrement) 3065 (ii).
Wrecking Plant Subsidy: in Com. of Sup., 5829 (iii).
Yarmouth Board of Trade: Res. Reciprocity, Read (Mr. Law) 5550 (iii).
Yarmouth Dredging Improvements: in Com. of Sup., 6031 (iv).
Yarmouth Farmers' Association, Res. *re* Reciprocity: Read (Mr. Law) 4122 (iii).
Yarmouth Public Building: in Com. of Sup., 1600 (i).
Year Book: in Com. of Sup., 6184 (iv).
Yukon Buildings, Salaries, &c.: in Com. of Sup., 3214 (ii).
Yukon Territory Ordinances: Presented (Mr. Murphy) 8 (i).